

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1939

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, we praise Thee that Thou art rich in those powers which fructify the human heart, in those voices which mark the path of holy living, and in that tenderness which makes earth brighter and happier. We unveil the cross and most humbly thank Thee for the Christ who made Himself of no reputation, took upon Himself the form of a servant, and gave the great world of humanity a vision of the Infinite heart; we pray that we may see His light slowly gaining on the shade. O Spirit Divine, make us pure in heart and fill our hands with brotherly benedictions. We beseech Thee to inspire us with deep, earnest, and reverent living; to find gems in the hard-beaten pathway; to wring comfort from ungenerous conditions; and to discern the royal way of life. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 194

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
October 31, 1939.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CHESTER C. BOLTON, late a Representative from the State of Ohio.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative the Senate do now adjourn.

The message also announced that pursuant to the foregoing resolution the Presiding Officer had appointed Mr. DONAHEY and Mr. TAFT as members of the said committee on the part of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the debate today on the motion to instruct and amendments thereto be equally divided between and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from President Wilson to Senator William J. Stone.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in three particulars: First, Shall free speech be responsible?; second, on the Statue of Liberty; third, on the new Rules of Civil Procedure, and to include a statement of the Assistant to the Attorney General, Mr. Alexander Holtzoff, on that subject. I have been informed by the Government Printing Office that the cost thereof would be \$146.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio speech I made last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a review of a book entitled "America's Chance of Peace," by Duncan Aikman and Blair Bolles. About this book a distinguished historian from Oklahoma, Mr. Marquis Jones, has said:

Truly it's a pertinent book. It has taught me more about America's actual position in relation to the war, the factors that may keep us out or may pull us in, than anything else put together that I have yet read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution unanimously adopted by the Missouri delegation touching the death of the Honorable Julian Friant, of Missouri, a special assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, a few days ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the W. P. A. situation in Minneapolis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from Edward E. Kennedy and also to extend my remarks and include a telegram from Mr. Ross McIntyre, of the Portland Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement from one of the officials of the Department of Labor appearing in the Department Bulletin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO A COMMITTEE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 322

Resolved, That E. C. GATHINGS, of Arkansas, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Claims as of June 2, 1939, and shall take rank accordingly.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

PREPAREDNESS OF BELLIGERENTS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE RESPONSIBILITY RESTS UPON CONGRESSMEN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, during his argument in favor of the lifting of the embargo so that we might aid Britain and France in arming for the World War, the gentle-

man from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] made this statement—RECORD, page 1127:

Here is this great disparity in sines of war to which we have so contributed through 6 years of preparation on the one hand and 1 year of preparation on the other, and it is an incontrovertible fact that the overwhelming sympathies of the people of the United States are favorable to the belligerents that have had the 1 year to prepare.

Conceding the accuracy of the statement that the sympathies of the American people are with Britain and France, the sad fact remains that if they are unprepared for this war such unpreparedness is the deliberate choice of their people and of their political leaders.

As long ago as November 13, 1936, Jack Beall, writing for the New York Herald Tribune, called attention to the statement of Winston Churchill, when, on November 12, in the House of Commons, Churchill, wartime Minister of Munitions and Secretary of State for War and Air, warned Great Britain that it had entered upon a period of danger greater than any since the German U-boat campaign.

Churchill denied the statement of Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin that at that time the defense situation was "reasonably satisfactory," and Churchill went so far as to demand a parliamentary inquiry to speed up arms production for a time of trouble, which he predicted for 1937.

Baldwin, speaking with—and I quote—"appalling frankness," gave as an excuse for not beginning rearmament sooner the political one that the country was pacifist throughout 1933.

That Beall was correct in his statement that political considerations, the apprehension of the Conservative Party in Great Britain, prevented that country from preparing for the danger of which Churchill then warned it, I quote from the official report of the parliamentary debate on the 12th of November 1936, which took place in the House of Commons.

Among other things, Prime Minister Baldwin said—and I am reading from page 1144:

I put before the whole House my own views with an appalling frankness. From 1933 I and my friends were all very worried about what was happening in Europe. * * * You will remember the election at Fulham in the autumn of 1933, when a seat which the National Government held was lost by about 7,000 votes on no issue but the pacifist. You will remember, perhaps, that the National Government candidate, who made a most guarded reference to the question of defense, was mobbed for it. * * * My position as the leader of a great party was not altogether a comfortable one. * * * Supposing I had gone to the country and said that Germany was rearming and that we must rearm; does anybody think that this pacific democracy would have rallied to that cry at that moment? I cannot think of anything that would have made the loss of the election from my point of view more certain.

And so we learn from the words of the Prime Minister of England himself in November 1936 that, because of party considerations, he did not take the issue of rearmament, of preparation for the threatened danger to the country; that he preferred party success to a campaign for British national security. These being the facts, there is now no excuse for urging that we must make good Britain's failure to prepare if she is not now adequately prepared.

Those who favor repeal minimize the charge that repeal is but the first step of a course which will get us into war. They add to this the thought that Germany may win the war and, if she does, we will be the next victim.

Those who oppose repeal scoff at the idea that, if Germany wins this war, she can or will attack us and we say that, by repeal, the war is brought one step nearer.

We all have our choice. If we who protest the repeal of the arms embargo win and, after the European war is over, Hitler comes to our shores, upon our shoulders rests the responsibility and to us falls the duty and the burden of defending our country.

Equally true is it that if those who advocate repeal prevail, and the husbands and the sons sail away to war, upon the shoulders of those who advocate repeal rests that responsibility, and the loss of the husbands, the fathers, and the sons who fail to return, who return maimed, crippled, and gassed, rests upon those who vote for repeal. From this responsibility there is no escape.

For myself, I choose the lesser risk, and this I do because, hard as it may be, I will not follow my emotions or my friendship into a position which will sacrifice my country, for I owe allegiance to but one land; that is to America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from a constituent in the State of Connecticut in defense of her position on the Dies Committee in their exposure of this list.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NEUTRALITY

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business pending before the House is on the Shanley motion and amendments thereto.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], in charge on his side, has used 6 hours and 25 minutes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has used 6 hours and 25 minutes.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] is recognized. Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply conscious of the grave responsibility which rests upon the House in passing upon the pending resolution, fraught with interest to every man, woman, and child in the United States. In these closing hours of debate, however, with the limited time allotted me, I shall not undertake to discuss the resolution in its entirety, but shall confine my remarks to the one controversial issue relating to the arms embargo.

There is a great deal of misunderstanding and misapprehension as to what the arms embargo is and the part that it plays in our neutrality legislation, and I want briefly to discuss the questions relating to it.

What is the arms embargo? When was it passed? Why was it passed? How has it worked?

I think I ought to be somewhat familiar with the history of this legislation relating to the arms embargo, since the Foreign Affairs Committee has handled all legislation relating to it, and I was chairman of the subcommittee which wrote the original Neutrality Act in 1935 and have been upon the conference upon the various bills. This enables me to speak with some authority with reference to its background and its history.

For 150 years we had no embargo on arms, but in 1935 we passed the so-called neutrality bill and one of its provisions was an embargo on arms to countries at war, or to neutral countries for reshipment to those at war. In the debate here and elsewhere it has been charged that the arms embargo is a barrier to war; that it is the heart of the neutrality legislation. I challenge the accuracy of both of those statements. The Neutrality Act of 1935 contained six distinct provisions, and those provisions, all except the arms embargo, had to do with questions which might prevent our becoming involved in war. An embargo on arms was placed in that bill and in the subsequent bills amending it, for one paramount reason, to discourage other nations from going to war. As I said in my speech when a former bill was passed to set an example, in the hope that other countries would follow our example and pass similar legislation and thereby discourage and prevent war. We realized, and everyone realizes, that the sale of arms has never involved us in any war. It did not involve us in the World War. It is not the sale of arms, but the delivery of arms and other commodities upon the ocean that has gotten us into war. I have listened to the debate in this House. I have read the debates in the Senate, and I have yet to find a single individual who has pointed out wherein the sale of arms has ever involved us in any war.

How has it worked? I say that it has not worked. It was an experiment. As was said of some other legislation, a noble experiment, noble in theory, but impractical in its enforcement and results. They say we have not been at war; that we have had it on our statute books and therefore it has kept us out of war. I say those who make this claim are wholly in error. The arms embargo has had no relation

whatever to our preservation of peace. Its enforcement has been most difficult. If we had wanted to pass a law that would have been fair and equitable and logical, instead of levying the embargo against only those countries engaged in war, we would have made it applicable to all countries, both in peacetime and wartime. If it was not unneutral to sell arms for 150 years to all countries, it is not unneutral now to sell arms to all countries.

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

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. No; not in the limited time I have at my disposal.

If we restrict it only to countries at war, then the effect will be, as we have found, that it has served not as a neutral act, while apparently neutral in fact, but wholly unneutral in effect, because it has played into the hands of the dictator nations. Instead of preventing war, instead of discouraging other nations from going to war, it has had exactly the opposite effect.

I have to go no further to prove this than to cite the statement of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY], who offered the motion that is now pending. He said, while presenting his argument in favor of the motion to instruct conferees to insist on retention of the arms embargo, that, in his candid judgment, if we had passed the legislation at the last session of Congress repealing the arms embargo there would be no war in Europe now. I think the gentleman was right in that statement, and I agreed with him while he was speaking; and if the gentleman was right in that, then why talk about the immorality of arms? Why talk about the people who may be killed and the blood that will be shed by arms, when it was that particular provision of the law—our arms embargo and failure to repeal it—which caused the rape of Poland, caused the death of thousands of patriotic Poles and thousands of Germans and destroyed and devastated Poland, and by this wanton military act gave part of Poland to Russia and the rest to Hitler.

If retention of the arms-embargo provision caused the present European war, which the sponsor of the pending motion admits, then why should we retain it upon our statute books when it has served as an encouragement to war and to the destruction of a sovereign state.

If the law will have that effect, it is unsound; it is unholy; it is unjust. Mr. Speaker, in the hearings before our committee it was disclosed that not only in Europe but also in the Orient the effect of this law, whereby we changed our policy of 150 years and stated we would not sell arms to countries at war, has served as an encouragement to dictator nations and, instead of preventing war, instead of discouraging war, has been an encouragement and an incitement to war. Any legislation that will do that, any statute upon our statute books that will cause that, ought to be wiped out, ought to be repealed, and that without a moment's delay.

But they say, "We cannot repeal it now; it is too late. We should have repealed it at the last session before war started." The attitude of these people who are now fighting repeal of the embargo is well illustrated by the story told yesterday by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN] of the man with the leaky roof:

I can't fix it while it is raining, and when it's not raining it don't need fixing.

We cannot change it now, they say, because the war is started; the whistle has blown; you cannot change the rules of the game after the whistle blows.

My reply is that we are neither the referee nor a participant in the European war, and we do not propose to become either; nor are we proposing to change the rules of the war game in Europe. We are only proposing to regulate the conduct of our own citizens here at home in the United States.

Oh, they say that you cannot change it because it affects countries differently; it will hurt Germany. If they are logical, if they are consistent, they would go further and oppose the cash and carry; but they are for that, but insist on retention of the embargo. Let us see about this. If it be not right under international law to change the rules of

the game after the whistle blows, if it be wrong to change the provisions relating to an embargo on arms because it would hurt Germany, is it not equally true that it would be unneutral to France and Germany to change the law by which we would restrict our ships and prevent our ships going to their ports and carrying them goods? What is the difference?

I say that it is inconsistent, it is illogical, and indefensible. No one opposes the cash-and-carry principle and plan upon the ground that that changes the law; they will vote for cash and carry, knowing full well that provision will hurt England and France. I say the argument that to repeal the embargo because it changes the rules during the progress of the game and yet pass new legislation to prohibit our ships from carrying goods to England and France, which will hurt them, is illogical, unsound, and unneutral. If it is unneutral to Germany, it is unneutral to France and it is unneutral to England.

They referred to Secretary Bryan and Secretary Lansing and their actions and correspondence during the World War. I have not time to take this up, but here is Secretary Lansing's position with reference to this matter. The letter written by Secretary Bryan in 1915 was written 8 months after the World War started. It was written in response to a request from one of the belligerents, Germany. Germany wrote the United States and asked us if we would not change our law so as to prevent the shipment of arms to their enemies. This is quite a different case from the present situation. We are proposing to change the law without any request from any belligerent, and there it was a request from one of the belligerents to change the law for their benefit only. Austria-Hungary 2 months later made the same request in writing, to which Secretary Lansing replied. I wish I had time to read the entire reply of Secretary Lansing, in which he defended the traditional policy we had always followed, but time will not permit, and I satisfy myself by reading now but one paragraph:

There is a practical and substantial reason why the Government of the United States has from the foundation of the Republic to the present time advocated and practiced unrestricted trade in arms and military supplies. It has never been the policy of this country to maintain in time of peace a large military establishment or stores of arms and ammunition sufficient to repel invasion by a well-equipped and powerful enemy. It has desired to remain at peace with all nations and to avoid any appearance of menacing such peace by the threat of its armies and navies. In consequence of this standing policy the United States would, in the event of attack by a foreign power, be at the outset of the war seriously, if not fatally, embarrassed by the lack of arms and ammunition and by the means to produce them in sufficient quantities to supply the requirements of national defense. The United States has always depended upon the right and power to purchase arms and ammunition from neutral nations in case of foreign attack. This right, which it claims for itself, it cannot deny to others.

The gentleman from Connecticut cited eminent international authority upon the proposition that the repeal now would be unneutral and quoted from three international lawyers to sustain this view. In reply to this I call attention to the fact that the New York Herald Tribune sent out a questionnaire to a number of international lawyers in which this question was asked:

Would the repeal of the arms embargo at the present time constitute, under existing international law, a violation of the neutral obligations of the United States?

Fourteen replies were received from international lawyers of eminence, professors of international law, teachers of international law, and textbook writers of international law. Of these 14 answered that it would not be unneutral, and only three, the ones cited by the distinguished gentleman, said it would be a violation of international law.

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

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am sorry, but I have not time.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I cannot. I would be glad to yield if I had the time, but I have only 15 minutes.

They talk about precedents. I want to cite ample precedents for changing and repealing the embargo in time of war

in our own country's history. In 1807 we passed during the war between France and England a general embargo upon all commodities and in 1809 when the war was still in progress we repealed that embargo, as we are seeking to do now. We also subsequently passed in 1809 an embargo not against France but against England alone and the war was still in progress. When we repeal this arms embargo we are following a precedent which we have set. We are following the advice of the majority of the international lawyers of this country. We are following the advice and the legal opinion of Secretary of State Hull and former Secretary of State Stimson.

Why should we not exercise that right if we believe its enforcement is impracticable and may get us into war. I believe with all my heart that if this war continues and we do not repeal the arms-embargo provision, we are going to be charged with being unneutral in its enforcement because shipment may be made to neutral countries and transshipment had to belligerents.

Since 1935, when the law was passed, we have only twice invoked the arms embargo in two small wars—the Italian-Ethiopian war and the Spanish civil war—and the State Department informs us that great difficulty was had in determining when shipments to neutral nations were not in fact intended for belligerents; and now, with a major war and many countries involved; how much more difficult will its enforcement be? You can very easily conceive, therefore, of the charge being made that we are unneutral in its enforcement because we would be permitting shipments to one neutral and not to another neutral.

Why should we not repeal it if it is best for our own country, if it is best for our own peace, if it is necessary to be fair, right, and equitable? Why not do it?

The United States has always boasted of being fair and of believing in international law and helping the weak; and yet the effect of this law, as has been pointed out time and again, is to permit nations that want to go to war to arm themselves and get ready, then unexpectedly creep upon other nations that are not prepared. They say that the war started on September 3 and now we can do nothing; our hands are tied; we are handcuffed. I call attention to the fact that last spring the President of the United States and Secretary Hull urged that this law be enacted and the arms embargo be repealed; that such legislation was initiated and all countries were placed on notice of the proposed change. We gave the dictator nations notice, but they never gave their victims—they never gave anyone—notice of what they were going to do. We started out to repeal this act in May and the legislation reached the half-way point. We passed a bill in June which the Senate was to consider next January. We did not repeal it entirely but modified the arms embargo by the adoption of the Vorys amendment. I call attention to the fact that we have not up to this time voted on the Shanley amendment. It was only the Vorys amendment upon which action was taken. That was a modification of the arms embargo—to strike out implements of war.

Why can we not change it now? The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] states that it may cause German aggression, it may cause them to sink our ships, but he makes no charge that the cash-and-carry provision, which will hurt England and France, may cause them to commit acts of aggression. If we have the right to change one, we have the right to change the other, and the motive for the change in the legislation should not be dominated by fear of any belligerent, but solely by the consideration of what is fair, what is right, and what is best for our own country. The gentleman from Missouri assumes that we are afraid.

When did it come to pass that a great country, the United States of America, that has always boasted of its independence and its right to make its own laws, shall take dictation from any foreign country, that we should cringe when we have a right to do what we think is for the best interests of our country by changing our laws? [Applause.]

We had a message yesterday which was evidently intended for the House of Representatives from the dictator of Russia,

in which he said that the arms embargo should not be repealed. What would they think of us if we should send them word that they must not change their own domestic laws? Is it because of the philosophy and the psychology of neutrality legislation that foreign nations think we are controlled by fear? Is it because we are willing to limit and restrict the rights of our citizens—and I am willing to do that to keep us out of war? We are willing to go that far. But it is going a little too far when we begin to patch up our own domestic laws at a time when we only have a partial neutrality law, and Russia says you better not do it; in other words, "Germany will get you or Russia will get you if you do not look out." That is not my conception of Americanism. That is not my conception of the spirit which should actuate legislation to be passed by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I resent—and I think this Congress will resent—any foreign government—England, France, Russia, or Germany, telling us how to pass our own legislation for the conduct of our own affairs and for the benefit of our own citizens. [Applause.]

The people of the United States have spoken on this question. The Senate of the United States has spoken by a vote of more than 2 to 1. Every poll indicates what the American people think about this proposition. It is up to the Congress to carry out the will of the American people, their views, their judgment, and their verdict, not for the sake of other countries but for the sake of America. I will close by admonishing you in the language of Cardinal Wolsey to Cromwell:

Be just, and fear not: let all the ends thou aim'st at be thy country's, thy God's, and truth's.

[Applause.]

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the country is tremendously interested in what we the Representatives of the country are about to do here in Congress. It is comforting to me to believe that the people, while profoundly interested, are not bitterly partisan in any way but on the contrary they are primarily interested in having the right thing done. I find that they are willing to listen to reason about the whole matter. They are definitely set in their judgment that we must stay out of war. They know in their hearts that there is no great question involved in these European controversies. They know that none of the great principles of liberty and justice and freedom that has made our country great is directly involved in these European controversies. In short and most emphatically they want us to stay out of war and to take that course that will most surely guarantee that we will stay out, and to take no step that will lead us into war. It shall be my purpose to respect this unanimous desire of the American people and vote against taking any step that I think will lead to war and for any step that I think will lead away from war. I think that in order to be neutral we must feel a sincere desire to act neutral. When two men are fighting I cannot be neutral if I rush to the aid of one of them and furnish him with a gun with which to kill his antagonist. Therefore, I shall vote to keep the embargo on arms and munitions and I shall favor strict shipping regulations that will keep our people and our ships out of danger zones as much as possible, and I shall favor such cash-and-carry provisions as will guarantee a sane and sensible attitude toward the belligerent countries and at the same time not put such restrictions on our own shipping as to drive it from the sea or from the legitimate lanes of commerce.

I felt that this special session of Congress should not have been called quite so soon. I felt and feel yet that until the various countries of Europe have indicated clearly their definite purposes we should not commit ourselves to any definite program. Until the lines are definitely drawn between the large countries of Europe it will be impossible for us to chart

our course. For instance until Italy has definitely indicated her course we should not indicate our course. In fact if Italy can remain neutral we surely can do so. So long as Russia maintains that she is neutral we surely should not jeopardize our neutrality. In other words there is no great principle of liberty or justice at stake so why jeopardize our people by permitting propaganda to warp our judgments. The people of Europe lay great stress on what we do. If we show by word and deed that we will not become involved in their constant quarrels they will settle down and maybe settle their differences.

I feel strongly that if we remove the embargo from arms and munitions and permit this sale to belligerents we will have taken a long step toward war. I know that it is said that we should have the right to sell to whomsoever we please and whatsoever we please. Yes, we can do that, and to carry that philosophy to its conclusion we can declare war against Germany if we wish to do so. When we sell arms and munitions and air bombers and all other munitions of war to England and France we cannot in good conscience then maintain that we are in fact neutral. It is not a fair argument to say that when we sell to England and France we are also throwing open the door to Germany to do the same thing, for we know that Germany cannot come to get these arms and munitions. With a great majority of the American people my sympathies lie with those countries that are fighting the battles of freedom and liberty as represented by democratic governments, but I do not think that the situation is such that we as a Nation need to intervene in their behalf by a declaration of war or by such economic and commercial assistance as will be tantamount to an open assistance, such as we would undertake if we were at war. It would seem to me that the lessons we learned in the World War are fresh enough in our memories to deter us from any precipitous action. In the World War we furnished first munitions, then money, and then men. We got back nothing but experience. We did not decide or help to decide any important question. We not only failed to assist the democracies but we apparently paved the way for the most fateful setback that democratic government has ever received. We paved the way for dictatorships with their antiliberty and anti-Christian purposes and programs. The World War did more in effect to retard Christianity than all the infidels of all ages have done. Russian communism, like a stealthy cat, is creeping over Europe. Hitler heeding his foolish desire to gain a great place in German history is losing sight of the enemy that he is permitting to come in at the back door. He is letting into Germany an influence that will challenge the best there is in the future generations of the German people—splendid as they are. They will not live with Russian anti-God communism and Hitler will find that it should be much easier for his people to get along with the French and British than with what Stalin represents.

Much has been said in these neutrality discussions about cash and carry. This phrase is a pleasant-sounding phrase. It is alluring in that it implies cash, which is a commodity, which by its scarcity measures the width and depth of depression. It surely has marked the greatest depth in the history of our country the past few years. We should not permit our need for an advance in business or our zeal for financial advantage to jeopardize our peace. We should not measure money against human blood and human happiness. No war ever paid for itself. War is morally wrong and economically wrong, while a few may prosper, many may die. In our great country there is plenty for all if we manage properly. The sweet music of the cash register is drowned out by the blare of the trumpets of war and the shuffling thud of marching young men. Let us be careful of our conduct. The peace and safety of 130,000,000 Americans hangs on our actions. I feel that a removal of the embargo on arms and munitions is a step toward war, and I shall not take it. On the contrary, I shall stand where we are and say to Europe, "You must settle your own personal quarrels. You can do so if you cease your struggle for power."

Mr. Speaker, I have the full approval of my course by my conscience, and I hope by my constituents that I am proud to represent. [Applause.]

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

Mr. SECOMBE. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose in these closing hours of debate to dwell at any length on the provisions of this bill. Every thoughtful Member no doubt has already made up his mind, and in the words of the poet:

He who is convinced against his will
Remains of the same opinion still.

As one who served in the World War and on foreign soil, I know the horrors of war; and while I have no respect for Hitler or Stalin, my chief concern is for the peace and security of America and my desire to see our country remain strictly neutral. I have always had the feeling that our chief concern at this time should be our enemies from within and not so much concern about meddling in the affairs of Europe. If any in this House should have a warm spot in their heart for the Allies, I should be one of them, as my mother and father were born in England and came to America and became citizens and raised a family of 10 children, but I am an American, and I am deeply conscious of the responsibility that rests on my shoulders in the passage of this bill; but I shall vote against that portion of the bill that will lift the embargo on arms and munitions, although I am in accord with that portion of the bill that all other goods sold to belligerents should be sold for cash on the line and transported in the ships of the purchasing nation.

I also am in accord with that part of the bill that prohibits American shipping of any kind in the zones of conflict, as well as to prevent all American citizens from war zones and areas of conflict. Although I personally feel that the only legislation that might be passed that will keep us out of war seems "known but to God," we must respect the opinion of all, and it is my conviction that we all desire everlasting peace and an end to all wars.

I shall also oppose that part of the bill which gives the President further discretionary powers, as I feel that power should be vested in Congress; and I am in full accord with Congress remaining in session to be ready for any emergency that might arise, and I shall vote against adjournment. [Applause.]

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

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up the time of the House to discuss this resolution at length, because on October 19 I spoke here in the House and expressed my views on the pending legislation.

I am just going to quote briefly from two paragraphs of that address and with a few comments, which I feel may be appurtenant to them, I shall not take up further time of the House. In that address I said:

To me the serious situation that presents itself to Congress is whether or not other nations have relied upon our position taken when this Neutrality Act was passed, and whether we now at this time can or should amend this act so as to help either one side or the other, or to place any one of the warring nations, or neutral nations, for that matter, in a different position than they were when the present war was declared in Europe.

After citing a number of authorities to the effect that should we change our neutrality law now, it would be an unneutral act, I said further:

To me there does not seem to be much question but what if we amend this act at the present time and lift the embargo on arms and ammunition so that it may be shipped to the warring nations, that we have committed an unneutral act sufficient to justify a nation that might take exception, to declare war on us for doing so.

I have listened to the debate here in the House on the resolution; I have read practically all of the debates in the Senate, outside of those I listened to personally; and I am more convinced than ever that if we vote to raise the embargo on the shipment of arms and ammunition to belligerents that it may and probably will lead to very serious consequences.

A great deal has been said here about the Communists and about Russia, and at the present time, even before we have acted on this bill, there is a war on now between the White House and Russia. It may be only a war of words now, but sometimes words lead to things more serious after they have been spoken. If we would have taken just one-tenth of the time in trying to put down the propaganda and acts of violence that have been going on in this country for the last 6 years, we would not have a situation facing us such as we have today. It was suggested yesterday by my colleague from Massachusetts that we recall our Ambassador from Russia. If this war of words continues between the White House and Russia, the chances are that we will not have to recall him but he will be sent home and we will be asked to recall our own.

That hard-working Member from California [Mr. VOORHIS] called the attention of the House yesterday to one of the most important things in this country, and that is the unemployment. If we had taken care of the unemployment in this country during the past 6 years instead of having so many on the dole, a good many American citizens would not have had to act as window dressers for communistic organizations in this country. When men are out of employment and hungry they turn to any organization which promises something better, and that is why we have the communistic organizations and the German Bund in this country today.

If anyone questions just what the belligerents are going to think about our repealing the embargo on arms and ammunition, as to whether it will be an unneutral act or not, just let me quote from what the Premier of Russia said in his speech of the 31st of October. I quote:

In any event our country as a neutral country which is not interested in the spread of war will take every measure to render war less devastating, to weaken it, and to hasten its termination in the interests of peace. From this standpoint the decision of the American Government to lift the embargo on the export of arms to belligerent countries raises justified misgivings.

It can scarcely be doubted that the effect of this decision will not be to weaken war and hasten its termination, but, on the contrary, to intensify, aggravate, and protract it. Of course, this decision may insure big profits for American war industries. But one asks, Can this serve as any justification for lifting the embargo on the export of arms from America? Clearly it cannot.

If anybody questions the purpose of the raising of the embargo, and whether we are going to help one side or the other who are engaged in this conflict in Europe, which is of no concern to us, all they need to do is to look at the Washington Times-Herald for yesterday morning and see the head line which says, "Allies wait repeal for 700 planes. One hundred million dollars worth of ships ready for war as soon as arms embargo is lifted." In New York, Baltimore, and at least three points in California a total of approximately 700 American war planes are in storage or nearing completion awaiting only repeal of the United States arms embargo before being shipped to England and France for use in the European war.

These planes, the bulk of them bombers, represent approximately half of those ordered by the Allies before the outbreak of hostilities September 3 and are worth about \$100,000,000.

In addition, French and British missions are said to be ready to place orders for another 5,750 airplanes, once the embargo is lifted, bringing their total investment to more than \$600,000,000. These are the figures given out as regards French and British orders delivered awaiting embargo repeal.

I was tremendously interested in the statement of my colleague from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], when he gave the example of the man who felt that he was to be robbed and asked to buy a gun, that he was going to be attacked. The hardware merchant asked him by whom, and he told him, and then the merchant said, "No; I am doing business in this community, and I have to remain neutral." Now, I can think of a much better answer than this merchant could have made to the man. He could have said to him, "No; you are deliberately planning to murder a man, and I don't propose to be an accessory to that murder." And applying that same reasoning to America, they can very easily say to England and France, and for that matter, to any other nation wanting to buy arms and ammunition: "No; this Nation, which is con-

sidered the most powerful nation in the world, and considered by other nations the most highly civilized, is not going to be an accessory to the wholesale murder of human beings, but we are going to do as all the other less powerful, and perhaps less highly civilized nations of the world are doing, and refuse to sell arms and ammunition to any nation when it is at war."

There can be no objections to selling on a cash-and-carry basis such articles as will sustain life and preserve humanity, such as food, clothing, and raw materials carried in the buyers' own ships, which will only have a tendency to advance and carry on civilization.

Let us, in these final hours of this debate, realize that our entrance into this war may, and perhaps will, be the end of our system of democracy, under which our great institutions have been developing during the last 150 years, and which have made us the greatest nation on earth. The greatest danger that could possibly face us is that of bankruptcy. We became prosperous by staying out of the last war. We brought on our great depression by going into it. When the time comes that it becomes necessary for us to repudiate our obligations or admit our inability to pay them, then our democracy ends. That is the reason that we have the war in Europe today, because at the end of the last war every nation involved in it, practically, was bankrupt, and it became necessary for them to repudiate their obligations. The result of that war was that since 1919 seven democratic nations, with population of more than 700,000,000 people, have fallen into the hands of dictatorship, and we do not need to think very much to realize that when it comes to this new war, that these dictatorships seem to all think alike. Communism sleeps easily with nazi-ism, and those whose views were the opposite a year ago, now see eye to eye.

George Washington gave us some very good advice when he said, "In all of your dealings with other nations, think of your own country first." We may sympathize with the Allies today, and, like my distinguished and beloved friend from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], may I say to you that every drop of blood that flows in my veins comes from people that are engaged on the side of the Allies today. I may sympathize with them, but I sympathize more with my own country, which needs the best judgment that I can muster at this time. That judgment tells me that we have here at home many unsolved problems; and what we ought to do is to try and solve these problems at home and let Europe solve their own problems without our help. Let us mind our own business at the present time.

We were able under the present neutrality law to stay out of the Ethiopian War; we have been able to stay out of the Japanese-Chinese War; we were able to stay out of the Spanish Civil War; and now let us stay out of this European war and keep the world safe for America when the time comes when we can be of real assistance to all of these warring nations, and we may be able to help them to a fair and just peace when they are through fighting. Let us maintain our high standard of living; and even though it be the last haven of peace and democracy, let us hope that we will be in position where we may offer our assistance in the way of furnishing our resources with proper security to help the warring nations to a just and lasting peace.

I shall vote to retain the present embargo. If we vote to lift it, and it brings this Nation into a war, which, in my humble opinion, it will, I shall be able to live the remaining years of my life with a conscience that will say to me, "You did not by your vote help to destroy humanity by lending your assistance to the killing of human beings."

If the embargo is maintained, America can always say to the rest of the world, no matter how long the war is prolonged, "We did not aid anybody in the destruction that only can come from arms, ammunition, and poison gas." [Applause.]

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

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, we know the definition of neutrality is "the condition of a nation which maintains a

policy of noninterference in conflicts between other nations"; and it is my intense desire to see that this great country of ours retains its neutrality in this present issue which had its beginning long before the present war began on September 1. To legislate neutrality is a difficult task, for true neutrality is absolute neutrality, when a nation abstains fully from any participation or interference in the war being waged; and America cannot have any neutrality if we are to follow the dictates of the President and lift the embargo now in force. Once that is done we shall be participating in commerce with warring nations and so violate the ethics of absolute neutrality, which would eventually mean our being drawn into war, and that seems to be the object of the administration.

I have no faith in the foreign policy of our Chief Executive. How could I have faith in the policy of a President who time and again has proven himself to be at odds with the vital issues at stake? He tells us our frontier is on the Rhine, while you and I well know that our frontier is no farther away than 3 miles east of the Atlantic coast. Again, he says it is up to us to defend the democracies of the world. But I say to you that it is up to us, first and foremost, to save the 130,000,000 people of our own democracy. Who are we to police the world and thereby involve ourselves in foreign quarrels, when we have problems of our own at home to solve?

Once again he voiced, in his famed Chicago speech, his opinion of those nations he termed the "quarantine nations." He mentioned the United States-Japanese Treaty of 1911, whereby abrogation could be made within 6 months if the necessity arose. He finally recalled that treaty, and the 6 months' abrogation period will be up in January 1940. Yet for 2 years he allowed arms and munitions to be sold to the Japanese Government for the express purpose of use in that country's undeclared war with China. I ask you, if he is sincerely for peace, why did he not have the treaty recalled when China was first attacked?

When war did come in Europe on September 1, the Chief Executive did not wait until the regular session of Congress would convene, but he called a special session on September 21 to introduce his ideas on the subject—and they were fixed ideas, as can well be seen. In his speech before Congress on September 21 he pleaded that the embargo be lifted. He declared that the only time we placed an embargo on our shipments was in 1812, and he implied that it caused our War of 1812. But, after careful research into all the records, I find that the embargo was lifted in 1809, 3 years before that war was begun, and, therefore, it could have had no possible bearing on the War of 1812. But such is the way the administration twists the facts to gain its ends.

At that, he did not call in the Japanese Treaty of 1911 until after the Bloom bill was defeated in the Senate. The King and Queen of England were visiting these shores at the time the Bloom bill was brought before Congress, and a Washington newspaper proclaimed that it would be a nice gesture if the House and Senate would pass the bill before the King and Queen left for home. But it failed to pass for the main reason that it delegated to the Chief Executive additional powers 27 times, and 7 more times delegated power to the Munitions Board, which he named. Had the Bloom bill passed and these powers been granted in addition to the already enormous powers held by the President under our Constitution, then Congress would have become merely a rubber stamp. Today we are faced with the Pittman bill, known as the neutrality substitute of 1939. It is, I say to you, only a rechristening of that Bloom bill.

Once more we have evidence of the insincerity of our President. He asked for the passage of the Neutrality Act of 1935 and the subsequent amendments of 1936 and 1937, and now he does an about face with the Bloom bill disguised as the Pittman bill and hopes to have the embargo lifted. This, I am sure, will lead us directly to war. The minute the Neutrality Act is weakened and we trade any war materials with any of the belligerent nations, then we no longer have absolute neutrality. I say that if the Neutrality Act as it

stands today is not satisfactory, let us make it so by amending it with the necessary changes, as should be done. Let us do this rather than lift the embargo, which will presage our entry into the war.

There are a number of schools of thought, however, in this connection. There are those persons who say we cannot possibly stay out of the war regardless of the embargo. To them I give as an illustration Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland. From 1914 to 1918, with war all around them on land and sea and in the air, they maintained absolute neutrality. And certain of these countries placed embargoes on the sale of war materials to the countries then at war. If they, when they were in the center of the bloody arena, could stay out of the World War, surely we can stay out of this war, 3,000 miles away from it. And to this school of thought I also say: These countries are the ones who today do not owe us any money, as do the warring nations who have not even paid up their interest.

There is the school of thought which cries that we need the business, that we should sell to the countries at war so that our factories hum with the work of production. To them I only need point to the 21 Latin American countries to the south of us. Our arms manufacturers—all of our manufacturers—could very well widen their South American markets.

Today we have only between 25 and 30 percent of the Latin American trade. The rest goes to European nations, those very nations now at war. There is no reason why we should not have practically all of that trade. For those who think that these countries south of us are only poorly developed wilderness, I ask that they check with their geography where they will find that their combined population is over the 100,000,000 mark. This represents a great deal of trade, and after all, why should we let other nations have that trade when it is we who, in the final analysis, must protect those countries against foreign aggression because of our Monroe Doctrine?

The entire issue is clouded in the maze of propaganda daily being fed to us. The metropolitan newspapers, the movies, and even the radio interests are using propaganda to achieve their aims. But the large manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and all other clear-headed, clear-thinking persons are fearful of losing our constitutional form of Government. And we may lose it if we follow the dictates of the Chief Executive and lift the embargo. How can we afford the cost of another war without bringing financial chaos to the best country in the world today? That is what we fear. Another war will cost between fifty and one hundred billion dollars, and that, added to our already staggering national debt of almost \$45,000,000,000, would most assuredly tear asunder our financial structure. This would mean the eventual repudiation of governmental stocks and bonds and other obligations. And when this happens, the constitutional form of government our forefathers fought and bled for, will be in grave danger. The founders of our great Nation fled from the selfsame persecution in Europe more than two centuries ago; and there are thousands and thousands of refugees fleeing the same conditions in Europe today. We cannot let it happen here.

What did the World War gain us? We lost in any way you look at it. In the 350,000 dead and wounded we lost the pride of young American manhood. And it has cost us, from the beginning of the war to the present date, almost \$100,000,000,000. Yet the few billions of dollars in trade we received during the World War amounts to less than half the amount Congress appropriated for peacetime measures in the fiscal year of 1939-40. That horrible sacrifice of our men, and the mounting total of its cost was said then to have been for the purpose of saving democracy, but I sincerely believe we only saved democracy for bigger and bloodier wars.

I say to you that we should, therefore, keep our Neutrality Act in force and not attempt to lift the embargo. Let us turn our efforts to the strengthening of our national defense.

The last session of Congress voted \$2,000,000,000 for this work, but I believe we could spend two or more billions in addition. I will support whatever requests are made by the Army and Navy engineers in order to increase the power of our defense, for I sincerely believe that the best insurance we can have for peace will be a national defense all other nations will be fearful of.

We have Senators and Congressmen, however, who are definitely pro-British and pro-French and who wish the embargo lifted in favor of those countries. I believe them wrong, for I believe that true Americanism is neither pro-British, pro-French, pro-German, pro-Russian, pro-Italian, nor anything but good old pro-American. Yet Senator AUSTIN, of Vermont, publicly admits he wants to aid England and France. He stated in a recent address—and I quote:

We must make it possible for Great Britain and France to get supplies. We do not need to ask whether the bill is neutral.

Senator BURKE, of Nebraska, declares that the lifting of the embargo would benefit England and France, and that he would want it so. Like the President's "quarantine" speech, and the idiotic statements that our frontier is on the Rhine, and that it is up to us to defend the democracies of the world, it shows us that the administration is not neutral, and that it intends, if possible, to help the Allies by any measures it can. But the administration does not seem to realize that once we sell our war materials to the Allied nations we lay our innocent ships, those of the merchant marine carrying noncontraband, open to the attacks of the enemy. And should one, two, or three American ships be lost, the United States would without question be drawn into the war. It is impossible for us to be just a little bit neutral and not give cause for war, or, at least, the type of reprisal which will cause us to enter the war. We cannot be a little bit neutral and still be honest.

Thus the administration is not honest. It lacks sincerity, and it is using the same tactics that almost ruined us in the World War and are sure to ruin us this time unless we stick to the truth and remain absolutely neutral.

The very purpose of the Neutrality Act—"to preserve the neutrality and the peace of the United States and to secure the safety of its citizens and their interests"—would be defeated with the passing of the Pittman bill and the lifting of the embargo. I assure you that I, representing the Ninth Pennsylvania District in the House of Representatives at Washington, will do all within my power to prevent the lifting of the embargo. I do not want to see the sacrificing of millions of American youth. I do not want to see our monetary structure and our constitutional form of government, which is the finest form of government in the world today, fall to pieces. I do not want to see any foreign "ism" take root and develop here.

So I say to you emphatically that I, as a Representative, will spend every available minute of my time in the endeavor to keep this great Republic of the United States free from the foreign entanglements which would draw us into the war and thence into oblivion.

We and our children must live in the world as we make it, and so America's future is important to all of us. That future depends on our decisions and our actions now; depends on our keeping out of war. And I assure you that my decisions and my actions will always be for a lasting peace. [Applause.]

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, for 6 weeks we have waited patiently for this House to have an opportunity to express its opinion on the proposed repeal of the arms embargo. That is the issue before us. Very few of us here oppose the strengthening of our Neutrality Act through provisions preventing our ships from carrying supplies to belligerents. Very few of us here today wish to see our people finance another World War. We are not as yet finished paying for the last one. But there are many Members here today—the majority, I sincerely hope—who cannot stomach the idea of our great Nation selling instruments of death for fool's gold—instruments of death, not only aimed at destruc-

tion of the soldiers of foreign countries with which we are not at war, but, more horrible yet, perhaps destined to carry their ill-fated message to thousands of women and children far behind the lines, messages of death from the people of the United States.

I condemn the proposed repeal of the arms embargo because it casts over our Nation the same sinister shadow that was with us in the years from 1914 to 1917—a belief fostered by the devil and his aides that our Nation could prosper by selling implements of destruction, a belief that our great Nation should shed the blood of thousands of American boys in order to prevent a crash in munitions-sales prosperity, a mistaken belief that we could help preserve democracy by fighting in European quarrels.

To repeal the arms embargo at this time serves notice on the rest of the world that the United States is unneutral; that we are definitely alining ourselves with the Allies. I want personally to see Hitler and Stalin uprooted as much as any man in this House. I want to see communism, fascism, and all kinds of "isms" but Americanism expunged from our beloved country. My immediate family made its contribution to the preservation of democracy in 1917. I am sure we would do so again today if necessary, as all good Americans would do, but with this proviso: For the United States only, on American soil, in defense of our Nation, and not fighting the battles of munition profiteers or to take part in ever-recurring boundary disputes in Europe or elsewhere.

I agree fully with two gentlemen who spoke yesterday, Mr. BARTON, of New York, and Mr. RANKIN, of Mississippi, who stated that we can best serve the cause of peace at this time by refusing to sell the trappings of war. Let us first see if there is actually a war over there. If it does materialize, let us give to the American people the opportunity to say whether or not we shall go to the direct assistance of the Allies. Why boost our country into this war through the back door and have our people wake up to find themselves in it eventually because of the passage by Congress today of the repeal of the arms embargo, because of the destruction today of our own neutrality. Today this war, so-called, is a game of international diplomacy. We always get the worst of it in diplomatic dealings with calculating foreigners. This war may not materialize into a real war if this Congress will show its desire for peace by refusing to encourage belligerents through the repeal of the arms embargo.

Each and every Member of this body wants to do what is right according to his or her views on this very serious question and also wants to keep our beloved country out of foreign entanglements and out of all wars. No man or woman who thought different would be fit for a seat in this place today. I accord to each and every one of you, whether you vote against repeal of the arms embargo or not, the credit for honestly desiring to do what your conscience demands of you.

May I call attention to one part of this bill that, through negative action, permits doing what I am sure that the bulk of the House would vote down if given the opportunity to do so? I refer to the sale of poison gas, which, if the repeal of the arms embargo prevails today, may be sold and shipped to belligerent nations by our munition makers—exported, mind you, from the shores of our great America.

The Senate saw fit to reject the Danaher amendment which had for its purpose the prohibition of the sale and exportation of poison gas from the United States. My only comment on the action of that august body is that I am proud of the fact that neither of the Senators from the great State of Minnesota were numbered among the 56 Senators who opposed this very humane legislation.

Mr. Speaker, any measure which, under the guise of neutrality, carries the damnable provision that permits munitions makers in this country to profit from the exportation of poison gas to belligerent nations—poison gas, the most despised weapon of war devised as yet by the ingenuity of man—out of our great Nation, supposedly dedicated to the preservation and not the destruction of mankind—I repeat, any measure carrying such provision, through negative action or not, does not deserve consideration on the floor of

this House. Any Congressman that votes for the repeal of the arms embargo today, without some perfecting amendment against the exportation of poison gas, may not have to answer to his constituents for that vote, but surely at times his conscience will disturb his otherwise well-deserved rest.

Think of the thousands of women, far back from the front lines, that you may by your vote today condemn to a horrible death, a death wrought in America, the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Death by bullets, shrapnel, or by artillery fire are humane in comparison to that by gas. The former is usually suffered by the soldiers in the front line, the latter has no regards as to whom it cuts down. Shall we here have it engraven on our memories that we have helped to enact legislation which makes it entirely possible for American manufactured poison gas to be dumped in bombs from speeding planes onto defenseless villages? Is this great Nation to descend to inhuman depths and foster the killing of women and children, not even in a humane way, as we would dispose of a crippled animal, but in the worst possible way permitted by the genius of modern invention?

Back home in Minnesota, when at times the rats become too numerous under our corncribs, I have used cyanide gas to exterminate them. I could see this gas, in imagination, as I was performing that necessary work of rodent destruction, slowly creeping down the burrows, heavier than air as it is and like water, finding its level—this same cyanide gas destroying all life as it came into contact with it. Are we in this House today going to pass this bill which makes it entirely possible to see this same thing reenacted, but this time with human beings as the victims, attempting vainly to run away from the approaching death that slowly wends its way down the valleys, choking the lives out of these people just as the cyanide gas choked the rats in our corncribs.

Oh, yes, you say, and think that this is an emotional appeal and is not based upon the hard realistic facts of war. My appeal to the House today, my appeal to you men and women, is based on a hard realistic fact, left to us by the last war—the fact of my brother for 20 long years in a Veterans' hospital with his wrecked mentality; the hard realistic fact of seeing the other 700 boys there suffering at that one hospital the tortures of the damned; and God knows how many American boys are in that same shape today—the number of this particular hospital is 101—suffering because of just such devilish inventions as poison gas and its kindred destroyers. I repeat, my appeal to you is based on just as realistic facts as can be arrayed before me. All I ask of you men and women today is to visit for 1 hour, if you have not already done so, the nearest veterans' hospital before you vote on this bill. Talk to the boys there if they are in shape to talk to you. Look at the living corpses fighting eternally their battles in the last World War. Then, my colleagues, if you still feel like voting for the repeal of the arms embargo, if you are still willing to vote for the exportation of poison gas, all I can say is that you have done your duty as you see it. [Applause.]

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on September 28 I publicly declared that I would vote for a cash-and-carry bill. I meant that when I said it, and I still mean it. I made certain reservations at that time, and that was that I would not vote for additional powers to the Chief Executive; and the fact that I had voted for the Vorys amendment on June 30 was serving public notice that I was against sale and exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent nations.

I now find that the bill passed by the Senate recently is not requiring cash settlement for the goods at all. It is greatly increasing Presidential power and lifts the arms embargo, permitting us to sell poison gas, liquid fire, and all other hellish instruments of war and destruction.

The people of the United States are against the manufacture and sale of these munitions. Mothers everywhere are

praying that the arms embargo be retained. British agents and propagandists in America today are doing all in their power to get us involved in this war, to again fight their battles. We have not yet recovered from the effects of the World War and maybe never will, and we ought to profit by our past experiences at this critical time and not be dominated by our emotions or political pressure. We should have but one thing in mind, and that is the peace and prosperity of America.

The bill we passed last summer has 16 solid pages stricken out by the Senate and 18 new ones added, making it an entirely different bill. Therefore, my patriotism and my constituency and my own common sense compel me to vote against the repeal. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Harter] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. HARTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, the administration is urging repeal of the embargo to keep us out of war, but, at the same time, is not the administration even now planning the expenditure of \$5,000,000,000 to network our country for war? If we are going to spend in getting ready for war, why should we not keep the embargo, conserve our factories and our manpower to better accomplish our complete national defense for which we all stand?

Mr. Speaker, while we are discussing the neutrality bill, what is going on in administration circles? Is it not true that while many of the Members of this body are here on the floor urging repeal of the embargo so that war profits will have a broader scope, that the administration is even now setting up this spending program? Is it not true that this spending program contemplates requests of Congress for about \$5,000,000,000 for this military network, but to be stated to us for the purpose of retrenching, due to the havoc that meddling will ultimately cause in this country? It is, or is it not true, that this program is a spending program, or is it for defense? I repeat, all of us stand foursquare for truly defensive expenditures.

Is it not true that we are going to be asked to appropriate this money for hospitals to be scattered throughout the country, with the understanding that they will be turned over for the care of our wounded? Is it not true that the administration wants to use that money for housing projects scattered in various places throughout our land, with the understanding that they will be used for barracks for our soldiers? Is it not true that we are to be asked to use that money to build military highways throughout our country, emergency airports, and so on—not for battleships, aircraft, anti-aircraft guns, conserving and building up our arms and ammunition supplies, and other similar measures of a defensive nature?

What is the story about this \$5,000,000,000 to be asked of us? Why is it not told to us now before we lift the embargo, so that, if it is given, you can levy the taxes on those who make the huge temporary profits as a result of lifting the embargo? Or do we later want to come in and either add the \$5,000,000,000 to our already huge Federal debt or collect it from those who are least able to pay and who will ultimately "pay the fiddler" in higher prices for the necessities of life resulting from our action here?

Why do we not tell the American public that the administration realizes full well that lifting the embargo will not conserve our substance, our factories, our man power, and so on, but that greater unemployment will follow the present war with all of unemployment's attendant horrors so well known to this country? Why do we not call the public's attention to our present huge domestic problems and get down to brass tacks in trying to settle those problems rather than lifting this embargo? Is the \$5,000,000,000 a cushion for that inevitable fall?

I repeat, we should go after our domestic problems and spend with the idea of building up our defense so that the nations of the earth will know we are prepared and have conserved our substance.

These are questions that should be answered to the rest of us in this body, as well as the public, who will have to pay the bill.

If the administration is not going to come in with any program such as I have asked about—and I am sure others have heard it talked about and read something about it—I hope those in charge will come out now and assure the public that there will be no after effects; that our substance is not being wasted and that there will be no such request for huge sums for the purposes mentioned; that the administration believes lifting the embargo is our best defensive measure and, above all, will permanently solve our crying domestic problems and pay off our nearly \$45,000,000,000 debt.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard it said that the bill passed in 1935, amended in 1937, and amendments to which we are now considering should not be called our neutrality bill, as it does not completely represent neutrality, as recognized under the precepts of international law. In this statement I cannot agree, although I will claim that the legislation strays from some of those precepts, and why not?

That question was answered at a time when passion, due to existing war among leading countries of the earth, was absent. It was answered by the Members of Congress passing the Neutrality Act, amended in the same temperate way in 1937. These enactments were well considered at a time of comparative world peace, when the United States and the present three warring nations were at peace, one with the other. After thorough, unimpassioned consideration, with the advantage of experience gained through horrible losses in life and resources, emerged the 1935 act with its amendments following in the same fashion in 1937.

In that legislation we have an embargo clause and we had cash and carry. Today we are considering amendments to our Neutrality Act. If we are considering amendments to a Neutrality Act, it surely is for the purpose of keeping the United States neutral under all circumstances. Today our consideration may, however, be befogged, although it should not. We should start with the premise of "what can best keep the United States neutral during the present and future belligerent outbursts"?

If we are impelled by that sole purpose, casting aside any affection and hate toward other countries or their leadership and sticking solely to that one impelling thought, "what can best keep the United States neutral," then we should, at least in our own minds, be able to come to a definite conclusion.

The Senate amendments are explained as containing cash-and-carry legislation. In examining it I found reasonable "carry" legislation, but I fail to find "cash" legislation, or let us call it "sufficient" legislation against extending credit to belligerents. So many thousands of pages of words have been printed about these amendments, but lack of emphasis, in my mind, has been placed on its lack of restriction against extending credit to belligerents.

It makes a feeble effort to legislate against dealing in securities of the belligerent governments issued after the date of the President's proclamation naming such government at war. It makes a feeble effort to legislate against extending credit only in regard to sale of arms, ammunition, and the like.

These clauses are so weak that I defy anyone conversant with the legislation to prove to me that it cannot, in each instance, be absolutely circumvented. Does the present legislation put any commodities dealt in with belligerents on a cash basis other than arms and ammunition? It does not, so why call any part of the Senate legislation a cash-and-carry section? Strip it of this misleading description and tell the public that it does not stop merchandise coming from this country reaching a belligerent on a credit basis. The American people want to stop such credit transactions. They think the legislation provides for cash on the barrel head, and that it stops our interest in belligerent securities. Let us go the whole way, and let them know that it does not.

Now, what about the embargo?

It was good enough before our blood pressure had cause to rise because of the present embroilment. It was good

enough for the law in 1935—in effect up to the present time—with protection for trade on inland waterways. Surely nothing has honestly happened to make the embargo less beneficial to the neutrality of the United States. That neutrality is our all-controlling objective.

We of the Niagara frontier are confronted with the old St. Lawrence waterway project. Simultaneously, with announcement of the Senate's action, the people of our section were caused to sit up straight in bed when the same paper carried the news that the St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty was "dusted off." It has been dead for a long time, but strangely enough the leaders of Canada, at just this time when the Senate acted favorably, and the House was about to consider the amendments to lift the embargo, decide that they will reconsider and sit down and discuss the matter with our leaders who have always pushed this phantom project. Was it timed to catch some congressional votes for repeal of the embargo—votes that might be affected feeling that the St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty would help their section—or is there some understanding that lifting the embargo will produce favorable consideration of the treaty by the Premiers of Ontario and Quebec? The Premiers of these provinces blocked action before, for which they should have the blessing of the Canadian people, as well as the American people, but why should the change in front happen to come at this psychological moment?

We have heard and read arguments on this legislation for months and should come to our conclusions dispassionately, having the one controlling objective before us: What is best for the neutrality of our land? My decision is to support the arms embargo, and I hope that the Senate amendments, with additional amendments keeping the embargo in our law and making a truly "cash" section are finally adopted as a result of this special session. That, to my mind, is what is now best for the neutrality of our land. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, however this vote may go, I am sure that when the roll is called it will represent the most heart-searching vote that has been cast in this House since I have been a Member. No one could hear the speeches that were made yesterday and that have been made throughout this debate and fail to believe that every man, when the time comes for him to answer, will be answering the deepest purposes of patriotism and honest conviction that he has. If mistakes are made they will be mistakes of information and not of intent.

With this in mind, I wish to refer to one or two points in the speech of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] which was just concluded.

PRESENT LAW BANS DELIVERY

The gentleman from Texas said that the thing that got us into trouble in the last war was not the sale of arms but the delivery of arms and on that basis proceeded to argue for the repeal of the arms embargo. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman and of the House to the fact that the present law does not permit the transportation or the delivery of arms by American ships.

I call attention to the sentence in the President's address to this Congress at the opening of this special session when he said, speaking of a sixth objective—

Under present enactments such arms cannot be carried to belligerent countries on American vessels—

And he concluded:

This provision should not be disturbed.

MERCHANT VESSELS ALSO SUBJECT TO CONTROL

Then what of carrying commodities in American vessels? I wish to call attention also to the statement of the President in that same address to this special session of Congress that the objective of restricting American ships from going into war zones could be achieved by legislation or—and I quote—"substantially achieved by Executive proclamation that all such voyages are solely at the risk of American owners themselves."

Norway did that in the World War, lost 1,000 ships and 900 men, but stayed out. Her shipowners were on their own risk and their men played a risky game for high pay.

I also wish to call the attention of the Members to the list of the emergency powers of the President as cited in Senate Document 133, prepared by the Attorney General in response to the request of the Senate as evidence that ships can be put on their own risk whenever their activities threaten to involve national concern.

The Attorney General cited the act of June 29, 1936, section 712 (d), which authorizes the termination of charters of Maritime Commission vessels "in any national emergency as proclaimed by the President."

The President has proclaimed a national emergency.

The *City of Flint*, about which there has been so much talk, is a Maritime Commission vessel.

As I understand it, the State Department has made no protest over the seizure of the *City of Flint* by Germany; it has only questioned the possible delivery to Russia. The State Department is not going to get excited when a ship is caught doing something that the bill before us proposes to make illegal. The Department knows that by proclamation today any Maritime Commission ship can be asked to surrender its charter.

Further, this same act, as cited by the Attorney General, gives the Maritime Commission authority "to requisition any vessel documented under the laws of the United States" during "any national emergency declared by the proclamation of the President."

Therefore there is no need for new legislation to control our ships or to prevent them from entering a war zone. They can be put on their own risk today or whenever their activities threaten trouble.

I confidently believe that the President in the same purpose and frankness with which he spoke to us would make such a proclamation if we should fail definitely to require it by enacting that provision of the bill before us, about which there is no controversy.

Why, then, repeal the arms embargo?

OUR DANGERS FROM COMMUNISM

The final reason we are asked to repeal the arms embargo is to take a step definitely to affect the outcome of the war now in progress.

Something has been said about communism and the whole field of totalitarian ideology. Evidence brought out by the Dies committee investigating un-American activities—and I may add, personal observation in one instance—convinces me that we do have a job in that regard, but our first job is here in America. And I take this occasion to say that as a member of the Appropriations Committee I favor putting a rider in every appropriation bill to deny Federal salary checks to any person who belongs to any organization that places allegiance to any temporal power ahead of loyalty to the United States. [Applause.]

Our greatest external danger from communism rests in war itself. As the Archbishop of Dubuque said in his national hook-up last Sunday, communism feeds on chaos, and the only hope for communism in America would be to see America exhausted from war.

The Most Reverend Archbishop said:

The present war is not, in my well-advised opinion, "a holy war." It is propagandized as such by the sinister forces of international communism. The communism anti-Christians want America and all Christian nations to engage in this war. Their agents here will stop at nothing to involve us for well do they realize that a war-exhausted America is the only hope for communism to capture America.

Mr. Speaker, the considered conscience and self-interest of this country by progressive steps in 1871, 1907, 1909, 1915, and 1917 made it a crime to supply cruisers, battleships, and submarines to any belligerent to use against nations with whom we were at peace. It was only a normal development in 1935 to add other arms and implements of war. What morality or self-interest now sanctions lifting the embargo on bombing planes, poison gas, and liquid-fire throwers?

Mr. Speaker, if there be a holy war, a crusade which we should join, let the issue be debated in these Halls. Let no foreign minister tell us our duty, whether he speaks in Moscow or in Washington, in London or Berlin. In European chancelleries we do not have even the small voice that was proposed for us in the League of Nations.

They play a strange game over there—scorning Stalin one day, courting him the next. Why should we mix in that kind of business?

Our natural and traditional policy is to let nations choose their own forms of government and to demand that they let us have ours. If we are to be committed to any cause, let it be done openly by definite determination of our own interests.

Let us not be drawn into any war by the lure of what the President so aptly called fool's gold. Let America, instead, look to her own defenses and devote herself to the development of our country and the protection of democracy at home.

If we take our counsel in these matters from any foreign minister, be he in America or be he in Russia or in England, or anywhere else, we are bound for trouble. They play a different kind of game over there from what we play here. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, in 1935 President Roosevelt sponsored and urged the passage of a neutrality bill placing an embargo on the shipment of arms from this country to nations engaged in war. A similar measure was repassed in 1936 and 1937. The act of 1937 provides for an embargo on arms and munitions of war, and that act is now in force and is the law of the land. It was urged by the administration when this measure was passed an embargo on arms was the surest plan to keep us from being involved in another foreign war. Some Members of the House and Senate, when those measures were up for consideration, insisted that we should not pass a neutrality bill in peacetime, but we should wait until war should come. But it was urged by the President and his leaders in the House and Senate that the proper time to pass such a measure was when the world was at peace, and our action would give the nations and the world notice as to our foreign policy.

When war was threatened last summer and there was much propaganda in this country for England and France, and after the King and Queen of England had come to visit us and the President had had his quarrel with Hitler, the gentleman from New York, Mr. SOL BLOOM, brought in the administration's so-called neutrality bill, to repeal the embargo on arms. The House by a decisive majority of Democrats and Republicans retained the embargo on arms and munitions of war and refused to grant the President's request. The bill then went to the Senate. The Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs refused to report out any bill. Congress was called into special session on September 21, 1939, and the administration by spur and lash forced a bill through the Senate repealing the embargo on arms and munitions, and the bill is again before us for consideration.

When the bill was up in the House I spoke and voted for what is known as the Vorys amendment that retained the embargo on arms and munitions of war. Recent developments have strengthened my opinion that the only way for this country to remain neutral, and the surest way to peace is to retain in our law the embargo against the shipment of arms and munitions of war to nations engaged in war. Although England, France, and Germany are now at war the administration is moving heaven and earth to repeal the embargo on arms and munitions.

Some of the administration's leaders insinuate that those of us who vote for the embargo have some sort of leanings toward Germany and Russia. I am fortunate to have the honor to represent a great American district. There is no Russian or Communist living in my district. I doubt if there

is as many as five living in my district who were born in Germany. In at least 5 of the 17 counties in my district there is not a person born in foreign lands. My people know no "ism" except true Americanism. They are of English, Scotch, and Irish descent. We are opposed to communism, nazi-ism, and fascism. We know just one flag, and that is the Stars and Stripes. We recognize but one loyalty, and that is to the United States of America. My constituents are descendants of the patriots of the Revolution, the War of 1812, the Civil War, and the Spanish-American War. They have had a prominent part on land and sea, in the air, and under the sea in every struggle of this country from the Revolution down to the present time. We look upon our form of government and our country as the finest and best that the world has ever produced. We still regard the statesmanship of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln as the wisest, most unselfish, and progressive that has appeared in the history of mankind. We are a liberty-loving and God-fearing people, still believing that "Righteousness exalteth a nation, and sin is a reproach to any people." [Applause.]

Our colleague, from Massachusetts, Mr. McCORMACK, condemns the speech of the Prime Minister of Russia made in Moscow the other day and urges the recall of our Ambassador to Russia. I have no sympathy for Russia or her Prime Minister. During the 12 years of the Republican administration following the World War our Government refused to recognize Russia because that communistic Government was doing all it could to overthrow this Government and other governments by force and violence. It remained for Mr. Roosevelt to insist on the recognition of Russia.

The Dies investigating committee of the House declares that there are nearly 3,000 Communists who hold key positions under this Government that are drawing good salaries out of our taxpayers' money. I am more concerned about these 3,000 Communists holding high positions in this Government, and what they are doing and saying to promote communism in this country, and about the activities of the thousands and thousands of aliens that have been permitted to remain in this country, than what some Communist may say in a speech in Russia.

May I suggest that our friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] help us to get rid of the Communists in this country.

I have spoken and voted for every measure that has come before the House to restrict foreign immigration and to deport enemy aliens, whether Communist, Nazi, or Fascist. The Dies committee has been and is rendering a fine service to this country. The administration is fighting the work of this committee. Let us aid the Dies committee to ferret out these enemy aliens and all groups that are plotting the overthrow of our Government.

PRESIDENT UNNEUTRAL AND BILL UNNEUTRAL

Under the act of 1937 it is the duty of the President when nations go to war to issue a proclamation warning the American people not to sell or deliver arms or munitions of war to belligerent nations. Some time ago President Roosevelt issued his proclamation that England, France, and Germany were at war, and he invoked the provisions of our Neutrality Act, passed in 1937. Therefore, it is now unlawful for anyone to sell or deliver arms or munitions of war to either one of these nations. Neither Germany, France, nor England can lawfully buy arms or munitions of war in this country.

When the President was urging the passage of these laws in 1935, 1936, and 1937, he insisted that this would be honest neutrality and would keep us out of war. England and France have blockaded Germany, and therefore Germany cannot secure any arms or munitions of war in this country. The President and his leaders have turned right-about face. They now say that in order to be neutral we must repeal our arms embargo, and if we do not we will be unneutral. The word "neutral" or "neutrality" means that you cannot take sides one way or the other, and not assist either party. England and France control the Atlantic. They are not blockaded. They can get to our country with their ships and

buy and receive arms and munitions of war if the embargo is repealed. Germany cannot.

I boldly charge that it is the purpose of the President and his administration to take sides in that war and help England and France. He knows that Germany cannot buy any of these war supplies. He knows that England and France are the only parties to that conflict that can buy under the terms of the bill. He knows that if the embargo is repealed that hundreds of millions of dollars of bombing planes, shells, poisonous gas, and other munitions of war will be sold at once to England and France. Germany and the world will know that in repealing this embargo that it is the purpose of this Nation to take sides and help England and France.

Few nations in the history of the world have shown such base ingratitude as England and France have shown to this country. We gave of our blood and our treasure to help them win the other World War. We loaned them billions of dollars. Today they owe us approximately \$13,000,000,000. They have ignored their honest debts and taken this great sum from the taxpayers of our Nation. We received nothing from that war—not even gratitude. But, notwithstanding all of this, personally I prefer to see France and England win the present war in Europe, but I am unwilling to take any step that will lead this country into another European war. I honestly believe that the repeal of the embargo is a step to such another war.

AID ALLIES AND PROFITS

One cannot believe by the wildest stretch of the imagination that to furnish arms and munitions of war to one side is a neutral act. It is unneutral and the repeal of the embargo is not to strengthen our neutrality but it is to accomplish two purposes. This administration favors the Allies, against Germany. The President for 18 months in many speeches declared that in the event of war we would be inevitably drawn into it. He and others have been insisting that we would have to get into the war. He stated at the dedication of the bridge between Canada and the United States:

In the event Canada was attacked the United States would come to her rescue.

Now Canada is a part of Great Britain and is now in the war.

The President had no right to make such a statement, as Congress alone can declare a war. In the President's message to the Congress for the last several years in urging a great naval and military program, he insisted that in the event of another European war we would be drawn into it. This administration has been getting ready for a war, and I have noticed when the heads of governments have built up a great war machine they are never satisfied until they use it.

The King and Queen were sent to the United States last June to facilitate the repeal of this embargo law and to make the way clear for our participation in the war in behalf of England and France. The English and French people have been watching with great interest the battle over the repeal of the embargo in the American Congress. When the Senate voted the repeal, English and French leaders freely expressed the belief that if the embargo is repealed this meant that the United States was on their side and eventually would enter the war with them.

I am opposed to our country taking sides in that war for France, England, or Germany. Germany and the world will construe the repeal of the embargo as evidence of our purpose to take sides and help England and France. It is not so much furnishing arms and munitions of war as it is the purpose of this nation behind that action. We know that Germany cannot buy any arms and munitions in this country because of the blockade. Her ships cannot reach our ports. To take this action when war is on and under these conditions, there can only be one conclusion reached and that is we desire to help England and France, and make profits out of the war. My position is that this Nation should follow President George Washington's advice, and the accepted foreign policy of this nation up to the World

War, "Friendship for all nations and entangling alliances with none." I am opposed to this Nation taking a hand for any European, African, or Asiatic country. We must mind our own business.

President Roosevelt said when he signed the Neutrality Act of August 31, 1935:

I have approved this joint resolution because it was intended as an expression of the fixed desire of the Government and the people of the United States to avoid any action which may involve us in war.

After the passage of the Neutrality Act of 1936, containing an embargo against the sale of arms and munitions of war to warring nations, he said in his speech at Chautauqua, N. Y., August 14, 1936:

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we should find in this country thousands of Americans seeking immediate riches—fool's gold, blood money—would attempt to break down or attempt to evade our neutrality.

They would tell you—and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if we could produce and ship this and that other articles to belligerent nations the unemployed of America would all find work.

There is a group in this country that desires repeal of this embargo for profits. President Roosevelt called this seeking for "fool's gold—blood money." He said that the American people, when it came to a question of profits or peace, would choose peace. More than 90 percent of the people in my district are opposed to the repeal of the embargo, according to the letters and telegrams that I have received. Two or three percent are in favor of us helping France and England. Another 2 or 3 percent say it will help business and bring profits. I think President Roosevelt, when he was commending the embargo on arms and munitions of war in his speech of 1936, was right when he spoke of this as "fool's gold—blood money."

No one desires more than I do to see our country prosperous, but I do not want to see that prosperity fished out of rivers of blood and lakes of tears. This Nation has developed the fastest and most powerful bomber in the world. We have also produced poisonous gases and powerful shells. If the Senate bill is passed and the embargo is repealed, we will deliver to England and France hundreds of millions of dollars worth of these powerful bombs, poisonous gases, and shells and other instrumentalities of death. These powerful bombers will fly over towns, villages, and cities and kill and maim noncombatants, women and children, and the aged. The poison gas will be used to sear the lungs and the bodies of thousands of the young manhood of some country. Our great Christian Nation, for profits will become the arsenal for warring nations to prolong wars, to increase the number of deaths, and the destruction of property.

WHAT ABOUT WORLD WAR PROFITS?

In the last World War in 1914, 1915, 1916, and 1917 the American people gleefully went about gathering great profits and dividends through furnishing arms, munitions of war, and other materials to the countries across the sea. There was great rejoicing in this country over what appeared to be our good fortune. In the beginning we were told by the Allies it was a fight to make the world safe for democracy, and a war to end all wars, but they said they had to have war munitions, materials, and supplies to win the war. We furnished those and made enormous profits. Later on they sent a commission and told the American Government they must have huge loans and credits or the war would be lost, and we loaned them huge sums of money and extended to them credits. Later on the Allies sent another commission to our country insisting that they must have our men and ships in order to win the war for democracy, and we were told that unless we got into the war, Germany would come over and get us. Up until that time the people of Europe were furnishing the blood and the tears. We were busy garnering to ourselves this "fool's gold and blood money."

On April 6, 1917, we declared war and then we began to furnish our own money and our own blood and tears. Five million young men were taken from their homes, their schools,

their offices, farms, and placed in army camps, and 2,000,000 of them were sent to the hell over seas. We were no longer happy and joyful. Tens of millions of fathers, mothers, husbands, wives, brothers, and sisters were made sad. News came day by day that many of our splendid young men had been killed or had died of disease. American blood and American tears began to flow. After our people had paid enormous taxes we wound up with a national debt of \$26,000,000,000. Hundreds of thousands of our finest young men died of wounds or disease; hundreds of thousands of others were disabled on account of wounds or disease; hundreds of thousands have died of wounds or diseases since the war. It made hundreds of thousands of widows and orphans. Our land is dotted with hospitals where there are tens of thousands of veterans of that war, some without eyes, some without limbs, some without minds, and others diseased; and before we are through paying that war will have cost this Nation more than \$100,000,000,000. We have hundreds of thousands of disabled World War veterans who are receiving no compensation or other benefits and are dependent upon public charity. Where are the profits? There were no profits in the World War. There are no profits in any war. We paid dearly for the "fool's gold" and "blood money" that we received in 1914, 1915, 1916, and 1917.

Shall we again exchange peace for profits fished out of the blood and tears of the other people? We are paying for our mistake of 1917, and we shall continue to pay for the next 50 years. Before we become involved in another European war we should clean up the last war. We must give more consideration to those who served so splendidly, courageously, and patriotically in the last World War, and their widows and orphans. We must pay the debt of gratitude due them and the great national debt that that war created.

When we entered the other war we had a very small national debt. Today the obligations of this Nation amount to about \$50,000,000,000. That is double the sum that we owed when we came out of the last war. If we should be involved in another war, we cannot finance it as we did before by borrowing money. We have already reached the debt limit in this country. We must in the beginning and follow through to the end with taxes so burdensome that the people of this country will not be able to bear them—and I might add that there will be very little of immediate profits should we become involved in another European war. The bills have already been drawn to be pushed through Congress when the emergency arises to take over not only the railroads, but the factories, mills, shops, mines, and almost everything else and everybody in this country. The American people will wake up to find out that the war has not brought profits but that they will have sacrificed their liberties. If we persist in meddling in the centuries-old quarrels and disputes in Europe, we shall bankrupt our own country and lose our own freedom.

MARKETS, LANDS, POWER

They are not fighting in Europe today over religion or forms of government. They are fighting, as they have for a thousand years, for commercial supremacy, territory, and power. Communistic Russia is giving some aid to Germany. England and France did all they could to have Russia on their side. France and England have Mohammedan Turkey, the Buddhists of India, and pagans on their side. There are dictatorships on the side of France and England. England has more than 300,000,000 people that are little above slaves. France is now under a dictatorship. This war started over the German City of Danzig and the Polish Corridor. This city and territory were taken from Germany at the close of the World War. President Wilson objected to it, and told the Allies it would bring on another war, and the war has come. Who wants to send two or three million American boys to Europe to help take Danzig from Germany and give it back to Poland? The various nations of Europe have been fighting over those lands for 800 years. Europe has been fighting over commerce and territory and for power for a thousand years, and they will fight for another thousand years, and on to the end of time. They fight whenever a new generation of boys have grown up. For nearly 150 years, with all their wars and quarrels in Europe, we had no part.

We followed the advice of the Father of our Country. We embraced the notion in 1917 that if we took a hand we could make the whole world free and safe for democracy and we could end all wars. Since that war 15 free nations have become dictatorships, and a majority of these are in Central and South America. We did not make the world safe for democracy. We did not end wars. There have been one or more wars every year since the signing of the Armistice, November 11, 1918.

We must know by this time that those quarrels cannot be settled by us. If we listen to those European nations they will keep us disturbed in peacetime as well as in war. As Washington said, "Why should we forego our detached position here 3,000 miles from Europe?" Why should we be in a quarrel or war every time they are in one? We had nothing to do with the starting of the present war. England and France wanted Poland to hold the territory taken from Germany, and England and France wanted to hold the colonies that she took from Germany. We asked for nothing and received nothing. In fact we did not even receive the thanks of those countries in Europe that we helped to save. But some faint hearts say that if Germany whips England and France she will come over here and get us. That scarecrow worked in 1917, but we should know better now. Germany, with the help of Russia cannot defeat France and England. They have access to the world while Germany and Russia are bottled up. In my opinion the most worried ruler in Europe today is Hitler himself. He begins to realize that he will be defeated and if Germany should defeat France and England no one can believe that she could come over here and attack us. It would require several million men, and it would require at least 7 tons of equipment for every soldier, and they would have to have some friendly place to land, and there would be no such place in the United States. There are not enough ships in the world to bring such an army and equipment to the United States. The sea would have to be free of navies. We have a great Navy. We have great coast defenses and the greatest and fastest bombing planes in the world. Furthermore, Germany, and France and England will come out of this war exhausted. What would Germany's enemies be doing while her military forces were attempting to come to the United States? The United States can take care of any enemy that might be able to come to her shores. It is much easier to defeat our enemies coming 3,000 miles to us than to go 3,000 miles or more to fight them.

I have thought many times since this debate was on how many wonderful American boys went to their death on Flanders fields believing that they were fighting to make the world safe for democracy and to end all wars, when, as a matter of fact, the Allies has already agreed among themselves how they would divide the loot and spoils if they won the war. When the war was over they did not talk about democracy. They were grabbing markets, territory, and power. They showed nothing but hate, selfishness, and greed. They forgot about the slogan for which American boys gave their lives and the American taxpayers gave of their hard-earned money.

The Allies are trying to hold what they grabbed, and those who lost are trying to recover their losses.

I am unalterably opposed to this Nation sending another American boy to fight and die in these foreign lands and on foreign seas. I firmly believe that if we repeal this embargo and take sides in this war in Europe that eventually we will be drawn into that war. We are safe from war until after the 1940 elections. Whoever heard of a person furnishing guns and pistols in a fight, knowing the reason for which they would be used, and keep from being involved in the fight and indicted if someone is hurt? If we furnish these arms and munitions of war it is going to create bitterness. The mothers and fathers of the young men who do the fighting must have a say in this matter. They do not want our country to enter another war to aid the Allies or any other nation, neither do they want us to become the arsenal for the world and seek fool's gold and blood money. Let this

Nation mind its own business and not exchange peace for doubtful profits. [Applause.]

JAPAN-CHINA

A war has been going on between China and Japan for about 3 years. It is estimated that 4,000,000 Chinese have been killed, a large majority of whom were women, children, and aged persons. Hundreds of cities and towns in China have been bombed and destroyed. Nanking, a Chinese city of 1,500,000 population, it is said now contains only 9,000 people. It was destroyed by Japanese bombs. Billions of dollars' worth of property have been destroyed in China. The invasion of China by Japan has been the most ruthless and cruel of any attack on any people in all history. Japan coveted Chinese territory. During all of this time our neutrality law had an embargo in it. President Roosevelt for some reason known to himself failed to declare that a state of war existed between Japan and China and issue a proclamation putting into force our neutrality law. Fifty-seven percent of the arms and war munitions used by Japan in overrunning and destroying China were furnished by the United States. Expert military men have asserted that Japan could not have overrun China but for the arms and munitions received from the United States. Why so much concern about what is going on in Europe when the people of this Nation are seeking fool's gold and blood money for helping this ruthless aggressor destroy a great, peace-loving nation that has always been the constant friend of the United States? Of course, the repeal of the embargo will give Japan a free hand to secure more arms and war munitions from the United States to complete the destruction and subjugation of China.

I am for the embargo—and it enforced—so that the cruel and heartless aggression of Japan in China may be brought to an end. This administration put the embargo on warring factions in Spain and between Italy and Ethiopia. Why this tender regard for Japan?

No one could regret the plight of Poland more than I do. However, I do not overlook the fact that a little over a year ago when big Germany was committing its acts of aggression against little Czechoslovakia, Poland mobilized more than 200,000 of her soldiers and marched into Czechoslovakia and took over 7,000 square miles of her territory. Poland grabbed last year and was grabbed herself this year.

First, I shall vote today for the Wolcott amendment to prevent the Federal Reserve Bank, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and other agencies of this Government loaning money or extending credit to the warring nations.

Second, I shall vote for the Vorys amendment defining what are arms and ammunition.

Third, I shall vote for the Shanley amendment authorizing the conferees to restore the arms embargo in the Senate bill.

Fourth, I shall vote to keep in the bill the cash-and-carry provision so that the bill, when it finally becomes a law, shall retain the embargo on arms and munitions to warring nations, and cash and carry for nonwar and nonmilitary supplies and materials, and shall keep American ships out of the warring zones, so that this Nation may not take sides and be involved in another European war.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Austin].

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, during a residence of a few short months in the House I have observed that it is incumbent upon a newcomer to note the fact that it is his first appearance in the Well. This I do, I hope, with becoming humility. But now is the time when all must speak constantly bearing in mind that we are not considering an entry into war or even a declaration of war.

In the following I have not the self-assurance to believe that I may add one iota to the voluminous verbiage or sophistications which too often during the last few weeks have been let loose upon the world—not only here and there, but also in the daily press, in the utterances of the great and the near great who have for fleeting moments been privileged to play leading parts in our national life, in the eman-

tions of our columnists and radio commentators, in the daily conversations of the man on the street, in the intimate exchange of home talk of the families of our land, in the millions of words that have been written to us in both branches of the Congress—words written sometimes in hate, but most often as a tragic expression of fear. No; I shall not try to add to what has already been said. But I do have the temerity to attempt to debunk this situation, strike off its dissembling coverture, and view it shorn of sham and pretense which have been gathered on its journey.

Thus presented for our action, can we not apply our consideration in the light of cold reason and logic? Is it not possible for us to have known facts and reasonable assumptions, weigh the evidence, and thereby reach rational conclusions which shall guide us in arriving at a safe and sound course of action? I confess that this is an ambitious and perhaps presumptuous task—but let's make a try.

First of all there are certain fundamentals, almost axiomatic, which must be accepted as the substructure upon which we are to build. The first is that Europe suffers and has suffered from a disease called war, which from time to time has become quiescent and then has presented acute exacerbations. This latter condition is now existent. Such has been the history of this unfortunate area ever since the legions of Ancient Rome brought the early tribes under the yoke and then taught them the processes of orderly government. Can you point out one war or series of wars during the intervening period up to the present time, the object of which was not territorial expansion, allocation of nationals, religious pretexts with temporal objects, seizure of material wealth or natural resources, monopoly of trade by land or sea, or personal ambition for world domination? And in what respect does the present war differ? Those days had Alexander, Caesar, Attila the Hun, Peter the Great, and Bismarck; now we have Hitler and the ominous shadow of Stalin presaging coming events. And by the same token, can you point out any of the mentioned wars wherein one or more of the warring nations did not summon outside aid by some lofty, sloganical appeal? Even we have heard of "War to end war," "Preserve democracy"; and today, if our ears deceive us not, we hear "Democracy is in peril," "Religion and civilization are at stake." Verily hath it been written that history repeats itself, and Europe presents another similar picture in the never-ending panorama.

Another fundamental we must recognize is that war is being waged even now in Europe. Peculiar as wars go, but nevertheless a declared war, with today a weird and ominous marking of time. If continued there will be the same horror, the same tragedy, the same devastation, the same ruin, the same murder of women and children, the same nothingness where once was life, the same cruel and terrible aftermath. The skies again shower destruction, land guns deal distant death, and beneath the surface of the sea men let loose their silent messengers of destruction. All of this is too well known to us and needs no lengthy description, so why dwell longer—too much has been said of this already. We agree that war is hell.

The next fundamental is that the United States abhors war and has no desire for war. It does not belong to our concept, it is not within our intent or purpose, it is a heritage no one of us has brought here from our European ancestry. But in spite of all this the shadow of war is over our land. Your desks and mine are piled deep with letters and telegrams carrying heart-rending appeals to keep us out of war. In the name of humanity they ask it; in the name Christ the King they ask it; in the name of God they ask it. Someone or several have brought this frenzy upon us and some day he or they will pay the price. What greater service could this Congress now do than to assure and reassure this country that there shall be no war because war mongers will be stifled, demagogues silenced, and propagandists denied? It shall not be said of us that judgment is fled to brutish beasts and men have lost their reason.

War! The thought palsies the lips of every man, it stabs the heart of every mother. Let us stop this talk of war.

Who wants it? Certainly not this Congress; certainly not labor nor capital; certainly not our fellow citizens of foreign extraction who are rightly sorrowing over the partition or the destruction of the land of their fathers; certainly not the man on the street, who must fight the battle and bear the brunt of defeat or of a victory which, taken at its best, will be only a defeat; certainly not the sister states of our hemisphere who, with us, desire to live in friendliness and harmony with their neighbors, to pursue the paths of peace which lead to individual and national well-being, to work out their destiny under liberty and freedom.

Why should we participate in this war? Has Divine command been placed upon us to act as the preceptor of Europe? Since when have we been empowered to sit in judgment on the prevailing or changing forms of government in Europe? Since when have we imagined that by Presidential decree or legislative act or popular desire we can forever erase the centuries old inborn national hatreds over there? Shall we again take our seats at the council table and attempt to instill reason and justice into minds that will have them not or to assist in the partition of Europe along just and equitable lines? Are we ready to share in a so-called religious war? No, none of these purposes shall take us in. We will fight again as we have in the past to maintain our national honor, our national security, our national being.

The foregoing are fundamentals and must be accepted. As such they need not be extended.

After rather close attention, I am led to believe that the joint resolution now before us, labeled as the "Neutrality Act of 1939," is for the double purpose of keeping the United States out of war and maintaining a strict neutrality toward all belligerent nations. In the first of these purposes it is on precarious ground. In the second it dismally fails. An analysis of this joint resolution divides it into two references, the first dealing with our relationship with belligerent nations and the second having to do with restrictions upon our own citizens as to their conduct and travel. With this latter portion but little fault can be found. In this particular consideration I frankly confess that I cannot get unduly excited over centralization of control, possible dictatorship, too much power in one man, loss of democracy or democratic principles. I have too much faith in the United States of America and the ever-living principles of freedom and liberty, the priceless heritage of its people. I realize the restrictions placed upon our merchant marine, but I also realize that there are other nations in the world which are not at war, that there are other paths of commerce that do not lie in combat areas, and particularly do I realize that the rich trade of South America offers alluring markets which by the application of business acumen and honorable dealing can be made permanently ours. The naming of combat areas, constantly shifting and extending, is a delicate and perhaps dangerous problem, but at least some faith must be placed in him who directs. On the whole, this reference in the bill will do, particularly when we understand that for the most part it is already the established and prevailing law of neutrality.

But the second reference, which really defines our foreign policy under the title of the "Neutrality Bill of 1939" and is the crux of this problem, is an entirely different matter. Why take the time of this House in recounting the astounding details? Let me say with all the strength and vigor I possess that with deadly hatred I abhor Hitler and all his works. His departure would remove a scourge of civilization, an unchained rabid dog, an anathema to a Christian world or any other world that puts its faith and its trust in a power above. But fair is fair and right is right, and the failure of other nations to keep their pledged word, to stand by solemn treaties, is no excuse for our country to do likewise. In 1935 our Congress published to all the world its determined position toward all nations that might engage in war. Amended in 1936 and reenacted in 1937, it almost unanimously passed both branches of the legislative body, was approved and signed by our President, was hailed and acclaimed by the press and the people as a noble expression of

position. Becoming the law of the land it proclaimed to the world that the greatest nation on earth on whose escutcheon was no stain of infamy had established a principle from which there would be no recession under the usual course of honorable conduct. France understood—and so did Germany—and so did Great Britain and so did every other nation with which we hold diplomatic relations. But the scene changes and 2 years after three of those nations are at war. Immediately after this Congress is convened in special session and we are asked by the administration to pass a bill under the guise of neutrality which will aid two of the belligerent nations to the damage of the third, and our President and our Senate which passed the bill and our Rules Committee call this neutrality. Again fair is fair and right is right. Shall we throw over them the mantle of charity and charge their act to lack of thought, or shall we call a spade a spade and charge them with complicity in an attempt to blind the American people? Has the author of this bill and have its proponents the courage to label this bill as it should be labeled, the "unneutrality bill of 1939, changing the rules contrary to the precepts and interpretation of International Law as expounded by authorities, aiding favored nations," and would he or they have the courage to vote for such a bill under a correctly defined title without a definite mandate to that end from the people which mandate does not now exist? Before me are the pleas of friends whom I respect, the homogeneous postals of the pressure groups, the threats of political oblivion—for none of these will I forget my oath of office in my country's service, for none of these will I prostitute my self-respect.

What makes this bill unneutral is the provision euphemistically called a repeal of the arms embargo. I need not further explain. It opens our markets and our ports to belligerent nations to purchase and carry away for cash the deadly instruments of war. And these include the poison gas that causes human beings to writhe and struggle and choke and gasp for precious air; these include the flame throwers that turn man into a pillar of fire. Mercy, culture, humanitarianism, brotherly love, Christianity—you claim these as the attributes of our Nation and then vote to send such weapons abroad to be used against your fellow men. Is it for the price the purchaser will pay? Is it to furnish employment to the unemployed? Is it to enrich the treasury of industry that further taxes may be laid thereon? Such motives are unworthy of the thought so inconsistent are they with Americanism. This repeal of the arms embargo is a departure from our published law and establishes intervention in place of neutrality. No one of us is endowed with certain ability to see tomorrow as we see today. Those who say that repeal of the arms embargo will lead to our participation and those who say it will not are both wrong if they think they speak with surety. This much, however, can be said that our present neutrality insofar as the arms embargo is concerned makes our participation possible, but the repeal of our present arms-embargo plan makes our participation not only possible but probable. Perhaps a belligerent nation unfavorably affected may consider a change an unfriendly act and be less careful in avoiding untoward incidents, or it may even reach the point of an actual declaration of war. Equally absurd courses of action are not so unusual today. Are you who are favoring this repeal of the arms embargo prepared to follow through? Are you ready to suffer the probable consequences? Can you tell the citizens of this country that you obeyed their dictate to preserve neutrality? Can you satisfy anxious minds that by your vote you have done your best to keep us out of war? If your answer is no, it is a fair question to ask yourself, "Am I really a representative of my people?"

We cannot by legislation keep this country neutral if the country is not neutral-minded. We cannot by legislation keep this country out of war if the country is war-minded. But our people are neutral-minded; our people are not war-minded. And our task is to keep them so. We miserably fail them if under the guise of neutrality we willfully translate their desire into intervention and we miserably fail them if by a repeal of the arms embargo we lead them into war. In

the final solution of this problem may the God of our Fathers keep us from temptation of every kind and from every source. [Applause.]

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

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, like every other Member of Congress, I received many communications during the last few weeks on the subject of neutrality legislation. These communications have been on both sides of the question. All of them have been written by sincere, honest people. A majority of them have opposed the repeal of the arms embargo. A strong minority have taken the other position.

One point that has been emphasized most strongly on the part of those who favor repeal is that this should not be made a partisan question; that it is too big, too vital, and too important to our welfare to be considered for one moment from the standpoint of partisanship. I agree with that viewpoint. Furthermore, I do not believe that anyone who is familiar with my legislative record can accuse me of being offensively partisan at any time. As to this particular issue, I can honestly say that I have approached it without the slightest trace of partisanship.

I do not believe that anyone can fairly accuse Republican Members of Congress of viewing this matter from a partisan standpoint. To make it a partisan issue would in the very beginning kill any chance of success on the part of Republicans opposing repeal of the embargo. There are approximately 100 more Democratic Members of the House than there are Republican. On any partisan issue, the Republicans are defeated from the start. The only chance to defeat repeal in this case is to treat the issue in a nonpartisan manner, and any statement to the contrary is not only a reflection upon the patriotism of the opponents of repeal but upon their good judgment, as well.

As far as my personal position is concerned, I supported the original neutrality bill, a prominent feature of which was the arms embargo, when it became a law in 1935. That bill was supported by the administration, passed both Houses of Congress almost unanimously, and was signed by the President. I supported the revision of the act in 1936, which was also an administration measure, and it received the practically unanimous support of all Members of Congress. I supported the 1937 bill, also an administration measure, which received almost unanimous support in both the House and Senate and was signed by the President. I supported those measures at the time of their enactment because I believed that a European war was almost inevitable.

I felt that if war did break out in Europe, it would be based upon the age-old rivalries and disputes over boundaries and racial questions. I felt that we could and should have no interest as a nation in a war of that kind. I felt that the only policy for this Nation to follow was to stay out and that we could stay out only by following a policy of strict neutrality. I believed then, as I believe now, that no one can question the neutrality of a policy which says that we will not sell implements of war or destruction to anyone.

For the past 4 years the arms embargo and the 1935 Neutrality Act as revised have stood as a part of the foreign policy of this Nation. Every European country knew that it was our policy, knew that these measures had passed Congress almost unanimously and knew that they represented the feeling and aspirations of the American people as far as involvement in European wars was concerned. Certainly, every nation which had reason to believe that it might be a party to a conflict had full notice of our policy in this regard.

Today the thing which was feared and anticipated, when the first Neutrality Act was passed in 1935, has come to pass. European nations are at war. Our laws prohibit the export of arms and munitions. As far as my position is concerned, I stand exactly where I stood in 1935, in 1936, and in 1937, when the country and Congress could and did consider this question from a calm, logical, impartial, and neutral standpoint. Those of us who are opposing repeal of the arms embargo stand today where we have always stood and where the President and the State Department

and the vast majority of the Members of Congress stood in 1935 and 1937.

The administration now takes a different position, not because of any change in the world situation between 1935 and the present time, but solely for the reason that there has been a change in the administration's foreign policy. That policy in 1935 was nonintervention and neutrality. That was still the position of the administration when the President made his famous Chautauqua speech on August 14, 1936, where he said "I hate war"; when he said also—

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we should find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down and evade our neutrality.

It was still the policy of the administration when the 1937 neutrality law was signed by the President. The first indication that there was any change in the administration viewpoint came when the famous quarantine speech was made in Chicago on October 5, 1937, when the President proposed in effect that peace-loving nations get together to quarantine and stop the aggressor nations.

This change in the administration's policy was further emphasized in the President's message to Congress on January 4, 1939, in which he spoke of using methods "short of war" as a means of curbing aggressor nations.

The proposal to repeal the arms embargo is a logical next step in the President's policy of intervention and participation in the power politics of Europe. It is a question that is far greater than the repeal of the arms embargo, as significant and important as that may be in itself. Its great significance lies in the fact that if we repeal the arms embargo, Congress and the country will have given their approval of this change in administration policy. It will be construed as a green light authorizing the President to further extend his now-declared policy of interference and intervention in European affairs.

All of this would have been significant, important, and dangerous had we taken up the matter of repeal of the arms embargo before the outbreak of war. To repeal the embargo after war has begun makes it doubly significant, important, and dangerous. If there has been any one thing which has been settled beyond a doubt in the debate which has taken place on this issue, it is that lifting the embargo at this time is an unneutral act. It is one of the acts "short of war" to which the President no doubt referred in his message last January. In other words, it means that we have taken sides, and, having chosen our side, the question is whether we can logically and consistently withhold further aid, even to the point of sending troops abroad, should our side in the conflict need and demand it.

If we do not intend to do this, then we are guilty of misleading and misinforming England and France as to our position. Press comment in these two countries, after the passage of the present bill by the Senate, was all to the effect that the result marked a great Allied victory.

In my mail this morning I received a letter from a young lady residing in my district, reading, in part, as follows:

I was in England when she declared war. Time and again I heard the remark: "Of course, the United States will come to our aid at once and not wait, as it did before, until the war is practically over." When I protested against such statements the reply was: "Oh, yes; you will. Our Governments have an understanding." When reminded of our Neutrality Act and our law against extending credit to nations in default on their debts to us, their reply was: "Your President will attend to that."

I do not know how general this impression may be in the allied countries. I do know that others returning from England and France have told me the same thing that this young lady mentions in her letter. If that is the viewpoint in England and France, how can they help but feel that this step, if we should take it, marks the beginning of our actual participation?

I think we should weigh well what we do today. Notwithstanding the fact that the administration's foreign policy has changed, it does not become this country's policy until approved by Congress. If we strike down the arms embargo

today, we are definitely, in the eyes of our own people and the eyes of the world, approving a foreign policy which means not neutrality but intervention and, I fear, eventual participation. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks our mail has been very heavy. We have received numerous phone calls and telegrams. We have been reading numerous polls to determine just how the public is really reacting and what their true thoughts are on this neutrality issue.

All manner of doubts and suspicions have been raised regarding the authenticity and the validity of these communications. Now, regardless of what your attitude may be regarding them, I have here, and I want to leave it for investigation, a petition containing well over 12,000 names and every signature is authentic. They were gathered by a group of women who had and have no motive but a sincere desire to preserve the neutrality of these United States. They were gathered in less than 15 days, without any subsidization, in the leading industrial district of the world—the Pittsburgh district—and if there is any region of the world that stands to profit from a lifting of this embargo it is that district.

I submit this petition and I might submit some 15,000 other communications that have reached my office as evidence of what the people think and what they know.

This petition asks—to be brief—that we restore the law as it was in 1937, when we were thinking only in terms of the welfare of the United States. At that time when we were neutral and wholly impartial we wrote a decision which some are now seeking to change, and whatever they may say on this floor, whatever reasons they may trump up to convince themselves that the issues are something else, they will not deceive the people. The people know that we are here deciding whether or not to tear out one of the major insulations against war in order that we may extend further assistance to one side in this conflict.

They know that the arms embargo is a barrier across the road that leads to war. They know that we do not have to lift this embargo in order to be more safe. This country is just as safe from invasion from Europe as it is safe from invasion from Africa or Mars. Most of the people know and the rest will learn that we are not here limited to a choice between one insulation, the embargo, and another insulation, the cash and carry. We can deceive ourselves but not them, because it is very evident that we can have both insulations as we had them prior to May 1. The administration forces allowed the cash-and-carry provisions to expire last spring, and my good friend the capable gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON], who spoke earlier, rose on this floor when the Bloom bill was under discussion and advocated that the carry-it-yourself principle as regards only arms and ammunition and implements of war be defeated, and it was defeated by a vote of over 2 to 1, and now it is offered to us as a new insulation in exchange for our insulation—the arms embargo.

I believe that we who are here writing this law ought to be just as candid as we can. There are two basic issues that underlie this debate. One is whether or not we shall maintain our strict neutrality or relax it in such a way as to benefit one side in the European conflict. The second issue is whether or not we shall increase the discretionary powers of the Executive.

Let us not lose sight of the fact that as we change this law to benefit those nations which control the Atlantic seaways, to that identical extent we open the possibility of Japan using our arms and ammunition for aggression in Asia. We cannot write a law that applies to only one ocean.

Throughout this confusion of debate and procedure I have and will preserve one rule to govern my vote and I offer

it to you for what it is worth. I shall vote consistently for that proposal which keeps us farthest away from the firing line, and I shall use only one lamp to guide my way, and that is the lamp of our experiences between 1914 and 1917. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BUCKLER].

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am against war, and as long as I am a Member of Congress I shall never vote to send our boys over to Europe to fight. But I am for this pending bill for the reason that I believe it is a better law than the law we now have on the statute books. A few more incidents like that of the *City of Flint*, and perhaps we would be in the war. You let those sailors be torpedoed over there and destroyed, and you are on your road to war. If we had the present proposed law, the *City of Flint* would not have been over in the war zone. So I am for this bill, and when I cast my vote today I am not going to cast it to please the Communists of Russia or the Communists of the United States. I am going to cast it for America, and I am going to cast it for this bill. [Applause.]

I am against the United States entering wars on foreign soil, and I shall vote against sending any of our boys to foreign wars, whether they be in Europe or any other place on the globe, as long as I am a Member of the Congress of the United States. I want America to stay at peace with the world and will vote to strengthen our neutral position. We can better stay out of war by passing the neutrality bill of 1939 than by defeating it. The pending bill is not perfect, but it is far better than the present law, and I fear that defeat of the present bill will invite dangerous incidents like the seizure of the ship *City of Flint*, which is now a threat to our security.

The neutrality bill of 1939 is better than the present law for keeping us at peace, and I set the reasons down in order:

First. Cash and carry: This keeps United States ships like the *City of Flint* out of the war zones and keeps American people at home and away from war-torn countries. Under the present law we let our ships and citizens run all over the world and get into foreign danger spots. By voting for the neutrality bill of 1939 I vote to keep United States ships and citizens at home.

Second. No credits to warring countries: Under the new bill we will sell for cash on the barrel head. They say that our loans to warring countries during the World War got us into that war. We eliminate the credit danger because we do not allow loans to warring countries under the new neutrality bill now pending. Foreign credits will not get us into war, because we are going to keep United States dollars also out of the war zones and home where they belong.

Third. Opponents say "Repeal of embargo is first step to war." If that is so why did not the embargo provision protect us against the *City of Flint* capture by the Germans? The *City of Flint* carried no munitions nor was it armed, but it was seized as a prize of war just the same. This can happen again and again under the present law, but it cannot happen under the new neutrality bill of 1939. We must pass the new law to protect ourselves from incidents like this which dragged us into the World War.

Fourth. Prevents causes of American entry into the World War. Under the new bill we prevent credits and foreign war loans. We keep our ships and people at home and mind our own business. We sell to those who have the money. We will not sell to those who have not the money. We will not let other United States ships, like the *City of Flint*, carry the American colors into the war zones. We will not be doing the things we did in the World War that got us into that war. In other words, we are being practical now, and I am for the practical ideas that are safe as against theories that are unsafe and are not working in practice like the present law.

When I cast my vote I want to vote for the best possible bill to keep our American boys out of this war. I am not going to let any foreign dictator sway my vote as a good American. I think we should be boss over ourselves over

here, and I think we will be under the neutrality bill of 1939. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I desire to repeat with all possible emphasis my statement that we must never again send our boys across the seas to fight in a European war. My reasoning back of those conclusions was set forth in the House debate on June 29. I am just as positive in my belief that we are going to be very seriously affected if Europe is compelled to accept a Hitler-dictated peace.

If Germany wins, you who have so often denounced the Versailles Treaty will then behold such an unfair treaty imposed by the victor that you may well save your denunciations for that time. Should you desire to get a glimpse of a real conqueror's treaty, then reread the terms imposed on Russia by Germany in 1917.

I do not agree with the oft-repeated statement that the present war in Europe is just another scrap over boundary lines. The conflict in Europe is a contest between contending theories of government—the democracies, however crude, on the one hand, and the totalitarian states, however cruel, on the other.

About seven centuries ago the Mongols invaded Europe under the able leadership of Tamerlane and Genghis Khan. These conquering hordes were turned back only by most desperate fighting, even under the walls of Vienna. This union of forces under Stalin and Hitler parallels the coming of the Mongols. It means the rise of barbarian practices and the death of institutions which we in America hold dear and sacred. If you really love American institutions, which are the outgrowth of English ideals, you simply cannot be indifferent to the struggle in Europe. I want those fighting on our side to share our stores. How are you opponents going to justify your course and your vote if you read in the morning papers a few weeks hence that English and French cities are in ruins from London to Edinburgh, from Paris to Marseilles? Will you be proud to realize that your vote prevented England and France from receiving the thousands of planes necessary for their defense and now awaiting delivery? Your only answer will be that in your attempt to be neutral you made a Hitler victory possible.

I do not presume to wisdom which would give me the right to seek to mold other men's minds nor to change carefully formed opinions. Nor do I claim knowledge of affairs not possessed by my colleagues. I do not want to preach, but, as one of the few men of this House who have lived a generous span of life of nearly fourscore years, I speak to my younger colleagues who are so kind to me. The old Governor appeals in affection and in the respect born of daily association.

I shall not live to see the final effect of this day's work. My thoughts are, therefore, projected into the future with an earnestness and anxiety which a younger man may not fully understand. I look back through recorded history; I strive to grasp the sorry shapes of events as they revolve and turn on the world's stage today. I am greatly moved by these events and by the tragic plight of humanity. I am, of course, most deeply concerned for our own country. I think of my nine grandsons and their world and their country, and I am consumed with the desire to make things better for them, to pass on to them a stable government functioning in a war-free world.

I lived through the agonies of the last World War, suffering them, day by day, while I went about my work in the same familiar places made strangely different by the absence of friends and neighbors as well as my only son and 20 volunteer companions from my own farm. The terrifying daily news of affairs in Europe penetrated our lives.

When I came to Congress I accepted the assignment to our common task of bettering life without any realization that it might bring us to this day of decision which may—yes; must—vitaly affect the lives and destinies of men remote from us in time and space.

Weighing the swiftly changing events of the past months since we last debated this Neutrality Act, and praying that

you and I will be given judgment now to act in legislative capacity for the ultimate good of our own people and of humanity, I shall support the bill which has come to us after weeks of Senate debate.

Our Senators have not faced the issue alone. The whole country has participated in the discussion as it has never done before. Led by thoughtfully considered public debate, reading a portion of the thousands of printed arguments, and listening day and night to the radio, our people have resolved themselves into a great forum. They have made known to us their opinions and decisions in this crisis. We have had ample guidance in the matter.

We are now assembled for final action, and every man among us wants to do right. Every decent high-minded man will surrender all thought of taking any action except that dictated by his own best judgment. Seldom is any man given the opportunity and the responsibility of such an epoch-making, far-reaching, deciding voice in world affairs.

Summoning all my mental and moral resources, and as the result of the deepest consideration and most solemn pledge to the future of my children and grandchildren, moved by anxiety for the welfare of the helpless millions in our land and other lands, I know, for myself, that I cannot do other than to support this legislation. I am convinced it is designed to promote the universal good and to protect our country and people so they may live and work without facing the horrors of war. We are legislating for the purpose of making our country one among a family of nations, all enjoying the same primary blessing of peace.

We are surrendering many of our privileges—freedom of the seas, world trade, and certain rights which we have regarded as part of our heritage—all for the sole purpose of keeping our boys out of the bitter struggles of war.

I cannot urge other men to accept my judgment. I can only beg for fullest realization of the supreme importance of the hour and offer my own conclusions. I fervently hold that support of the pending bill is essential to the highest welfare of our country, as well as that of the whole world. As the world is now so closely knit, we must think in world terms. I believe support of this bill, inside or outside party lines, is the part a man must play today, the side on which he must fight, because he is motivated by a sacred desire to serve the highest good.

To those of you who may reasonably expect to live to see the far end of this day's work I want to repeat what a contemporary told me after the last World War—a man who had participated in it as a leader of men and a commanding general. I speak of Gen. Hunter Liggett, who said to me that he would like to have traded his life for a life 50 years ahead. Recalling his brilliant military career, I asked the reason. He said, "Within the next 50 years, perhaps within 25 years, it will be decided whether European civilization will commit suicide on the field of battle." He added, "If there is another great World War, and if it is fought to exhaustion, it means the end of European civilization." That is what I fear. If what is finest in that civilization perishes, what hope is there for our own economic and political system?

Because of the dignity of human life, and out of the richness of human experience coming from length of life, I feel that I may speak to some of my younger colleagues in this personal vein. Because they, too, will, in ripeness of years, look to a future they cannot share, I beg them to cast aside political expediency as totally unworthy of this great hour. Let us all express ourselves, by this vote, with the full realization that it is our supreme effort to banish hate among nations. Certainly it is our greatest contribution to the cause of peace and happiness for America and for the world.

I support this legislation in that spirit. I find I can follow no other course. I can only ask others to search their minds and hearts and to act, guided by their finest natures and by highest purposes.

Though we vote on different sides, our American citizens must know that we shall vote guided by our convictions and moved by our sense of citizenship and public duty. Any other imputation would be shameful. [Applause.]

LXXXV—83

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, no true American will approach this momentous question other than in a spirit of humility, sincerity, and doubt. No true American will stand here today, who loves this country, and who wants to keep his country out of war, and vote for a bill or for an amendment that he really believes would involve his country in war, and at the same time stultify his name throughout history. Months ago, in attempting to make up my mind definitely on this important subject, in my imagination and in my heart I communed with the shades of Washington, Jefferson, Wilson, Lincoln, and the other great men who were born here and loved this country so well, and who by their effort and by their every word placed America first and other nations second. I have communed in my thoughts with the Unknown Soldier, who lies in Arlington in "honored glory, known only to God," and "I have honestly come to the conviction that it would be in the interest of peace for the United States, and in the interest of peace and happiness for the whole world to repeal the arms embargo now on the statute books of our country. [Applause.]

I do not claim, Mr. Speaker, to be a great international lawyer; I do not even claim to have wandered exhaustively among the dusty documents of 1,000 years ago or more, as my friend from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY] has done, in pursuit of the hidden riches of international law and the kingdom of Utopia.

I have the greatest admiration and respect for the learning and integrity of the gentleman from Connecticut, but I must say here that I am puzzled and astounded by the position the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY] has taken in offering this motion to this House. My friends, the main argument, the only argument that this great student of international law offers to you here today, as to why this arms embargo should remain is that it would be changing the rules during the game. Oh, he voted for it before, when every rule of the game of international law had been trampled underfoot by the dictators of the world; when every rule of humanity expounded to us by the fathers of our country, when every rule of international law taught by Professor Borchard, at whose feet for so many years the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut sat, had already been repudiated and trampled underfoot by the nations of Europe for 10 these many years—the only beacon shining for the people on this earth. The United States has not been a party to this trampling upon respected and revered international law, whereunder and whereby the peoples of this earth could live in peace and tranquillity.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. Now, my friend, I have only 10 minutes. You had 30 or 40 minutes. I beg your pardon.

When all of the rules of the game have been violated, the gentleman from Connecticut comes in here and, as the only Democratic member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, takes the position that the United States of America, this great Nation, must stand with its arms bound, with its conscience tied, unable and afraid to do anything because the musty pages and documents of international law, which have been repudiated by every nation on the face of this earth except the United States, say that you should not change the rule during the game.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not yield.

Mr. FISH. For a correction?

Mr. RICHARDS. Give me more time and I will yield.

Mr. FISH. Twenty seconds.

Mr. RICHARDS. No; not 20 seconds. I do not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FISH. I will yield you time.

Mr. RICHARDS. How much time?

Mr. FISH. For the purpose of a correction. The gentleman said there was only one Democratic member on the committee. There are two Democratic members, because

the gentleman from New York, Dr. PFEIFER, is with us in this fight.

Mr. RICHARDS. Well, I have not talked to the gentleman from New York, Dr. PFEIFER, but this is the first time since I have been here that I have heard that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has a right to speak for any Democratic Member in this House. [Applause and laughter.]

My friends, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY] is a baseball player, as I am. He was a football player, as I was once in my younger days. He loves to go to the boxing matches, as I do, but when two boxers get into the ring and get to fighting each other according to certain recognized laws and rules, and he sits on the sideline with his children, and before the fight is over the fighters begin to gouge and dig, and sooner or later it appears that they may trample his children underfoot, the gentleman from Connecticut contends that he cannot protect his own children because the rules of the game will be infringed. [Applause and laughter.]

My friend talks about international law. International law. I subscribe to the same view held by the great Woodrow Wilson and President Taft and other great statesmen, that no peace and happiness could come to this world until we have true, respected international law. But, my friends, international law. O international law, float not forever on the fair horizon, dwell not forever in the dream of the enthusiast, remain not forever in the song of the poet, but come and make thy home among the children of men. That is what I want. That is what the people of the United States want.

There are a great many gentlemen on the left side of this aisle who come here before the American people and try to befuddle their minds and make them believe that this is a vote for or against war. I will unburden my soul to both sides of this House in response to that and say to you that I do not assume, I do not believe, that the repeal of this law or the retention of this law will preserve peace for the United States.

Peace in the United States will only be preserved by the radio, by the picture shows, by the newspapers of this country, and wherever men assemble and gather together on the streets and wherever the ministers of religion rise in the pulpit. As long as those people, as long as these agencies, control themselves, as long as they keep their heads, they will realize as you do and I do that there can be no benefit to the United States in becoming involved in this war and will not aid in molding war opinion.

Now, my friends, just another word. It has been said here that this is a bill in favor of England and France; that the repeal of this embargo would be in favor of England and France and against the other side. That may or may not be true, but regardless, a motion to retain the embargo or a law to repeal the embargo should stand on its own hind legs and should be measured with the American yardstick. If you want to measure this act with the American yardstick and show the sincerity of this administration, the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, Mr. Speaker, turn to another section of this bill which I feel is the crux of the bill, for every man and woman here knows that we became involved in World War No. 1 because of our insistence on the rights of international law as it applies to neutral trade and travel upon the high seas, and you will find that this section will operate to the disadvantage of England and France.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. Some people say we are trying primarily to hurt Germany; yet here is England mistress of the seas and, during wartime, I have often said that international law is what England says it is. This is another reason why I have no confidence in international law as it exists at the present time. Let me say, however, that if we prohibit our ships from going into belligerent ports, it is directly against the interests of England and France, because England and France control the seas and we could get to their ports but

not to ports of belligerents on the other side, and everybody knows it.

In closing let me say that this is an American bill. I hope with all my heart it will have a tendency to make the American people think more seriously than they have been thinking, and I hope it will do a lot to keep us out of this war. I hope it is a neutral bill. I hope it will not be considered an unfriendly act by any nation in this war; but, Mr. Speaker, if it helps any belligerent, let us pray that it does not help those nations who have robbed the people in Europe, in many instances, of every vestige of human rights, including the right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience; that it will not help the nations which are today, by subversive activity, seeking right here in America to undermine our own system of government. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SEGER].

Mr. SEGER. Mr. Speaker, most decisions that we have to make in Congress are not much more difficult than the average decision in business or professional life. An issue is presented which either coincides with or militates against a man's party principles, or his own economic philosophy and practical experience; he casts his vote "aye" or "nay" and if he is right 51 percent of the time he can go to sleep with a reasonably clear conscience.

But the vote we shall cast today is of a different character. Its implications reach forward into the mists of national and international destiny. It deals with the lives of young men in other nations, and may, before this war is over, involve the lives of our own young men. I doubt if there is a single Member of the House who, during the past 4 weeks, has not experienced the harrowing ordeal of sleepless nights. We are thinking neither of personal nor party profit. Every man, alone with his own conscience, is asking the question: "What will this vote mean when we look back on it in the years to come? Will there come a day when the historians of the future will write, 'The vote to lift the embargo, which seemed so harmless at that time, proved to be the first step toward America's participation in the second European war'?"

No man can answer that question. Only the future will tell. But so long as there is any doubt at all I, for one, want my vote to be against any action that has even the remote possibility of being a first step.

I was the war-time mayor of my city. I remember when the war broke out, and the industries of my district began transforming their production from peacetime to wartime goods. This was in 1914, long before our entry, and no one of us imagined that the manufacture of munitions for the Allies could possibly be a first step. We thought we were putting our workers to work in the good cause of democracy; we thought we were helping the Allies with our factories, and that this would be all the help we would ever be called on to give. But we know today, in the light of history, that though we did not enter the war until 1917, we had already in 1914 taken the first step.

I have been impressed by letters from manufacturers from my district who fear this vote may lead to involvement, who say that this munitions business may mean temporary profits to them, but they are opposed for America's sake.

A Member of this House said on Tuesday that he was not in sympathy with all the screaming of the mothers of this country that we keep the embargo for the protection of their sons. Mr. Speaker, the cries of the mothers of this country in the year 1917 still ring in my ears. Some of them came to my office and literally threw themselves on the floor and clasped my knees and begged me to keep their boys from being taken away. When I said to them that my own two sons had already gone they answered, "Oh, yes; but you are a public man; you have to do those things." Yes; a public man's sons had to be the first to go; and the wife of the public man went about her duties with her chin held high and a smile on her lips, but with anguish in her heart.

I hate Hitler now just as I hated the Kaiser then. I believed that my boys and the boys of those anguished mothers were

offering their lives in a noble cause. Today, as I read the history of the first World War, and consider the iniquities of the Treaty of Versailles, and all the long chain of evil consequences that it involved, I wonder whether Europe could not have made better peace in 1915 or 1916 than it made in 1919. I wonder whether we would not have served the Allies better if, instead of becoming a party to their slaughter and their hatreds, we had tried to help them to an earlier and a juster peace.

We lost our chance to work for peace in those days. Are we throwing away our chance to work for peace today? Is not our duty at least to try for peace before we commit ourselves to begin the manufacture and shipment of arms and poison gas? Our boys may or may not be involved as a result of our vote, but millions of mothers in other lands are waiting with bated breath and a clutching at their hearts for our decision. I have stood before my people again and again and promised, "You can rest assured my vote will never be cast for sending our boys to fight in any war on foreign soil." No pledge that I have ever made has evoked such a heartfelt response. I intend to vote today against what might be a first step in the violation of that pledge. In casting my vote to sustain the embargo on arms I believe sincerely that I am casting a vote for peace. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, in the consideration of the resolution now before us I believe it is of primary importance for us to decide at the beginning the purpose of its adoption. In fact, that decision will to a very large degree determine the entire issue. If we have in mind a policy of neutrality as the safest course to pursue to avoid involvement in the present war in Europe, the resolution will take one form. On the other hand, if our object is something other than an impartial treatment of the belligerents abroad, then the resolution can very properly be of an entirely different character.

The issue resolves itself, therefore, Mr. Speaker, into one of policy rather than procedure. Is it our intention to conform to the declared purposes of this resolution by the enactment of neutrality legislation, or do we intend, under the guise of neutrality, to find an avenue for the expression of our prejudice? Neutrality will take one course; prejudice will go in a different direction. It was my understanding, and I believe it is still so understood by our people, that our purpose was the consideration of legislation designed to protect our neutrality, with the conviction that such neutrality would assure the greatest measure of security against our possible involvement in the war in Europe. Will the hope of the American people for peace be realized by following the advice of Washington to "observe good faith and justice toward all nations," or will these aspirations be attained by disregarding the warning which he sounded that "passionate attachments for others should be excluded"? It is for us to choose between these two courses—"good faith and justice toward all nations" or "passionate attachments for others." That choice will determine our course.

If we decide that the welfare and security of our people depend upon the long-established and traditional policy of "unentangling alliances," we will go one way; but, if the passion to intervene in the affairs of others has persuaded us to abandon this time-honored policy, then, of necessity, we must head in the opposite direction. Which is the probable pathway to peace? Which is the likely road to war?

The truce under which the nations of Europe have lived for a few short years has ended. It has been just another in the series of truces that have marked the centuries of struggle for power in the Old World. Europe is once again at war. Age-old quarrels, implemented by new ambitions and intensified by new passions and new intrigues, have been revived. Men march, women wonder, hearts hesitate as the war lords resume command in Europe. It marks the complete collapse of the idealism which prompted our abandonment of a fixed foreign policy some 20 years ago.

At the present time America is at peace with the world. And what is more important, we can, I believe, if we have the will to do so, stay at peace with the world. Why should it be otherwise? America took no part in the discussions which led up to this conflict. We had no place there. The representatives of Europe conferred on the redrawing of maps and the realigning of power. It was they who decided that war was to be the solution of their problem. It was they who cast the die which plunged their nations into another death struggle. It was they who concluded that their future depended upon the results of this disaster. The American people had made no agreement guaranteeing the sovereign rights or the territorial boundaries of any nation in Europe. The American people had given no assurance on which any of the governments of Europe could base any hope for military assistance in the event of war. As a people we were not involved in the diplomatic maneuvers or the calculated commitments which preceded this catastrophe. As a Nation, we were supposed to have withdrawn from the game of power politics in Europe after the close of the World War.

The proximate events leading up to the present tragedy in the Old World are a matter of record. The remote causes are also well known. Neither need be recited in detail at this time. Suffice it to say, that the course which I advocate places no stamp of approval on the cruel persecutions, the religious oppressions, or the terrorizing aggressions of any dictator. As an individual, I claim the right to denounce and condemn such practices, and I deny categorically the implication which is attempted to be made that a refusal to intervene in the conflict is tantamount to condoning these acts. They cannot be excused or condoned. As I see it, Mr. Speaker, they are the disastrous consequences and the pathetic results of the disintegration brought on by the World War and of the mistaken motives of the peace that followed, both of which invited the tyranny of a man to assert itself as a saving force for a nation. Like the present war, this tyranny was the sad aftermath of the idealistic crusade which prompted our previous abandonment of a fixed foreign policy.

The present war, causing, as it must, interruptions and dislocations in our normal relations with the belligerents, very naturally concerns us as a nation. Of necessity we must adopt some plan as the basis for our conduct toward and our treatment of those engaged in hostilities. A decision of some kind must be made. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we must decide on one of two alternatives—involvement or noninvolvement, neutrality or unneutrality. I can see no middle course. We will intervene and thus invite involvement, or we will pursue a policy of neutrality and thereby guard against such involvement.

The main problem before the House today is the question of lifting the embargo on arms and ammunition. There is little fundamental disagreement on other matters. On this question, however, there is a division of opinion. Both sides to the controversy contend that the course which they advocate will carry out the mandate of the American people to keep out of war. The proponents and the opponents of the lifting of the embargo represent two conflicting schools of thought. Those who urge lifting the embargo believe that America must join with other nations to punish aggressors, that we must assume a responsibility in a program of collective security, that we must lend our aid to the establishment of quarantines, that we must join in righteous crusades to enforce peace, that we may resort to "measures short of war" for the purpose of restraining others from going to war; in a word, that we must take a part in the quarrels of others in the hope of stopping the quarrel. Have I overstated these obligations? If I have, the fault lies with those who have advocated their assumption—and our own President suggested both the establishment of quarantines and the possible use of "measures short of war." I say the fault lies with those who have advocated, not with those who have opposed, them. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that common

sense tells us that conduct of this kind will inevitably make friends of some nations and enemies of others. Will a nation accept a quarantine as a friendly gesture? Can it be denied that if we suggest hostility we naturally will invite hostility? Can we cooperate with one belligerent without antagonizing the other belligerent? Does this tend to possible involvement or noninvolvement?

The repealists claim that this cooperative effort, including assistance during hostilities, comes within the range of neutrality. To make such cooperation effective a verdict of guilt or innocence as between belligerents must be reached. Thereupon the sentence is to be carried out by the one called upon to decide whether such guilt or innocence exists. The judge, the jury, and the executioner are one and the same person.

Since this policy of cooperation requires the determination of guilt or innocence, it becomes necessary to vest wide discretionary power to decide this question. The repealists demand the delegation of such powers to the President so as to enable him to decide with whom this Nation should join in a campaign of a type, which in 1937 he characterized as a "quarantine." I contend, Mr. Speaker, the delegation of such discretion is fraught with danger no matter who the President may be. It is a surrender by the Congress to the President of one of its most important and far-reaching constitutional powers—the power to declare war. To discriminate between two enemies may easily be construed as an unfriendly act by the one against whom the indictment is laid. I fear, Mr. Speaker, that such discrimination will set in motion forces which cannot be stopped short of actual involvement, and that the price which we would undoubtedly pay for the decisions reached would be our active participation in hostilities. Does this course tend to war or lead toward peace?

Those who favor this policy base its justification on high moral purposes. With this claim before us it is difficult to understand the attitude of the repealists in objecting to an embargo being placed on poison gas. Many of us had hoped that at least some limitation might be placed upon this fearful phase of the conflict abroad. Can it be said that lofty purposes and noble motives and a fine sense of moral values will fail to blush in shame as the responsibility for this type of warfare fastens itself upon the proponents of repeal? Will the record of poison gas when it is written calm the conscience and quiet the soul of those who seem bent on furthering its fiendish use?

These are questions that must be answered. We must face facts—cold, barren, unadorned facts—which no amount of empty phrases can conceal and no amount of fervid enthusiasm can cover. Lifting the embargo on arms and ammunition is the plan of those whose basic philosophy approves going to war as the means of securing peace. Lifting the embargo is the avenue by which our intervention in the World War is endorsed and by which it is sought to catapult us into some form of a League of Nations. Lifting the embargo propels us as a partner into the game of power politics in Europe and gives us a stake in the gamble of dictatorships. These are fundamental propositions; they are matters of fact, and if they be such facts as draw certain conclusions, then surely I cannot be responsible for the results of the statement. The conclusions spring from the facts themselves. The American people need neither fiction nor imagination to give them the grim outlines of what our last romantic adventure entailed. Memory is all-sufficient for this purpose. And I am persuaded, Mr. Speaker, that neither their sympathies nor resentments will induce them to embark on another crusade.

Those who oppose lifting the embargo believe that a program of neutrality is the pathway to peace, and that it conforms to the long-established policy urged upon us in the early life of the Republic to avoid "entangling alliances." Such a program we believe is one of realism rather than idealism. It profits by our past experiences instead of gambling on future experiments. It restrains us from attempting another enthusiastic enterprise "to make the world safe for democracy" or to engage in "a war to end war." We believe

that the way of peace does not lie in an attempted return to unrealized idealism, the failure of which is so shockingly before us today, but in applying to the problems of the present those principles which time and experience have so abundantly vindicated. We are convinced that our intervention in the quarrels of Europe will neither cure the ills nor remove the causes. We believe that our duty at home is greater by far than our responsibility abroad. We believe that the peace of America is something more than to be hoped for. We believe it must be planned for—and that plan, we believe, must rest upon an impartial treatment of all belligerents. The plan may not be ingenious, but it is safe.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, we will never stumble into this war. If we get in—and God grant that we will not—we will be led into it, led into it by pursuing policies which will invite the antagonism of one and encourage the favor of the other. We will get in if we have an inordinate ambition to determine the balances of power in Europe and crave a desire to help in remaking the map of the continent. I believe that our relations with other nations involve too much to be trifled with. We cannot blow hot and cold. Vacillation has no place in international relations. We are either interventionists or noninterventionists. We owe a duty, and a solemn duty, to the American people to disclose to them the basis upon which we deal with other nations, so that they in turn may endorse and approve the fundamental philosophies upon which our relations depend, or reject and disavow them. If we are to be interventionists, let us tell them so. If the effort to put us into a League of Nations is to be revived, let us declare it unequivocally as a part of the plan. If our destiny depends upon a "collective security" policy and a participation in the politics of the Old World, let us so advise our people. If we are to join in a concerted action of "quarantine" in all quarters of the globe, let us acquaint our people with their new responsibilities. Those of us who oppose the lifting of the embargo on arms, Mr. Speaker, are not reconciled to these commitments nor do we believe that they represent the will of the American people.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that in spite of the stress which the present strain brings, in spite of the winds of passion that beat upon us, in spite of the great waves of emotion and sympathy that toss us about, and the fury of the unrelenting gale of propaganda that twists the truth into distorted fabrications, we believe that our people have not been torn loose from their moorings, that they still have one fixed and resolute purpose, to remain, as the Father of our Country prayed that it might remain "unentangled and free." In opposing the lifting of the embargo we reaffirm our faith in a fundamental American philosophy of noninvolvement and reject the seductive overtures of those whose imagination, rather than experience would determine our national destiny. Our duty, as we see it, is to hold high a torch of living light rather than brandish a flame of intolerant hate. We hope to be peacemakers, not participants.

Mr. Speaker, I have consistently supported every national-defense program that has come to the House since I became a Member. I believe in an adequate national defense, and that such a defense of necessity must be measured in the light of world conditions. I intend to continue this course. I believe it is our first duty in these days of conflict abroad to provide for a defense which will command the respect of any and every nation, and which will be adequate to protect the honor and the integrity of the country. I believe that every safeguard should be provided which will insure the peace and tranquility of our people and which will impress our strength upon any who threaten the invasion of our rights. Such a defense, Mr. Speaker, would be a defiant note of independence to any ambitious dictator. I make this declaration, Mr. Speaker, as an answer to those who claim that nonintervention is the wail of a weakling or the cry of a coward.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the war abroad should increase our interest in our own national defense, and that, instead of concerning ourselves with supplying arms and ammunition to others, we should direct our energies to the expeditious completion of our own defense plans. Examine

for yourselves the records of our military mechanization. Examine for yourselves the record of our naval construction. Determine in your minds whether we would not do well to use our ingenuity and energy to consummate the plans which have been advocated or authorized by the Congress and which have been supplemented by the President's suggestion as necessary for our defense needs.

Shall it be said that we must experiment in the making of munitions for others in order to learn how to do this for ourselves? Shall it be said that our defense depends on the establishment of an arsenal for others? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the lifting of the embargo on arms will be a handicap, not a help to the national defense. It will negative the pronouncements of the President and the purposes of the Congress that present world conditions require a national defense second to none. With such a defense we will be prepared to defend our position in this hemisphere and command respect everywhere.

For myself, Mr. Speaker, I can take no other course than oppose the lifting of the embargo. I have reached no hasty conclusion. I have counted the costs as I see them. I believe I have but one duty—to be true to my own conviction as an American. I believe my people seek peace and intend to pursue it. I believe that the Nation's integrity and its honor may be maintained without becoming involved abroad. I believe that our task is one of realism, not romance.

I have an abiding faith in the stability of our people, in the steadfastness of their devotion—a faith in their moral courage and in their spiritual strength. That faith stands firm today. It is the substance of my hope that by the energetic pursuit of peace America may render a real world service. In this fateful hour may that faith likewise be to us the evidence of a cherished destiny as yet unseen.

What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES of Texas). The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I may be trespassing in asking the attention of the membership, because what I intend to say has been said by others probably better than I could say it, and I make this apology; but I do believe that some of the things that have been said will bear repeating. In asking the attention of the membership for these few minutes I request that I be not interrupted, because I shall not yield.

The other day when this debate began I expressed the high hope that when it was over we could be proud of ourselves because of its character. I believe my hope has been justified by the quality of debate we have had.

I have heard many speeches—proper ones, of course—that would indicate that the United States was upon the verge of war. I regret this, for I do not believe we are either on the verge of war or anywhere near it. [Applause.] In my opinion, every Member in this House is utterly opposed to this country's getting into the war that is now more or less raging in Europe. [Applause.] I believe every patriotic citizen in America is determined also to help keep this country out of war. How best to do this is a subject of legitimate argument.

We are at peace with all the world. There is war in Europe. It is not of our making. The President of these United States did everything and reached the very bounds of his prerogatives in trying to keep down the war in Europe. One hundred and thirty million people in America, along with countless millions throughout the earth, prayed unceasingly that this cup might pass from any part of the world. It did not, and certain nations are at war. We are trying to stay out.

The question has been raised here—and it does not appeal to me at all, let me say—of changing some rules during the progress of the game.

Whose game? It is certainly not one in which we are engaged. We have no part in the game that is being played in Europe. If that question must be argued, may I say that every country upon the face of this earth was put upon notice early this year that a proposal to change the neutrality law of this country was in the making. This was offered and recommended by the President of the United States and the Congress began acting. The House of Representatives during the last session and before war was declared in Europe enacted an amendment to the neutrality law. The bill went to the Senate. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations voted to put off consideration of that measure until the January session. As with any other proposal of any administration of the Congress when it is in process of enactment, be it a tariff law, be it a tax law, be it a social law, everybody has been put on notice. In the case of a tax law everyone in America that would pay taxes under the law if it went into effect is put upon notice that at the taxpaying time of the following year he will in all probability come under its terms, cut his cloth, fix his business, and make up his budget with that in view. So this matter of changing the rules in the middle of the game or in the game at all could not apply to anyone in Europe engaged in the present war because they were put on notice we were going to try to enact another bill. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, this game has been going on in Europe for 6 years with some nations. I think everyone admits that one nation in Europe has been arming for something during the past 6 years. For what? We did not know a few months ago. But with a law upon the statute books like we have today, if every other country in the world had peace and were trying to be neutral had a law like we have, a rich nation that owned its own munitions factories or had the money to buy munitions of war could without war being declared pile up as much ammunition as they could use in a 3-year or even a 5-year war, with unsuspecting small nations lying at their door, without factories for the manufacture of munitions, without the money to buy them unless they were placed in dire need by invasion of their territory. Is that a game that is quite fair? I do not think it is.

Is it immoral to sell munitions of war to somebody who was not the aggressor, who did not want war, who did not prepare for war? Is it unfair to sell them even a musket to defend that sacred place known as their fireside and their home and their inalienable right to liberty? It seems to me that would be a little bit cruel. Is it immoral to sell a Chinaman a gun with which to protect his land, his community, or his home? Is it immoral, and against the nations that are armed to the teeth, when an unarmed nation is attacked, to sell that unarmed nation, any place on the earth, something with which to defend itself, not for the purpose of being an aggressor, but only to defend that which is sacred and near and dear to them? I cannot see any immorality in that.

Nothing has been said in this debate, and no proposal has been made here or elsewhere that we refuse to sell arms and ammunition to Russia, a neutral; to Italy, a neutral; or to any other neutral in all of Europe. There is no condition that we can put on at the time of sale that will prevent resale to one of the belligerents. So, in effect, when you are selling to the neutrals you may be selling to one of the belligerents. I think we all might understand now where the great neutral country of Russia stands in the conflict and where the great neutral country of Italy stands in this conflict.

Mr. Speaker, we have a practical proposition here. The House passed a bill; the Senate passed a substitute or amendment to the House bill. What are you going to do about it? Are you going to send that bill back to the Senate and ask for a conference, giving the House conferees freedom of action? The Senate conferees are certainly not going to be instructed. It is going to be a free conference as far as the Senate of the United States is concerned. The Senate, by more than a 2 to 1 vote, passed a bill. It put in the bill repeal of the arms embargo. It also put in that bill a provision which would prevent American citizens from traveling

on belligerent ships. It also put in that bill a provision that American ships be prohibited from going into belligerent zones.

Keep us out of war? The doing of those two things prohibited in the Senate bill got us into the World War 22 years ago. Do you want to fail to write those provisions into the law of this land? If you want to write those provisions into the law, the thing to do today is to send the bill to conference and have the conferees free. Suppose the House conferees were instructed to stand by the Shanley amendment or by the Vorys amendment and they took their instructions to be that they could never yield? The Senate conferees by a command of more than 2 to 1 would say, "We cannot yield, and we will not yield on other points unless you yield on the arms embargo." In that case you would have no law. That is a terrible responsibility to take, and I, for one, will refuse to take it. [Applause.]

Let us think a little about the situation we are in and what might be the result of our act. What a picture we would have with no legislation at all. We would have reckless American citizens traveling on belligerent ships. We would have reckless American shipowners sending their ships into danger zones with American cargoes and with American sailors. What would be the reaction in a great conservative country like yours and mine, in which, as I stated, 99 percent of the people are praying that they may stay out of this war, if an American ship were sunk and 100, 200, or 500 innocent boys were sent to the bottom of the ocean? I tremble to contemplate what might be the reaction of this country to the sinking of ships and the destruction of American lives while we were asserting our right to ship any place in the world.

I saw this country—and I was a Representative in the Congress of the United States at that time, when there occurred the loss of lives and the violation of rights we then claimed—I saw this country converted from a peace to a war mind in 60 days. Five million men were called to arms, and two million of them went across the sea. We in America stand today in the backwash of that great conflict. Hopes were blasted, and the faiths of lifetimes were blotted out, and they have never returned. I pray God that as a Member of this body I may never be called on again to move an army under this flag. [Applause.] But I fear, Mr. Speaker, that if we do not enact these provisions, if we do not make it certain that the conferees are free to bring back a bill with these provisions in it, something may happen that will inflame the minds of this people again.

I am not disturbed about America. I believe the heart and the soul of America is still fine. It has been less than a century and three-quarters since the farmers drew up along the lanes of Lexington, and there asserted their inalienable right to freedom of action when they violated the rights of nobody else. I am an optimist not only about my own land but about the whole world. I know that, however we may divide in this House on this or any other question, if those rights are ever invaded or challenged by a foreign foe there will be a lane of Lexington drawn up in every nook and cranny of this land. [Applause.] I have faith, I have hope, and I have the confidence in our people, and the people to the ends of the earth to believe that imbedded in them is more good than there is bad when that emotion is appealed to. I cannot help but feel, and believe that the individual, the nation, or the civilization that forgets and denies God is doomed and damned, which I believe it should be. [Applause.]

I am one of those who want to see this thing done in the best way, and the way that we will be best understood, so nobody can say we have taken them by surprise or that we have changed the rules in the middle of the game; a game, in my opinion, in which we are not engaged, a game—let me repeat—in which we have no part; a game in which I pray God we may never have any part. [Applause.]

I express the hope and belief that in the years to come the people not only of our land but throughout the length and breadth of this earth will be inspired and guided, under God, by the teachings and precepts of the Man who more than

nineteen centuries ago walked the Galilean land, and that again throughout the world, with dictators forgotten, with freedom fought for, attained, and maintained, goodness, good will, and peace will come. [Applause, Members rising.]

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to different Members call upon God to give them a clear conscience to sell instruments of death and destruction to one belligerent to destroy the sons of mothers of another belligerent. But this is not a religious crusade. Religion is not all in one nation or in any set of nations. Like patriotism, it is common to all people. No man or nation has a monopoly of it.

Just why any Member should so far forget his religious teaching as to call upon God Almighty to help him destroy other people when the Fifth Commandment expressly says that "Thou shall not kill," is beyond me. These Members had better call upon the other fellow—Satan—as the one who does the killing and who will enter into a league with them in that unholy business. There is no need of getting excited. We know that in this resolution we are dealing with the lives of millions of young men of all nations, and perhaps ultimately with the lives of our own sons.

Oh, I am familiar with the argument we have just heard. I heard that same argument in 1914 here in Washington, and I heard it again in the campaign of 1916. "He kept us out of war." I was here in Washington in 1917 when the same argument and the same God was called upon to get us into war and to help us kill other nations' people. At that time they first protested that we were going to stay out of war, and then they gradually eased us into it—eased into the struggle—and we had no business there. [Applause.]

In the name of the Senate's fake neutrality resolution we are here in reality debating intervention. We are debating the un-American venture of selling arms, munitions, and implements of war to one set of belligerents with which to assassinate their own and other belligerents' youngsters. There is no neutrality or morality in mass murder, and I do not care which side we assist. Until 1917 we had sense enough to mind our own business and keep out of European quarrels.

I am opposed to raising the embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war. Therefore I shall vote for the Shanley amendment. "The way to disarm is to disarm." These were the words of President Roosevelt in his message to Congress a few years ago. May Congress now send him a message that "The way to be neutral is to be neutral in reality and not in make-believe." [Applause.] It is not to sell arms, munitions, and implements of war—of death and destruction—to any belligerent nation. That is not neutrality. It may again involve us in a foreign war.

This is not our war. We have not yet designated Great Britain or any other nation to select wars for us. We have no quarrel of our own with any of the belligerent nations. No European nation has insulted or is threatening us. If we have any just cause to fight any nation, then let us have the manhood and the courage of doing it. Let us not ship arms to some other nation to kill the sons of men and women in this world. That is not a manly act; it is a cowardly act. Whom do you want to kill? Will you tell me? And if you do not want to kill anyone, why do you want to sell to any nation the instruments that do the killing? Let us not play the part of a coward and in the name of neutrality assist one set of belligerents against another.

We have turned our press, our theater, and our radio over to some nations to spread their false propaganda. It is a repetition of 1914. We may again burn a Bob La Follette in effigy and afterward apologize for our mistake. Let us not repeat the mistake. We have plenty to do to take care of our own people.

While our hearts ache for the youth of all Europe, yet there is nothing that we can do to help them. They themselves must get rid of their oppressors and establish the United States of Europe. Until that is done there will be no permanent peace or democracy in Europe.

This is Europe's war. As the editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal so ably says:

From now on America must be careful, careful, because from now on America will be bombarded from without by pleas, sophistical reasoning, false atrocity stories, selfish, ax-grinding propaganda of all descriptions; and from within by bugle blowers, flag wavers, munitions-making lobbyists, overly sentimental jackasses, unassimilable foreign groups, and all the rest of the lunatic bacteria that international strife always uncovers.

America has no business in Europe at a time like this; no business. Make no mistake about that. Their quarrels are not our quarrels and need never be unless we make them so. If we get drenched in their showers of blood it'll be only because we didn't have the common sense to mind our own affairs and keep them on the right side of the Atlantic. * * *

As for the moral aspect, the who-right-who-wrong question, no debate on any other subject whatsoever could be more stupid and futile—and dangerous. No nation is entirely good, no nation entirely bad. Thinking so brands the "thinker" a fool. This war is merely the continuation of the 1914-18 edition, the result, to a great extent, of subjecting a proud and worthy people to one of the most vicious, vindictive, and short-sighted "peace" pacts ever conceived by so-called civilized men, the terrible Versailles Treaty.

The United States is the melting pot of all nationalities. Some nationalities have not melted quite fast enough. There are still some hyphenated Americans. Of course, it is natural for us to sympathize with different nations, depending upon our ancestry. But, after all, there is room for just one thing, and that is for all of us to be pro-American. It is just as un-American to be pro-British as to be pro-Russian, pro-Italian, pro-German, or pro anything else. Where is Mr. Dies' committee? Why does it not investigate all of these un-American activities so that we can get rid of all of them? Let us be tolerant of one another's sympathies but let none of us ever forget that the United States comes first, last, and all the time.

Let us be intellectually honest with ourselves. We know there are no angels among the warring rulers in Europe. They are all aggressors. If you would take Stalin, Churchill, Hitler, Duff Cooper, Mussolini, Chamberlain, and Daladier and put them into a barrel and roll it down a mountainside you would always find an aggressor on top. Our witnesses are Poland, Ethiopia, the Boer Republic, Palestine, Morocco, and India. The belligerent nations are all equally guilty, just as the youth who in the past have done and in the future will do the fighting and the dying are all equally innocent.

We were tricked, propagandized, and lied into the last war. The *Lusitania*, a British passenger boat, was loaded with munitions by Great Britain and our citizens were invited to their destruction. You can answer who was guilty of this outrage. The fact that the *Lusitania* was loaded with munitions was known to some of our officials but kept from the Secretary of State, William Jennings Bryan. Let us hope that the *Athenia* did not suffer the same fate for the same unholy purpose—to arouse our emotions and involve us in a foreign war.

Undoubtedly, Lord Beaverbrook again told the President that this was our war—that they were fighting for democracy—to protect us. Did you ever see a yellow dog get into a fight and then yelp loud enough so that every respectable dog in the community finally got into the scramble? Undoubtedly, that yellow cur too yelped that he was fighting the battle of the other dogs. He, too, yelped for cash and carry and a \$2,000,000,000 stabilization fund.

Suppose someone got control of all the bridges between the District of Columbia and Virginia, and that later he got into a fight with that State. Then suppose we sold him cash-and-carry arms and poisonous gas with which he destroyed sons of that State. Would Virginia think we were neutral, or would she consider us an accomplice before and after the fact?

Then substitute Great Britain, who has control of the ocean. Great Britain, who still unlawfully searches our ships on the high seas. Now you will have a true meaning of this so-called Pittman neutrality resolution.

This resolution is the first step into the European conflict. Step by step we will be eased into it, the same as in 1914. Then we went from "neutrality in spirit" to "too proud to fight" to "benevolent neutrality" to "armed neutrality" to "military intervention." Let us not get into

another war via cash and carry and the stabilization fund. The price comes too high.

Let us be American citizens. Let us not become a party to manslaughter any place, and I can guarantee you that there is no danger to America. No nation or combination of nations can ever attack us successfully, and if they do we will send them to the place where it never gets cold. [Applause.]

Why shed crocodile tears? Great Britain and France are responsible for this war. The revelations made by the Russian Government after its revolution show that she, Great Britain, and France were equally responsible, if not the aggressors, in 1914. Then, after we won that war for the Allies they grabbed everything in sight. They laid the egg in 1920—the Versailles Treaty—out of which Mussolini and Hitler were hatched.

Let us bring 1914 up to date. Let us assume that Mexico, Russia, and France entered into an alliance—that Mexico's purpose for the alliance is to get back Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California. Then suppose the President returned from a fishing trip and found that Russia had been mobilizing her Army, that then he wired to Stalin and asked him to stop mobilization because it meant war. Suppose that Stalin replied that it was too late, he could not stop it.

Then, let us say, war starts and after 4 years Great Britain takes the role the United States took in 1914 and showers us from the air with "14 points." Suppose these "14 points" are agreeable to us and we lay down our arms, but to find that we are denied the right to sit at the council table.

Then after the loot had been divided among the so-called democracies we are called in to sign the treaty and admit that we started the war. Then suppose that Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California are given to Mexico; Alaska to Russia; Florida to Spain; New England to Canada; and Michigan, North Dakota, Minnesota, and Montana are made buffer States.

Suppose that, in addition, Canada wants an outlet to the Gulf of Mexico; that she is given a corridor through what is left of the United States and New Orleans is made a free city. Then would we not also have a Hitler? Would we not have taken back at the first opportunity that which was taken away from us? No matter which European nation you may sympathize with let me ask you these questions: Do you again wish to have your sons leave part of their limbs and their health in Europe? Some of their bodies on "Flanders Field"? Do you wish them again to wallow in the filth, the mud, and the blood of foreign battlefields? These are the questions for you fathers and mothers to decide.

If we are again lied into this war will there be another Coolidge, another Hoover, and another Roosevelt to veto the soldiers' bonus bills? Will the profiteers again form an economy league to uphold such vetoes? And will it again be necessary for Congress to pass another bonus bill over the President's veto?

Let us mind our own business. We have the best Government on the face of the earth. Let us protect it. If we get into this war we ourselves will have a Hitler. The itch already exists at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

If Congress would now promptly refuse to repeal the embargo there would undoubtedly be peace in Europe within 6 weeks. The truth is that Great Britain again wants other nations to fight her war for "power politics." As expressed here the other day, Great Britain will fight until the last Frenchman is killed and the last American dollar spent.

If we pass this Senate so-called neutrality resolution—intervention resolution—it will be drenched in rivers of tears, soaked in the blood of Europe's civilization, and perhaps our own. It will be saturated with treacherous, poisonous gas—a murderous weapon that has not been used to date in the present war, but the use of which the Senate legalizes in this resolution.

I wonder how the Members who voted us into the World War in 1917 feel when they see our colleague from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] wheeled into this Chamber. He left

both of his legs in France "to make the world safe for democracy."

I wonder if those who were responsible for our entry into that conflict can give a satisfactory answer to themselves and to our colleague. Can they tell themselves, and can they tell him why and what for? I wonder if they realize that the same forces; the same mad emotions aroused by false propaganda are again controlling their action.

Let us not list our sons as eligible for service, but if war comes as a result of our action, let us go ourselves. Let us not say "go" to our sons, but rather "come." Let us not use our political position to obtain swivel-chair jobs for ourselves and our sons and let the sons of others do the fighting and the dying because of something that we started. Let us see to it that we get front seats in the first-line trenches in France, where the British ought to be, so that we can at least extinguish ourselves with honor in the European insanity, which insanity is so magnificently and splendidly propagandized in our own country. I say where the British ought to be, because you and I know that Great Britain will fight until the last Frenchman is killed and the last dollar of the stabilization fund spent.

In the name of all that is good, in the name of morality and humanity, and in the name of the fathers and mothers of all the sons of the belligerent nations and of our own sons, I ask you to vote for the Shanley amendment. Have a heart. [Applause.]

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

PEACE OR WAR

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, the question before us today is fundamentally the question of peace or war. When we vote on this all-important question now pending before the National House of Representatives, it is our prerogative to follow one course or the other: Peace or war. [Applause.]

Peace, the Christian; war, the barbarian. Peace, the happy, natural state of manhood; war, his corruption, his disgrace.

This so-called neutrality measure as it comes to us in the House from the Senate of the United States can have only the effect of increasing the inhumanities of the war already being waged in Europe and of bringing the horrors of that war closer to our people.

It is a repudiation of America's age-old and persistent plea that war should be exiled. It brands as hypocritical all the efforts of the statesmen of our past and our present to lessen the horrors and inhumanities of war by preachment and by covenant with other nations.

I abominate, no less than my colleagues, the practices of some of the nations now involved in the struggle in Europe.

But I abominate even more the very thought that our people should in any way facilitate the ruthless, the wanton, the heartless, and cold-blooded murder of the women and children who will be slain by the bombs and bullets that this measure as it stands would send from this country to Europe.

Mr. Speaker, you know the feelings and the heart of man. You know as I do that no man of any nation will ever remain calm and unbiased toward a people who have contributed in any way to the slaying of his loved ones. Loved ones who have committed no crime, who are as innocent in this war as your children and mine.

Yet this bill, probably by accident, and certainly not by design, makes a double attack on the women and children of all of the nations at war.

Every war involves a greater or less relapse into barbarism. War, indeed, in its details is the essence of inhumanity. It dehumanizes. It may save the state, but it destroys the citizen. War destroys in 1 year the work of many years of peace.

In the first place, we all know what this bill, with its elimination of the embargo on arms and munitions of war, will do. As soon as that embargo is lifted hundreds and eventually thousands of bombing airplanes will be started for Europe, either under their own power or on ships.

And while they will leave their new European ports undoubtedly with instructions to confine their operations to military objectives, we all know what happened in Poland. We read of hundreds of children and hundreds of women, as well as noncombatant males, who were ruthlessly slaughtered. Of course, we were told that this was only incidental and inadvertent to the destruction of military bases. But the point I make is, that regardless of whether they are killed by accident or ruthlessly slain, they will find their bodies broken and maimed by American bombs and American machine-gun bullets dropped from American planes. True, our men will not be flying the planes or pulling the triggers, but it will be the repeal of the existing embargo that will have sent these war machines and these bombs and bullets overseas. Is that humanity? Is that what this House, representative of the American people and of their ideals, is going to vote for?

Now there can be only one answer to the landing of those American-made bombs on the homes of the belligerent not being serviced or supplied by America. And that answer to that scorned or deprived belligerent is a similar, or even worse, frightfulness over the homes of the favored warring countries.

For God and humanity's sake, I beseech you, my colleagues, not to be parties to this unendurable horror by voting to repeal our neutrality, to repeal the embargo on arms and munitions.

It is clear to me that America sacrifices her much vaunted humanitarian principles when she contributes thus to war's horrors.

For the past month my office has been flooded with letters from constituents discussing the neutrality question from every conceivable angle. All are united in the one thought of keeping American boys and men on this side of the now treacherous sea.

To this view I subscribe wholeheartedly. We should direct our energies toward peace and national defense of the United States.

In a concerted effort to avoid war's dangers in the future, Congress enacted three neutrality laws between 1935 and 1937.

Back in 1935 when the first Neutrality Act was passed, it was enacted on the basis that one of the most effective ways of staying out of war was to refuse to sell arms and ammunition to countries at war.

It was thought then, and should be the thought now, that to take the profits out of war would be to stay out of war. Congress by an overwhelming majority adopted that resolution and President Roosevelt approved it.

Only a few months later Congress again reiterated its policy and approved an embargo on the exportation of arms, ammunition, and the implements of war. The vote in the House on that measure was 353 to 27. Again in 1937, Congress approved the arms embargo in legislation which contained still sharper teeth—teeth which the administration is now endeavoring to yank out by the roots.

The Senate passed this legislation by a vote of 63 to 6, while the House gave its approval by a vote of 376 to 12.

These measures met with the approval of the President and they became America's neutrality statutes.

As yet we have had no proof that America could stay out of war if the arms embargo were repealed. History points the other way.

The present neutrality law is not perfect. No one has contended it was perfect. You cannot have perfect legislation in regard to neutrality due to the very inconsistency of the matter with which it deals. No law yet conceived would be flexible enough to cover the interests of the United States in Europe, Asia, and South America simultaneously.

But, let us not take a chance at a time like this. Let us show the European world our version of twentieth century civilization. Let us retain our present neutrality law. Let us continue to take the profits out of war. Let us carry forth the trust our people have placed in us, and hope with all our hearts, that no man living within this country today will live to see scenes reminiscent of 1917.

This world of ours has been tottering since those fearsome days. Another world-wide conflict might wreck it.

There is, as I have said, a second part of this pending bill which, if adopted as it stands, is an assault upon the very lives of the innocent women and children of Europe's warring nations. For, while this bill by lifting the embargo would make death easier, it would by its other provisions make it more difficult even than it is at present to get food, clothing, and those other necessities which are essential to life.

This bill makes it easier to ship bombs and bullets and harder to ship bread and butter.

Is that the position we are to take? Is that how we are to carry on America's traditions?

I submit that there is a distinction between those things which destroy life and those things which preserve life.

I submit, further, that our national position should not be that we want to participate in the destruction of lives but that we do want to aid in preserving life.

The distinction between these things is recognized in our existing law. It prohibits the shipment of destructive forces while permitting, with certain limitations, the shipping of those which, on the other hand, are essential to the preservation of life.

It seems to me unnecessary, after outlining the inevitable consequences of the passage of this bill upon all the warring nations, to point out the subsequent consequences on our own people.

Those consequences will be war. War is bred in hatred and distrust. This bill sows hatred and will breed war.

Our Nation may make millions of dollars by selling our bombers and our bullets. But we are going to give away the lives of our youths, we are going to wreck our families and possibly destroy our civilization.

I have labored over this problem as undoubtedly has every Member of Congress. I reach the conclusion that this bill as it stands would aid in the destruction of Europe and would eventually lead to America's participation in a last and most horrible war.

There is, therefore, only one course for me to take. I shall vote against the repeal of our neutrality; against lifting the embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war; against American inclusion in the conflict; and against the spread of frightfulness to the women and children in all Europe.

What defense, I repeat, will excuse us for ignoring the solemn injunction of the founder of Christianity, whose words of appeal ring down to us through the ages, "Peace on earth, good will toward men." [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] 5 minutes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, of all that has been said on the subject of neutrality, of all that has been printed, of all that has come to us over the radio, of all that I have heard or read, I am firmly convinced that to repeal the arms embargo at this time the United States of America, in the eyes of the peoples of the world, will be guilty of committing an unneutral act.

Let us take a glimpse at the pages of history, to the eventful days of 1914-15, when the United States was involved in the arms traffic and the American people demanded an arms embargo. At this critical period in our history, Great Britain pointed a restraining finger at these United States of America and told us in no uncertain terms to the effect that, should we enact an arms embargo now that war is in operation, you, the United States, are guilty of an unneutral act.

The statement of Great Britain was agreed with by President Wilson and Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan, with the result that the proposed arms embargo was not adopted.

Mr. Speaker, are we going to forget the findings of the Senate Munitions Committee when they exposed the activities of the munition manufacturers, the international bankers, and others of their ilk, which resulted in the American people demanding and the Congress enacting the existing neutrality law.

Are we going to forget what took place in Spain a few years ago, when the American people demanded that we further strengthen the present neutrality law by the enactment of the arms embargo?

Are we going to turn our backs to the fact that Secretary of State Cordell Hull, Senator KEY PITTMAN, and even our present Chief Executive, as well as Members of this Congress, shouted with glee again and again their approval of the neutrality law containing the arms embargo, and hailing the legislation as a measure to keep America out of war?

Are we going to ignore their frank statements not so many months ago when they advised this Congress and the American people that repeal of the arms embargo, once war is declared, is an unneutral act?

Are we going to ignore the opinions of celebrated authorities on international law who are frank to advise that if we commit this unneutral act of repealing the arms embargo we deliberately invite acts of reprisal and retaliation on the part of Germany?

The mandate of the American people to us Members of Congress is to keep America out of war, and I contend with all my sincerity a vote to repeal the arms embargo is a violation of our sacred duty as representatives of the people, since it is a challenging invitation to German reprisal and retaliation and the first step on the part of this body to plunge America into war.

God forbid that any Member of this body should by his vote be guilty of bringing another World War upon the American people.

Keep in mind the first act of retaliation on the part of Germany means that the American people will demand redress, and then it becomes the duty of Congress, in the preservation of our national honor, to declare war.

War, war, that hideous word that brings heartaches and tears of blood and leaves in its wake a trail of destruction. Can not you gentlemen visualize the march of the youth of our Nation to the training camps and the change that is wrought on these fresh young hearts that transforms them into vicious and blood-thirsty individuals? Let us follow their course to the port of embarkation where they engage on another futile trip to the Old World in an attempt to settle century old disputes.

Are you going to close your eyes to the cemeteries in Europe and here in America where countless American flags mark the last resting place of thousands of the youth of yesterday?

Are you going to erase from your minds the pitiful sights in the 85 Veterans' Administration hospitals in our country today where you find the young men of '17 and '18 with mangled bodies, suffocated lungs, and shadowed minds—still fighting today the World War that they were told was a "war to end all wars"?

Are you content to forget the sorrowful plight of the widow and the orphan, of the gold-star mother, all waiting for the footsteps that will never return?

How can we forget this aftermath of war that has imposed a depression that has hounded every man, woman, and child, for 10 years of untold suffering?

Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize again that to repeal the arms embargo at this time is an unneutral act—a violation of international law—a challenge to Germany to retaliate—a step in the direction of our again becoming involved in another European brawl.

My vote shall and must be "no." Do not repeal the arms embargo; and, Mr. Speaker, when I return to mingle among my people—should our country be plunged into war—I am proud to know that I can look into the eyes of every mother and father, wife and child, of the soldier-to-be, knowing that my vote is no cause for their pointing their finger of shame and condemnation for failure to carry out their instructions, their clearly expressed mandate, keep America out of war. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who has just spoken was three times national commander of the Veterans

of Foreign Wars, an organization composed of veterans who fought in foreign lands, and he speaks for the veterans, as he has for many years past.

I now yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, first of all I remind the House that there is on the statute books today a so-called Neutrality Act. The distinguished floor leader from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] in his address said that if we did not agree in effect to the bill which repeals the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war passed by the Senate, now before us, we should have no Neutrality Act. Today we have a neutrality law, and I call the attention of the Members of the House to the print of the Foreign Affairs Committee of three bills that have been under consideration—the law in effect now, the bill passed by the Senate, and the bill passed by the House last spring.

Mr. Speaker, I am against the repeal of the Neutrality Act. I am against the repeal of the embargo on arms and munitions of war. I could not make such a cruel arraignment of any one of my colleagues as to say that his vote will be cast insincerely. If a vote were so cast, it would haunt the man or woman who cast it for the rest of his or her days. It is true that there can be no greater love than this, that a man lay down his life for his friend. It is equally true that there should be no greater shame than this, that a man set out to kill his friend for his own benefit, and insincere voting may well bring about the death of his friend.

I know there are honest differences of opinion. I know there has been much soul-searching about the vote we are about to cast for we must all want to do what is best for America.

I am placed in a curious position myself, because, as the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee will remember, I voted against the so-called Neutrality Acts in past years because I thought there were some very unwise provisions in them, some that were likely to bring America into difficulty. But today we have a Neutrality Act on our statute books and it has been the law for a number of years. And, according to personnel of the State Department, authorities such as John Bassett Moore, Charles Cheney Hyde, Professor Borchard of Yale, Dean Roscoe Pound of Harvard, and also, I was told by the members of my own committee, on the minority side, of whom I am so fond, the changing of that law to aid one set of combatants after the countries had gone to war would be in effect unneutral. Germany has already given notice that the lifting of the embargo would be considered unneutral, and that there would be retaliation. When we lift the embargo we cross the bridge from neutrality to unneutrality, we cross the gap from peace to war, I fear. How can I face my conscience if I vote to repeal that act while the war is in progress, if I feel it be unneutral, if I believe later it will be the cause of sending our men to their death? It will not only send our youths to their death, in my opinion, but it will send our country economically to its death.

It is far better to speed up our national defense to such a state of efficiency that no nation would dare to attack us. The cost to this country would be far less if we were to have a navy equaled by none, a navy that could protect our own America and all of the American Hemisphere, and an army that could protect our own land and even protect all of the Western Hemisphere, than it would be to send our commodities, our money, and our men to Europe to fight in this war.

I have watched our international situation steadily since 1914. Overseas I saw those who were running the governments in France and England. I saw men who were directing the army and the navy, and the soldiers in the trenches. I saw the almost pitiful pleasure of those men because the United States had entered the war. I worked with them for a while. You do not forget those things. All my ties are with the British and French, but I do not feel we should enter this fight. America must come first. During the World War, in working overseas for a time, I realized that

no human being who saw the horrors of that war at close range can ever forget them. In hospital work for veterans after that and later as a member of the World War Veterans' Committee, I had a chance to see what havoc war played with men and women. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House for a number of years, I have listened and taken part in discussions upon international affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I have read speech after speech made in the Senate, I have listened to speech after speech in the House, I have read statement after statement of the administration, and not one of them reassures me. The distinguished majority floor leader spoke of the spirit of the men of Lexington, and of those early colonial days. In my own congressional district I represent the beautiful little town of Lexington. Mr. Majority Floor Leader, how do you suppose those men who fought at Lexington would feel if they realized that we were going to throw their sacrifices to the winds? They fought that day to unshackle the people of this country from the chains of Europe. Every single one of our forebears came to this country for freedom, for liberty. Are we so soon to forget that we left Europe to get away from tyranny, to get away from persecution? If we enter this war, Mr. Speaker, from now on we shall be in every entangling alliance, we shall be in every European intrigue, we shall be in every international conflict. I say it is time to call a halt.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard very little about women and the part they played during the World War. Sometimes perhaps we forget the frail women left behind, women grown old too soon, the women doing men's work, and doing it freely, with all their hearts, even giving their sons and husbands whom they loved more dearly than their own lives, because they felt by so doing they were going to end war. What can we say to those women today and to the fathers, and to the men who fought for us, what can we say to the men today who are in Congress who were disabled by that war, and who are gallantly carrying on; what can we say to them if today, willingly, with our eyes open, we vote to send other men and their sons back to that inferno, to that hell, which is war, that settles nothing?

Mr. Speaker, I presume that what I say today will change no vote, but what I do say I say from the depths of my heart, and out of a sincere conviction. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of hesitation that I seek to address the House upon this subject. I am painfully aware of the fact that I have done so on many occasions in the past. I doubt if I can add much.

Probably most of you know that from the very beginning I have had no faith in the efficacy of legislation which seeks to establish rigid rules governing the conduct of the Government of the United States in the face of unpredictable events. It was for that reason largely that I voted originally against the arms-embargo provision of our present law—against its reenactment in 1937 and in favor of its repeal last July. At best I think it will not be denied we have embarked upon an experiment in legislation never tried by any other government. We have sought to perfect a precautionary system, as it were, which would protect our peace and safety, and in doing so we have encountered difficulties—some of them unexpected. We have on the statute books today this arms embargo. One would be tempted to believe, after listening to this debate, that its enforcement in the present conflict is our first experience under it, but it is not our first experience. We have already had experience with this same law—not a very happy experience, as I look upon it. It was invoked first, as I recollect it, when Italy attacked Ethiopia. Automatically the embargo against the sale of arms to both of those belligerents, if you could call poor little Ethiopia a real belligerent, went into effect. Italy did not need any arms from outside her borders. She was armed to the teeth. True, of course, Ethiopia had no money and probably less credit, but be that

as it may, we found ourselves in the position of denying to the little man any opportunity, as far as we could prevent it, of gaining weapons for his own defense. I can imagine that Mussolini smiled rather grimly when he read our law.

We had experience with this law in the case of the Spanish civil war. It is not important what I or any of us believe as to the merits of that fearful conflict in Spain. Our law was invoked and neither side could purchase any arms from us. Franco must have smiled as he read our law. He purchased everything that he needed, or it was given to him, from Italy and Germany. His opponents were proportionately handicapped. I have heard it suggested by military people that the weight of weapons—munitions, if you please, arms—was what gained Franco his victory.

So in those two instances I think we see conclusively that our law operates to the advantage of the heavily armed aggressor and to the distinct disadvantage of the little man, who, suddenly attacked, in desperation tries to find a weapon with which to defend himself. [Applause.]

We have had another experience under this law. Mr. Speaker, you and I know that for more than 2 years, almost 3 years, war has been raging in Asia—Japan against China. Our law has not been invoked in that case. Why not? I am not competent to judge the mind or to read the thoughts of the President, but the fact is that the President has not declared that a state of war exists between Japan and China, and without that declaration our famous arms embargo cannot go into effect. How is it that such declaration has not been made? I can only assume that the President has taken advantage of a technicality in that neither Japan nor China has declared war upon the other officially, and thus he has felt justified in refraining from invoking the law which normally is expected to take effect whenever a real war takes place between two or more foreign nations. Why is it, I ask, that advantage has been taken of that technicality? Again I am not competent to judge the mind or read the thoughts, but I suspect that we have refrained from invoking our own law in the case of Japan and China because we know that China is the victim of aggression; that she has no industry competent to supply her with arms, and that to defend her territorial integrity and her independence she must purchase arms elsewhere, and that to invoke our law would, with respect to the securing of arms, be a bitter blow to China and place her at a distinct disadvantage in the face of her powerfully armed and aggressive enemy.

So we see in those three instances that this thing has not worked very well. It is a demonstration, in my view, of the utter impossibility of laying down a rigid rule which shall govern the Government and the people of the United States in the face of unpredictable events. My complaint about it from the beginning is not that we are doing something which we are not required to do under international law, but that we have inserted an element into the foreign policy of the United States, legislating into that policy in permanent form, this thing which I think is unwise. It is unworthy of us and, potentially, it is dangerous, for we cannot tell where it will lead us, none of us can. I would not pretend to predict its possibilities.

I am in favor of the Senate bill as an alternative, a preferable alternative, to the present law. I confess I am not wildly enthusiastic. Already we have found the difficulty of writing a neutrality act, already we are guilty of inconsistencies; and yet I do not object to those inconsistencies, because most of them I believe arose from "commonsensical" considerations. But to demonstrate how difficult it is to write a so-called neutrality act, let us consider the cash-and-carry provision of this bill, which says, in effect, that no American vessel shall carry any articles to a belligerent, and that any belligerent seeking to purchase any article or to acquire them must come here, pay cash on the barrel head, and take them home in his own ships. This sounds awfully nice until you begin to follow its application. Someone suddenly remembers that the Dominion of Canada (a belligerent) is just across Lake Erie and across Lake Ontario and that to apply the cash-and-carry provision to our commerce with Canada would utterly disrupt

and destroy our whole economic connection with the Dominion. Visualize a law which forbids an American vessel on Lake Erie leaving Buffalo and going across the Niagara River with some petroleum aboard her. Visualize, if you please, the utter stagnation of the entire commerce of the Great Lakes, and also remember that Canada is our second largest customer, if my recollection of the figures is correct. So we found it necessary to effect in the law an exemption, not mentioning Canada but describing the situation as the "inland lakes bordering upon the United States." Then someone remembers that the West India islands, some of them, are British Crown colonies. They are belligerents. A cash-and-carry provision enforced against them would utterly disrupt our whole economic connection with them, so they are exempted. Then someone remembers that it would be a silly thing to forbid an American ship leaving San Francisco and sailing to Hong Kong, a British Crown colony, but a belligerent, or to Sydney, Australia, or to Auckland, New Zealand. We remember that, and so we exempt the entire Pacific Ocean, the entire Indian Ocean, the Arabian Sea, and I do not know what else.

I mention these little sidelights not that they are in themselves of vital importance, but they tend to illustrate how difficult it is to write a law of this kind and apply it consistently in the face of unpredictable. My regret is that we ever tried it.

There can be no doubt, however, that an overwhelming majority of our people expect the Congress to enact legislation which, if legislation can do it at all, will keep us from being involved in the present conflict. I believe the Senate bill approaches this difficult problem in a realistic way. It refrains from trying to make any distinction between arms on the one hand and raw materials and manufactured products, and food on the other hand. I believe this is the only attitude we can take with respect to the management, if I may use such expression, of our foreign commerce during war. We learned during the World War, and we are learning it again in the present conflict, that none of the belligerents makes the slightest distinction between arms on the one hand and raw materials on the other; all are contraband, and ships carrying them are subject to seizure under international law. If we are to regulate our commerce in time of war we might just as well realize that there is no distinction between arms on the one hand and materials other than arms on the other. In fact, a ship loaded with wheat is in just as much danger of being seized or sunk as a ship loaded with rifles. So I believe the Senate in its cash-and-carry provision at least approaches this difficult problem realistically and that if legislation can keep us out of war, this particular provision will do more in this direction than any other provision that can be drafted. [Applause.]

I believe scarcely a corporal's guard of us here in the House would urge an embargo against all exportations to belligerents, raw materials, food, fuel—I believe scarcely a corporal's guard of us would literally insist upon that, for that would not only be abject surrender but would also inflict misery and unhappiness upon our own people by our own act, and needlessly so. If this provision is enacted, however, it is a fact that no American vessel can become involved in the blockade established by the belligerents in Europe. This being the case we shall be as free as it is humanly possible for us to be free, we shall be free from the occurrence of those incidents of violence which we dread.

It may not be important, it may not even be interesting, Mr. Speaker, but on second thought I feel that the Members of the House will agree with me, that this legislation is being proposed largely because we are afraid of our own emotions. We are afraid that incidents will occur somewhere which will get us angry and drive us into war. It is precautionary legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am optimistic about the future. I do not believe we are going to be drawn into this war; and, again, I try to look at it realistically. My reading of the history of this country convinces me that the American people will never go to war unless they have become the victims of a

studied, persistent series of overt acts of violence [applause], acts committed not merely by individuals, by cranks, by radicals, but committed at the behest of a foreign government. Without such acts, a series of them, without such acts carried on to such extent that their purpose and motive has become completely recognized I think America does not go to war. Who, Mr. Speaker, is going to commit such acts?

What belligerent is going to commit a seriously violent, overt act against the Government and people of the United States? In a former war a great belligerent tried that. That belligerent took the great gamble. It committed a series of violent, overt acts against the people of the United States, and capped them finally by an announcement that any American vessel that dared enter a vast area of the ocean would be sunk on sight without search, seizure, or mercy. They took the great gamble. They gambled we would not be angry enough to go to war, or that if we did we would be futile in a military sense. They thought they could win the war as it was then going on in Europe before we could get there. Their own Ambassador here in Washington, Von Bernstorff, warned his Government not to do that. He knew that we were getting angry, and again angry, and still angrier, and that we would not take another challenge. But his advice was ignored. They took the great gamble, and they lost the war. [Applause.]

Under this legislation as now proposed in the cash-and-carry provision, overt acts cannot be committed against our ships, because our ships will not be permitted to carry anything to the belligerents in Europe. What overt acts, then, can be committed? I have heard it suggested that sabotage would be instigated here in the United States in the form of explosions and outrages of one sort and another, and that in the face of that possibility we would better pass a law which might keep us free from sabotage. Mr. Speaker, if we are ever to frame the foreign policy of the United States upon the theory that we cannot keep order in our own Government, in our own country, then, by heaven, we would better crawl into a hole and pull the hole in after us. [Applause.]

It may be that madmen are loose in Europe; but as America stands today, in all her might and with all her potential power, I cannot conceive of any man so mad as to invite the United States to be his enemy. [Applause.] So I have never been panicky about our being drawn into this conflict, because I cannot conceive that any of the belligerents wants us to get in there and be its enemy. It would spell their ruin, and they all know it. [Applause.]

Let us be calm about this thing. I do not mean to be impertinent, but I think we have been a little jittery in the last 2 or 3 weeks. What we must do, of course, is keep our heads steady and keep our feet on the ground. Put our house in order. It needs it. Those high in authority in the United States Government should refrain from scolding other nations. [Applause.] Nothing is gained for us or in the interest of peace and liberty by exciting enmity. Perfect our defense. Command respect. I think Theodore Roosevelt expressed it very well when he said, "Speak softly and carry a big stick." [Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to my distinguished colleague from the State of New York. He has made a powerful address directed along the line of commerce and profit. I intend to approach this subject from a different angle.

Pride in ideal achievement, of course, is the source of all progress—at least so we are informed. The United States has made great progress in many fields and in one in particular. There is manufactured in the United States today the swiftest, the most powerful, the most deadly bombing plane known to the world. It is an instrumentality of war for offensive purposes, not defensive. No person can stand beneath the wings of one of these monarchs of the air without feeling a sense not only of admiration but of awe, and when

one contemplates the purposes for which it is designed and the potentialities of death which it will carry when it starts on its mission, one stands aghast. It is the last word in military art. But we shall never know just how effective it is until it has been tried out, not in the zones of combat but in the little hamlets and villages nestled in the back country—on the countryside of some nation. I sometimes wonder just how effective this great instrument of war will be and just how destructive it will be. We know there is a move now being made to put it into the channels of foreign commerce—to sell it to other countries for use as an offensive instrument of war.

The distinguished gentleman from New York referred to Ethiopia. I am glad he did. In drawing an illustration, one of many which I have from official records, I will give you a brief picture of just what happened in one little, quiet, peaceful village in that primitive country, Ethiopia, on the 13th of January 1936, if my recollection is correct, 4 long years ago.

The last word in bombing planes at that time under the flag of Italy made three trips over that village within a very few moments. The bombs were released and immediately after the explosions of these bombs men came into the village to record the effectiveness of this instrument of war.

They reported that chunks of human flesh were quivering on the branches of trees. One crate of bombs had been dropped upon the market square and 60 people were mangled and torn to ribbons. Mules and horses were stamping in their own entrails. The little white church in that town was simply plastered with brains and blood. Men were running in all directions wildly insane, with eyes bulging from their sockets. Men were lying on the ground biting the ground and digging their nails into the ground. One woman sitting against a wall was desperately trying to haul her bloody intestines back into her abdomen. One little child sat on a doorstep holding up whimperingly the stumps of her arms in appeal to her mother, who was dead, with her face gone. The man who performed that heroic deed with these bombing planes designed for going back into the country districts, into the quiet villages and hamlets, recorded in his diary, "When my bomb dropped on the people below they blossomed like a rose." When the news went back to that country they had a celebration and they went wild with joy. They were war mad. Medals were struck off and pinned upon the aviator who performed that deed.

That is a new method of warfare, going back into the quiet country districts, and the purpose of it is psychological. By blasting the mothers and the babies and the old people back in the towns, far back from the war zone, the effect is simply to terrify the soldiers at the front. It is a new method of warfare. Perhaps our bombing planes can make the wretched, terrified victims of some of these back villages and hamlets blossom like a rose. Perhaps they can blossom like the poppies on Flanders fields that mark the graves of some of our dead. Perhaps they can do that. So far none of these bombs have been dropped on the helpless people back of the lines. I ask you, do you propose that this great Republic shall, by its acts, release the several hundred planes now ready for shipment to go over there, and put our stamp of approval on this diabolical, un-Christian, brutal type of murder? [Applause.] That is precisely what you propose to do. Every dictator in Europe, and every government, every one of the rulers in all the nations abroad involved in the conflict, is just waiting for that stamp of approval, and then hell will break loose, and we will be the instigators of it—make no mistake about that.

I am against unleashing these offensive weapons to go over there to go back into the country sections to kill women and children. The idea that we should furnish a butcher's cleaver, knowing that the man who wants it and pays for it is going to use it to butcher innocent victims not in the combat zone is abhorrent.

You have referred to this as a game. It is not a game. It is an insult to any game to call this type of procedure a game. I say to my colleagues that once a plane made in America drops its load of bombs on some peaceful village or town, destroying women and children, it will engender hate. My good brothers from the beautiful Southland, you men of chivalry, is there such a thing as hate as the result of military excesses at any time? Has our country suffered from hate generated in that way? What has it cost our country if you would reduce it to dollars and cents? What has it cost in affection and state of mind in this country?

I say to you that if you lift this embargo you have taken the first step to war. I know something about the record. Let me tell you that the big munitions interests who make the instrumentalities of war have served notice on both political parties that if they fail to lift this embargo neither will receive contributions from them for the next campaign. That applies to both sides, and you know it. You dare not take the floor and deny it.

Mr. Speaker, how little, oh, how little decency and morality count when the lure of profits leaps upon the scales to outweigh the nobler impulses of mankind. How quickly the war-profit group descended on Congress when an effort was made to put a ban on the sale of poison gas. Millions of gas masks have been issued by the belligerent nations to their children, even the little nursing babies are equipped with these contrivances. Can these masks, I wonder, withstand the penetrating, smothering, agonizing effects of this new article of neutral international trade? But why be troubled? There is profit to be had, so we are told by those who seek fool's gold—and that seems to be the test of true neutrality in this year of our Lord 1939.

A man is a faker, so we are now told, who does not believe that such a course leads to "peace on earth, good will to men." The modern conduct of a good neighbor is to kill the wife and children of his neighbor's family. The way to be neutral, so we are told, is to take sides; that the way to stay out of war is to get in. Some years ago we were told that to sell arms and ammunition would prolong wars. Now we are told it will shorten war.

We have today, as we did in 1917, the same Molochs of greed, demanding their toll in human life for profits.

I ask you men to read the news items in the press in 1917. The Times, February 4:

In many brokerage offices, the assembled customers stayed long after the half day's work was done, discussing market and banking prospects in a more optimistic frame of mind than in many weeks.

The Times, February 4:

Stocks rebounded sharply yesterday on receipt of definite news from Washington that the break with Germany had occurred. * * *

Bethlehem Steel rose 30 points, and the new Bethlehem B. shares gained 10 $\frac{1}{4}$. * * *

Tribune, March 6:

On Saturday it was generally believed that the bill providing for the arming of merchant ships would be passed, and stocks gained considerably as a result.

American, March 12:

Wall Street has accepted the arming of ships and the special session of Congress as the second step along the road that leads to war with Germany, and on that theory bought stocks. * * * Stocks have been purchased on the theory that war means a boom for a time. * * * Wall Street is proceeding on the assumption that war is inevitable.

The Sun, April 9:

Sentiment among bankers is patriotic and it is bullish. To many persons, long on stocks, war apparently merely spells another long period of abnormal profits for our corporations. * * * The big men hold stocks.

The Times, May 17, 1917:

The Liberty Loan is not only a means of making democracy safe. It is a means of benefiting the money market.

The Saturday Evening Post, October 13, 1917:

The first Liberty Loan paid only 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ percent interest, but it was made free from all taxes, including the enormous super-toll on large incomes. Thus it would come about that a very rich man * * * would be receiving the equivalent of perhaps 10 percent on an investment that pays the poor hardly one-third as much.

On the day that war was declared in 1917 an item appeared in a prominent financial circular commenting upon the requested appropriation for the Army and Navy alone of \$3,400,000,000 and the members of the National Council of Defense, the Federal Reserve banks, and the Treasury officials gave assurance that \$2,000,000,000 at an interest rate not to exceed 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ percent would be almost immediately available.

This financial circular made this statement:

Anyone viewing this formidable array of strength would be a pitiable pessimist, indeed, if he looked to the future with any feeling of trepidation or foreboding.

And continuing, this financial circular said:

If the record of the country's coming achievements carries a tinge of scarlet, the golden luster will be undimmed.

I shall not clutter the record with a long list of present-day newspaper clippings, but the following is typical and only a reflection of what occurred in 1917:

"WAR BABIES" CLIMB ON EMBARGO VOTE—CURTISS-WRIGHT HITS NEW HIGH—MARKET IS IRREGULAR

NEW YORK, October 28, 1939.—Stocks opened irregular in a narrow range today with trading moderately active. Bonds were steady. Cotton futures advanced 5 to 12 points.

Passage by the Senate of the neutrality bill without the arms embargo stimulated some buying in war stocks, but in many instances traders seized the opportunity to take profits and gains were small.

Curtiss-Wright featured with a block of 12,000 shares at a new high of 9 up $\frac{1}{4}$. North American aviation opened 2,000 shares at 28 up $\frac{1}{4}$. Douglas and United Aircraft eased fractionally.

Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being called a faker, I say to you that the lifting of the arms embargo is the first step that will take the United States into the European war, and by that I mean a war that will send our men there.

Mr. Speaker, I shudder to think what history will say about this day's work of the American Congress if this House votes to lift the embargo to engage in such bloody, inhuman slaughter. It will establish a record in the field of brutality under the name of neutrality that will have no parallel in ancient or modern history. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY].

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, it was Kipling who said:

The tumult and the shouting dies;
The captains and the kings depart;
Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice,
An humble and a contrite heart.

If this vote that is taken today is an adverse vote against the people of the United States, it is the first step toward war, it is the first step in the blood business, because the deliveries of arms, ammunition, and implements of war will follow and incidents will arise, as they did in the last World War, which will hasten our entry into the conflict and possibly destroy the Christian civilization of America.

I want to read to the House the statement of a Democrat, a good Democrat, three times Governor of Ohio, and now the senior Senator from the State of Ohio, on this issue of neutrality—of lifting the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war—instruments of human destruction, if you will.

I shall vote "no" on the proposal of cash and carry of implements of war intended for European belligerents.

The demand for lifting the embargo on munitions and implements of war does not in Ohio come from the smallest unit of government—the family—where father, mother, and the children gather at the hearthstone and plan for the peace and safety of all.

America opened its arteries in the World War to make the world safe for democracy. It was a royal feast for vengeful peace dictators, international gamblers, and profiteers. If we open our arteries again, we might bleed to death.

The people should not forget that when our implements of war get into action international and neutrality laws are as dead as the Unknown Soldier.

Our pot of gold should be used over here to take care of those who went over there.

If cash and carry is adopted in 1939, and the war game runs true to form in Europe, we may have cash and credit in 1940 and cash and boys in 1941.

This is the statement of the Honorable VIC DONAHEY, who knows Ohio politics, who is the barometer for Ohio politics in this country, as far as his State is concerned. The sentiments of the Buckeye State will be registered in the vote here today of 19 or 20 out of 23, who are with the people of this country and who are not with the munitions makers and the international bankers.

Who started this fight to lift the embargo on implements of war? A few months ago the British King and Queen were here. I paid my respects to their visit on that occasion. I said then they were the advance agents for the next World War. They had a nice social visit. Just after they went back Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan went to London and he was there before war broke out. He returned to the United States with a contract as fiscal agent for Great Britain in the purchases of war supplies. I do not doubt what our friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] has just said—that there is a movement on foot to control the two major political parties with campaign contributions from the profits on the munitions makers will sell to Europe. It was done in the last World War. It will happen again. War is insanity—it is "man's ingratitude to man." How any Christian can vote to sell poison gas, the most deadly instrument of modern warfare, is beyond comprehension.

Some time ago, back in the year 157 A. D. or thereabouts, I think it was, a philosopher, Tertullian, in his Apologeticus, said, in giving his appraisal of the Christians of his day:

See how these Christians love one another and how they are ready to die for one another.

Oh, I say today with derision, perhaps, "See how these Christians love one another and are ready to sell poison gas, implements of destruction, and bombing planes to kill their fellow Christians." Not with my vote. There will be no qualms of conscience in the dead hour of the night in the not-far-distant future, when a vision might arise of human beings enmeshed in entanglements of barbed wire, with their intestines hanging out and their lungs shattered by the poison gas and the implements of destruction we sent over there to engage in this blood business. When that day comes I thank my Creator that no fellow human being will be murdered through my vote today.

If we are going to become international sadists—I repeat, if we are going to become international sadists—then I ask the Congress to be fair and to be honest and write into this bill today a provision that on every implement of war, every bomb, every phial of poison gas there be stamped the words "Made in the United States of America." Do not be hypocritical about it when you put this country in the wholesale murder business. [Applause.]

Mr. Molotov, Premier Foreign Commissar of the Soviet Union, was under discussion here on the floor yesterday because he criticized the United States Congress in its deliberation of the present neutrality issue. I agree with the gentleman who criticized Mr. Molotov, because it is none of Mr. Molotov's damn business what we do in this country [laughter], and I second that motion to censure the Soviet statesman; but I want those who criticize Mr. Molotov and who are always saying if we do not lift the embargo we are going to aid Hitler and Stalin, let them remember the conduct of England and France. There is not a man in this Congress that has any use for the ideologies of Hitler or Stalin because they are so repugnant to our free institutions. I give credit to each Member for his opinions and expressions in this debate. Not a word is said about the propaganda of our friends for whom this law was created, the synthetic democracies of Britain and France, the nations that hold in subjection in their colonies today millions and millions of black men, yellow men, and white men in a state of serfdom akin to human slavery.

We are asked to be neutral. Thank God they have taken off the mask. It has been off for several months now. We

know now why this law is to be passed—to help the synthetic democracies of England and France. There has been a campaign of aspersion against some of us who dared to be pro-American. Our colleague the ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee went to Europe with his colleagues to attend the Interparliamentary Conference at Oslo, and because of transportation difficulties he rode in a German plane from Berlin to Oslo, as a guest of a neutral government, and yet men on this floor and elsewhere and in certain newspapers throughout this country and Great Britain and France who are pro-British and not pro-American, have sought to pin on him a Nazi label.

They just cannot do it in the face of his war record [applause]; nor can they pin on Charles Lindbergh, Jr., a Nazi label. [Applause.] Charles Lindbergh, Jr., although I do not know him except by reputation, is a son of a man who sat here as a Member of Congress and was bitterly opposed to our entry into the World War. He had the courage to speak and write against the war declaration. He was one of the immortals of his day. Charles Lindbergh, Jr., would not be his father's son unless he gave the pronouncement which he did on this important question; and, no matter what the London Daily Times and other pro-British newspapers here and abroad may say, they cannot accuse Charles Lindbergh, Jr., of being anything other than pro-American; I salute Charles Lindbergh, Jr., and I salute Senator BORAH and scores of men in public life upon whom aspersions have been cast in the Canadian papers and in the London papers and in some American newspapers. They tell about Molotov getting mad because we do not try to do what he tells us to do. Let us embrace them all when we make any criticism, and not pick out just one side. They are all guilty of trying to mind our business.

Not long ago I referred to the fact that I was permitted to point out the danger of British propaganda leading up to this embargo controversy, and I suggested to the House at the time the King and Queen of Britain were here that no one in the House is so dumb or inarticulate as not to understand or express the cheap publicity surrounding the presentation of a Bible from King George to the President of the United States.

It was the same good book presented to the simple natives of Africa, India, and the Orient by other missionaries of lesser mien than the King and Queen. It was the same good book that preceded the flag and historically it was the Bible and the flag which preceded the British trader.

I read of the presentation of the King James version of Holy Scriptures in Hyde Park, N. Y. I recall the James boys, James I and James II. [Laughter.] I remember that it was James I that upheld the doctrine of the divine rights of kings. If I recall correctly he said, "There is a divinity that doth hedge a king." I do not forget his attitude toward the nonconformists and his statement, "They will conform or I will harry them out of the land." Yet I am frank to say that I was astounded when English propaganda did not stop with the visit of the King and Queen, with the presentation of the King James Bible by the King and Queen to the President of the United States. In answer thereto we are told that there went forth a prayer for the King of England, there went forth a prayer for the success of the British King over all his enemies, domestic and foreign—and that was in the United States of America, in the State of New York, in Hyde Park! Possibly it was under the theory of "Love your enemy," or possibly it was under the injunction, "Do good to them that hate you," that this prayer went forth. I commend it on these grounds in its entirety, and without profanity and without sacrilege, Mr. Speaker, I remind you that there is a prayer for the President of the United States written when our Nation was in its cradle of infancy by the first bishop of the United States, Bishop Carroll, of Baltimore. It is recited in thousands of churches and homes in the United States. It is a prayer for peace. This is the prayer of the saintly John Carroll, first bishop of the Catholic Church in the American Republic:

We pray Thee, O Almighty and Eternal God! Who through Jesus Christ hast revealed Thy glory to all nations, to preserve the works

of Thy mercy, that Thy church, being spread through the whole world, may continue with unchanging faith in the confession of Thy name.

We pray Thee, who alone art good and holy, to endow with heavenly knowledge, sincere zeal, and sanctity of life, our chief bishop (N. N.), the vicar of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the government of His church; our own bishop (N. N.) (or archbishop); all other bishops, prelates, and pastors of the church; and especially those who are appointed to exercise amongst us the functions of the holy ministry, and conduct Thy people into the ways of salvation.

We pray Thee, O God of might, wisdom, and justice, through whom authority is rightly administered, laws are enacted, and judgment decreed, assist with Thy holy spirit of counsel and fortitude the President of the United States, that his administration may be conducted in righteousness, and be eminently useful to Thy people over whom he presides; by encouraging due respect for virtue and religion; by a faithful execution of the laws in justice and mercy; and by restraining vice and immorality. Let the light of Thy divine wisdom direct the deliberations of Congress, and shine forth in all the proceedings and laws framed for our rule and government, so that they may tend to the preservation of peace, the promotion of national happiness, the increase of industry, sobriety, and useful knowledge; and may perpetuate to us the blessing of equal liberty.

We pray for His Excellency, the Governor of this State, for the members of the assembly, for all judges, magistrates, and other officers who are appointed to guard our political welfare, that they may be enabled, by Thy powerful protection, to discharge the duties of their respective stations with honesty and ability.

We recommend likewise, to Thy unbounded mercy, all our brethren and fellow citizens throughout the United States, that they may be blessed in the knowledge and sanctified in the observance of Thy most holy law; that they may be preserved in union, and in that peace which the world cannot give, and after enjoying the blessings of this life, be admitted to whose which are eternal.

Finally, we pray to Thee, O Lord of mercy, to remember the souls of Thy servants departed who are gone before us with the sign of faith, and repose in the sleep of peace; the souls of our parents, relatives, and friends; of those who, when living, were members of this congregation, and particularly of such as are lately deceased; of all benefactors who, by their donations or legacies to this church, witnessed their zeal for the decency of divine worship and proved their claim to our grateful and charitable remembrance. To these, O Lord, and to all that rest in Christ, grant, we beseech Thee, a place of refreshment, light, and everlasting peace, through the same Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

As I look upon the world today with its two-billion-three-hundred-million-odd souls confusedly arranged by race and by nations, as I look upon the population of the world, I, too, humbly pray in the form of a litany. I pray, Mr. Speaker, that America may be delivered from the spirit of imperialism, from the fate of Ireland, and from the fate of Gibraltar, O Lord, deliver us. From the fate of Malta, O Lord, deliver us; from the fate of Poland, crossed and double-crossed by the British Government, only 550 miles away from Germany, which failed to send any help to bleeding Poland, although she proclaimed to the world she had a mandate to protect Poland's honor—not even a bomb—but showered only pamphlets down from her war planes. From such a fate, O Lord, deliver us. What kind of a game is this, the power politics of Europe today? England condemns the rape of Poland in the western part of Poland by Hitler, but they bless the rape of Poland when that rape is committed by the Stalinist union in the eastern part of Poland. The British Chancellor, Mr. Chamberlain, commends the Government of the Soviet Union in taking control of Poland, as evidenced by this headline [exhibiting newspaper], but I continue my prayer:

From the fate of Kenya, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Tanganyika, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Uganda, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Zanzibar and Pemba, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Mauritius, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Nyasaland, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of St. Helena, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Seychelles, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Somaliland, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Basutoland, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Bechuanaland, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Rhodesia, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Swasiland, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of southwest Africa, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Gambia, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Ashanti, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Nigeria, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Cameroon, O Lord, deliver us.

From the fate of Sierra Leone, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Togoland, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of the Sudan, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of India, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Ceylon, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Cyprus, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Hong Kong, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of the Malay States, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Mesopotamia, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of North Borneo, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Bruei and Sarawak, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Palestine, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of the Straits Settlements, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Weihaiwei, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Papua, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of New Guinea, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of western Samos, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Fiji, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Nauru, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Tanga, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Barbados, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Jamaica, O Lord, deliver us.
 From the fate of Trinidad, O Lord, deliver us.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude my prayer by saying, without sacrilege, deliver us, O Lord, from the influence of Lord Lothian, the British Ambassador at Washington. Deliver us, O Lord, from Prime Minister Chamberlain; deliver us, O Lord, from Lord Beaverbrook, worthy successor to Lord Northcliffe and the intense British propaganda of the Anglophile, and from the spirit of imperialism, O Lord, deliver us. May the shade of our immortal George Washington be with us today. May he admonish his countrymen once again to guard against foreign entanglements. May the God in heaven who guides the destinies of this young Republic, be with us in this critical hour.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, if the war imps in the court of the god of Mars ever leave off from their blood drinking long enough to evidence manifestations of joy at the spread of their idol's philosophy, surely there must have been some real rejoicing on that distant planet the last 2 days. Not, my friends, because this House is now contemplating a declaration of war, but because we have ignored so completely any discussion of the possibility of promoting peace in Europe, we have said much about the advisability or inadvisability of promoting the war interests of one side or the other but we have heard far too little about our opportunity for promoting a civilization-saving peace in Europe. The Record will show that we are being allowed only 2 days and a few hours to debate this world-shaping decision, but in even such limited discussion, I wish more time had been taken to expressing thoughts regarding this country's great opportunity, in this sorry hour, to help restore peace in Europe.

We have heard much about the arms embargo as a weapon for war but we have heard far too little about the fact that the arms embargo is also a great weapon for peace. It is to this significant opportunity that America now has to make a peace contribution to the world, here and now, that I address myself.

Mr. Speaker, some have said we should repeal the arms embargo and use this weapon of arms shipments as a war measure to help the so-called democracies abroad; some have said we should use this weapon because it is ours and it is our right to discharge it where we will; some have said with more loquacity than logic, in what sounded like an oratorical prologue to a declaration of a holy war, that we should use this weapon to kill for the sake of Christianity; a few have even said audibly what many have whispered, that we should use this weapon for profit. In fact, so close to the position of profit from war have all arguments come which favor repeal that even the most pious cause savers have insisted that we offer our salvation for sale at so much a prayer and at so much a pistol with the interesting admonition

that "Once you have run out of cash, you have run out of cause." I shall have more to say about this later in my speech, but I pause here to ask, what will those who propose that America's foreign policy be rewritten to read, "Causes saved for cash," suggest to this Congress when there is no more cash? I shudder to predict their action then.

Those who, in their too zealous enthusiasm to win support for the repeal of the arms embargo at this time, let their imaginations run and resort to extravagant statements in an attempt to describe the present European war as a "holy war" should find food for thought and cause for reflection in a radio address delivered by the Most Reverend F. J. Beckman, archbishop of Dubuque, last Sunday, when he said in part, and I quote his own words:

The present war is not, in my well-advised opinion, a just war, much less a holy war. It is propagandized as such by the sinister forces of international communism. The Communist anticrists want America and all Christian nations to engage in this war. Their agents here will stop at nothing to involve us, for well do they realize that a war-exhausted America is the only hope for communism for America.

My colleagues, if there is a holy cause America can serve in this war, and I believe there is, it is the holy cause of peace and not the holocaust of war.

My friends, over 95 percent of all Americans want peace. Peace with profit is intriguing to be sure, but peace for preservation of American ideals at home is imperative. [Applause.] Thus, more important to civilization in Europe than repeal as a weapon for war is the arms embargo as a weapon for peace.

Both sets of belligerents are today marking time in the war; no civilians are being bombed, no poison gas is being used, the armies on the western front are talking to each other with loud speakers. Should America, today, risk the consequences of breaking this stalemate? Should we give false hope to one side and false fear to another by taking sides on the economic front of this war at this time? Suppose one side—inspired by the hope, no matter how poorly founded, that our armies will again follow our arms—takes up the killing in earnest? Or suppose that other side, in the desperation that history is repeating itself, discards all caution and conscience? No matter who starts wholesale butchery of human lives it is inevitable that reckless ruthlessness will be met by reckless resistance, and our weapon for peace will have turned into the most useful sword for the god of Mars. Is any man so wise or so bold that he can guarantee this eventuality cannot result from repeal at this crucial time? If so, let him record his omnipotent wisdom in the next speech.

On the other hand, holding repeal in abeyance at this time with no assurance to either side that new offenses, inhuman atrocities, future actions may not make us change our course transforms this arms embargo into the greatest weapon for peace—peace not only in America but throughout the world—that any neutral nation ever had. Holding repeal in abeyance now while all is so happily quiet on the western front makes the arms embargo an invitation to all nations to use the conference table, a suggestion to all belligerents that they outline their aims in the war, a symbol that here stands a country reluctant to encourage—even for cash—either side to proceed with the killing. [Applause.]

On the arms embargo question we are not faced with the alternative today of "repeal it now or repeal it never," but those who would take the fateful gamble this day and hour despite the petitions and prayers of American mothers must remember that it is a question of "repeal it today and you repeal it forever" so far as this war is concerned. There is no argument advanced by repealists today which would not be just as effective 2 months, or 6 months, or 2 years from today, if future events indicate the necessity or wisdom of changing this weapon of peace into a weapon of war. But once repeal is voted, there is no opportunity left to use this power for peace. Our weapon for peace will have crumbled in our hands; our symbol of peace will have become but another bloody blade in the war. And no man voting for repeal today

can shift the responsibility for so hastily scrapping this weapon of peace as he faces his conscience, his constituents, and his God.

The gentleman from New York, the Honorable BRUCE BARTON, has so clearly put this plea to use the arms embargo as a device for promoting European peace rather than European war, that I am sending a copy of his address home to many of my friends. It is a feature of this whole discussion which I join him in feeling has been sadly neglected by those who would rush through repeal at this time, unmindful of the fact that even today, as we vote, the arms embargo and the concern about what we shall do with it is helping to hold hostilities in Europe down to such a point official communiques published in this morning's papers from all governments report "little action" or the even more encouraging words of "all quiet." Heaven forbid that any action we take today will change these reports to long casualty lists and vivid descriptions of vicious fighting 60 days from now.

A study of the entire debate on this arms-embargo issue reveals there are four points of view on the question, each supported by a different group; and while there are borderline shadings of opinion from one group to another, I believe the separation into four divisions will enable each of you to peg your own position and classify yourself with accuracy.

The first group says, "Let us sell arms for cash because it is our war." This is the self-defense group, and they reason that if England and France should lose the war, we would be the next victim; they argue that America depends upon the British Navy for our first line of defense and that our frontier is on the Rhine. There is no shame or hypocrisy about this group, and I admire their candor, although I disagree with their conclusions. To my mind there are several glaring weaknesses in this position. In the first place, if it is our war, then they should say, "Let us get into it as Americans should. Let us send our armies with our arms, if this is our war; let us assume our full share of the sacrifices of war. Let us, above all, not give cause to the slur of being Uncle Shylock by entering into any partnership with England and France whereby the people of these two countries do the fighting and the dying, do the bleeding in the mud and the rotting in the sun of no man's land while we do our part by supplying arms and munitions for cash in advance with the admonition that when you run out of cash it ceases to be our war and you must both bleed and die without benefit of American arms. Let us be consistent. If this is our war, we should join up in the fight; if it is not our war, we should stay all the way out regardless of the attractive possibilities of profit camouflaged in deceptive language."

Thus far this debate has produced not a single competent military authority who says we must fight this war for self-defense. Contrawise, Gen. Smedley Butler says, "Don't let anybody feed you that misinformation," and Gen. Hugh Johnson says such a position is "the most ill-formed, half-baked, blatant, dangerous, and unsupportable demagoguery. It is exactly the same soapy sophistry that pulled us into the World War." Certainly there does not seem to be much basis for repealing the arms embargo as a measure of self-defense.

The second group in this controversy say, "Let us sell arms for cash, because it's our cause." This group I refer to as the world savers. They said in 1917, "It's a war to end war; it's a war to make the world safe for democracy." This time these clarion calls have a hollow ring; so they say, "Let us save Christianity or civilization." In all events, many sincere people belong to this group, and I respect their idealism and sincerity. World savers must be credited with good intentions, but their reasoning is bad when they offer selling arms and munitions for cash as a device for washing away the sins and Satans of the world. Just to examine their stand carefully is to recognize the inconsistency of their position. Again, I say if there is somewhere some cause we should save or some nation of devils we should exterminate by sending 10,000,000 American boys to possible death, or worse, and

by losing every American liberty we now enjoy, then these repealists should say in simple candor, "Let's join up in the war here and now and get on with our saving. But surely we do not want to appear before the world as 'world savers for a profit.' We don't want our American foreign policy to read, 'Causes saved for cash—you furnish the men, the cause, and the cash; you take the risk and do the dying. We'll join up with the saving if you pay cash on the barrel head; but, mark you, no more cash, no more salvation.'" I doubt whether democracy, or peace, or civilization, or Christianity can be successfully saved on such a basis, and can see no reason for selling arms for a profit under the masquerade of such holy names. When and if this war becomes our war or our cause, let us get in as Americans should. Until and unless the time comes, let us stay out as neutral Americans must.

To present ourselves as cause savers on the partnership basis of "death for you, dividends for us" is too much like using gangster methods of holding hostages in front of them while they escape from robbed banks with their swag. It smacks too much of sending the collection plate into a heathen land 3 months ahead of the missionary.

The third group has a different viewpoint—they are more consistent albeit less convincing than the first two groups. They proclaim, "let us sell arms for cash because it is our right." This represents the biggest group favoring repeal. They protest loudly their desire for peace and they do not want America to go to war but they proudly assert it is America's right to sell what she will, when she will, to whom she will, regardless of what her existing law says she will or will not do. I believe this might be designated the "dollars and sense neutrality group," although there seems to me to be more dollars than sense involved in such a stand, because when business risks loom so large that they jeopardize American lives and liberties I submit that at such time good business becomes bad business. I will concede that America has that right, but the whole panel of reliable expert testimony warns us that we cannot exercise that right and remain strictly neutral. We can no longer deny this fact. We can evade the issue, close our ears to the evidence, pit the guesswork of laymen against the testimony of experts, but we cannot deny the fact that repeal of the arms embargo is a step away from neutrality.

Consequently, I question whether it is worth the risk to our peace and progress in this country to jeopardize the happiness of 130,000,000 people so that perhaps a million of them can make profits from such a gamble with the business of peddling the machinery of death. Were the evidence less convincing that such a course is a step toward war, and were the testimony of authority less one-sided in stating that repeal during war is an unneutral act, I might go along with this group because they cast their votes with the hope, no matter how poorly founded, that it is not a step toward war, and economic conditions in this country are so desperate that we are all looking for an easy way upward.

But I submit that all the possibility of profit from all the blood machinery we can sell to all the nations on both sides of the war are not worth the life of a single American boy. If I am wrong, what mother in America will offer that living sacrifice? If I am right, what Congressman would seek to force the sacrifice upon her? Surely I cannot force myself to vote for repeal of the embargo from a "purely materialistic point of view."

The one group which remains cries out, "We should not sell arms for cash, because it is our fundamental policy to keep out of war." This group I call the strictly neutral group. While their sympathies for good causes are just as sincere as any other group—and I know that I personally would fight to the last to keep communism, or nazi-ism, or fascism from invading our sacred shores—these men recognize the rules of the game of international relations, abide by the decisions of experts and authorities, pray that the arms embargo may be used as a weapon of peace, and refuse to permit personal sympathies or private prejudices to swerve them from the path

of real neutrality. English, German, Italian, Canadian, Russian newspapers all have indicated that these people, too, have read the international lawbooks and they are watching our action on the arms embargo as a symbol to determine our neutrality or unneutrality in this war. Once we take the warlike step of selecting sides by official action while the war is in progress, we become an active belligerent on the economic front and all our protestations of desiring peace are in vain if any nation or coalition of nations begins fighting back on a military front against our economic alliance with their enemies. Thus while we shout praises for peace we may in actuality be writing what is tantamount to a modern declaration of war. At least, it may easily become an invitation for the indignities and the incidents which, when amplified and aggravated by jingoistic press agents and hysterical radio commentators, can so easily and quickly lead us to war.

No man can guarantee us against this eventuality; when we try to mix manifestos of mercy with murder for money we gamble with the lives of all our constituents. It is easy enough to argue that no nation will attack us, that we can play cats and dogs with the rules of international law and rely upon our size to keep us at peace. But the record of 1917 is against such argument. When nations desperately fight for life or death or when their leaders goad their people on with falsehood and propaganda they know no rule of caution, consider no ultimate consequences, but strike out where they will and where they can against the forces surrounding them. True, we can win the war if we get in—but at what a cost. And having won the war, we merely bury ourselves more deeply in European intrigue and power politics and begin paving the way for our next entrance into the next war, because neutrality for us will then have become simply the relic of a bygone age of greater statesmen and better Americans than we.

The one mandate you and I have from the people of America today is to keep America out of war; the only Macedonian cry we hear from home is the fervent cry for peace. We now and then hear a whisper for peace with profit, or peace with vengeance, or peace with the big stick, but the great predominating cry is simply, "We want peace."

You, who today would assume the responsibility of implanting upon a formula for peace the unneutral act of lifting the arms embargo, have some important questions to consider which thus far remain unanswered. How can taking an unneutral step in wartime help preserve peace? What guaranty can you place against the mountain of evidence that such a step is a gamble with war? What do you hope to accomplish by such a step unless it is to help win a war which is ours, or save a cause which belongs to us, and if such a motive underlies your vote, should not America be told that if arms will not do the job our armies must follow through? If not, who will answer the question: Specifically, how will repeal of the arms embargo, of and in itself, help maintain American peace? For the answer to that question, the ears of 130,000,000 Americans are now attuned, but thus far the static of evasion has interfered with any clear-cut answer to that straightforward question.

Fellow Americans, my sympathies, too, are with England and France because, while I do not consider them altogether blameless in the development of the situation now plaguing the world, they do more nearly represent the cause I favor. I have no faith in either the methods, the objectives, or the leadership of communism, nazi-ism, or fascism. However, as a public servant I take it as my public duty to cast a conscientious vote for peace, and not to hazard my puny judgment and limited experience against the ageless wisdom of cumulative authority and experience which demonstrates that to repeal our arms embargo while the war rages in Europe is a definite step toward war. If and when this war becomes our war, or the cause is clearly enough outlined by friend or foe so that it definitely appears to be our cause, then America may change its mantle of peace for the armor of war. When the mandate from the people comes to us with the words, "It is now our time to fight for honor or for home

or self-defense," our decision may be different and the problem changed, but our mandate at this time is to vote for peace and to keep America out of the European war. And I predict and pray that this mandate from the people will continue to denounce the folly of war. I expect to guide my future actions and make my future decisions on the basis of what the future reveals. Changed circumstances may alter our current conclusions, but on the basis of today's facts and today's circumstances, I submit, America can best serve the cause of peace, both at home and in Europe, by refusing to lift our arms embargo here and now.

The world today needs a strong neutral nation which by its impartiality during wartime stands ready and available to help hurry the day of peace. Let us hold aloof from the war and remain ready to answer the summons when warring factions join in asking us to help disentangle their armies and reassemble true statesmen to work out a just and permanent peace. Let us not at this time stultify our influence for peace by signifying our unneutrality in the war. If America maintains a neutral peace, we can by our example, rather than by our arms or our armies, hurry the day when other people will throw off oppression and discard unworkable theories to voluntarily accept and adopt the blessings of self-government as a means of bringing greater happiness to greater numbers. Thus by being isolationists from war we can become the world's greatest inspirationists for peace.

On the 18th and 19th of last month the Scandinavian countries, which, contrary to careless statements on this floor, are each and all enforcing embargoes against shipments of arms and munitions in this war—and official letters to this effect are in Tuesday's RECORD on page 1153—met in Copenhagen and adopted a code of neutrality which included this statement:

The Ministers taking part in the discussions appeal to their people to face the anxieties and privations of the wartime with calmness and composure. They give expression to their conviction that it is in the interest not only of the northern peoples but of all nations that throughout the war there remains a group of states which may facilitate that reconciliation of the belligerent nations which the future must bring.

Ladies and gentlemen of Congress, let us by our retention of our arms embargo and our continuance of real neutrality make it possible for the United States to join that gallant group of neutral nations. Let us render real constructive service in promoting a just peace rather than by taking action which may stimulate a war which is now lagging and which may well evolve into an early peace if we do nothing at this time to indicate to anybody that this country even remotely contemplates entering the present European war. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] concluded his address, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], among other things, said that he, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], spoke for the veterans of the World War. I challenge that statement for the purpose of the RECORD, and call attention to the fact that when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House on April 12 of this year he said:

First, let me say at the outset that I speak only for myself. I am making this clear to avoid any misunderstanding. Because of my activities in veterans' affairs in the recent past, it was suggested that I appear as a representative of all veterans. I assure you that I assume no such position.

In addition to that, if I am correctly informed, the recent American Legion convention in its session at Chicago declined to either favor or oppose the repeal of the arms embargo. Further, Mr. Speaker, I was surprised at the position now taken by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]. When he appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House when that committee had neutrality legislation under consideration, in response to some questions by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], a member of the committee, the following occurred:

Mr. HENNINGS. Do you believe in any act whatsoever? Do you think we would be better off if we repealed all legislation and went back to where we were before?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I would say yes.

In response to a question by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], also a member of the committee, the following occurred:

Mr. RICHARDS. You say owing to propaganda we got into the last war, and we had no business in it, or, in effect, you say that, yet you advocate repeal of the present neutrality legislation to throw us right back to where we were at that time.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes, sir.

Mr. RICHARDS. You think it is better to take our chances on that than to have any legislation at all?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Exactly.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has changed his position. [Applause.]

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. FORD], when I spoke on the question of repealing the arms embargo, I was not speaking for the veterans of this country. At no place in my remarks can the gentleman point out where I assumed such authority. I spoke as a Representative of the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania. Furthermore, my position is very consistent. I still take the position that all legislation on neutrality should be taken off the statute books, but I am not in favor of changing our neutral position once war has been declared. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I speak once more to make my position clear on the Vorys amendment and to clear up any possible confusion.

I am for the Shanley amendment. I am for the Vorys amendment. I am for the best embargo we can get. The Vorys amendment will represent the most limited embargo and possibly the most drastic embargo that we can get. I urge every friend of the embargo to vote both for my amendment and for the Shanley motion.

It just comes down to this in this embargo business: Bombs, poison gas, or liquid fire from America to kill men, women, and little children in Europe. Are you for it or are you against it? It is just that simple question that is going to be presented.

I have dropped bombs. You do not aim at a uniform or wait until you see the whites of their eyes. You aim at a ship or a town. You cannot tell whether the people are dressed in uniforms or dresses or babies' rompers.

Now, granting the sincerity of all of us who are voting here, it does not help much when a little baby is screaming in agony from a wound to say, "I sincerely thought it would be all right."

We ask about the war aims and the peace aims in Europe. I think the belligerents have a right to say to us, "America, what are your war aims? What are your peace aims?"

What are our war aims? Let me quote from a distinguished gentleman here, one of the repealists, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]. He suggested this:

Let us once again become savior of Europe. * * * Let us wage war again to preserve Europe and to make the world safe for democracy. Let us wage war again to end war, then let us resolve that within a quarter of a century we shall do it all over again, and again, and again * * * the burden of America, our destiny.

That is not my war aim.

Can Europe say to us, "What are your peace aims? Are you going to be as 'phony' a neutral on one side as Russia is on the other; staying out, but gaining profit and power from our blood and tears?"

My answer would be "No." Our peace aim is to hold peace for ourselves and to bring peace and not more killing abroad. Our peace aim is to live at peace with our neighbors nearby and far away. You have our good will and our respect, but our peace aims do not involve furnishing you either arms for war or unsought advice on your balance of power. Our peace

aim is based on union, that those who live near each other must learn to live together in peace. With this aim we spread from 13 little nations across a continent. We had one continental war, but we have made peace forever. This peace aim now spreads across our hemisphere in the good-neighbor doctrine. We say, "Europe, you must learn this lesson, that peace is preserved not by alliances of ideologies or bunds of races, or balances of power, but by having neighbors learn not to fight with each other. Until you learn that lesson we won't help you fight."

Once more I say on the Shanley motion, as amended or not amended, the embargo issue is clear. Bombs, poison gas, or liquid fire. Are you for it, or are you against it? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER], such time as he may desire.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, and include therein excerpts from international law codified, on the subject of neutrality.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WARREN). Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, the subject under discussion is that of neutrality. The right of the United States Government to legislate upon this subject at this time I have previously stated, and my views may be found in the RECORD as of October 19, 1939.

I am more firmly convinced than ever that the views thus stated were sound and in accordance with the principles of international law. I am also firmly convinced that the repeal of the arms-embargo provision of our law is a direct violation of international law.

Our right, as a sovereign nation, would permit us to strengthen our neutrality laws for the security and protection of our own Nation. This is upheld by the law of nations. On the contrary, we are not permitted to relax in our laws in such manner as to lend aid of any kind to one or more of the belligerents and also against other belligerents.

Much has been said regarding international law and I desire to, at this time, quote from Fiore's International Law Codified, which, on the subject of neutrality, is as follows—and which, if violated, immediately subjects us to attack and the repeal of the arms embargo by this Congress at this time can and may provoke that very thing:

NEUTRALITY AND THE RIGHTS AND DUTIES ARISING THEREFROM— CONCEPT AND NATURE OF NEUTRALITY

1791. Neutrality, objectively considered, is in itself a state of fact, and consists in the complete abstention from any hostile act against either one of the belligerents and from any act calculated to favor either one of the belligerents in their military operations.

Subjectively considered, it indicates the legal status of a state which, in the event of war, takes no part in the hostilities, either directly or indirectly.

1792. Neutrality may be voluntary, absolute, or conventional. The first is a consequence of the autonomy of every state and of the right which it possesses to regulate with complete independence all matters concerning its relations with other states and to determine freely the position which it intends to assume on the outbreak of war.

The second is the neutrality which in a general and absolute manner is imposed in the common interest of all the states upon one of them, either by means of a general treaty or of a rule established in common accord by the states assembled in a congress, or through conditions agreed upon as to the recognition of the international personality of such state.

The third may be the consequence of a special treaty, by the terms of which two or more states undertake by reciprocity to observe neutrality in the event of war between one of them and a third power.

1793. General or absolute neutrality should be deemed under the legal protection of all the states interested in having it respected.

STATES ENTITLED TO BE CONSIDERED NEUTRAL

1794. Every state has the right, when war breaks out, to declare and notify, through diplomatic channels, its intention to remain neutral. Having made such a declaration and notification, it has the right to expect to be considered as a neutral and shall be entitled to the rights which arise from such legal status from the time of its declaration.

States whose neutrality must be deemed obligatory shall be considered ipso facto neutral as soon as war breaks out.

1795. A state which did not declare its intention of remaining neutral but actually fulfills the conditions necessary to be so considered, in the fact that it does not, directly or indirectly, take

any part in the war, shall have the right to be considered neutral and entitled to enjoy and exercise the rights arising therefrom on condition of complying with the duties of neutrals.

1796. A state forfeits its right to neutrality whenever it takes part in the war for any reason, or furnishes assistance to a belligerent, either by undertaking some hostile act against one of the belligerents or by promising to do something which may be regarded as an act of military assistance.

The act of assistance does not lose its character as such by reason of the fact that the state would be obliged to undertake it on account of a previous treaty concluded with a belligerent or otherwise.

1797. No state may limit its neutrality to a part of its territory only.

The legal status of every state, from the viewpoint of absolute abstention or nonabstention from the war, shall be considered just as indivisible as its personality.

1798. No state which is the ally of a belligerent in a war waged by the latter against a certain state can lay claim to being a neutral in another war sustained at the same time by its ally against another state.

RIGHTS OF NEUTRAL STATES

1799. Any state which has declared its neutrality may make use of its military forces to defend it. In like manner, states which have declared themselves unneutral can form an alliance among themselves in order to defend their rights as such.

At any rate, the states which have remained neutral could increase their armaments with a view to defending their neutrality.

1800. Every neutral state may claim the legal and legitimate enjoyment of all the rights appertaining to an independent country in time of peace. It cannot, however, exercise them except subject to the restrictions made necessary by and the requirements of the state of war.

1801. No limitation upon the exercise of the rights of neutrals may be arbitrarily imposed by either belligerent. Such a restriction is only justified when provided for in the conventional rules established by the states with regard to their reciprocal duties in cases where they shall have declared their intention of remaining neutral, or when the restriction arises from the very nature of neutrality.

INVIOLENTIABILITY OF NEUTRAL TERRITORY

1802. It must be considered an absolute right of any neutral state to preserve, during the war, the inviolability of all its territory, with its dependencies, and of its territorial waters, and to insist that no act of warfare shall be consummated therein by any of the belligerents.

1803. The belligerents are bound scrupulously to respect the inviolability of neutral territory and its dependencies and to abstain from committing therein any act of hostility, even of completing therein a military operation commenced outside such territory.

Every act of warfare undertaken or accomplished in the territory of a neutral state must be considered as contrary to the laws of war. Accordingly, it is unlawful to seize an enemy ship within the territorial waters of a neutral country, even when the ship has taken refuge there in order to escape the enemy.

If, however, a belligerent should commence an attack on the high seas and near the end of the battle the attacked ship should enter neutral waters, the inviolability of such waters could not be considered as infringed by the fact that the attack ended there, provided there was unity of action on the part of the enemy warship.

INDEPENDENCE IN THE EXERCISE OF THE RIGHTS OF SOVEREIGNTY

1804. Every neutral state is entitled to exercise with absolute independence its rights of sovereignty in time of war as in time of peace. The free exercise of these rights may not be restricted on the ground of the possible consequent prejudice to either belligerent. It may be limited only in accordance with the preceding rules, or under special circumstances calculated to attribute to the acts of sovereignty the character of interference and of assistance to one of the combatants.

FREEDOM OF PEACEFUL COMMERCE

1805. A neutral state has the right to protect the freedom of peaceful commerce of its citizens in time of war, and to insure in every way the security of navigation and the inviolability of its merchant vessels and their cargoes. It is likewise its duty to protect the undeniable rights of its nationals to be considered as exempt from the laws of war so long as they have not infringed the duties of neutrality, and to safeguard their right to do business as freely as in time of peace. Moreover, such right may be exercised through the maintenance of commercial relations not only between neutral ports and those of the enemy but between any two ports of the belligerents, in execution of treaties concluded during peace and which must be considered as having remained in full force notwithstanding the outbreak of war.

1806. The belligerents are bound to consider in full force treaties concluded during peace with states which, at the outbreak of war, have made a declaration of neutrality, and to continue to assure to them and to their citizens the full enjoyment of all the rights and advantages arising out of these treaties, just as if the war, to which these states remain neutral, had not supervened.

DUTIES OF NEUTRAL STATES

1807. A neutral state must:

(a) Abstain faithfully and completely from taking part in the war and do nothing which, directly or indirectly, may contribute

to render either belligerent stronger; in general, abstain from any act whatever having the character of assistance to one of the belligerents for war purposes; and abstain impartially from lending assistance to either belligerent.

(b) Neither permit nor tolerate either belligerent, on the territory of the state or its dependencies, to undertake any operation of war or accomplish any act with respect to the war.

(c) Undertake by its laws to compel all persons subject to its jurisdiction to respect the rules of neutrality and the duties arising therefrom.

(d) Undertake to enforce its criminal laws to the end that persons subject to its jurisdiction may not violate with impunity the rules of neutrality and the resulting duties.

(e) Prevent, by all means at its disposal and with due diligence, any eventual injury which may be done to either belligerent from a violation of its neutrality by private individuals.

ACTS WHICH MAY BE CHARACTERIZED AS ACTS OF HOSTILITY

1808. The following shall be deemed acts of hostility:

(a) Assistance given to one of the belligerents by means of armed troops or placing at his disposal ships of war or vessels calculated to aid in the operations of the war.

(b) The permission or toleration of the use of its territory by one of the belligerents for the passage of its armies.

(c) Permission for or toleration of any operation within its ports or territorial waters by a belligerent warship calculated to strengthen its power or augment its armament, or to take in provisions and coal, except in case of urgent necessity, and then not beyond the quantity necessary for the needs of the crew during the time required to reach the nearest home port of the belligerent.

(d) Openly favoring or encouraging the enlistment of recruits within its territory on behalf of one of the belligerents.

(e) Permission for or toleration of a ship of war or privateer of one of the belligerents entering its ports or territorial waters to sell or to place in safety its prizes, except in cases of forcible entry under distress, in which circumstances shelter may be granted, on condition, however, of not taking advantage thereof for purposes of war.

(f) Permission granted to citizens to enlist in belligerent armies, or to accept letters of marque to engage in privateering, or to accept proposals of the belligerent states for fitting out ships of war or for participating in any manner whatever in the fitting out or armament of a privateer.

ACTS CONSISTENT WITH NEUTRALITY

1809. The following shall not be deemed hostile acts or acts inconsistent with neutrality:

(a) The passage of armies through neutral territory when the belligerent has crossed it without authorization and the territorial sovereign is powerless to prevent it except by becoming involved in the war.

(b) The enlistment in the belligerent armies of private individuals without authorization of the government, provided the government has applied to its citizens the laws in force concerning the legal consequences of enlisting abroad.

(c) Open and impartial commerce in munitions of war carried on by individuals at their own account and risk, without direct or indirect encouragement of the government.

(d) Any act whatever on the part of private individuals, not prohibited by municipal law, which may have been of advantage to one of the belligerents, but which was accomplished on the initiative of a private individual alone without the state having done anything that may have contributed to lessen the individual's risk and to protect him against the laws of war.

1810. It is no longer to be regarded as contrary to the duties of neutrality to grant permission to the belligerents to transport the sick and the wounded through neutral territory.

BELLIGERENTS TAKING REFUGE IN NEUTRAL PORTS OR TERRITORY

1811. It shall not be regarded as contrary to the duties of neutrality to give refuge in neutral ports to belligerent ships compelled to enter on account of stress of weather or of maritime disasters, or to receive on neutral territory soldiers requesting asylum after battle or troops pursued by the enemy who may seek refuge. These duties of humanity must, however, be accomplished without any indirect prejudice to the interests of the other belligerent and in compliance with the following rules:

1812. The neutral government may protect troops which, pursued by the enemy, have taken refuge in its territory. It may likewise do everything required by humanity for the maintenance and lodging of the soldiers, subject to the right to be repaid for the expenses incurred therefor by the state to which the troops belong, but it may not allow them to resume fighting unless they have been disarmed before leaving the neutral territory.

1813. The neutral government is bound to subject belligerent ships of war which have sought refuge in its ports on account of stress of weather to the condition of resuming their navigation only after a certain period of time, not less than 24 hours, following their arrival. It may permit ships which have been forced to put in for the purpose of repairing damages to make only such repairs as are necessary to render them seaworthy and to resume their voyage without augmenting their armament.

If a belligerent vessel has taken refuge in a neutral port to escape the attack of an enemy, which was pursuing it with superior forces and was certain to capture it, the neutral government could not, without violating the laws of neutrality, allow it to put to sea again in order to continue fighting, but must detain it and permit

it to depart only after the commander has given his word to take no further part in the war.

PRISONERS LANDED AND PRIZES ABANDONED IN NEUTRAL PORTS

1814. A neutral state should not permit a ship of war which by unavoidable circumstances is compelled to enter one of its ports to land prisoners of war therein unless they are set free and permitted freely to depart.

1815. Should a belligerent vessel, owing to unavoidable causes, be compelled to abandon in a neutral port or in neutral territory prizes which it has captured, the neutral government ought to provide for the custody of the goods so abandoned and place them at the disposal of their owners unless the goods are contraband of war. In that case the goods would have to be kept in custody until the end of the war and should only be placed at the disposal of their owners or of the captors in conformity with the decision of the international prize court.

DILIGENCE REQUIRED IN THE OBSERVANCE OF THE DUTIES OF NEUTRALITY

1816. Any government of a neutral state which has not displayed perfect fairness and good faith in the strict observance of the duties of neutrality, and that due diligence which is required by the nature of things and the necessities of war shall be held responsible for any consequences of its failure to exercise due diligence.

1817. The diligence required of any government shall be determined with due regard to the circumstances which might render more or less imminent the danger of violating the duties of neutrality and the possibility of preventing injury to one or other of the belligerents.

Its responsibility would be in direct proportion to the means at its disposal to prevent the violation or to avoid or diminish the resulting injury to a belligerent and the degree of diligence displayed in adopting them. (Compare rules 604 et seq.)

FAULTS RESULTING FROM THE LACK OF DILIGENCE

1818. Ignorance on the part of a government of an act accomplished or planned by private individuals with the intention of violating the duties of neutrality cannot bar its liability for lack of diligence on its part whenever such ignorance may, under the circumstances, be considered as malevolent or grossly negligent.

1819. No neutral government shall be deemed guilty of a want of due diligence for not having adopted extraordinary precautions for the protection of the interests of the belligerents by limiting the liberty of its citizens beyond the bounds permitted by the institutions of the country. Nevertheless, the present powerlessness of a neutral government in preventing a violation of its duties of neutrality shall not be sufficient to bar its liability whenever it is shown to have failed in due time properly to provide the legal means calculated to prevent private individuals from violating the duties of neutrality.

ARBITRAL AWARD ON THE QUESTION OF DILIGENCE

1820. The determination of the degree of diligence which a government is bound to observe in the faithful discharge of its duties of neutrality is an unusually complex question which must be referred to a tribunal of arbitration.

DUTIES OF BELLIGERENTS TOWARD NEUTRALS

1821. The belligerents are bound to consider all states which at the outbreak of war have made a declaration of neutrality or have fulfilled the conditions required to be legally deemed neutrals, as enjoying all the rights of neutrals in time of peace, subject to the restrictions imposed in accordance with the common law in case of war.

They must also abstain from applying the laws of war to the citizens of neutral states not engaging in hostile acts, and consider them under the protection of the law in force in time of peace whenever they honestly and in good faith perform the duties of neutrality and do not infringe the laws and usages of war.

1822. The belligerents shall have no right by virtue of the exceptional law of war to capture neutral goods on board an enemy ship, except in case of contraband of war. (See rules 1870, et seq.)

1823. It shall not be permissible to treat a neutral vessel as an enemy or commit against it any act of hostility, when, by its papers, the vessel is able to establish its legal status as a neutral, and when there shall be no well-founded or reasonable ground to suspect the genuineness of the documents produced, or to raise the presumption that the vessel has forfeited its rights as a neutral.

1824. In principle, it should be deemed unlawful to capture enemy goods on board a neutral ship, unless they be contraband of war, even with respect to states which did not sign the treaty of 1856.

1825. Capturing an enemy ship in neutral territorial waters shall likewise be deemed unlawful, and the belligerent shall be bound to recognize the right of the neutral state to request that the prize be set free. (Cf. rule 1803.)

1826. The belligerents have no right in time of war to modify the rules governing peaceful commerce, but it is their duty to allow the citizens of neutral states to navigate their vessels and conduct commercial relations with perfect freedom and security under the protection of the common law in force in time of peace and of treaties, subject only to the restrictions arising out of effective blockade and the prohibition of carrying contraband of war.

RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF NEUTRALITY ACCORDING TO THE HAGUE CONVENTION OF 1907

1827. The states represented at the Hague Conference of 1907 and those which shall subsequently adhere to the general act shall be

bound to recognize the compulsory legal force of the conventional rules, adopted in common agreement, concerning the rights and duties of neutrality during war on land and on sea, provided the states which have signed the general act are parties to the war and subject to the reservations made by individual signatory states.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, this Congress usually represents in their action the will of the majority of the American people. This must be so, since the membership of this body is changed so often and because of the ease with which objectionable Members may be removed by the people.

In this debate it has repeatedly been stated that this Congress will never vote war against any nation involved in the European conflict. I do not believe this statement is true. I believe this Congress or any other Congress will vote war against any nation just as soon as the majority of the people in this country demand it.

Just now we are all agreed that we would not vote war against any foreign power. We do not because there is no demand from the people of this country for any such declaration. Therefore, the argument that we do not want to go to war is no argument at all, either for or against the present bill. To recount all the miseries of war does not answer the question before us. We have operated 2 years under a law having in it an embargo against the exportation of arms to warring nations. We passed that law when there was no recognized war in Europe or elsewhere. Our purpose was to do all in our power in peacetimes to avoid our being drawn into a conflict abroad should any such conflict develop. I think this was a futile piece of legislation, because we could not possibly legislate concerning a situation that was not then in existence and about which we knew nothing but mere surmise as to future possibilities. Since this act was passed and after 2 years of its operation a general conflict has broken out in Europe. Nations are now at war. At a time when war has actually broken out in Europe we are asked to repeal the embargo and change our policy. If we mean now what we meant when we passed the embargo law, we should avoid any act which would tend to encourage or discourage any nation at war. The only way I know of to keep out of a fight is to keep out.

Should we repeal this embargo, as I predict the House will this afternoon, we will have placed ourselves just one step nearer to involvement. If the repeal helps some nations and handicaps others, those handicapped will point to our act as the very means of their failure. From those nations and those who sympathize with them we cannot expect the same international treatment to which this or any other neutral nation is entitled. Those nations may commit acts which will arouse the ire of the people of the United States; and just as soon as that ire is sufficiently aroused, this Congress will vote war. Whether that ire is justly aroused we will not know, because the facts upon which that ire is fed may not be facts at all, or at least not all the facts. Information will be fed to the people of this country that those who want war will feed them. When public opinion is well formed in the United States, whether based on facts or not, that public opinion will demand action of this Congress, and this Congress will respond. For this Congress who now say "we will not vote war" to actually vote war is the easiest thing in the world to accomplish. All that is necessary is first to arouse the American people.

I for one am not willing to predict that we shall not enter this European war. I hope we do not. I will do all I can to prevent it.

In the present bill, just as I pointed out 30 days ago in this House, is a difficult matter to vote up or down. The provisions insisted upon by the President that our ships and citizens stay out of foreign war zones seems to me to be the best possible safeguard we could throw around this country. That part of the bill should be passed. But in the same bill and interwoven with it, is the repeal of the arms embargo. We cannot separate those propositions—we must vote "yes" or "no" as the bill stands.

Under these conditions I am convinced to a moral certainty that to change our stand on the exportation of arms at this time—a time when there is actual warfare raging in Europe—would open the door to possibilities which would actually involve us in war or furnish the basis of propaganda upon which a demand for war in this country could be built by those who would profit most out of our entry into war. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I shall have to vote "no" on the entire bill.

Every nation in the world knew what our law was when they entered into war, and we most assuredly cannot be called unneutral if we mind our own business and stick to our own law. The turn of events in Europe may present a different situation before us in a very short time. We shall have to meet this situation. But today, right now, I refuse to offer any nation any excuse whatever to commit unfriendly acts against the people of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, we must stay out of the European conflict. We can stay out. We shall stay out. I shall bend every energy within me to that end. It is not our war. It is not of our making. We cannot and must not become a part of Europe by engaging in their conflicts every time a new generation of young men has arisen.

Every reasonable step must be taken to insure that end. Will retaining the arms embargo keep us out? Five years of an embargo, at the instance of two of our best thinkers, Jefferson and Madison, did not keep us out in 1812. International law and President Wilson's best efforts did not keep us out in 1917. This bill, putting strictures upon American shipping and the movement of American citizens to keep them out of war zones, may keep us out. I believe it will assist.

Sweden and Norway sold materials to all belligerents in 1917 and are doing so now. They did not get into the European conflict then and are not getting in now, although they lost 2,000 ships in the World War.

What keeps them out and kept them out? The same thing that can and will keep us out—a clear-headed national consciousness.

Is American thinking kept clear by scarehead statements and speeches made in the Congress and out by leading Members—statements not factually founded, but so constructed as to frighten the people? Declarations that this will or will not keep us out of the European conflict are mere statements of opinion. Since they are mere statements of opinion, why emblazon these statements with suggestions, not based upon fact, the effect of which is to frighten and confuse the millions of Americans who want above all things to see this cup of bitterness pass.

Basically, the catastrophe in Europe is the result of hatred. Why feed the flames of hatred in America with wild statements that result in evil, in the guise of good?

Can the American conscience stay clear if the molders of public opinion in America persist in rash acts and rash statements? Has a group of self-styled Solomons descended upon the earth, who believe that dogmatic statements amount to sound reason? No, Mr. Speaker; pride of opinion is a snare and a delusion, and it is more calculated to deceive than to instruct.

For my part, the reasoning of Senator George Norris; of Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of State under Hoover; William Allen White, leader of American thought for half a century; President Roosevelt, and other great Americans, seems logical.

Mr. Speaker, I have concluded to cast my vote in favor of the pending measure. I shall vote to repeal the existing arms-embargo law and to substitute a bona fide cash-and-carry system. I desire to state briefly the reasons which have led me to this conclusion, which have led me to adopt this course of action. First, let us consider the end which we seek to accomplish and then consider the means which are best calculated to accomplish that end.

Fortunately, we all agree as to the end. We differ only as to the best means for accomplishing that end. There is one point, at least, upon which we all agree—the desire to keep this country out of this war. In that desire the membership of this House is as united as one man. In that desire the people of this country are united. Few there are, if any, who would be willing to see this country reenter the bloody shambles of Europe. That sentiment is universal at this time.

But you ask if everybody desires to keep the peace, if everybody desires to keep out of this war, why should we worry? Why all this anxiety? Why all this solicitude? There are two sufficient answers to that question. In the first place, it takes two countries to keep the peace, whereas one country can break the peace, can precipitate war. No one country alone can decide whether it will have peace or war with another country. The worse of two countries can provoke war, can embroil itself and others in war. I repeat, there is no certain, no sovereign way, by which the most peace-loving country, acting alone, can preserve peace and prevent war. I mean, of course, no country that is not willing or is not bound to purchase peace at the price of surrender.

In the second place, the voice of experience bids us beware. In considering the future we must remember the past. When the World War broke out in 1914 the desire in this country to keep out of that struggle was as universal then as the desire to keep out of the present war is all-pervading now. The very suggestion that we enter that war provoked unanimous protest and abhorrence. At the outbreak of that war President Wilson himself proclaimed:

We must be impartial in thought as well as in action, must put a curb upon our sentiments as well as upon every transaction that might be construed as a preference of one party to the struggle before another.

But time passed, and war came. Incident followed upon incident, casualty upon casualty, and disaster upon disaster. One tragedy trod upon the heels of another. Our ships were sunk. Our citizens were killed. Blood of our blood went to watery graves. Our sympathies were touched. Our emotions were stirred. Our passions were inflamed. Interested and insidious propaganda fed the flames. We entered the war. We sent 2,000,000 soldiers into the slaughter pens of Europe. It cost us uncounted billions of treasury. But that was not the worst—it cost us rivers of blood. It cost tens of thousands of lives. It wrecked many, many other lives which it did not destroy. Many a young life was ruined in the very morning of existence—left mere mutilated images. As we respect and honor the veterans of the last war, no one wishes to reinforce them with the veterans of another war. As we cherish and revere the Gold Star Mothers, we do not wish to increase their number by reenacting their tragedies. We want no more mothers in this country to be weeping like Rachael of old for her children.

But I need not repeat what everybody knows. I need not reiterate what everybody believes. I need not recall what no one can forget.

I come now to the simple question that is in every heart, that is on every lip: How can we keep out of this war? I wish that I knew the answer. The most that we can do, the best that we can do, is to take counsel of experience. Let us not pursue the path that led us into the last war. Let us, as far as we can, avoid the causes that dragged or drove us into that conflict. There were some then who strove to avert war, but they strove in vain. Let us now do everything that human foresight can do to prevent the sinking of our ships, to prevent the killing of our citizens, and to prevent a recurrence of those causes and those casualties which involved us in that catastrophe. The pending resolution is at least designed to do that. It proposes, among other things, to repeal the existing arms-embargo law. The present law places an embargo upon the shipment of arms, munitions, and the implements of war to a belligerent or to a participant in a declared war, but it does not prohibit the shipment of the raw materials out of which arms and munitions are made. It does not prohibit our ships from transporting such raw

materials to the belligerent countries. It does not prohibit our ships from traveling in troubled waters—in belligerent waters. It did not prevent the *City of Flint* from falling into the hands of a belligerent power. It would not prevent our citizens from traveling on our ships into those danger zones where death lurks in the deep—nay, where death "stalks like a pestilence at noontime."

The pending measure proposes to do those very things, to prevent, as far as we can, those causes which plunged us into the last war. The pending measure not only forbids our ships to transport arms and munitions to a warring power but forbids them to transport the raw materials out of which the implements of war are made. Not only that, it forbids our ships to transport both raw materials and finished products of every kind to a warring nation. More than that, it forbids our vessels to enter the ports or to enter the waters of those countries where the war is waging. There are some, indeed, who complain that the proposed measure goes too far, that the proposed sacrifices are too great. But if this bill errs at all, it errs on the side of peace. For my own part, I am willing to do everything—I am willing to make any sacrifice that can be made with honor—to preserve peace and to avert war. I am unwilling to do less. I shall, therefore, vote for this measure in the belief that it is a bona fide cash-and-carry measure.

This act, if passed, will, among other things, prohibit the sale of arms and munitions in this country to any belligerent government except for cash. It will prohibit the export of materials of any kind to a belligerent state until the shipper has filed a sworn statement with port collectors that title has been transferred to some foreign government, corporation, agency, or national. It will require all belligerents to transport all such materials and munitions in their own vessels or in the vessels of some other country than the United States. It also prohibits the shipment of arms and munitions in American vessels to any belligerent port on the globe and it bars American vessels from transporting supplies or passengers to belligerent ports situated in a danger zone or combat area. Last, but not least, it forbids American citizens to travel on the ships of a belligerent power, whether armed or unarmed.

I repeat that I support this resolution in the belief that it is a bona fide cash-and-carry measure and upon the assurance that it will be administered as such in good faith. When I say cash and carry I mean cash and carry. With me cash does not mean credit and credit does not mean cash. Cash, as we say out West, means "cash on the barrel head." Ninety days is not cash. I would not vote for a makeshift or a subterfuge.

I want Congress to pull these evils up by the roots. I want Congress to do its duty. I want the legislative department to meet and to discharge its responsibility. The administration, the enforcement of the measure, must, under our system, be left to the executive department.

Mr. Speaker, if you ask me whether this measure, if enacted, will positively keep us out of war, I answer that I do not know. No man can tell. I know of no royal recipe to prevent war. If I did know, I would be wiser than other men, because they do not know. They may declaim they do, but they cannot be that wise. During the last 3,500 years there have been more than 8,000 treaties of peace entered into among the warring nations of the past. The average life of these treaties was less than 6 months. The mortality rate on the average was more than two treaties for each and every year during the last three and one-half thousand years. So how can we now be dogmatic in our beliefs?

If you ask me why I am not content to retain and to rely upon the existing arms embargo law, I can make but one answer, and I answer in the light of experience. We tried the embargo once. We tried it from 1807 until 1811. The first Embargo Act was passed in 1807. It was followed by nonintercourse acts and nonimportation acts. Mr. Jefferson believed that the embargo would keep us out of war. He tried it in good faith. Jefferson said that he could hardly withhold himself from the wish that an ocean of fire rolled between this country and Europe. President Madison, suc-

ceeding Jefferson, tried the embargo in good faith. It did not keep us out of war. It failed then. It might fail now. At all events the embargo is condemned by experience. It was tried in the balance. The pending plan has not been tried. It has not been weighed in the balance. It has not been condemned by experience.

Mr. Speaker, if you ask why I am not willing to repeal the existing arms embargo and let it go at that, why I am not willing to return to international law, why I am not willing to rely upon international law to keep us out of war, I make this answer: we relied upon the law of nations to keep us out of the last war. We pleaded, we insisted, upon our rights as a neutral. We insisted that the belligerent powers observe the duties enjoined upon them by the law of nations. In spite of international law, in spite of all its sanctity and all its sanctions, we became involved in the bloodiest holocaust that ever scourged the sons of men. Mr. Speaker, I must be excused if I judge the future by the past, if I insist upon taking counsel of experience, if I decline to accept the advice and authority of those in high places who would counsel us to revive the age-old and time-honored doctrine of international law and who would ask us to rely in the future as we relied in the past upon that "time-honored doctrine" to keep us out of war.

We relied upon the law of nations to keep us out of the last war. It failed, as the embargo failed, to keep us out of war. Like the embargo, it has been condemned by experience. It was weighed and found wanting. We put our faith in the law of nations but those hopes, like Dead Sea fruit, turned to bitterness and ashes on the lips.

To revive the law of nations and rely upon the law of nations to keep us out of this war could, in my judgment, lead us again into hostilities. We know what would happen, we know from recent and from bitter experience, we know that our ships would be sunk, that our people would be killed, that passion and propaganda would again run riot, that history would probably again repeat itself and repeat its tragedies. That would be the way into war, not the way out.

I realize as much as anyone that the pending proposal is, in a certain sense, an experiment, but, sir, it is counseled by experience. The proposed plan has not been tried in the past. It has not been condemned by experience. It has not been adjudged in default at the bar of history. The embargo has been tried and it failed. The law of nations has been tried and it failed. It may be that the proposed plan will meet with no better fortune in the future, but we cannot know, we do not know that in advance. It has not been condemned in the past. I cannot lift the veil of the future, but in the light of experience, the proposed plan holds out the best promise to preserve the blessings of peace and to avert the evils of war.

Just a word about the oft-quoted idea that we are changing the rules in the middle of the game. To be literally correct, we started changing the rules before the game started, which we had reason to believe would start soon. The world had notice of our intentions. We have a perfect moral right to proceed in an orderly manner to complete those intentions.

In my judgment, it will not do to allow those international bullies, who have started what even they with their propaganda call a senseless war, for which they have been preparing for a decade, to say to us either directly or indirectly: "You started to change the rules. We started the dreadful game of war. Now it will be immoral for you to change the rules involved in this holocaust." In other words, those belligerents who have constantly attempted to preserve the peace and who made their calculations in the light of peace, rather than in the shadow of war, will not be permitted, by this theory, even to defend themselves against the aggressor—even to buy food and clothing for their women and children who every day clutch their gas masks and tremble at the sound of a whirring motor. I would treat them alike and let them all have equal opportunities according to their own situations, to purchase our materials.

I must reiterate what has been called to the attention of the Congress, that the neutral nations in Europe—neutral both in this and in the last war—as Sweden, for instance, have plied their trade with belligerents, taking their chances under the rules of international law. I am informed that Sweden and Norway lost a thousand ships each in the last war, but they did not become embroiled in the conflict merely because they traded with belligerents.

In my opinion the real likelihood of our getting into this conflict lies in the danger to democracy. Under the doctrine of democracy America has grown powerful and great, and the individual has maintained his rights under our Constitution. If that principle becomes the more endangered in Europe, then it is possible to foresee a change from the now prevailing sentiment against entry into the European conflict, and a grim determination on the part of our people to protect the doctrine of democracy, even to resorting to war, the instrument by which this Nation was brought into being. I repeat, that in my judgment, there lies the possibility of our involvement, when and if democracy in Europe, in the judgment of our people, becomes in serious danger of complete extinction and the civilized world likely to be forcibly turned over to international brigandage—then, and not until then, is there a possibility of sentiment in this country being revolutionized to a desire to enter the war.

My judgment is that the aggressors under force of circumstances are and should be compelled to take their chances with the nonaggressive, peace-seeking nations in this conflict. This bill nearest approaches that objective.

I shall vote for it after months of thoughtful premeditation, having in mind the boys—including my own sons—and the mothers of this Nation, and keeping also in mind that under our democracy we have personal and individual rights that are so sacred and so important to us and our posterity, that they are worth every effort, both physical and mental, that we can put forth to solve this problem.

We know that the ancient nations of the earth flourished, decayed, and disintegrated. We have the consolation that history teaches most unmistakably that nations, like individuals, prosper according to their right thinking, and that the idolatrous exaltation of a material sense of power and intelligence inevitably leads to decline, deterioration, ruin, and downfall. [Applause.]

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter written by ex-Governor Pinchot, of Pennsylvania.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, last spring I was one of the charter members of the Committee to Keep America Out of Foreign Wars. I was profoundly concerned that America was being war-conditioned. My attendance at the convention of the American Legion in Chicago in September convinced me that America was war-wary.

All polls now indicate that 95 percent of the American people are profoundly opposed to our entering any foreign war.

No administration and no Congress can put the American people into war in their present temper. There is instant suspicion of any moves that tend in this direction. Propaganda must be much more subtle than it was in 1917.

How to keep America out of war is the fundamental issue. There is general agreement that we were drawn into the last war by three primary causes. War passions were inflamed by the sinking of American ships carrying supplies to belligerents and by the drowning of American passengers on belligerent ships. Our self-interest was aroused by the large credits to the Allies and the possibility of their loss. Each of these causes is measurably removed in the pending legislation. American ships may not carry anything to belligerent ports in Europe and may not enter combat zones. Americans are prohibited from traveling on belligerent vessels.

American-owned goods may not even leave America consigned to any belligerent. All credits to belligerents are prohibited even for 90 days.

Any Americans who are against Roosevelt, right or wrong, may be reassured by the knowledge that these provisions are most unacceptable to the administration and have been consistently opposed.

I have voted for the embargo hitherto under the conviction that it would discourage resort to arms. That hope has been proved vain.

Our problem now is how to keep from being involved. The longer the war lasts the more danger there is that America will be drawn in.

I believe removing the embargo will tend to shorten the war and encourage a diplomatic peace.

My conclusion is strengthened by the Russian-German alliance which has profoundly altered the world picture since we last considered this matter 3 months ago.

I cannot bring myself at this juncture to take action that is calculated to strengthen the hands of Hitler and Stalin.

Whatever may be the limits of their ambitions or their purposes, they obviously bode no good for the things in which we believe. Their coalition has a sinister significance and one that no thoughtful student of world affairs can properly ignore.

The Communist Commissar of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Molotov, sees signs of a holy war and attacks the Vatican concern over the godlessness that is sweeping over Europe. Apparently Stalin considers this is, and is determined this shall continue, an unholy war.

Russia is opening its markets 100 percent to Germany. America has opened its markets 85 percent to all who come.

In the interest of keeping America out of war, I believe we may wisely impose the restrictions of this bill on credits and on American passengers and vessels entering the war zones and may open our markets 100 percent to all who may have the cash to buy and take away.

All signs indicate this is not likely to mean a war boom. The signed American cat dreads the fires of another war inflation.

Any who support this legislation under the hope of a business boom are likely soon to be disillusioned.

The world has moved some distance since it was last involved in strife. Peoples are generally both war-weary and war-wary.

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

Let us all recognize the high determination of Americans everywhere to keep us out of war. Let us be charitable to the patriotic purpose of all those with whom we may temporarily disagree.

America is going to emerge from this holocaust strengthened and spiritually rededicated to fulfilling our manifest mission as an example of ordered democratic progress for the salvation of the world—not by our armed might, although we shall be adequately prepared—but by the awakening of individual Americans everywhere to our responsibility as Americans to make of our democracy a more pronounced success. Then the weary struggling peoples of the earth may be moved to follow our example, and democracy will experience a renaissance. "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me." [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN] such time as he may require.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, if I were convinced beyond a doubt that the bill now before the House would lead us toward war, I would not support it. It is my opinion that this bill, if enacted into law, will keep us out of war.

In the World War thousands of men were blinded. Although, in my opinion, blindness is not the worst affliction that can befall man, nevertheless, it is a terrible handicap. I know what I am talking about because for 30 years I have been without vision. Do you suppose that I would favor legislation which I knew would result in the murdering of hundreds of thousands of human beings and in the maiming of thousands for life? No; I would not! War is inhuman.

If we would take the profits out of war, and there would be no such thing as annexations or indemnities, it is doubtful whether nations would go to war. I do not think that the people of our Nation or of any other nation in the world want war. I do not believe that our great President Roosevelt would intentionally have us participate in a war unless it was absolutely necessary to defend the people of our country. The President has demonstrated many times that his main interest is in humanity.

If we would use about one-tenth of the money which is expended for munitions and other damnable devices of war for education and for the eradication of slums, we would be doing something that is not only constructive but also very humane.

Almost every square foot of ground in Europe has been saturated with human blood because of religious, national, and racial hatred; and human blood will continue to be spilled until that time comes when man will look upon his fellow man as his brother. Any country that persecutes people because of their religion, nationality, race, or color should be condemned—in fact, our country is guilty of inhuman treatment of many of its own people. The great God of the universe has put on this earth an abundance of everything necessary for man, and yet in every nation in the world thousands of human beings are poverty stricken. It is disgraceful and abominable for mankind to be compelled to suffer in a world of plenty. I hope the time is not far distant when the people of every nation in the world will come under one flag—the flag of humanity. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I was not a Member of this House in 1935 and 1937, when the present law was placed on the statute books, but as a World War veteran and a former member of the Foreign Service of the United States I was naturally interested. My impression about legislation in this body is that few matters that have been thoroughly considered and vigorously debated are passed by such overwhelming majorities as this was; and while I did not even then approve of the principle of an arms embargo, I fear that I looked on the so-called Neutrality Act as a probably harmless gesture expressing, whether wisely or not, the universal desire of the American people for peace.

Since then I have seen some of the complications that the arms embargo can give rise to under varying and unforeseen conditions. As a Member of this House, and of its Committee on Foreign Affairs, I had occasion at the last session to go into the matter more thoroughly, and my conviction has grown and hardened that so long as such a provision remains law it will raise more problems than it solves and will tend to incidents and involvement. I therefore voted against restoring the embargo to the Bloom bill. I have seen no reason to regret my vote in that instance, and I see nothing in the changed conditions of today to change my stand. On the contrary, I believe that the recent trend of events has justified and borne out the wisdom of that vote.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the district that I have the honor to represent in this House. The people of the Second New Hampshire District are a sober, earnest, industrious, thoughtful people, of whom it has been said that they have all of the Puritan's virtues and none of his defects. They are tolerant, friendly, and peace loving; but woe betide the man who thinks that he can dictate to them or trample on their rights. Their fathers fought and subdued the wilderness; they fought at Bunker Hill and Bennington and on many another field for American independence, and they sent a larger percentage of their manhood into the war to preserve the Union than any other Northern State. I belong to them and I understand them; and it was more of a satisfaction than a surprise to me to find that the position I have taken met with the approval of an overwhelming majority of them. [Applause.]

The people of my district want peace; they see no reason for our involvement in the present war. They are cool and level-headed about this and will not be stampeded by emo-

tional appeals based on incidents such as are bound to occur as the conflict takes its course, and which no legislation can prevent from occurring.

At the same time their sympathies are wholly and deeply engaged on the side of those—call them democracies or not—who, with whatever faults and shortcomings, are fighting today, as they see it, for the principles of human freedom which their fathers embodied in our Bill of Rights. They feel strongly that the present law seems to assist those who are attacking those principles, and that the retention of the arms embargo would be welcomed with rejoicing in Berlin and Moscow; and they tell me that they are unwilling that any dictator shall tell them what laws they are to keep and what reject. I should not know how to face them if I voted for what they would consider a surrender of their independence in the face of threats and intimidation.

I am not going to take the time of the House for any extended argument, as I believe the case for the present bill has been fully and ably presented. I should like to add just this:

Some of the opponents of this bill are proposing—illogically, it seems to me—to compromise. From the point of view of one who, like myself, regrets the surrender of hard-won principles of international law, the present bill as a whole can only be regarded as a painful but probably necessary compromise, which surrenders rights for which our ancestors have fought and died, in the hope thereby of maintaining peace. My sentiments have been brilliantly expressed by that indomitable son of our sister State of Virginia, Senator CARTER GLASS, in a memorable statement which I am sure no Member of this House has failed to read. Like him, I am forced to recognize the practical necessity for compromise; and I shall vote for this resolution with the conviction that it is a wise and practical measure which reasserts our freedom of action, while tending to guard us against incidents which might arouse the national passions and break down in the minds and hearts of the American people their present will to peace. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has used 1 hour and 34 minutes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has used 1 hour and 25 minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, so there may be no misunderstanding with reference to the time, I understood that debate was to run until 3:20.

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

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. And I hope this will not be taken out of the time for either side.

Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I submitted a unanimous consent request that would have carried the debate until 3 o'clock today. That request was objected to. After consultation I decided to move the previous question at 3 o'clock, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] feel they are committed to 20 minutes more time—10 minutes a side. I have agreed to that, but I shall move the previous question at exactly 3:20.

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

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we might just as well admit that propaganda is coming into this country in such magnitude that the 1914-17 stream looks like a mere trickle. We will have to admit that it has only begun. It is a regrettable fact that on the eve of the consideration of this bill in one of the great metropolitan papers of this city, those who would oppose the repeal of the arms embargo would be caricatured as marching down the street arm in arm with Stalin. The bloody beast of intolerance breathes its hot breath upon the Members of the greatest deliberative body in the world by name-calling, character-assassinating editorials that would question the high purposes and the patriotic devotion to their country of the Members that are

trying to find the answer to the momentous questions, which will undoubtedly be settled this week. The editorials eulogize those who would take one course as against another because some differ as to the meaning of the word "neutrality," because some differ as to the concept of what our national policy should be as distinguished from what our personal prejudices seem to be at the moment. This is a sad commentary upon the freedom of the press and freedom of the speech guaranteed by our Constitution, that one group be castigated. I am willing to resolve the doubt in favor of the sincerity of the editors and columnists who resort to hitting below the belt when men of high purpose speak their heart upon these questions, that will chart the course of our Government in peaceful waters of true neutrality or in the storm-tossed seas of hatreds, fears, butchery of the innocent, and dethroning of the powerful.

I am sure you will be charitable with me when I say that while propaganda is showing its force, little can be done about it. The right to propagandize the American people is so clearly linked up with freedom of press and assembly that it is difficult and probably not desirable to halt the flood. Our defense against propaganda is to use the experience of the World War technique as a basis. We should accept nothing from foreign shores without weighing the alleged facts in the balance. We should ask ourselves "What is the source?" "What ax have they to grind?" "Exactly how does this affect the United States?" Let us ever and always apply this test to every morsel of information that comes to our eyes or ears.

We are called here in special session because a war has broken out in Europe. The natural history of Europe has been a history of war and conquest. The rotten growth of hate is so imbedded in the hearts of the several peoples of Europe that bloodshed by our American boys in another war, millions of dollars' worth of ammunition, and tons of food and oil and petroleum shipped from America would never remove it. We tried that once in a tragic effort to change Europe's history and we must confess that the present situation is worse than the one before the World War. Before we pit our Nation on the side of our personal feelings in this terrible conflict let us recognize that we are asking our Government to make new sacrifices for old results. We did not make the world better because we fought the last time, and we should remember our lesson. We should give serious consideration to the thought that if our Government persists in the policy of intervention, whether or not the United States will become permanently involved in the conflicts of empire in Europe.

Yesterday an appeal was made to us to make true the shibboleth of Woodrow Wilson that we fight to make the world safe for democracy. Yes; to the tune of this shibboleth we marched our boys behind the bugles and the blares of trumpets to New York harbor to be transported across 3,000 miles of ocean while conscientious people preached and exhorted in America that we were fighting a war to make the world safe for democracy. What a travesty of justice to our people and to the soldiers in Flanders Field and to the lifeless unknown wreck who gave his all now lying in Arlington National Cemetery. The expression "Make the world safe for democracy" is a superficial, impossible, and an unwise slogan. Think of it! "Make the world safe for democracy." It is to say "make food safe for gluttony," "make religion safe for fanaticism," "make the social world safe for free love," "make justice safe for lawlessness." It is a weak, unsound, beggarly slogan. Our Government and our Republic was created to make safety, not to have safety made for it.

The cost of human life, the price of maiming, cutting, tearing the flesh of the flower of our youth, the gnawing destruction of the tissue of the lungs and nose and eyes of our soldiers, the shell-shocked, nervous veterans in mental wards throughout the length and breadth of our land, the terror in the hearts of the mothers who died a thousand deaths every moment that their sons were over there—the cost of these things can never be computed. The cost of a few tangible items we can figure. The cost of the World

War up until June 30, 1921, was \$25,729,000,000. Continuing costs will run this figure up to \$100,000,000,000. Let me recapitulate some of these continuing costs:

Veterans' Administration.....	\$6,391,000,000
Interest on war debt.....	9,557,000,000
Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928.....	88,000,000
Total to June 1934, original and continuing costs....	41,765,000,000

June 30, 1934, is the latest date for which official figures have been published relative to World War costs. Add to this figure bonus payments in the amount of \$1,899,000,000. Bear in mind that it was contended by Winston Churchill before Parliament in London that the United States should pay its proportionate share of the Allies' cost of the war from the date that we declared war until our first troops landed in France.

On January 4, in the President's message to the regular session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, it was apparent that the appeal this time is to "make the world safe for religion." It was and is a dangerous appeal, because it is an attempt to arouse religious passion. Slogans for wars are made to throw men off their feet in their calm, cool, deliberate thinking. Shibboleths disturb their dispassionate judgment and remove the whole matter out of the realm of rational discussion into a realm of emotional ferment where man can be swayed to impulsive action by being frightened with the cry, "Your religion is at stake."

The hue and cry of the President on January 4 is not unlike the columnists and editors who cry "to arms for religious liberty." They have some relation to a Mohammedan mullah attempting to raise his tribesmen to frenzy frantically crying out, "The Christians are coming, the Christians plan another jihad."

It is true, of course, that the imposing success of Hitler and Mussolini, with their countries on the maps of Europe, by appeal to brute force, constitutes a challenge to the Christian faith. But there is a difference between seeing the challenge to the Christian gospel by the obliteration of all the churches in the Soviet Union and the limitation upon the creeds and the religions of Germany and Italy on the one hand and starting out to preach another crusade and girding ourselves for battle on the other hand.

The cries of the war makers, "Your holy religion is threatened; your sacred altars are imperiled; to arms, prepare to fight for your faith; God wills it," do not recognize the first line of defense for humanity and for religion and for the right to worship God as you see fit.

Ask yourselves the question whether or not dealing with the totalitarian challenge to your sacred altars in religion on the level of a war is not a throw-back to the Dark Ages.

At 10:30 one Sunday morning three parishioners of a church served by a friend of mine were lamenting the fact that the churches in Russia had been obliterated and their creeds wiped out. This discussion took place on a golf course. These three men earnestly hoped that communism would not close our churches here. This happened during the hour of worship; they did not attend, but they earnestly hoped that their church would stay open and that their parish would be served by a clergyman. Unwilling to even attend a church service, they hoped that the day would never come in America when communism would wipe the churches from the face of our Nation.

I appeal to you to look at our problem in neutrality with all the coolness and calmness of judgment that you had 2 years ago and 4 years ago when the latest Neutrality Acts were put upon our statute books. If we as American people were sincere that this conflict in Europe was a fight to save our churches and our altars in America and to safeguard our right in America to worship God as we see fit, on last Sunday morning the churches of this Nation would have been filled to overflowing and the depleted coffers of our churches would have overflowed with our hard-earned money. The most sacred possession of our people, the right to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences, is not the real issue in this war hysteria. If we lose the right of freedom of worship guaranteed to us by the fundamental law of our land, it will be because the price

for that freedom has grown so cheap that we do not support any church program in time of peace.

In a world filled with Hitlers, Mussolinis, Stalins, and the swaggering Japanese generals, so closely following the bloody conflict to make the world safe for democracy, that slogan could not be an effective appeal for a new war.

Last summer the French and English diplomats pursued the elusive man that walks like a bear, that rules with an iron hand over 168,000,000 people, to crush Hitler from the east. As long as diplomats of England and France were pursuing this bloodthirsty, ruthless, murdering, purging ruler of Russia, "Making the World Safe for Democracy" was not a safe slogan for this war while the battle lines and the sides were being drawn. It is still not a safe slogan because the geographical position of Turkey is needed to bottle up one side in this conflict.

The history of Europe from the time of the invasions of Germanic tribes has been a continuous story of government without the consent of the governed. For the purpose of this discussion let us examine some of the facts that were taking place immediately before and during the life of our Republic. In 1760 northeast of Austria-Hungary and east of Prussia lay the largest country in Europe with exception of Russia—Poland. Her people were Slavic, ruled over by feudal nobles, so jealous of each other that they were an easy prey for the other countries of Europe. Without privileges from the nobles, Polish working classes were miserably poor serfs, practically slaves, who gave up to their masters a greater portion of the crops they raised. Frederick the Great looked at this land of West Prussia which separated East Prussia from the rest of his kingdom with a covetous eye. He persuaded Maria Theresa of Austria and Empress Catherine II of Russia to join in the division of Poland in 1772. Other European nations condoned the division because they were greedy and annexed land wherever they could get it. By 1795 all the remainder of Poland was divided up between Germany, Austria, and Russia. The Prussian and Austrian armies and the common people of these countries had no desire to fight and conquer the Poles, but their kings gained the exclusive advantage of annexing more subjects upon whom to levy taxes.

Lithuania, northeast of Poland, was Russia's share in the division. The Lithuanians had been united with the Poles by the marriage of their duke to the daughter of the King of Poland, after the duke had followed his father-in-law upon the throne of Poland.

DOWNFALL OF THE FRENCH MONARCH

For hundreds of years the French King had been growing stronger until there was not another noble in the country who could oppose him. Any subject who offended him was thrown into prison without trial. Peasants and working classes had been ground down under heavier and heavier taxes. Millions of dollars sucked from the coffers of the poor went into the King's armies, the frivolity of his court, and the gayety of Paris. The French people, ripe for revolt, were without a leader until the royal treasury was empty.

Under the leadership of Mirabeau, the temper of the people was such that the King dared not force his will upon them, and, in 1789, the people stormed the Bastille and took it. Revolt of the common people spread like wildfire. Soldiers disobeyed officers, the King was captured in an attempt to flee France, and the people took charge of the Government. Kings of England, Prussia, Spain, Russia, and Austria, all made war on the French Republic, because they, too, had oppressed their subjects and they did not want their own empires to be put down; so the peasants—the poor—were herded like sheep to fight to uphold the kingdoms that kept them in serfdom. The French Army, with enthusiasm for this new freedom, beat back their invaders.

In such a setting Napoleon Bonaparte came to the front in charge of a French army in Italy engaged in combat with the Austrians. At one time the Austrian House of Hapsburg controlled a greater part of the peninsula. When Charles V was elected Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, as a Hapsburg he was ruler of Austria; as a descendant of Charles,

Duke of Burgundy, he was lord of what is now Holland and Belgium; he was King of Spain, as the oldest living grandson of Ferdinand and Isabella. In the fifteenth century he defeated the French King for control of northern Italy, and only Russia, Turkey, Poland, and England were not under his sway.

Napoleon's armies were defending the French people against the Austrian armies, which were fighting to force the French people to return to the rule of the hated kings. Napoleon forced the Austrian Emperor to make peace with France. In the second war he cut to pieces the Austrian army and a second time compelled his enemies to make peace. Success intoxicated him and he sought and was elected Emperor for life.

The Kings of England and the Emperors of Austria and Prussia and the Czar of Russia had long since forgotten they owed their power to the swords of their fighting men and they claimed that God in His wisdom had seen fit to make them rulers over these lands and they were responsible to God alone.

The victorious French were full of warlike pride in their victories over the tyranny of kings and they swept over Europe to spread the idea that the people had rights that kings were bound to respect. For 16 years Napoleon beat the Austrians and Prussians singly and combined. He crushed the Prussian army trained in the school of Frederick the Great. He drove out the King of Spain, the King of the Sicilies, and the Kings of several small German Kingdoms. He placed his brother, friends, and son upon the several thrones of Europe, took away from Prussia all her territory, except Brandenburg, Silesia, Pomerania, and East and West Prussia. He organized the whole Polish Kingdom as the Grand Duchy of Warsaw. He annexed Belgium and Holland, and parts of western Germany and Italy. These new rulers named by Napoleon had come from the ranks of the humble. Bernadotte, one of Napoleon's generals, was chosen by the Swedes as their King.

Intoxicated with success, one-half million Frenchmen invaded Russia; the Russian people set fire to their beautiful city of Moscow, and bands of Russian cossacks, through snow and ice, came down upon Napoleon's army from the rear and took 100,000 prisoners. Encouraged by this terrible defeat of the French, the allied kings of Europe united to drive the little Corsican from the throne of France. In 1814 the troops of the kingdoms of Austria, Prussia, Russia, and England, and the Swedish troops, led by Bernadotte, Napoleon's former general, defeated the Corsican. The allied kings set the brother of Louis XIV upon the throne of France, and Napoleon was banished to Elba. He escaped, and the magic of his presence brought such joy to the soldiers of the King that they threw themselves at his feet. The King of France fled a second time, and the man chosen by the people was once more head of the Government.

All the kingdoms of Europe declared war against France and headed for her borders. Napoleon marched rapidly north into the low countries and defeated the Prussians. On the field of Waterloo the French were defeated in one of the great battles of the world's history. The defeated Prussians had made a wide circle and returned to the field of battle to aid their English allies, who had come from Brussels. A second time Louis XVIII was put upon the throne by the bayonets of foreign troops. The feudal lords were once again in control.

After Napoleon had been crushed, the kings and princes of Europe met at Vienna to divide Europe. Only the fear of uprisings similar to the French Revolution among the masses of people had driven the kings to act together. The Congress of Vienna in 1815 is a fair example of the way wars have always been settled without consideration of the wishes of the people. The map was divided by the hates and fears and intrigue of the several kings and princes. The Austrians were afraid of the Russo-Prussian combination. England did not love Austria but feared the other two powers. Prussia was given back some of its Polish territory and a great deal of land in western Germany along the

Rhine, together with a part of the Kingdom of Saxony. Saxony's people were bitterly unhappy over this arrangement. Some of Austria's part of her Polish territory was given to Russia. What is now Belgium was joined to Holland. Its people are of the Catholic faith and disliked to be joined with the Protestant Dutch of Holland. Finland was transferred to Russia. Norway, taken away from Denmark, was given to Sweden, although the Norwegians wanted their independence. This union was another source of trouble. A greater part of Poland and Lithuania were joined to Russia. To pay back Austria for her loss of Poland, she was given all of northern Italy except the counties of Piedmont and Savoy near France. France ended up with territory she had before the revolution.

The Bourbons ruled France, the two Sicilies, and Spain. The Albanians, Serbians, and Rumanians were made subject to the hated Turks. The three kingdoms once vacant were supplied with kings their subjects hated. Poland was divided into four different governments. The Swiss were the only ones left untroubled.

This congress of 1815 by the kings, emperors, and princes laid the foundation for future revolutions and wars without number in Europe. The Poles unsuccessfully attempted to revolt, were forced to give up the use of their language, their schools, their courts, and their churches. The Italian people formed secret societies which had for their objective the uniting of Italy for freedom against foreign rulers. Mutterings of discontent were among the people of Germany. Greece revolted against the Turks and won its right of independence 15 years after the congress. Soon afterward Belgium broke away from the Netherlands. People of France revolted against the Bourbons and dethroned them permanently. In Spain one revolution after another followed. France changed again from citizen-king to a republic with the nephew of Napoleon Bonaparte as president, as ambitious as his uncle to be emperor.

Russia attacked Turkey in 1853. France and England were afraid that if Russia conquered the Turks she would become too powerful, so France and England rushed troops to aid Turkey. Russia was defeated. Thousands of soldiers were killed on both sides in this Crimean war. The little kingdom of Sardinia in western Italy joined the English and French in return for Napoleon III's promise to make war with Sardinia against the Austrians. If Austria lost, the Sardinians were to receive all of northern Italy, and France was to receive the county of Savoy and the seaport of Nice. As soon as the Austrians were beaten, Napoleon III gave the Sardinians only Lombardy in return for Savoy and Nice to France and the Austrians kept the county of Venetia. Other small Italian states seeing the success of Sardinia revolted against the Austrian princes in 1859. The people of Sicily, with the help of the secret promises of the King of Sardinia, revolted against the King, put upon their throne by the congress of Vienna. Next the armies of the common people of Sicily marched upon Naples, joined along the way by the people who rose against their former masters to welcome the liberator. The people of Italy and Sicily voted to join their brothers on the north to make a new kingdom of Italy. Victor Immanuel, King of Sardinia, thus first became the King of united Italy, and the dream of Italians for 600 years had come to pass.

All this time the kings of Europe had been engaged in contests with their own people, the French Revolution had taught the common people how to obtain liberties and the same year that the Austrians drove Prince Metternich from Austria, the last king was driven out of France. German princes were in trouble with their subjects, who demanded a share in the government, the right of free speech, free newspapers, and a trial by jury.

Austria, Russia, and Prussia joined together in the Holy Alliance to stop the spread of republican ideas and to curb the growing power of the common people.

Bismarck, a Prussian nobleman, became a prominent statesman in Prussia. His object was a united Germany which would be the strongest nation in Europe. The German states

united in a loose alliance called the German Confederation. Austria was the largest and Prussia second largest. Bismarck built a strong army. Every man in the nation, rich and poor, was obliged to serve in it. Taking advantage of trouble between Schleswig and Holstein, which belonged to Denmark and yet contained a great many German people, Bismarck declared war on Denmark. He induced Italy to declare war on Austria by promising Italy Venetia and other provinces in return for her aid. Prussia and Italy defeated the Austrians and Prussia took the leadership of the German Confederation.

Bismarck anticipated that France would be his next opponent. He kept the Austrians from joining to the rear of Prussia by requiring Austria to give very little territory to Italy and very little indemnity to Prussia.

The ambition of Napoleon and Bismarck could not continue in Europe without their coming to blows. A war with France would unite the German people. The French Emperor was extremely jealous of the easy victory that Prussia and Italy had won over Austria. Napoleon was proud of the French Army and wanted it to remain the greatest fighting force in Europe. He was as anxious for an excuse to attack Prussia as Bismarck was for an excuse to attack him. There certainly was no ill-feeling between the French and German people. The Germans along the Rhine under Napoleon had been given more freedom than they had under the Prussian feudal lords. Hostility and jealousy only existed between military chiefs. Bismarck thought that Europe was too small to contain more than one master military power.

Napoleon III proposed that the several kingdoms of southern Germany be given to France because they were hostile toward Prussia. Bismarck showed the original manuscript to the rulers of the little southern German kingdoms to turn them against Napoleon, and they bound themselves to fight on the side of Prussia in case war broke out with France. In similar fashion the Belgians became angered at the French. Bismarck had built a highly organized army that was ready at a moment's notice. The French, on the other hand, were lax. French citizens who could afford it were excused from the rolls of the army. The Emperor's revenue, through lack of system, went to the private pockets of government officials.

The incident used as an excuse was not hard to find. Old Queen Isabella, of Spain, had been driven from her throne, and the Spanish Army, under General Prim, offered the crown to Prince Leopold, of Hohenzollern, a cousin of the King of Prussia. This alarmed Napoleon, who imagined that if Prussia attacked him on the east this Prussian prince, as King of Spain, would lead the Spanish Army over the Pyrenees against him on the south. France made so vigorous a protest that the Prince asked the Spaniards not to think of him any longer. This was not enough for Napoleon, who now proceeded to make a fatal mistake. The incident was closed, but he persisted in reopening it. He sent his Ambassador to see King William, of Prussia, to ask the latter to assure France that never again should Prince Leopold be considered for the position of King of Spain. The King answered that he could not guarantee this, for he was merely the head of the Hohenzollern family. Prince Leopold, whose lands lay outside of Prussia, was not even one of his subjects. The interview between the King and the French Ambassador had been a friendly one. The Ambassador had been very courteous to the King, and the King had been very polite to the Ambassador. They had parted on good terms.

In the meanwhile Bismarck had been hoping that an excuse for war would come from this incident. He was at dinner with General von Moltke and Count von Roon when a long telegram came from the King, telling of his interview with the French Ambassador. In the story of his life, written by himself, Bismarck tells how, as he read the telegram, both Roon and Moltke groaned in disappointment. He says that Moltke seemed to have grown older in a minute. Both had earnestly hoped that war would come. Bismarck took the dispatch, sat down at a table, and began striking out the polite words and the phrases that showed that the meeting had been a friendly one. He cut down the original telegram of 200 words to one of 20. When he had finished the message sounded as if the French Ambassador had bullied and threat-

ened the King of Prussia, while the latter had snubbed and insulted the Frenchman. Bismarck read the altered telegram to Roon and Moltke. Instantly they brightened up and felt better. "How is that?" he asked. "That will do it," they answered. "War is assured."

After the telegram was published in newspapers the people of Paris and Berlin were shouting for war. This was the start of the Franco-Prussian War, and simply proves how helpless the people of European countries are when they fall prey to diplomatic intrigue.

The war was short. France was condemned to pay indemnity of 5,000,000,000 francs. Alsace and Lorraine were annexed to Germany. Alsace was inhabited largely by German people intermingling with the French, and the whole province had belonged to France so long that its people felt themselves to be wholly French.

Bismarck took Lorraine, which was predominantly French, against his better judgment because the important city of Metz was strongly fortified. He was overruled by his military chiefs, but the desire among the French for revenge on Germany for taking this French-speaking province has proved that Bismarck was right. From a second-rate power, Bismarck's policy of blood and iron had made Germany the strongest military force in Europe.

The Reichstag, born as the result of the revolutions of 1848, has been called a big debating society, whose members had the right to talk but had not the right to pass any laws that were contrary to the wishes of the military leaders.

In 2 years France paid her indemnity and the German troops left her borders. France now adopted the German military system. She spread her colonies to Africa and other parts of the world. She enlarged her navy. England and Russia would not stand for France being crushed a second time when Bismarck proposed to reduce France to a second-rate power. England and Russia had spoiled his plans, and he waited for a chance to get revenge. The English and Russians were determined that Prussia would not grow so strong that she could divide the rest of Europe, and they joined together to maintain the balance of power.

Revolts in the Balkan nations now broke out among the Serbians and the people of Bosnia and Bulgaria. Russia, ever since the reign of Peter the Great, wanted a port free of ice and a chance to trade with the Mediterranean world. The Turks of Constantinople could bottle the Russians' agricultural trade at any time. So the Russian diplomats were happy to start up trouble among the Turks and Slavish people of the Balkan states. The Russian people rushed into an easy victory over Turkey with the help of the revolting Balkan states. Rumania, Serbia, and Bulgaria became independent. To maintain the balance of power, England and Austria joined with Germany to divide the territory of Europe so that Russia could not dominate little groups of nations to make her the strongest nation in Europe. As a result of this conference, Bulgaria was left under the control of Turkey and had to pay large sums each year to Turkey to be left alone. Her territory was made so small that less than one-third of the Bulgarians were living within her boundaries. Largely, the Serbians were still under Turkish rule, as were the Greeks of Thessaly and Epirus. A part of these Balkan states were to pay taxes to Austria in return for a promise never to take them from Turkey, and so the Congress of Berlin, like that of Vienna in 1815, laid higher the foundation for wars and revolutions.

The grievances of the people from the treaties that have been made as a result of power politics in Europe have kept the people of Europe in constant war. The murder of the archduke of Austria was merely the incident that exploded these old hatreds and fears and persecutions. We can never stop the avalanche of hate that has resulted from any of these boundary settlements until the people themselves decide upon their own boundaries, upon their own form of government, upon their own right to worship God as they see fit; and we cannot settle it for them. The will to govern themselves must first be born in their own hearts.

For 150 years during our national history Europe has been an armed camp. The rank and file of the people have

spilled their blood on the battlefields of Europe over issues that could gain them nothing, and after every war there has never been any combination of powers wise enough, charitable enough, and with the foresight inspired by justice to draw boundary lines which would forever keep the people of the several nations of Europe from becoming accomplices of their ruthless, restless, and greedy rulers. The general idea of the Versailles Treaty was to cut up Germany so as to make it a weak, subservient, second-rate power. Reparations payments to the Allies, we will have to now admit, bled the German democracy dry. It gave Poland a corridor to the sea and separated East Prussia from Germany. Hungary is not satisfied with the Rumanian frontier forced upon it by treaty. Bulgaria wants territory returned to her from Rumania, Jugoslavia, and Greece.

Devout Christians after the next war may be given to a country that allows no creeds. People who love one country and its form of government will be given to another country in whose philosophy they do not believe. Whoever wins this war, the people will lose, because the treaties that follow the war will still be as unjust as the treaties that have followed any other war in Europe. There will still be the heartless division that will divide men from their sacred altars, and again the people who feel these deep social, religious, economic, expatriated grievances will be made accomplices of other restless, ruthless rulers who will build upon the deeply embedded personal grievances of the victims of this war to make new, first-rate powers as a vehicle to avenge their grievances. So that we may understand how the several peoples of Europe feel after power politics dictates the cutting and slashing of national boundaries to reduce the vanquished to second-rate powers, let us visualize how our people could be stirred to never-ending national hate if a strip out of the center of our country all along the Mississippi River 100 miles wide were given to Mexico or Canada. Can you not see how our people would rally around a leader who would restore the fertile valley of the Mississippi to the United States of America?

We can never hope to stop war in Europe and our blood should never be spilled there again. In such an unending struggle that gnaws at the very bowels of civilization itself this country and those in high official position should remain discreetly aloof from that conquest when we know that our right to worship God, our right to freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the press are not jeopardized.

When our Neutrality Act was first put upon the statute books we resolved that war was a losing game and that we would enact legislation that would keep us out of wars that did not involve our primary interest. We dedicated ourselves to the purpose that we would settle our difficulties around the conference table, and the very purpose of the act was to keep us aloof from other people's quarrels. We said then that when the President shall find that a state of war exists he shall name the belligerents involved, and from the date of his declaration we would not ship arms, ammunition, and implements of war to either belligerent. We were not concerned then with who should win. The President of the United States so interpreted the act early in October, when the Italo-Ethiopian war at last became an uncontrovertible fact.

We should not ship arms, ammunition, and poison gas to be used upon the poor, weak, defenseless victims of power politics in Europe. We should not contribute to the tearing, maiming, and wounding of the helpless. Our Government resources, through Government-controlled corporations, should not be loaned to private corporations of any belligerent to prolong the war. The arms embargo is the best law to keep us from being involved and the Shanley and Wolcott motions should be supported.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALL] such time as he may desire.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but give expression to a feeling of keen regret and disappointment at the turn some of the speeches in favor of the Pittman bill have taken.

And it strikes me as high time that in the interest of bringing cool and sober judgment to the decision we are going to make, we again assess our objectives.

I take it that they are simply these: To conserve the neutrality of our country as between the present and any future belligerents to the end that America shall remain at peace.

The final vote on this resolution will decide the differences that exist as to the best means of keeping us neutral and out of war insofar as any neutrality legislation can help bring the latter result.

Much of the debate here on Tuesday and Wednesday, and again on today, fills me with great misgivings. It would seem that the United States has a role other than that of an honest neutral.

In passionate and fervent language we have been urged to assume various roles—the role of the flaming knight to overcome the goddess; the preceptor of international morality; the policeman of international behavior; and whatnot.

We have been told that certain belligerents are fighting "our battles"; that America cannot now shirk her responsibilities; that we must, in every way short of war, take our rightful place in the pacification of the world; that we are too great a power to simply sit by and do nothing while civilization is on the brink of destruction. And so on.

I cannot believe that any of these roles or missions are part of our destiny. Certainly they have nothing to do with the role of an honest neutral.

And I do not believe that if we should attempt to play them that we could be successful. Great as we are, we have our limitations, and the sooner we honestly admit this fact the better off we shall be. We do not know, and cannot know, and, above all, it is not in our power to determine, what is best for Europe. The grim history of Europe ought to teach that. And the grim history of our participation in the World War ought to prove it. Rightful as was our entry into that conflict, we determined nothing. At least not decisively.

Yet in the face of these facts we are again listening today to much of the same old story. But again it has nothing to do with our role as an honest neutral.

The destiny of the United States lies not on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean but on this side. And our task on this side is great enough without trying to take in the world. Our mission—and it is a big mission—lies in the Western Hemisphere and not in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to retain the arms embargo.

Mine is the deepest conviction, untroubled by any reservation, that the retention of the arms embargo represents the course of action that is best calculated to meet the primary interests that engage our thoughts in the present European conflict—the nurturing and protection of America's well-being and security, and her destiny.

The arms embargo is the core of the joint resolution pending before the Congress. The cash-and-carry policy, so-called, and the restrictions under it of certain rights of our people, are subordinate in the degree of importance.

This is crystal clear in the light of honest argument as well as clever pretense; despite the deluge of discussions and harangues and the attempt by some to sink the real issue, that of the arms embargo, in a veritable verbosity of words.

The repeal of the arms embargo, I am convinced, would constitute a threat to our peace.

I am not willing to be a party to the experiment of keeping us out of war by doing something that may bring us in.

I am for honest neutrality. I am for nonintervention.

I am opposed to any theory of collective action under any guise which may ease us in as a participant in the age-old feuds of Europe, whether it contemplate measures to fix and punish the aggressor, the employment of "sanctions," or the adoption of policies of aid short of war.

Relaxation of the arms embargo is an unneutral step. If we take it, we should not seek to blind ourselves to the potential consequences.

We enacted the arms embargo in 1935 as a measure of stringency, to furnish practical implementation of our desire to keep out of possible embroilment in any war through the

furnishing of the primary weapons of war to any of the belligerents. Ours was the undisputed right to enact that legislation. It was not framed to meet the needs or the desires of any European or Asiatic country or group. It was simple municipal legislation, American legislation, to safeguard our own best interests and not those of any other country. In short, it was a declaration to the rest of the world that in the event of any conflict to which we were not a party we would implement our neutrality by refusing to participate in the traffic of primary munitions to any of the belligerents. And when the present conflict began that law was on the books and became operative.

Now we are asked to relax this prohibition, this self-imposed stringency. We are asked to upset an established policy and a custom followed time and time again by other countries of the world on the theory that it is to better preserve our neutrality.

I cannot escape the inexorable conclusion that to repeal the arms embargo, to modify in the midst of a conflict our adopted rule of impartiality, would make our Government a party to the destruction of that impartiality and a party to the taking of sides.

We should not twist and torture our declared neutrality so that the policy of impartiality under the arms embargo will become one of taking sides.

Repeal of the arms embargo is not the sign post pointing the way for enduring peace for America. Rather, it is a gamble, an adventure into the unknown, but with gravely troubled feelings of what such a course may hold.

I am going to resist the repeal of the arms embargo to the full limit of my powers.

Let us stay clear of the grim business abroad. Let us adhere to our resolution of not taking sides.

We cannot know nor determine decisively what is best for Europe. On this the history of the World War speaks too eloquently and our undimmed recollections do not let us forget.

With reference to the so-called cash-and-carry provisions of the joint resolution, there are some modifications that I would like to see adopted. However, we can keep the present arms embargo and still have the cash-and-carry policy on all articles other than arms, ammunition, and implements of war. It is a distortion of the fact to say that retention of the arms embargo with cash and carry on secondary supplies is not possible. This is the objective we should strive for, and it is for this policy that I shall cast my vote. But if the arms embargo is not retained I shall vote against the joint resolution.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a table of ships stopped on the high seas during the present war, issued by the Secretary of State, and to include excerpts from other authors.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on August 20, 1935, the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], during the debate on the present neutrality bill used the following language:

If the United States hopes to avoid being drawn into another World War, it must decide promptly upon a policy to safeguard its neutrality. Such a policy must be determined in advance. Our experience in the last war shows plainly that it cannot be improvised after the war breaks out. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 74th Cong., p. 13788.)

Mr. Speaker, if there were any doubt about the correctness of that statement heretofore, the 2 days' debate in the House of Representatives certainly should eliminate this doubt. The language used in the debates in both Houses and particularly in the House of Representatives during the present session of Congress demonstrates the wisdom of determining a neutrality policy in advance, and the danger of trying to improvise it after a war breaks out.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard the majority leader of this House today curse, damn, and doom a nation with whom we are at peace. I have heard him and others on the floor of this House, directly and impliedly, name aggressor nations with whom we are at peace and call them un-Godlike. I have heard opponents of this legislation on the floor of the House, in the press, and elsewhere called Communists, fellow travelers of Communists, and pro-German. Among such opponents are World War veterans, some of whom are disabled.

A cartoon published recently in a Washington newspaper pictured Stalin, marked "Communist" in the center; a caricature of a woman on one side labeled "Pacifist"; and a caricature of a man on the other side marked "Isolationist," all marching arm in arm. The heading was "Fellow travelers." All in the name of neutrality.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader, Mr. RAYBURN, at the beginning of this debate appealed to the Members of this House not to become personal and to keep the debate upon a high plane. Mr. Speaker, as he spoke, I could not but remember the following quotation taken from the address of the President of the United States in the New York Herald Tribune Forum on October 27, in which he said:

In and out of Congress we have heard orators and commentators and others beating their breasts and proclaiming against sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That I do not hesitate to label as one of the worst fakes in current history. It is a deliberate setting up of an imaginary bogeyman. The simple truth is that no person in any responsible place in the national administration in Washington, or in any State government, or in any city government, or in any county government, has ever suggested in any shape, manner, or form the remotest possibility of sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That is why I label that argument a shameless and dishonest fake.

Again he says:

Repetition does not transform a lie into a truth.

Mr. Speaker, I concede to every proponent of repeal from the President on down, the same sincerity and the same honesty of purpose which I claim for myself, and which the President and some of the proponents of repeal deny to some of us who are sincerely and honestly trying to prevent the doing of that which we believe would be the first step toward war. War means that all the resources of a country are used, including its manpower, and for the President to label an argument sincerely advanced by opponents of repeal "a shameless and dishonest fake," for the President to charge that those proponents of the embargo are deliberately setting up "an imaginary bogeyman," for the President to call opponents of repeal fakers, liars, or falsifiers does not contribute anything to the solution of the problem and is unfair and not arguing the issues upon that high plane to which the majority leader referred in his opening speech of this debate.

Mr. Speaker, every one of the Members of this House and Members of the Senate have pledged themselves to peace. The President has time and again assured us that there is going to be no war. I do not question your sincerity nor do I question his, and I want to say again that, despite charges of being a faker, a fellow traveler of communism, pro-German, and whatnot, I concede to each one of you, including the President, the same honesty of purpose and the same sincerity which I claim for myself. My war record and record in this House stands, and I challenge any man to question my Americanism.

However, Mr. Speaker, I cannot forget that on March 4, 1917, 435 Members took their seats in this very House of Representatives; 435 Members took their oath of office. At the other end of the Capitol 96 Members of the Senate took their seats and took their oath of office. Before, during, and after the Presidential campaign of 1916 each one of these men had pledged himself to peace, pledged himself against war, just as you men and you women of both Houses are doing and have done during the past weeks. Mr. Speaker, I cannot forget that within 32 days after that Congress was sworn in and the Members took their seats that same Congress, pledged to peace, declared war against the Imperial Government of Germany. Despite all of the assurances on the part of the

President of the United States and on the part of individual Members of Congress that under no consideration will we go to war and that under no consideration will we send troops again to France, I cannot forget, Mr. Speaker, that in February 1917 Congress cut President Wilson's War Department appropriation bill \$70,000,000 on the ground that we were not going to war, and in August 1917 I was marching down Michigan Avenue in Chicago with a rifle on my shoulder.

I cannot forget that while as late as January, February—yes; as late as March—1917 we were told that war was impossible; that the people would not stand for war; that the overwhelming sentiment was against war; and that even when war was declared we were told that no troops would be sent to France. Despite all this, in September 1917 I was marching from the Capitol to the White House behind John Philip Sousa's band playing *The Stars and Stripes Forever*, and a month later I was on a transport on my way to France. As late as January 1917 we could hear men and women singing, *I Did Not Raise My Boy To Be a Soldier*, and a year later the bands were playing, *Over There, Over There*.

I cannot forget, Mr. Speaker, that as late as March 1917 we were told that the American people would not stand for war, did not want war, there would be no war, public sentiment was strongly against war; and yet, 6 months later, I could hear ringing in my ears the shouts, the frenzied cries as I marched on my way to France. I could see women fainting as they lined, 10 deep, the streets in every city in the country. No, Mr. Speaker, all the assurances that individual Members can or will give now, all the assurances of the President, will not stop war if we now and here unloose the forces that bring war. It is not what we say here but what we do here that will bring war.

Ray Stannard Baker, Wilson's biographer, who has devoted perhaps more study to the subject than anyone in this country, in 1931 wrote:

The more one studies the course of President Wilson during the period of neutrality the clearer become the fateful consequences that hung upon his decisions. As a matter of fact, the war was decided not so much by American battalions on the French front in 1918 as by the President's decisions during the period of neutrality in 1914 and 1915, which involved the disposition of indispensable supplies of American goods and money. (Vol. 5, p. 197, Ray Stannard Baker's *Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters*.)

Mr. Speaker, I have devoted weeks of my time to studying the history of the period preceding the World War from 1914 to 1917. I have devoted that time and study with the hope, Mr. Speaker, that I might bring to this House some views, some facts, which might help us to avoid the mistakes of that period and thus avoid the doing of those things which in 1917 brought war in spite of the assurances on the part of the President and Congress, sincerely given, that there would be no war.

President Wilson, Secretaries of State Lansing, Bryan, and others did not write the history of 1917. They made that history. That history was written and is being written today—20 or 25 years later. We are not writing history today. We are making it. The history we are making today will be written 20 or 25 years hence. If we make the same mistakes that they made, then the historians of the future will condemn us for not having avoided the pitfalls which we should have avoided. Let us first study the course of the World War.

In the spring of 1914 President Wilson sent Col. E. M. House to England on a mission. The immediate object was to promote a better understanding between Great Britain and Germany through American influence. House was, as we all know, President Wilson's closest adviser. He made a report to President Wilson on May 29, 1914, more than 2 months before the war was declared. In that report he points out the danger of war. We hear nothing about "making the world safe for democracy." We hear nothing of "saving civilization," and so forth. We were still friendly with Germany and truly neutral with all countries. We are amazed when we read the language of his report, which reads in part as follows:

Whenever England consents, France and Russia will close in on Germany and Austria. England does not want Germany wholly crushed, for she would then have to reckon with her ancient enemy, Russia; but if Germany insists upon an ever-increasing navy, then England will have no choice. (Vol. 5, p. 38, Ray Stannard Baker's *Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters*; also from the original letter from Col. E. M. House in Mr. Wilson's file; also in the *Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, vol. 1, p. 249.)

This is not the Kaiser nor Hitler talking about being "encircled," but a report of Colonel House to Wilson that France and Russia, with the help of England, would close in on Germany.

In the same letter Colonel House wrote:

The best chance for peace is an understanding between England and Germany in regard to naval armaments, and yet there is some disadvantage to us by these two getting too close.

Ray Stannard Baker, in his *Life of Woodrow Wilson*, volume 5, page 364, further says:

Everything turned on the control of the seas. Great Britain had it, and by virtue of it was gradually involving America.

In other words, when we wipe the cobwebs of prejudice, hatred, and sympathy from our eyes, we are forced to the conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that Great Britain went to war to maintain her control of the seas, and Germany went to war to prevent Russia, France, and Great Britain from, as House said, "closing in on her."

Mr. Speaker, I have examined the papers, letters, notes, and messages of William Jennings Bryan, Colonel House, Ambassador Walter Hines Page, Secretary of State Lansing, and others, and I found much interesting material there from which we can now profit. While I have never altogether agreed with Bryan's philosophy of government, I have always been one of his admirers and as the years have passed, I have become convinced that in many instances I was wrong, and he, while idealistic, was right. As I examine the period from 1914 to 1917, his name looms in history. I feel that had we followed the advice of Bryan in many things, we would have avoided entanglement in the European war.

Immediately following hostilities in Europe in 1914, both England and Germany repeatedly violated our international rights, England being perhaps the greater offender, the difference being however, that while England's violations pertained to property rights, the German violations involved American lives.

The first question involved was the question of sending munitions of war to Europe, and the question of giving credit. The question of neutrality as it pertained to the shipment of munitions was discussed by me in my remarks before this House on October 23, and I shall not comment on it today.

When hostilities began in 1914, Henry P. Davison, of the J. P. Morgan Co., asked the Wilson administration what its attitude would be with regard to loans to belligerents. Robert Lansing, then counselor of the State Department, advised that all precedents were in favor of loans. Bryan, however, argued in a letter dated August 10, 1914, that—

Money is the worst of all contrabands because it commands everything else. * * * We are responsible for the use of our influence through example.

Again he said:

The powerful financial interests which would be connected with these loans would be tempted to use their influence through the newspapers to support the interests of the government to which they had loaned because the value of the security would be directly affected by the result of the war. We would thus find our newspapers violently arrayed on one side or the other, each paper supporting a financial group and pecuniary interest. All of this influence would make it all the more difficult for us to maintain neutrality—

Bryan warned.

Bryan's view that loans would violate the spirit of neutrality was supported by Lansing:

He at once endorsed the position as sound in principle, even though not supported by precedent, and later came back to suggest an illustration which appealed to me as a very forcible one, namely, that as the Government discourages its citizens from enlisting in foreign armies and withdraws the protection of citizenship from them as long as they serve under another flag, it should discourage the money of this country from taking a part in foreign wars.

On August 15, 1914, the following was telegraphed to J. P. Morgan Co.:

There is no reason why loans should not be made to the governments of neutral nations, but in the judgment of this Government loans by American bankers to any foreign nation which is at war are inconsistent with the true spirit of neutrality. (Vol. 5, pp. 175-176, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

Bryan took the position that these loans, while legal, were inconsistent with the true spirit of neutrality.

Lansing quotes Bryan as saying:

This, I believe, is the first time any great nation ever took this position. * * * It may be regarded as setting * * * a new precedent.

On October 23, 1914, Lansing, at the request of Wilson, prepared a memorandum in which he stated:

For the purpose of enabling European governments to make cash payments for American goods, it is suggested to grant to them short-time banking credits, to both belligerent and neutral governments, and, where necessary or desirable, replenish their cash balances on this side by the purchase of short-time Treasury warrants. Such purchases would necessarily be limited to the legal capacity of the particular bank, and, as these warrants are bearer warrants without interest, they could not and would not be made the subject of a public issue. These securities could be sold abroad or be readily available as collateral in foreign loans and would be paid at maturity in dollars or equivalent in foreign exchange. (Vol. 5, p. 186, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

Space will not permit the giving of the full information on this subject, but it can be found on the pages in the volume quoted.

After the first loans were made, Andre Tardieu, French Minister, wrote:

The increasing volume of allied needs afforded the Americans almost unlimited trade possibilities. Prices had risen enormously. Profits had swollen tenfold. The Allies had become the sole customer of the United States. Loans the Allies had obtained from New York banks swept the gold of Europe into American coffers. From that time on, whether desired or not, the victory of the Allies became essential to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am forced to the conclusion despite every argument to the contrary, that while these loans and munition shipments may not have been the sole factor, they were one of the great contributing factors that involved us in the European war.

NEUTRALITY

No man ever tried harder to be really and truly neutral than Woodrow Wilson tried from the period of August 3, 1914, to March 1917. Yet no Executive ever surrounded himself with more advisers and friends and officials who were seeking to get us into the war and who were responsible for the doing of those things which, in spite of Wilson's desire to keep out of the war, finally got us into the war.

On the morning of August 3, 1914, when Germany declared war on France, President Wilson in an interview said:

I want to have the pride of feeling that America, if nobody else, has her self-possession and stands ready with calmness of thought and steadiness of purpose to help the rest of the world. (Vol. 5, p. 6, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

Again, on August 17, 1914, he said:

The United States must be neutral in fact as well as in name during these days that are to try men's souls. We must be impartial in thought as well as in action. (Vol. 5, p. 38, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

When in 1914 a distinguished group of Belgians arrived at the White House, accompanied by Secretary Bryan and Secretary McAdoo, their spokesman made a moving appeal:

Peaceful inhabitants—

He said—

were massacred, defenseless women and children were outraged, open and undefended towns were destroyed, historical and religious monuments were reduced to dust, and the famous library of the University of Louvain was given to the flames.

President Wilson expressed his pleasure and pride that "your King should have turned to me in time of distress," and promised that the documents left in his hands should have his "most thoughtful consideration."

You will, I am sure—

He said—

not expect me to say more. Presently, I pray God very soon, this war will be over. The day of accounting will then come. * * * Where wrongs have been committed their consequences and the relative responsibility involved will be assessed.

Even then Woodrow Wilson was careful not to condemn even Germany. He continued that—

It would even be inconsistent with the neutral position of any nation which like this, has no part in the contest, to form or express a final judgment.

On the same day he replied in nearly the same words to the protest of the Kaiser, and a little later to the President of France. (Vol. 5, pp. 160-162, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

I want the American public to compare this attitude of neutrality with the attitude of President Roosevelt, who continually talks of "aggressors," quarantining nations, condemning nations, and individuals, and telling them he could not prevent Americans from being unneutral.

On August 21, 1915, President Wilson wrote to Colonel House as follows:

Two things are plain to me: 1. The people of this country count on me to keep them out of the war. 2. It would be a calamity to the world at large if we should be drawn actively into the conflict and so deprived of all disinterested influence over the settlement. (Vol. 5, p. 373, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

Robert Lansing, in his War Memoirs, wrote that President Wilson was sincerely trying to maintain neutrality as late as March 1917. A study of the history shows that it was the things that we did while trying to sincerely keep out of war that swept aside our good intentions and built up the war psychology that finally got us into war.

BRYAN'S ATTITUDE

William Jennings Bryan was known as the Apostle of Peace. Had he thought that war would be declared, he would undoubtedly have refused to accept the appointment of Secretary of State. Had he remained in the Cabinet, he could have done much to avoid war. The pro-Ally influence of Page, Lansing, and House, in my humble judgment, resulted in getting us into the war.

Both the Allies and the Central Powers violated our international rights with impunity. The climax came when, on May 7, 1915, a German submarine sank the *Lusitania*, with some 1,200 persons of board, nearly 800, including some 159 Americans, being lost at sea. On the night the *Lusitania* was sunk Mr. and Mrs. Bryan were at a dinner party. Mrs. Bryan is a brilliant woman and a practicing attorney. She kept a complete diary, and wrote the following in it:

Mr. Bryan was very much disturbed at the news. He said on the way home, speaking of the *Lusitania*: "I wonder if she had munitions on board? If she did," he said, "that puts a different phase on the whole matter. I will have Lansing investigate that." The next day Mr. Lansing examined the clearance papers and reported that the *Lusitania* did have munitions on board. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 74th Cong., p. 2257, speech by LEE, of Oklahoma.)

Bryan took the position that, if the *Lusitania* carried contraband, then "England has been using our citizens to protect her ammunition." He wrote Wilson:

Germany has a right to prevent contraband going to the Allies, and a ship carrying contraband should not rely upon passengers to protect her from attack. (Vol. 5, p. 338, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

Mr. Lansing, on page 30 of his War Memoirs, wrote:

Mr. Bryan declared that no American citizen should do anything which might involve this country in war, even though he were compelled to surrender a strict legal right in order to avoid becoming the cause for such a disaster.

One of the reasons Mr. Bryan gave for resigning on June 9, 1915, was that Mr. Wilson refused to take steps to prevent American citizens from traveling on ships carrying munitions of war. On June 4 Wilson wrote Bryan:

I am inclined to think that we ought to take steps, as you suggest, to prevent our citizens from traveling on ships carrying munitions of war, and I shall seek to find a legal way to do it. (Vol. 5, p. 355, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

Although Wilson contended for the right of citizens traveling on munition-loaded passenger ships, he then for a time seemed willing to make this concession to prevent Bryan from resigning.

No one can condone the sinking of the *Lusitania* without warning and with passengers on board. However, the failure of the Government to publish the full facts pertaining to the disaster and the sending out of half truths regarding the *Lusitania* disaster did more than any one thing to build up war psychology in this country. There is a phrase in the Bible that says, "There is no God." When the entire phrase is taken it reads, "The fool hath said in his heart, 'There is no God.'"

Mr. Speaker, had those in authority published the fact that the *Lusitania* was loaded with military supplies and ammunition very few passengers would have sailed on that ship, and certainly few, if any, Americans, after the German Ambassador published the well-known warning in the press. Mr. Speaker, those in authority who permitted more than 1,200 passengers to sail out of an American port on a passenger ship, concealing the fact that she carried munitions of war and military supplies, were responsible, in my humble judgment, for the death of the men, women, and children who died in that disaster.

After the ship was sunk the real facts were hidden from the public. The public was not told that the ship had ammunition and military supplies on board, and upon that half truth or suppression of truth was built a war psychology. Mr. Speaker, a terrible responsibility rests upon those in authority who thus failed in their duty.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we are being told half truths. Again we are being made the victims of a system of propaganda and a suppression of truth, whose only purpose can be to build up another war psychology. During the past weeks hundreds and thousands of newspaper columns have been written upon the German seizure of the *City of Flint*, but scarcely anything upon the 22 vessels that have been seized and the cargoes that have been confiscated by England and France during the same period. Mr. Speaker, I am placing into the RECORD under permission to extend my remarks a table furnished me by the Secretary of State, which gives a list of all the American vessels reported to the Department as having been detained by belligerents for examination of papers or cargo from September 1 to October 31.

American vessels reported to Department to have been detained by belligerents since Sept. 1, 1939, for examination of papers or cargo
[Completed to Oct. 31, 1939]

Vessel	Owner or operator	Cargo	Detained	Released
I. C. White	Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey		Tanker challenged by an unidentified cruiser Sept. 7, when 15 miles offshore near Barranquilla, Colombia.	
Eglantine	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co.		German, Sept. 18. Ordered to stop by German submarine; told not to use radio and to send papers for inspection. Advised not to use radio for 3 hours on being permitted to proceed.	After 1 hour and 20 minutes.
Meanticut	do		British, Oct. 23. Ordered to proceed to Oran to discharge certain Italian cargo.	Oct. 27.
West Gambo	do		French, Oct. 22. 750 bales carbon black ordered ashore.	
Endicott	do		French, Oct. 22. 2,276 bars of copper and 1,796 bags carbon black ordered ashore.	
President Harding	United States Lines		French, Sept. 9. Cargo still under seizure on Oct. 28: 135 tons copper, 34 tons petroleum, hides, oil, coffee, tin plate, and miscellaneous.	Promptly.
Saccarappa	South Atlantic Steamship Co.	Phosphate, cotton	Arrived Sept. 3. Cargo seized Sept. 8 by British authorities.	Ship released promptly; cargo unloaded.
Shickshinny	do	do	Detained Sept. 16, Glasgow, by British authorities.	Sept. 18.
Sundance	do	Rosin and general cargo.	Detained Oct. 11, London, to date, British authorities.	
Black Osprey	Black Diamond Line	General	Vessel picked up Sept. 5 by British naval vessel.	Sept. 13.
Santa Paula	Grace Line		When 30 miles from Curacao ordered to stop, delayed 20 minutes, unidentified British cruiser, believed to be <i>Essex</i> .	
Executive	American Export Line		Detained Casablanca, Morocco, Sept. 27 on orders from Paris because of nature of cargo.	Sept. 29 on condition vessel proceed to Bizerte, Tunisia.
Ethan Allen	Lykes Bros. Steamship Co.	Tobacco	British authorities, Sept. 20.	Sept. 30.
Patrick Henry	do	Cotton, flour, copper	British authorities, Oct. 10.	Oct. 22.
Oakman	do		British authorities, Oct. 13.	Oct. 27.
Cranford	do		British authorities, Oct. 17.	Oct. 21.
Nashaba	do	Copper, cotton, etc.	French authorities, Oct. 14.	Oct. 25.
West Hobomac	do	Gilsonite, cotton, rice	French authorities, Oct. 18.	Oct. 25.
City of Joliet	do	Cotton, lead, copper, etc.	French authorities, Sept. 14.	Oct. 5.
Syros	do	Cotton, lead, etc.	French authorities, Sept. 22.	Oct. 10.
Hybert	do		Detained Sept. 10 about 2 hours by German submarine. Examined papers and warned not to use radio for 24 hours.	
Lehigh	U. S. Maritime Commission	Cargo for Hamburg	British authorities, Sept. 5.	Sept. 7.
Warrior	Waterman Steamship Corporation		British, Sept. 7, cargo phosphate requisitioned.	
Wacosta	do		Detained Sept. 9 for 3 hours by German submarine. Papers examined, holds searched.	
Black Eagle	Black Diamond Line		British authorities. Details not known.	
Exochorda	American Export Line		French authorities at Marseille. Removed 2 seamen (German nationality) Sept. 6.	
City of Flint	U. S. Maritime Commission, owner, chartered to United States Lines.	Contraband	Seized on high seas and taken by prize crew to Soviet port.	

This record shows that four American ships had been detained by the Germans. Three of these ships were detained by German submarines. In each case the cargo and papers were examined and the ship was permitted to proceed with the warning not to use the radio for a certain period of time. The first ship stopped by the Germans was the *Hybert*, owned by the Lykes Bros. Steamship Co. It was stopped on September 10. The submarine commander examined the papers and detained the ship for 2 hours and released it after warning them not to use the radio for 24 hours.

The second ship stopped was the *Wacosta*, owned by the Waterman Steamship Corporation, on September 9. The papers were examined, the holds searched, and, after 3 hours, the ship was permitted to proceed.

The third ship was the *Eglantine*, owned by Lykes Bros. Steamship Co. It was stopped on September 18 by a sub-

marine and after 1 hour and 20 minutes permitted to proceed, after being told not to use the radio for 3 hours.

The *City of Flint*, about which so much has been written, was the fourth ship.

On the other hand, 13 American ships were stopped by the British and 9 by the French during the same period. Space does not permit the discussion of each one individually. Suffice it is to say that the British on October 23 stopped the *Meanticut*, owned by the Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., ordered the ship to proceed to Oran to discharge certain Italian cargo. Here the British stopped the ship, ordered the discharge of the cargo, which was consigned to an Italian or neutral port, without one word of protest by the State Department.

On October 22 the French stopped the *West Gambo* and ordered 750 bales of carbon black ashore. On the same day

the French stopped the *Endicott* and ordered ashore 2,276 bars of copper and 1,796 bags of carbon black. On September 9 the French seized the cargo of the *President Harding* and are still detaining this cargo of 135 tons of copper, 34 tons of petroleum, hides, oil, coffee, tin plate, and so forth. On September 3 the British seized a cargo of phosphate-cotton, while on September 6 the French authorities at Marseilles removed two seamen of German nationality from the *Erochorda*. This last case reminds us that the United States went to war with England in 1812 because England took sailors from American ships.

Twenty-two American ships stopped by the British and French, cargoes and men removed, and not one word of protest from the State Department, practically no word of publicity in the papers, and volumes written about the *City of Flint*, which, it is conceded, had a cargo of contraband and was subject to seizure. Mr. Speaker, it is this type of publicity or lack of publicity—this type of propaganda—that got us into the World War, and it is this type of propaganda and half truths that will get us into this war if continued.

During the World War time and again England, as well as Germany, violated our rights. We condemned German violations in strong language, while at the same time we tolerated violations on the part of the British and French. The same thing is happening again, Mr. Speaker.

Again let me repeat that I have no sympathy for Hitlerism, Stalinism, or any other "isms," but my desire to keep this country out of war compels me to give the facts that the American public is entitled to have in the hope that I may make some little contribution toward keeping this country out of this war.

On March 1, 1916, Mr. Lansing, on page 110 of his War Memoirs, summarized the attitude which we took in 1916, as follows:

For a year and a half we had made protest after protest to London because of illegal practices of the British authorities in their treatment of American commerce and in their disregard for American rights on the high seas, and these controversies were in progress at the very time when the proposals of the United States in regard to submarine warfare were rejected.

Sifted down to the bare facts the position was this: Great Britain insisted that Germany should conform her conduct of naval warfare to the strict letter of the rules of international law; on the other hand, Great Britain was herself departing from the rules of international law on the plea that new conditions compelled her to do so, and even showed resentment because the United States refused to recognize her right to ignore or modify the rules whenever she thought it necessary to do so. Briefly, the British Government wished international law enforced when they believed it worked to the advantage of Great Britain and wished the law modified when the change would benefit Great Britain.

Again we are facing the same problem. England and France want us to be unneutral and to help them as against Germany and her allies, and if we follow the same course, the same result will follow—war.

But coming back to the *Lusitania*, Mr. Speaker, notes were sent back and forth between the United States and Germany. Bryan, in discussing the *Lusitania* note to Germany, said that it had a one-sided bearing as being so much sharper than remonstrances directed at Great Britain and as inflaming anti-German sentiment. He pointed out the illegal actions we were condemning were taken in retaliation for illegal British action which we tolerated. He referred to the misuse of the American flag. Wilson at first agreed to Bryan's view and later Lansing got him to change his mind. Our position was insisting that Germany comply with international law while tolerating England's violation of international law. Wilson was surrounded and was influenced by pro-British and anti-German groups, headed by Ambassador Page. Bryan was the only one who was truly trying to remain neutral. (Vol. 5, p. 338, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

On Tuesday, June 1, 1915, a meeting of the Cabinet was held on the reply to the German note on the *Lusitania*. Bryan accused other members of the Cabinet as being pro-Ally and was rebuked by President Wilson and Wilson came out now against sending a new note to Great Britain on interference with neutral trade which he had earlier approved,

showing that he himself had finally been influenced by Lansing and others to an unneutral view. At the close of the meeting, Bryan told Wilson he thought it unfair to all concerned for him to remain in the Cabinet. Wilson did not want an open break and asked Bryan to submit new suggestions as to a course of action. Wilson drafted a drastic note, Bryan pleading for delay or cooling off time. (Vol. 5, p. 351, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

When the President received the reply from Germany on his note of May 31, Bryan's anxiety greatly increased. It seemed to him that, unless drastic changes were made in American policy, war, and possibly immediate war, could not be avoided. (Vol. 5, p. 351, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

On Monday, June 7, Bryan spent an hour with Wilson passionately pleading against a course he felt certain meant war. On June 9, 1915, Bryan resigned.

Robert Lansing, in discussing the matter, said:

With his firm conviction that the reply of the United States which the President had approved (to the two German notes on the *Lusitania*) would in the end bring about war between the United States and Germany, Mr. Bryan's withdrawal from the Cabinet was consistent with his avowed principles and with his conception of right and duty. (P. 29, War Memoirs of Robert Lansing.)

The primary reason for Mr. Bryan's resignation from the Cabinet was that he felt the course Mr. Wilson followed would bring war; that Americans should not exercise rights if the exercise of such rights meant disaster to the Nation and that neutrals should not be permitted, or, at least, should be warned against, traveling on belligerent ships or on ships carrying ammunition. History today records that William Jennings Bryan was right.

Mr. Bryan resigned on June 9, 1915, and Robert Lansing was authorized to act as Secretary ad interim on the same day. Several individuals were considered and among them Walter Hines Page, Ambassador to Great Britain. Mr. Lansing, on page 13 of his War Memoirs, gives the reason why Ambassador Page was not appointed in the following language:

However, Mr. Page's prejudice in favor of Great Britain had embarrassed the administration and caused Mr. Wilson many anxious hours.

Colonel House, in discussing Page, said:

My entire evening was spent in listening to his [Page] denunciation of the President and Lansing and of the administration in general. (The Intimate Papers of Colonel House, vol. 2, p. 177, February 9, 1915; vol. 6, p. 162, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

Mr. Lansing took office at once, but subsequent events show that Lansing's prejudice in favor of Great Britain and France was second only to that of Mr. Page.

On July 11, 1915, Mr. Lansing wrote a memorandum on foreign policy that he expected to follow. Using his own language as found on page 19 of his memoirs, he said:

Having, however, a settled conviction that eventually this country would enter the war on the side of the Allies, I prepared for my own guidance a memorandum as to our own foreign policies, based on the hypothesis that the United States would join in the conflict with foreign powers.

I was not only surprised and amazed but I was shocked that within a little over a month after Bryan's resignation the Secretary of State upon whom devolved the duty to remain neutral should write a memorandum of policy upon the hypothesis that the United States was to join forces on the Allied side. All through Mr. Lansing's book one finds not only statements showing his sympathies and his desire to enter the war immediately upon the Allied side, but dissatisfaction and regret that American public opinion was not in favor of war and that the propagandists were not able to build up a war psychology necessary to force Congress to declare a war which Congress did not want to declare. In the same memorandum of July 11, above referred to, he said:

Germany must not be permitted to win this war or to break even, though to prevent it this country is forced to take ultimate part. American public opinion must be prepared for the time which may come when we will have to cast aside our neutrality and become one of the champions of democracy. (P. 21, War Memoirs of Robert Lansing.)

Again he said:

Thus the open announcement that the foreign policies of the administration would be based on the presumption that the United States would finally declare war against Germany would have been a serious mistake, even if the President had been won over to that course of action, which I am sure he could not have been in the summer of 1915 or any time prior to March 1917. (P. 19, War Memoirs of Robert Lansing.)

Again he said:

While my personal views as to the ultimate position of the United States (on July 11, 1915) were thus clear, the time was not ripe to take definite action. The opposition to entering the war on the side of the Allies was strong in 1915 in spite of the *Lusitania* affair.

Not one word about ammunition, and so forth.

The largest body who opposed our entry into the war were undoubtedly Americans who thought that the war was not our affair but a European quarrel with which we had nothing to do.

Again:

They clung tenaciously to the traditional policy of aloofness from European questions as they interpreted the words of Washington's Farewell Address. (P. 22, War Memoirs of Robert Lansing.)

And again, on pages 25 and 26 of this book, we find the following:

A very large majority of the people favored a continuance of neutrality and the avoidance of a rupture of diplomatic relations with Germany.

He said he could take no "other course" but to keep conductive correspondence with Germany.

How much more satisfying—

He said—

It would have been to have denounced the whole wicked business, to have sent Bernstorff home, and to have declared war against the Government which was the instigator and defender of the barbarous outrages. (Pp. 25-26, War Memoirs of Robert Lansing.)

And then, on pages 27 and 28 of his Memoirs, we find the following amazing statement:

While many of us in the administration desired to declare war, it seemed unwise until the indignation of the great bulk of the American people against Germany could be sufficiently aroused to force their representatives in Congress to vote for war with substantial unanimity. It meant a slow, irritating period of education and enlightenment as to German aims and the meaning of the great European conflict.

Mr. Speaker, think of the Secretary of State of the United States, 2 years before war was declared between Germany and the United States, speaking of arousing the indignation of the American people to force their representatives in Congress, Members of this body, to vote for a war which Congress and the people did not want. Think of the Secretary of State speaking of a "slow, irritating period of education" necessary to bring about war. And who was to do this educating, and how was it done? By suppressing information, by giving half truths, as they were given in the *Lusitania* case when the Government withheld from the people information that the *Lusitania* carried military supplies and ammunition. Half truths such as are being passed out to the people again, as is illustrated by the thousands of columns of newspaper space that is being given to the incident of the *City of Flint*, and nothing to the confiscation of cargoes and taking of men from ships and the 22 other ships detained by France and England.

Again, on July 8, 1915, Secretary Lansing, in writing to Wilson and discussing another note that was being sent to Austria on the sale of munitions, said:

Home consumption would be the real purpose and answer to Austria, the nominal purpose. (P. 55, War Memoirs of Robert Lansing.)

All through Lansing's book, his letters, and papers we find an impatience because of America's reluctance to go to war. On January 9, 1916, Lansing wrote another memorandum, which he entitled "A memorandum on the feelings of the American people toward the Germans in order to crystallize my thoughts and to have definite reasons upon which to work out a basis for the conduct of our intercourse with the Central Powers." The memorandum reads in part as follows:

We are not yet ready to meet the submarine issue squarely. Our people are not aroused to a sufficient pitch of indignation at the barbarism of the Germans. It is hard to comprehend this apparent indifference, but the fact that it exists cannot be doubted.

I cannot understand how a man whose duty it was to keep this country out of war could be so far blinded by his prejudice as to deplore the fact that our people were not aroused to a sufficient pitch of indignation to go to war.

Again, in his memorandum, Lansing said:

The first effort, in my opinion, should be to prevent, if possible, a situation arising which will force this Government into open hostility to the German Government. The time for that has not come. * * * I do not believe that Congress would favor drastic action and would be resentful if the President should act without their authorization. It is a humiliating position, but some way will have to be found to postpone definite action until there is a change among a portion of our people. There is no stronger bond among a people than race, and lacking it the United States labors under a serious disadvantage. (P. 102, War Memoirs of Robert Lansing.)

Again in his memorandum he said:

The sympathy founded on kinship, even though it has been unexpressed for generations, is biased and unjust and unreasoning. It causes a division of the American people into groups who are openly hostile to those who have different sympathies.

He then argues:

Since we cannot find a national tie in blood, we must seek to find one based on other grounds, otherwise we cannot claim to be a nation. That tie is to be found, I believe, in the political principle underlying our system of government. That principle is democracy in our public relation and individual liberty in our private relation. Any attack upon this principle in either form of expression will unite our people and arouse in them a strong spirit of patriotism. (P. 103, War Memoirs of Robert Lansing.)

Having discovered to his own satisfaction the one thing that aroused the people whom he had been unable to arouse heretofore, the one thing to create a war spirit and a war psychology which he so much desired, he then stated that our democracy was being attacked, and that our liberty was in danger, and used the following language:

It is my opinion that the military oligarchy which rules Germany is a bitter enemy to democracy in every form; that, if that oligarchy triumphs over the liberal governments of Great Britain and France, it will then turn upon us as its next obstacle to imperial rule over the world; and that it is safer and surer and wiser for us to be one of many enemies than to be in the future alone against a victorious Germany. (P. 103, War Memoirs of Robert Lansing.)

Again, on page 103, he continues:

Public opinion is not yet ready to accept this point of view. The American people will have to be educated to a true vision of the menace that Germany is to liberty and democracy in America as well as in Europe.

In other words, he was going to help educate the American people to the menace that Germany was to our liberty and our democracy, and right there is where we began to talk about making the world safe for democracy. That saying was nurtured, conceived, bred, and born in our very State Department.

During the period from 1914 to 1917, Mr. Lansing and the State Department were insisting upon the observation of international law and the exercising of our international rights against Germany and Austria, and tolerated the violation of our rights by Great Britain and France. This is being done today as evidenced by the table of ships detained, which table I am placing in the record.

Again, when resentment against England for violation of our rights grew so great as to endanger our relations with England, Mr. Lansing, in discussing his viewpoint used the following language:

Sympathetic as I felt toward the Allies and convinced that we would in the end join with them against the autocratic governments of Central Empires, I saw with apprehension the tide of resentment against Great Britain rising higher and higher in this country. * * * I did all I could to prolong the disputes by preparing or having prepared long and detailed replies and introducing technical and controversial matters in the hope that before the extended interchange of arguments came to an end something would happen to change the current of American public opinion. (P. 112, War Memoirs of Robert Lansing.)

Compare this policy with Mr. Bryan's attempt to delay and go slow contained in the *Lusitania* note. Should we be surprised that with the attitude of the Secretary of State, whose judgment was warped, whose whole desire was to help one side against the other, who deplored the fact that there was no war psychology in America, who spoke of educating the

public—should we be surprised that in the face of these facts America entered the World War?

The attitude of Walter Hines Page, our Ambassador at the Court of St. James, is difficult to understand. He, too, deplored the lack of war psychology in this country.

Colonel House recognized Page's prejudice and on August 4, 1915, he wrote to Mr. Wilson:

Page is in a blue funk. * * * To read Page's letters one would think the Germans were just outside London and moving rapidly westward upon New York.

Again, on August 4, 1915, he wrote:

Our hopes, our aspirations, and our sympathies are closely woven with the democracies of France and England, and it is this that causes our hearts and potential economic help to go out to them and not the fear of what may follow for us in their defeat. (Vol. 5, pp. 371-372, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters.)

But the most difficult thing to understand is the letter that Ambassador Walter Hines Page wrote to Colonel House on July 21, 1915, in which he used the following language:

It's a curious thing to say, but the only solution that I see is another *Lusitania* outrage, which would force war. (Vol. 5, p. 370, Ray Stannard Baker's Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters; also in vol. 2, p. 26, of the Life and Letters of Walter H. Page.)

Think of an American Ambassador to England representing this country being so desirous of our getting into the war, so blinded by prejudice as to make the statement that the only way to force war was to place another 1,200 innocent men, women, and children upon a liner, load that liner with munitions of war and military supplies, send her out to sea, fire torpedoes through her, hear the anguished cries of men, women, and children, and see some 800 of them drown. A man must, indeed, be greatly prejudiced to express a desire for such an incident to plunge America into war. Again, with views such as these, is it surprising that America entered the war?

Discussing Colonel House's viewpoint, Ray Stannard Baker in his *Life of Wilson*, volume 5, pages 365 and 367, said that tension eased after the second *Lusitania* note and that the British were disappointed. And when, Mr. Speaker, in the early part of 1916, Colonel House was sent to England and France on a mission of peace, instead of trying to make peace, he told Briand and Cambon, of France and England, that if there were any danger of the Allies being defeated the United States would enter the war. Returning from England via Paris, Colonel House paused to reassure Briand and Cambon, and with regard thereto he wrote in his diary:

I again told them that the lower the fortunes of the Allies ebbed the closer the United States would stand by them. (House's diary, February 17, 1916; *Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, vol. 2, p. 163; vol. 6, p. 148; Ray Stannard Baker's *Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters*.)

On February 9, 1916, Colonel House wrote to Wilson:

It was finally understood that in the event that the tide of war went against them (the Allies) or remained stationary, you (the President) would intervene. (Vol. 6, p. 148, Ray Stannard Baker's *Woodrow Wilson Life and Letters*.)

He seemed actually to have promised the Allies that the President would intervene, and in his diary of February 7, 1916, found in the *Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, volume 2, page 163, he said:

We had a complete understanding as to the immediate future.

Again, are we surprised that we should enter into a war when the peacemaker sent to Europe handed a club to one side with which to defeat the other, and is not that exactly what we are doing today in our neutrality bill? Mr. Speaker, the actions of the administration and those within it, their partiality, the naming of aggressors, talk of quarantining nations, and a thousand and one other things have pointed to the fact that we are today following the same course that Woodrow Wilson's administration followed from 1914 to 1917. And there is no question but what that same course will ultimately, if continued, reach the same result—war.

That even those within the administration are alarmed is illustrated by Raymond Moley in his *Newsweek* article of September 25, 1939. Mr. Moley has many friends within the administration to whom he can go and who will give him

confidential information. I was amazed to read Mr. Moley's article in the periscope section of that weekly the other day:

WHAT'S BEHIND TODAY'S NEWS AND WHAT'S TO BE EXPECTED TOMORROW—
WASHINGTON SPLIT

Beneath the surface, the New Deal is severely split over foreign policy. Speaking in strictest confidence, an amazing number of officials (including some key administrators and advisers) are expressing genuine misgiving at the trend of administration policy. They talk of Mr. Roosevelt's impulsiveness, of his "overplaying" the emergency here, of his extreme righteous indignation toward Hitler, of his known belief that this country's self-interest makes it essential that we help preserve Britain's sea power, and of his reported thoughts that "anything may happen" if and when Italy as well as Russia joins Germany in the war. The blunt truth is that a sizeable minority of new dealers feels there is a real likelihood of the United States being taken into war within a few months.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss the question of the shipment of munitions. Ray Stannard Baker, who is perhaps the best student of the life of Wilson, in volume 5, page 181, made the following interesting statement regarding the traffic in war materials with the Allies:

Thus by the end of the year 1914 the traffic in war materials with the Allies had become deeply entrenched in America's economic organization and the possibility of keeping out of the war by the diplomacy of neutrality, no matter how skillfully conducted, had reached the vanishing point. * * * While British diplomacy maneuvered with skill to involve American industry and finance in the munitions traffic, it is certain that American business needed no compulsion to take war orders.

This statement was made in 1931, 8 years before the present war was declared, and I believe it is as true today as it was true in 1914.

Senator BONE, in the congressional debates on neutrality in 1935, quotes Admiral Sims as saying:

Thus the enormous pressure of the golden stream of war profits made us insist upon our right to make money out of the vital needs of nations fighting for their lives, and to insist upon being protected in this trade.

He added:

If a war arises, we must therefore choose between two courses: Between great profits with grave risks of war on the one hand or smaller profits and less risk on the other.

Again he quotes Admiral Sims:

A sudden inflation in a few industries, with the constant threat of a sudden collapse of these inflated industries upon the close of a European war, is not a healthy industrial development, even regardless of the risk to the nation which is involved.

According to Senator BONE, export of explosives jumped from \$10,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1914, to \$189,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1915, to \$715,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1916. He stated:

It is not strange that Germany found it difficult to look upon our policy in this regard as particularly neutral.

And, again, in the same debate Senator PITTMAN, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, made the following statement:

Great as our trade was during the World War, and high as were our profits, they did not begin to compensate for our financial losses arising out of the war, and cannot, of course, be considered as any compensation for the suffering and death imposed upon our soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, the most heartless, cold-blooded act was when Congress twice—once in the Senate and once in the House—refused to eliminate the sale of poison gas and flame throwers. The President of the United States has asked European countries not to use poison gas and flame throwers, and they have a right to question his sincerity in making that request when both Houses of Congress have refused to put an embargo on poison gas and flame throwers. Mr. Speaker, the shipment of arms and ammunition to England during the World War did more than anything else to stir up hatred in Germany against the American people. German mothers who lost sons in the World War thought that those sons were killed with American shells or with American ammunition. The history of that period shows that the feeling was tense against America. Already the radio reports from Germany and other countries show a feeling of hatred toward America.

Every shell and every bomb will have painted upon it, in the eyes of the German people, the American flag. Every

shell will scream "America!" as it is hurled against the German lines, and you might as well have the band playing The Star-Spangled Banner as those American shells and bombs go crashing across the lines. The German people know where they come from.

And when, Mr. Speaker, you have created in Germany the same hatred, the same prejudice, the same desire to injure America that the propagandists have created in America to defeat Germany, then you will have steel striking flint and the result will be fire and war. Then, Mr. Speaker, you will have loosed the dogs of war and all the pledges of peace and professions of love for peace on the part of the President and Members of Congress and on the part of those who have loosed the dogs of war will be unable to stop the holocaust.

The Constitution has placed upon you and upon me and upon every Member of Congress a terrible responsibility—the responsibility of deciding just when America declares war; just when we are going to send our boys to the trenches; just when we are going to make widows and orphans and cripples; and when America is justified in taking that step.

I am no pacifist. My record stands, but, Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by saying that it is not what we say now or in the months to come, but what we do which will bring about war. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that if we repeal the arms embargo, we will have taken the first step toward war. I pray God I am wrong.

IMPREGNABLE NATIONAL DEFENSE, REAL NEUTRALITY, AND THE PRESERVATION OF PEACE IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, may I say that congressional action prohibiting the sale of arms and munitions to aliens engaged in war—declared or undeclared—and authorizing an increase in present appropriations for our land, sea, and air defenses materially would accomplish the following:

First. Keep us out of the present European war. Our participation in the last one cost us so many billions that this increase in current appropriations is small by comparison.

Second. Build up our defense—in time of peace and at peacetime prices for labor and material—to the point where no nation, or combination of nations, would dare attack us.

Third. Facilitate enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine and the Panama declaration.

Fourth. Accelerate the recovery of industry—not only in arms and munitions but industry in general—speed up employment, and bring about far greater prosperity than would be achieved by repeal of the arms embargo—all without risk of our becoming involved in war.

Fifth. Tend to shorten the wars in Europe and the Orient.

Sixth. Keep the American republics free from the ideologies, racial animosities, and political rivalries of other nations.

Seventh. Definitely assure the preservation of liberty and civilization.

Eighth. Enable us to preserve our sanity in a mad world and be in a better position to aid in world rehabilitation when hostilities have ended.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I realize full well that no souls are going to be saved at this late hour, but I do not want to have this debate closed and the record stand that my colleague, the author of the motion which we will vote upon in the next hour, ever stated on this floor that the Congress could not change the Neutrality Act. I listened attentively to the gentleman yesterday and checked his words this morning. I find that his statement was that we could not change our Neutrality Act in any way that did not strengthen our neutrality and that when embargoes were removed with an intent to aid one side, that should not be tolerated.

Reference was made this morning to the poll of the New York Herald Tribune, and it was stated that 11 out of 14 of the men replying to that questionnaire said that we could repeal the embargo, but not one of those names was submitted to this House. I have learned this afternoon on good authority that the list submitted is not complete; that several

of the authors to which the Herald Tribune sent letters and who replied are not included in the list of 14 names and one of the 11 is understood to be a consul for the British Embassy.

Mr. Speaker, in the remaining moments I think it might be well to clear up one more point. Emphasis has been made by several speakers in this Well that we served notice on the world that we were going to change our neutrality law. I submit the only official action taken by the Government of the United States or any legislative branch of the Government of the United States by the time war started in Europe was the action of this House. We have not reached the point—and I do not mean this to be partisan—where the Secretary of State or the President of the United States can declare the legislative policy of this Government. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY].

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of economy and because I believe that practically everything has been said in this debate that can be said, and said gallantly by all with the fullest respect for the traditions of this House, I will speak briefly. Previous speakers used my name in their speeches and made erroneous comments about my attitude on changing the rules. I always thought that when a speaker mentions another man's name he would yield, but those gentlemen refused to do so. Any man who knows my attitude knows that I have never made those statements. We changed our neutrality laws, of course, during war. Those gentlemen who stated that the proponents of this motion, including myself, do not want changes made during war have made a ridiculous statement which has not been borne out by the facts.

We have to change them at that time, because when any belligerent, regardless of what side he is on, attempts to interfere with our neutrality rights, it is the prerogative of the President to come to the Congress and ask us to use our embargo powers. If anything happens on the seven seas which hurts the prestige of this country, of course, we are going to change the laws, but we change them for one purpose and one purpose only—to strengthen our neutrality—and we ought to strengthen that neutrality by an intent to be really neutral.

The greatest test this country ever had was back in Washington's day. If a poll had been taken of the people at the time—the Franco-English war broke out in 1793—the people would have voted for helping France. Nobody wanted an embargo. What did George Washington do? He saw through the chaos and confusion of the moment. He saw that whatever temporary gain or benefit he might give France would redound to the everlasting detriment of America, so he put the embargo on, even though every poll that could be taken in America in those days would have been against it.

That aid and the alliance with France was the most decisive assistance we ever received. As Meis says, "No American should forget that. No Frenchman will. But it launched us into the midst of intricate European diplomatic problems."

Remember that when that news of the French declaration of war on Great Britain came to us in February 1793 we were still the ally of France, pledged to defend the French West Indies in case of war. But this was a distinctly European war, and had not Thomas Paine said so effectively that "separation from England meant separation from European wars"? Did not the same separation from all Europe mean the same thing?

Washington thought so, and enjoined, "friendly and impartial conduct."

Mr. Speaker, I have said repeatedly that the historic traditions and precepts of the founding fathers of this country have been fulfilled in almost 150 years of unbroken devotion and loyalty to neutrality. I think those traditions have never been better expressed than in the definition which Prof. E. M. Borchard and William Potter Lage have

enjoined in the preface to their challenging book *Neutrality for the United States*.

Neutrality is an old institution which finds its source in candor, in the obligation to hold the scales even, to remain a friend of both belligerents, to lend support to neither, to avoid passing judgment on the merits of their war. It assures both belligerents that they are dealing with a friend, not a disguised enemy. The belligerents must know who is in the war and who is not. In return for obligations assumed by a neutral the belligerents undertake to respect his rights as a neutral, including the right to remain out of other people's wars.

I think that I was one of those who did everything possible short of the outbreak of the present chaos in Europe to assist and help our peace-minded administration in stopping the war. But when that war broke out and our President saw fit under his finding power in the present Neutrality Act that there was such a war and that we should preserve neutrality, I accepted the solemn pronouncement of his embargo proclamation, and I have tried to conduct myself under the fulfillments of the definition that I have given in his proclamation.

In that proclamation on September 5 of the President on neutrality, he says:

And whereas the United States is on terms of friendship and amity with the contending powers and with the persons inhabiting their several dominions.

And he enjoins upon us an "impartial neutrality during the existence of the contest."

Mr. Speaker, the present attempt to change the law is a complete departure from all of the historic aspects and all of the implications of this tradition. Everybody knows what the notorious purpose of this law is and my only answer can be in the words of Prof. Charles Cheney Hyde and Prof. Phillip C. Jessup that—

The manipulation of American governmental control already established through a statutory embargo, with the deliberate design or aiding a particular group of warring powers by an effort that takes cognizance of their relative supremacy at sea, is a deliberate taking of sides which marks intervention in the conflict. Such intervention is not impartial in spirit, and it is not abstention from participation in the war. It is, on the contrary, a specious form of interposition sought to be disguised under a cloak of professed equality of treatment of the opposing contenders. Yet the real character of such conduct shines out like a lighthouse in the fog.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Would the gentleman divide his amendment as proposed in order to afford the House an opportunity to have a separate vote on the part that refers to flame throwers and poison gas? If the gentleman will do that, I am quite sure that sort of an amendment would carry.

Mr. SHANLEY. I do not believe the House is in any position to stand for that. Knowing what happened to the Tobey amendment in the Senate, I cannot believe there could be a successful attempt at splitting the amendment at this late hour.

[Here the gavel fell.]

NEUTRALITY

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the American people do not want war, and they are determined to keep this country out of the present war in Europe; and no matter what argument may be made and what reason may be advanced by those that are in sympathy with England and France for the sale of arms and munitions of war in the present struggle, it is clearly apparent that the best, the safest, and the surest way to keep out of this war is to maintain strict neutrality and prohibit the sale of arms and munitions of war to any of the warring nations.

Those who advocate the repeal of the present embargo on arms to the warring nations would disregard and set at naught the advice of the founder of our Government, George Washington, given us in the Farewell Address, and solemnly repeated in annual ceremonies in this Chamber on Washington's Birthday, the 22d day of February.

If our Nation continues on the course that has placed it in the preeminent position among world powers, we must follow the advice of Washington when he said:

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations in extending our commercial relations is to have with them as little political connections as possible. * * * It is our true policy to steer clear of any permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world. * * * It is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character. * * * There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. * * * Observe good faith and justice towards all nations, cultivate peace and harmony with all. * * * In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the 22d of April 1793, is the index to my plan. * * * After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound, in duty and interest, to take a neutral position.

Our Government maintained a policy of strict neutrality then, and for the protection of our country and our people neutrality must be maintained now.

President Washington in his neutrality proclamation decreed that—

Whosoever of the citizens of the United States shall render himself liable to punishment or forfeiture under the law of nations by committing, aiding, or abetting hostilities against any of the said powers, or by carrying to any of them those articles which are deemed contraband by the modern usage of nations, will not receive the protection of the United States. * * * I have given instructions to those officers to whom it belongs to cause prosecution to be instituted against all persons who shall, within the cognizance of the courts of the United States, violate the law of nations with respect to the powers at war, or any of them.

Mr. Speaker, in this hour of strife let us turn to the ideals of the great humanitarian, our beloved President, Woodrow Wilson, who sought to lift humanity from the misery of war and strife and place all mankind on the enduring foundation of a league of nations to maintain permanent peace.

Mr. Speaker, we have reached the turning point in the affairs of world governments. If the family of nations is to go forward on the path of progress, we must turn away from armaments and war and devote our efforts to the establishment of a tribunal with the power to settle international disputes and maintain order and peace among the nations of the world, with power supreme over all countries where peace and war are at stake.

In this crisis let us stand ready to assist our fellow men in the warring nations to compose their differences and unite in building an international organization composed of the several nations to establish and maintain permanent peace throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, while the nations of Europe are going through this travail of blood we must not and cannot take part in that carnage by placing in the hands of the belligerents the forces and instruments of destruction. Let us be a good neighbor and maintain strict neutrality by retaining an embargo on the exportation of arms and munitions of war.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the amendment to retain the arms embargo.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, certainly before we vote on this neutrality bill we should consider its genesis, its origin, the motive behind it, and what its objectives were originally. In the Committee on Foreign Affairs some 15 years ago when we considered this question of an arms embargo, not long after the war, the gentleman from Ohio, former Senator Burton, and myself, considering the reasons that involved us in the World War, came to a conclusion that every Member of the House and the country must come to—that one of the main factors in our involvement in the World War was the sale of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. We tried to work out a plan that would prevent the sale of arms and ammunition and write it into a neutrality bill for one single purpose and with one single motive—that of keeping the United States of America out of foreign wars. [Applause.] That is all there was behind the arms embargo. It took

some 10 years to educate the people and the Congress, so that finally there was an almost unanimous desire on the part of the people and of the Congress itself to write an arms embargo into the law. This was the sole motive, the origin, and the genesis of the arms embargo with which we are confronted.

It was written into law in time of peace to be effective in time of war, and now we find in time of war that there are those in high authority who insist that the arms embargo must be taken out of the neutrality bill. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the burden of proof rests on those who would take the arms embargo out of the bill—the burden rests on them to prove how taking the arms embargo out of the bill will keep us out of the war. No one has done that because no one can do it. So much for the history of the arms embargo.

I am opposed to the traffic in arms, in the first place, because I believe it to be an utterly unmoral, un-Christian, and vicious system turning our country into a great slaughterhouse for the sake of blood money and war profits that will involve us in every war all over the world. There can be no compromise on that issue—the issue of blood money and war profits. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] said that Germany gambled and lost the war. That is true; but why should we in Congress gamble with the lives of the youth of America by repealing the arms embargo that was enacted into law to keep us out of war? [Applause.]

I would not gamble with the life of one single American for all the blood-stained dollars of Europe. I would not gamble with the life of one single American soldier to sell arms, poisonous gas, and flame throwers.

Gentlemen have risen on this floor repeatedly and said that the sale of arms and ammunition is an immaterial proposition, that it is a mere gesture, that it does not amount to anything, that it cannot drag us into war. Let me recall what happened in 1917. I can prove to you that that was the main factor in getting us into the war. We did not declare war against Germany, Germany declared war against us by attacking our ships without warning. Why did they do it? Not because we were shipping food and raw materials, but only because we were shipping arms and ammunition.

I have right here in my possession letter after letter written by Ambassador Gerard, the American Ambassador to the Imperial German Court at Berlin, who repeatedly said that within 3 months after the war broke out in 1914 the Kaiser would not see the American Ambassador because of the hatred, the hostility, and the enmity of the German people toward America for only one reason, because we were selling arms and ammunition which was killing German soldiers.

Is it not self-evident to every Member, whether he be Republican or Democrat, that if we continue this vicious system for blood-money and war profits and send arms and ammunition to the other side to be used against German soldiers, whether it be poison gas or shells, anything made in America that kills German soldiers will be resented by the whole German people? If you do not think this is a move to war, then you belie and deny the whole history of the World War and the causes and origin of the World War.

We in America are not afraid of the Germans. We are not afraid of the English or the French or the entire world. We have the greatest Navy in the world. Mr. Speaker, I challenge anyone from the President down to specify what nation or nations have the faintest thought of attacking the United States of America, or what nation or nations have the faintest capacity to attack the United States of America; yet we are told that we must be in fear of invasions from foreign lands, if this nation or that nation wins.

This whole question, Mr. Speaker, comes down very largely to a symbol, and this symbol is the arms and ammunition issue before us. If we retain the arms and ammunition embargo in the neutrality bill the word will flash throughout the United States and all over the world that the Congress

of the United States has decided to keep out of the wars of the world. [Applause.]

Repeat the arms embargo and the word will be flashed today all over the world that America has taken sides, that we have intervened, that we have lined up on the side of the Allies, that we are already participating in this war and that their fight is our fight. Very soon the propagandists will come over here and make us believe that, because we are the greatest pushovers in the world for foreign propaganda. They will make us believe that we are not only a part of this war, but that we started it.

So, Mr. Speaker, my appeal to you is to remember the words of Washington and Jefferson; Washington who proclaimed the original American policy of neutrality—noninterference, no entangling alliances, and peace. Let us not scrap these policies. The foreign policies of Jefferson and Washington are identical.

The President of the United States, in a message to the Congress, said that the arms embargo under Jefferson was the cause of the War of 1812. I submit to you that that was a complete embargo. We are not asking for a complete embargo, but only an embargo on arms and ammunition and poisonous gas.

Where do you Democrats think Thomas Jefferson would stand today? He would stand exactly where he stood 150 years ago, for an embargo—an embargo on arms, ammunition and poisonous gas and all deadly and lethal weapons.

I respect the gentleman from Mississippi who got up here as a true Jeffersonian Democrat, and I appeal to the Democrats of the South not to make this a party measure. This is an American measure that far transcends all party lines as it involves the security of America and the lives of our people.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from New York one-half minute.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, let me point this out. There is not a northern State, not one, that is not divided, that I know about, but in the South you will find Virginia and North Carolina and Georgia and Alabama all lined up to defeat the arms embargo. If this vote rested with the North and with the East and the West we would carry it by an overwhelming majority. If it were not for the propaganda and the power of the administration, the arms embargo would stay in the bill by over 100 majority. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont 1 minute.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am embarrassed by the fact that the last speaker failed to recognize that the entire delegation from Vermont is in opposition to his proposition. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my own well-conceived ideas in respect to this legislation now under discussion, and to express, I think, the sentiment of a large majority of those whom I represent in this National Assembly. I shall not be alarmed by those who, in apparent sincerity, insist that the proposed neutrality bill, if passed, will inevitably cause this Nation to enter into a World War. I deny such an implication; in my opinion, it is baseless. This Nation has gone to war on three occasions because of a foreign power's depredation upon our maritime rights and the wanton destruction of our property and our citizens upon the high seas. When this depredation was wrought we were doubtless within our rights under the well-conceived rules of international law. International law is a safe course to follow in peacetime, but it rarely is efficient in time of war, and my interpretation of this act, as passed by the Senate, and which is now before us, is in no sense an attempt to abrogate or annul international law, but has for its purpose

the safeguarding of international law and the removal of those acts on the part of this Nation which heretofore have been the proximate cause of our declaration of foreign wars and our entrance into destructive combats with those who observed no well-established rule between nations and were only prompted by viciousness to take what they could and destroy that which they could not take. Under the rules of international law this Nation, when it is not engaged in war, can send its ships to any port and everywhere upon the high seas and its citizens into the four corners of the earth, and both its ships and its citizens have a right to carry on commerce and trade with belligerent nations as well as those at peace, subject, of course, to the rule governing contraband shipments. If all belligerent nations were careful to observe the rules of international law in respect to the destruction of property and citizens not engaged in war, we would have no use for this proposed Neutrality Act. My conception of the act is that it is an enabling act on the part of a great nation which is determined to keep out of war by observing rules and regulations which would make impossible the infraction of international law and the commission of depredations by belligerents which could not be overlooked.

What is the purpose of this act? I think it can be stated concretely and in an understandable manner and the purpose cannot be successfully gainsaid. This Nation has evidently learned something by experience, and a very sad experience, and we now propose to profit by this experience. First, this act makes it unlawful for the entrance of our ships, for any purpose, into those belligerent countries engaged in war. Second, it forbids our citizens from traveling on any vessel in the control area of belligerents as defined by the President. Third, it provides that no merchant vessel of the United States shall go armed if engaged in foreign commerce. Disarming these vessels would remove the excuse of belligerent submarines for sinking and destroying property and life because of these submarines' inability to determine whether or not our vessels carried contraband war materials for its enemies. As far as this Nation is concerned, this is the most serious aspect of modern war. I am satisfied that those who have studied this problem realize that when a belligerent Nation seizes our commerce thinking it contained war contraband for its enemies, then that fact should be verified by search and seizure before the vessel is captured or destroyed within the purview of international law. Fourth, this act further provides that this Nation shall not buy the bonds of or make loans to any foreign nation engaged in war. In my opinion, this is the most exasperating act that this rich Nation could ever do and it cannot do this and be neutral.

So determined is this Nation to keep out of war that it has resolved every doubt against our right under international law and we have safeguarded business and commerce so that no belligerent nation could justifiably complain, and I assert without fear of successful contradiction that no other nation on this earth has ever undertaken to do what we propose to do by the passage of this pending act. This is not a gesture at neutrality—it is a purpose to do nothing which would involve us in foreign wars. And then again in this act we say to the belligerents, as well as all other nations, our ports are open; we are engaged in our normal business; if you want any commodity we produce, send here and get it or send somebody after it if you prefer; pay us for it and take it away wherever you will with the distinct understanding that we are not responsible in any manner whatsoever for its ultimate delivery. If this is not neutrality not heretofore exemplified on this earth, then I do not understand what it means for a nation to be neutral. I do not care what international law writers may say about the rights of belligerents or the duties of noncombat nations, I believe in my heart that this act under discussion is greater in its concept of human rights than anything ever evolved into international law. It is the highest tribute that this or any other Nation ever paid to an unselfish people who are determined to stay out of foreign wars and to preserve a civilization which fears God and respects mankind. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is a physical, if not an intellectual, imposition upon the membership of this House at this time to undertake to make any remarks with reference to the issues involved in the pending controversy. I feel that if ever there has been an issue that was submitted to the Congress of the United States, in both branches of the Congress, that was fully and fairly and intensively and by every avenue approached, it has been this controversy. So I have felt there could be no justification for the suggestion made by some that there was any disposition upon the part of the leadership of this House to cut off legitimate debate upon this issue; and in view of the very full and exhaustive arguments that have already been made, as indicated, I know that my intellectual ingenuity, if I have any, would not be able to suggest in my remarks any new arguments or, possibly, any new or helpful implications from any of the arguments that have already been made. I simply desire to reiterate and, possibly, if I may, to emphasize some of the arguments that have been made in favor of the pending proposition. I think that it would be futile for me at this stage of the proceedings to hope to change the fixed conviction of any Member on either side of the aisle.

I am very happy that there has been universal testimony presented by every Member who has spoken in either branch of the Congress of the universal desire of the American people to maintain peace—to maintain peace and friendly relations with every nation in this world, even including the belligerents in the present contest, or any potential combatant that may enter into the contest later. I think that that universal sentiment is significant of the morality and the religion of the American people, and I rejoice that these debates have not had any issues upon the question of the solidarity of our people upon those questions. There is one assertion in this debate that has been denied, but I hope possibly to deny it with a little more emphasis than has heretofore been expressed, and that is the charge frequently made in debate, that one of the prime causes that led the Congress of the United States into this declaration of war against Germany in 1917, was that the Congress of the United States at that time was influenced by the selfish, sordid, and personal appeals and interests of the munitions makers of this country. I was here on that fateful April 2, 1917, when Woodrow Wilson, then the President of the United States, convened the Congress in extraordinary session. I regret that in the providence of God and that in the weakness of human nature so many of those 435 colleagues of mine who sat in this Chamber on that historic occasion, on both sides of the aisle, have passed to the last review before the High Chancery of Heaven and that only 21 of us now remain here by the sufferance and tolerance of our constituencies.

I heard the President of the United States speak from his place on that stand on the memorable and historic occasion when the Representatives of the American people of both parties were waiting to hear the recommendations of the Chief Executive—not a democratic executive, but the President of the United States of America, and I shall repeat his words in part, because some student of history in years to come may be deceived by the statement that we went into the last World War in the interest of the munition makers of this country. I shall not read it all, but I quote in part what he said:

On the 3d of February last I officially laid before you the extraordinary announcement of the Imperial German Government, that on and after the 1st day of February it was its purpose to put aside all restraints of law or of humanity and use its submarines to sink every vessel that sought to approach either the ports of Great Britain and Ireland or the western coast of Europe or any of the ports controlled by the enemies of Germany within the Mediterranean. That had seemed to be the object of the German submarine warfare earlier in the war, but since April of last year the Imperial Government had somewhat restrained the commanders of its undersea craft in conformity with its promise then given to us that passenger boats should not be sunk and that due

warning would be given to all other vessels which its submarines might seek to destroy, when no resistance was offered or escape attempted, and care taken that their crews were given at least a fair chance to save their lives in their open boats. The precautions taken were meager and haphazard enough, as was proved in distressing instance after instance in the progress of the cruel and unmanly business, but a certain degree of restraint was observed. The new policy has swept every restriction aside. Vessels of every kind, whatever their flag, their character, their cargo, their destination, their errand, have been ruthlessly sent to the bottom without warning and without thought of help or mercy for those on board, the vessels of friendly neutrals along with those of belligerents. Even hospital ships and ships carrying relief to the sorely bereaved and stricken people of Belgium, though the latter were provided with safe conduct through the proscribed areas by the German Government itself and were distinguished by unmistakable marks of identity, have been sunk with the same reckless lack of compassion and of principle.

It was because of that appeal, and those undisputed facts, the Congress of the United States, late in the morning of April 5, 1917, voted on the President's recommendations, because of those grievances and those alone, to embark in that war with Germany. And I rejoice, as characteristic in great crises, certainly in that crisis, that no partisanship should divide the Congress of the United States upon issues affecting the integrity, the dignity, and the security of our country. I rejoice to remember that on that vote in the House of Representatives there were 193 Democrats who voted in favor of the declaration of war and 174 Republicans in favor of that declaration and that in the Senate of the United States 44 Democrats voted in favor of that declaration and 38 Republicans, showing that practically bipartisan-nonpartisan division on that great patriotic issue.

Therefore, I have undertaken, to answer that calumny that some gentlemen have undertaken in this argument to embalm against the integrity and patriotism of those of our Representatives who sat in the places that you now occupy on your side of the aisle and mine, that they were actuated by any motive or purpose except to preserve the dignity and rights of the people of the United States. [Applause.]

There is one phase of this bill that I desire to discuss very briefly. That is with reference to the embargo question. That is the very heart and essence of this whole controversy. There is no question about that. The whole issue in the House of Representatives this afternoon is going to revolve around the so-called Vorys amendment. We may just as well be prepared to meet that issue, because it is the essence of this entire controversy. These other things are somewhat incidental to it.

Now, what is neutrality, in its abstract sense? Efforts have been made here to persuade the House of Representatives that the passage of this bill, in view of certain geographical and strategical situations abroad, would be in favor of one side in this contest across the seas, but what does neutrality in essence, in spirit, in purpose—I am almost tempted to say in sacrament—mean? What does it mean in terms of international law, as well as equitable and just relations between the nations of the world? It means equality of opportunity for all of them, as far as our interests are concerned, in the abstract sense.

There have been pointed out innumerable instances of immemorial practice, even before this Government was formed; but since the foundation of this Government as a separate political entity it has been the immemorial practice, with one unfortunate exception, to recognize the right of belligerents, regardless of the justice or merit of their contention, to come to our shores and buy and pay for whatever they desired.

Furthermore, international law has heretofore gone much further than that and given to American ships, sailing under American flags, the right to transport our products to belligerent countries, taking the risk, of course, of carrying contraband of war. What do we propose to do here? We propose to pass a law saying that our arms embargo, as constituted under the present law; that is, arms and munitions, shall be lifted.

It is important for us to remember that several propositions are concentrated and involved in the general program

that we are seeking in the Senate bill. We are proposing that any nation, France, England—yea, Germany, Russia, or any other government on the face of the earth can come to our shores in their ships, taking their own responsibility, and paying for those arms, munitions, and equipment before delivery, and if they can get away with it, take them back to their own country. Is there anything unneutral in the naked, abstract essence of that proposition of equality? If so, wherein does it lie? Oh, well, it may be argued by some, of course, because of England's present strength on the seas, that she is able to prevent German ships from coming, but, my friends, how does any man here know how long it will be before the British-French blockade may be broken by the submarine and air attacks by that almost irresistible air force of Germany? The situation would be entirely changed, but the principle of equality that we are seeking to write into this law for America now and hereafter, not only for this war but for any war that may come, will not be changed by the mere temporary changes in the fortunes of battle between the present belligerents.

I want to confess frankly, my friends, that I am not sensitive, personally speaking, about the temporary advantage that might be given to the western Allies if this embargo were lifted. There are now two alliances in Europe. Do not forget that. France and England; Russia and Germany. I may say that from the conception, from my admiration for the form of government represented by those two alliances as reflecting what we here in America believe as the constitutional system of government for a free people, I cannot complain that France and England may have some temporary advantage in this controversy. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WARREN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, it was understood between the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and me that the gentleman from Alabama be allowed to continue beyond the time.

Mr. FISH. I should be happy to do so if I have any power. I would suggest 3 more minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. Five more minutes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am loath to trespass on the House.

Mr. BLOOM. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama be allowed to continue, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible, if not indeed impossible, to put an embargo against the natural processes of a man's mind. Despite statutes, and despite proclamations, thank God we are still entitled to think at least as we please, although in some governments of the world men cannot act as they please under their systems of regimentation. And I say that I cannot find in myself any sympathy with the totalitarian governments' system of government.

I cannot conceive—it may be that I am narrow, bigoted, possibly, and prejudiced in my conceptions of what ought to be the fundamental rights of a free people.

I cannot conceive the denial of certain fundamental rights of men anywhere in the world. I conceive that a man ought to have the right to acquire property and dispose of it as he pleases, and to have it protected. I believe, and I feel that most of you Members believe, that a man ought to have the right to read the newspapers and magazines, to think for himself and argue with his friends and come to some conclusion or formulation of opinion, and express it as he sees fit without fear of the concentration camp, the firing squad, or "liquidation."

I believe that if out of the impulses of these hearts of ours, that sense of worship, that sense of appreciation in recognition of some great power infinitely stronger than ourselves, we see fit to go to some humble cabin church in the recesses of a rural district and kneel there at that altar and worship God as we see fit in that place, or if we go to some great cathedral in one of the great cities of the country with

all of its dignity, and majesty, and kneel down there to worship under the ritualism of that church, that it is a very valuable right for a free Government and a free people to maintain, and that we should be permitted to exercise such right. I believe that if you are working in your legitimate occupation here in the United States of America anywhere and you were suddenly to receive an order that you should drop your job and leave your family and go to some far distant place at the order of a regimented government to work as they saw fit and at what wages they saw fit to pay you, that you would resent it. I believe that if those powers came into this country, any power that might have temporary possession here in America, and destroyed all of our places of worship and destroyed those places which we have prepared for the more cultural development of life that it would be resented. Why? Because we believe and I feel that the democracies of Europe, including the Scandinavian countries, believe that all power ought not to vest in the state with its tyranny and power of arms, but that there should be reserved to its citizens, even the humblest and most obscure, some fundamental rights of freedom of speech and of religion, and some ordering of their own lives. [Applause.] These are the reasons why I cannot find much sympathy with the ideology—and to my mind that is a very much overused term these days—or the convictions and principles of these totalitarian governments.

They talk about flame throwers and poison gas and seek to eliminate them by amendment. Mr. Speaker, in the last World War who was it that first used poison gas and flame throwers and all other diabolical instruments of destruction in the war against their enemies? If you are familiar with the history of that operation, the question answers itself. War is a desperate thing; it is an inhuman thing; it is an un-Christian thing; it is a diabolical enterprise. God hasten the day, if ever it may come, when war as an instrumentality of action between the so-called civilizations of the world may perish from the face of this earth! [Applause.] I do not know that such day can come—at least, the world has been pretty slow in its progress to that end—but every combatant wants to use every instrumentality and device that his adversary uses; and why would it be equitable and just to refuse to a belligerent—any belligerent—the same weapons of offense or defense that those on the other side already have in vast quantities? Where is the equity in that proposition? Where is the justice of it? Where is the humanity of it?

Just one word in conclusion. This is a solemn moment for this House and for every Member in it. This has been a memorable debate in the Congress of the United States. This has been a most important issue affecting the destinies of the American people, their peace, their security, and their prosperity, not only immediately but possibly for many years to come, and I am glad the American people have shown such interest in it. I am glad that, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] this morning, the participants in this debate have shown such a fine sense of restraint and courtesy in argument. I feel sure that we all have the same objectives.

I recall many years ago reading a quotation from Bulwer-Lytton's *Richelieu*; and I quote it not because it was of French origin or to indicate my sympathy for the French in this contest, but as a great apostrophe to liberty and patriotism as a principle, and I want to apply it to the spirit of this debate.

Richelieu said:

"All things for France"—lo, my eternal maxim!
The vital axle of the restless wheels
That bear me on!
Beyond the map of France—my heart can travel not,
But fills that limit to its farthest verge.

Let us appropriate that sentiment to this country of ours. All things for the United States of America; all things for the peace and security of its people; all things that may be devised by legitimate and logical legislative programs to preserve that peace and fraternity with other nations.

It is because in my heart of hearts I believe the Senate bill more greatly conduces to those objectives that I give it

my support, and I trust all efforts in this House to emasculate or destroy it may be defeated. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to instruct the conferees and all amendments thereto.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WARREN). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VOYTS].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may the Wolcott amendment be read and made known to the Members of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Wolcott amendment will be again reported by the Clerk.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: At the end of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VOYTS] add the following:

"That the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on House Joint Resolution 306 be further instructed to insist upon the following as to section 7:

"SEC. 7. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful for the Federal Reserve banks, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Export-Import Bank of Washington, or any other agency of the Federal Government, or for any person, association, partnership, or corporation within the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations of the government of any state named in such proclamation, or of any political subdivision of any such state, or of any person, partnership, association, or corporation acting for or on behalf of the government of any such state, issued after the date of such proclamation, or to make any loan or extend any credit to any such government, political subdivision, person, partnership, association, or corporation. The provisions of this subsection shall also apply to the sale by any person within the United States to any person in a state named in any such proclamation of any articles or materials listed in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 12 (1).

"(b) Whoever shall violate any of the provisions of this section or of any regulations issued thereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$50,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both. Should the violation be by a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or director thereof participating in the violation shall be liable to the penalty herein prescribed.

"(c) Whenever any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked with respect to any state, the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to such state, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

"(d) This section shall not apply to loans, discounts, advances of credit, and other evidences of indebtedness incident to shipments between the United States and states bordering on the United States as described and provided in subsection (f) of section 2 of this act."

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 196, nays 228, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

YEAS—196

Alexander	Carter	Elston	Harrington
Allen, Ill.	Casc, S. Dak.	Engel	Hart
Andersen, H. Carl	Chapman	Englebright	Harter, N. Y.
Anderson, Calif.	Chipperfield	Evans	Hartley
Anderson, Mo.	Church	Fenton	Hawks
Andresen, A. H.	Clason	Fish	Healey
Andrews	Clevenger	Ford, Leland M.	Heinke
Angell	Cluett	Fries	Hess
Arends	Cole, N. Y.	Gamble	Hinshaw
Ashbrook	Colmer	Gartner	Hoffman
Austin	Connery	Gearhart	Holmes
Ball	Corbett	Gehrmann	Hope
Barry	Costello	Gerlach	Horton
Barton	Cravens	Gifford	Hull
Bates, Mass.	Crawford	Gilchrist	Hunter
Bell	Crosser	Gillie	Jacobsen
Bender	Crowther	Graham	Jarrett
Blackney	Culkin	Grant, Ind.	Jeffries
Bolles	Curtis	Gross	Jenkins, Ohio
Bradley, Mich.	Dirksen	Guyver, Kans.	Jenks, N. H.
Bradley, Pa.	Ditter	Gwynne	Jensen
Brewster	Dondero	Hall	Johns
Brown, Ohio	Douglas	Halleck	Johnson, Ill.
Burdick	Dowell	Hancock	Johnson, Ind.
Carlson	Dworshak	Harness	Jones, Ohio

Kean	Moser	Rogers, Mass.	Taylor, Tenn.
Keefe	Mott	Routzohn	Thill
Kinzer	Mundt	Rutherford	Thomas, N. J.
Kitchens	Murray	Ryan	Thorkelson
Knutson	O'Brien	Sandager	Tibbott
Kunkel	O'Connor	Schafer, Wis.	Tinkham
Lambertson	O'Leary	Schiffler	Tolan
Landis	Oliver	Secombe	Treadway
LeCompte	Osmer	Secrest	Van Zandt
Lemke	Pfeifer	Seeger	Voorhis, Calif.
Lewis, Ohio	Pierce, N. Y.	Shafer, Mich.	Vorys, Ohio
Luce	Pittenger	Shanley	Vreeland
Ludlow	Powers	Shannon	Wadsworth
McDowell	Rabaut	Short	Welch
McLean	Rankin	Simpson	Wheat
McLeod	Reece, Tenn.	Smith, Conn.	White, Ohio
Maas	Reed, Ill.	Smith, Maine	Wigglesworth
Mapes	Reed, N. Y.	Smith, Ohio	Williams, Del.
Marshall	Rees, Kans.	Springer	Winter
Martin, Iowa	Rich	Stefan	Wolcott
Martin, Mass.	Risk	Sumner, Ill.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Mason	Robison, Ky.	Sweeney	Wolverton, N. J.
Michener	Rockefeller	Taber	Woodruff, Mich.
Miller	Rodgers, Pa.	Talle	Youngdahl

NAYS—228

Allen, La.	Disney	Kennedy, Michael	Pierce, Oreg.
Allen, Pa.	Doughton	Keogh	Plumley
Arnold	Doxey	Kerr	Poage
Barden	Drewry	Kilday	Polk
Barnes	Duncan	Kirwan	Ramspeck
Bates, Ky.	Dunn	Kieberg	Randolph
Beam	Durham	Kocialkowski	Rayburn
Beckworth	Eaton	Kramer	Richards
Bland	Eberharter	Lanham	Robertson
Bloom	Edmiston	Larrabee	Robinson, Utah
Boehne	Elliott	Lea	Rogers, Okla.
Boland	Ellis	Leavy	Romjue
Boren	Faddis	Lesinski	Sabath
Boykin	Fay	Lewis, Colo.	Sacks
Brooks	Ferguson	McAndrews	Sasscer
Brown, Ga.	Fernandez	McArdle	Satterfield
Bryson	Fitzpatrick	McCormack	Schaefer, Ill.
Buck	Flaherty	McGehee	Schultz
Buckler, Minn.	Flannagan	McGranery	Schulz
Buckley, N. Y.	Fannery	McKeough	Schwert
Bulwinkle	Folger	McLaughlin	Scruggam
Burch	Ford, Miss.	McMillan	Sheppard
Burgin	Ford, Thomas F.	Maclejewski	Sirovich
Byrne, N. Y.	Fulmer	Magnuson	Smith, Ill.
Byrns, Tenn.	Garrett	Mahon	Smith, Wash.
Byron	Gathings	Maloney	Smith, W. Va.
Caldwell	Gavagan	Mansfield	Snyder
Camp	Geyer, Calif.	Marcantonio	Somers, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.	Gibbs	Martin, Colo.	South
Cannon, Mo.	Gore	Martin, Ill.	Sparkman
Cartwright	Gossett	Massingale	Spence
Casby, Mass.	Grant, Ala.	Merritt	Starnes, Ala.
Celler	Green	Mills, Ark.	Steagall
Chandler	Gregory	Mills, La.	Stearns, N. H.
Clark	Griffith	Mitchell	Sullivan
Claypool	Hare	Monkiewicz	Summers, Tex.
Cochran	Harter, Ohio	Moutrone	Sutphin
Coffee, Nebr.	Havener	Mouton	Tarver
Coffee, Wash.	Hendricks	Murdoch, Ariz.	Tenerowicz
Cole, Md.	Hennings	Murdock, Utah	Terry
Collins	Hill	Myers	Thomas, Tex.
Cooley	Hobbs	Nelson	Thomason
Cooper	Hook	Nichols	Vincent, Ky.
Courtney	Houston	Norrell	Vinson, Ga.
Cox	Izac	Norton	Wallgren
Creal	Jarman	O'Day	Walter
Crowe	Johnson, Luther A.	O'Neal	Ward
Cullen	Johnson, Lyndon	O'Toole	Warren
Cummings	Johnson, Okla.	Pace	Weaver
D'Alesandro	Johnson, W. Va.	Parsons	West
Darden	Jones, Tex.	Patman	Whelchel
Delaney	Kee	Patrick	White, Idaho
Dempsey	Kefauver	Patton	Whittington
DeRouen	Keller	Pearson	Williams, Mo.
Dickstein	Kelly	Peterson, Fla.	Wood
Dies	Kennedy, Martin	Peterson, Ga.	Woodrum, Va.
Dingell	Kennedy, Md.		Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—4

Curley Darrow Smith, Va. Taylor, Colo.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pair:

Mr. Darrow (for) with Mr. Smith of Virginia (against).

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that my colleague the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SMITH, is absent on account of illness. He has a pair with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. DARROW. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the so-called Vorys amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. VORYS of Ohio moves to amend the motion of Mr. SHANLEY to instruct the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on House Joint Resolution 306 as follows:

Strike out all after "section 2" and insert:

"Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful to export, or attempt to export, or cause to be exported, arms or ammunition from any place in the United States to any belligerent state named in such proclamation, or to any neutral state for transshipment to, or for the use of, any such belligerent state.

"For the purposes of this section, arms or ammunition shall include bombs, torpedoes, submarines, poison gas, flame throwers, liquid fire, and the other articles enumerated in categories I to IV, inclusive, and VI and VII in the President's proclamation, No. 2337, of May 1, 1937."

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 179, nays 245, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]

YEAS—179

Alexander	Eaton	Johnson, Ill.	Rockefeller
Allen, Ill.	Elston	Johnson, Ind.	Rodgers, Pa.
Allen, La.	Englebright	Jones, Ohio	Rogers, Mass.
Andersen, H. Carl	Evans	Keefe	Routzohn
Anderson, Calif.	Fenton	Kinzer	Rutherford
Anderson, Mo.	Fernandez	Knutson	Ryan
Andresen, A. H.	Fish	Kunkel	Sandager
Angell	Fries	Lambertson	Schiffler
Arends	Gartner	Landis	Secombe
Ashbrook	Gearhart	LeCompte	Secrest
Austin	Gehrmann	Lemke	Seeger
Barry	Gerlach	Lewis, Ohio	Shafer, Mich.
Barton	Gilchrist	Luce	Shannon
Bender	Gillie	Ludlow	Short
Blackney	Graham	McDowell	Simpson
Bolles	Grant, Ind.	McLaughlin	Smith, Maine
Bradley, Mich.	Griffith	McLeod	Smith, Ohio
Brewster	Gross	Maas	Springer
Brooks	Guyer, Kans.	Mapes	Stefan
Brown, Ohio	Hall	Marshall	Sumner, Ill.
Burdick	Halleck	Martin, Mass.	Sweeney
Carlson	Hancock	Michener	Taber
Carter	Harness	Miller	Talle
Case, S. Dak.	Harrington	Mills, La.	Thill
Chapman	Harter, N. Y.	Mott	Thomas, N. J.
Chipherfield	Hartley	Mundt	Thorkelson
Church	Hawks	Murray	Tibbott
Clason	Healey	O'Brien	Tinkham
Clevenger	Heinke	O'Connor	Tolan
Coffee, Nebr.	Hess	O'Day	Treadway
Cole, Md.	Hinshaw	O'Leary	Van Zandt
Connelly	Hoffman	Oliver	Vorys, Ohio
Corbett	Holmes	Osmer	Welch
Costello	Hope	Pfeifer	Wheat
Crosser	Horton	Pittenger	White, Idaho
Crowther	Hull	Powers	White, Ohio
Culkin	Hunter	Rabaut	Wigglesworth
Curtis	Jacobsen	Rankin	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	Jarrett	Reece, Tenn.	Winter
Ditter	Jeffries	Reed, Ill.	Wolcott
Dondero	Jenkins, Ohio	Reed, N. Y.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Douglas	Jenks, N. H.	Rees, Kans.	Wolverton, N. J.
Dowell	Jensen	Rich	Woodruff, Mich.
Dworshak	Johns	Risk	Youngdahl
		Robison, Ky.	

NAYS—245

Allen, Pa.	Byrne, N. Y.	Creal	Ferguson
Arnold	Byrns, Tenn.	Crowe	Fitzpatrick
Ball	Byron	Cullen	Flaherty
Barden	Caldwell	Cummings	Flannagan
Barnes	Camp	D'Alesandro	Flannery
Bates, Ky.	Cannon, Fla.	Darden	Folger
Bates, Mass.	Cannon, Mo.	Delaney	Ford, Leland M.
Beam	Cartwright	Dempsey	Ford, Miss.
Beckworth	Casey, Mass.	DeRouen	Ford, Thomas F.
Bell	Celler	Dickstein	Fulmer
Bland	Chandler	Dies	Gamble
Bloom	Clark	Dingell	Garrett
Boehne	Claypool	Disney	Gathings
Boland	Cluett	Doughton	Gavagan
Boren	Cochran	Doxey	Geyer, Calif.
Boykin	Coffee, Wash.	Drewry	Gibbs
Bradley, Pa.	Cole, N. Y.	Duncan	Gifford
Brown, Ga.	Collins	Dunn	Gore
Bryson	Colmer	Durham	Gossett
Buck	Cooley	Eberharter	Grant, Ala.
Buckler, Minn.	Cooper	Edmiston	Green
Buckley, N. Y.	Courtney	Elliott	Gregory
Bulwinkle	Cox	Ellis	Gwynne
Burch	Cravens	Faddis	Hare
Burgin	Crawford	Fay	Hart

Harter, Ohio	McAndrews	Parsons	Snyder
Havener	McArdle	Patman	Somers, N. Y.
Hendricks	McCormack	Patrick	South
Hennings	McGehee	Patton	Sparkman
Hill	McGranery	Pearson	Spence
Hobbs	McKeough	Peterson, Fla.	Starnes, Ala.
Hook	McLean	Peterson, Ga.	Steagall
Houston	McMillan	Pierce, N. Y.	Stearns, N. H.
Izac	Maclejewski	Pierce, Oreg.	Sullivan
Jarman	Magnuson	Plumley	Sumners, Tex.
Johnson, Luther A.	Mahon	Poage	Sutphin
Johnson, Lyndon	Maloney	Polk	Tarver
Johnson, Okla.	Mansfield	Ramspeck	Taylor, Tenn.
Johnson, W. Va.	Marcantonio	Randolph	Tenerowicz
Jones, Tex.	Martin, Colo.	Rayburn	Terry
Kean	Martin, Ill.	Richards	Thomas, Tex.
Kee	Martin, Iowa	Robertson	Thomason
Kefauver	Mason	Robinson, Utah	Vincent, Ky.
Keller	Massingale	Rogers, Okla.	Vinson, Ga.
Kelly	May	Romjue	Voorhis, Calif.
Kennedy, Martin	Merritt	Sabath	Vreeland
Kennedy, Md.	Mills, Ark.	Sacks	Wadsworth
Kennedy, Michael	Mitchell	Sasser	Wallgren
Keogh	Monkiewicz	Satterfield	Walter
Kerr	Monroney	Schaefer, Ill.	Ward
Kilday	Moser	Schaefer, Wis.	Warren
Kirwan	Mouton	Schuetz	Weaver
Kitchens	Murdock, Ariz.	Schulte	West
Kieberg	Murdock, Utah	Schwert	Whelchel
Kocialkowski	Myers	Whittington	Williams, Mo.
Kramer	Nelson	Shanley	Wood
Lanham	Nichols	Sheppard	Woodrum, Va.
Larrabee	Norrell	Sirovich	Zimmerman
Lea	Norton	Smith, Conn.	
Leavy	O'Neal	Smith, Ill.	
Lesinski	O'Toole	Smith, Wash.	
Lewis, Colo.	Pace	Smith, W. Va.	

NOT VOTING—4

Curley	Darrow	Smith, Va.	Taylor, Colo.
--------	--------	------------	---------------

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pair:

Mr. Darrow (for) with Mr. Smith of Virginia (against).

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that my colleague the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SMITH, is detained by illness; if he were here, he would vote "no."

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that my colleague the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. TAYLOR, is confined in the hospital; if he were here, he would vote "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY], which the Clerk will report for the information of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHANLEY moves that the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on House Joint Resolution 306 be instructed to insist upon the following as section 2:

"Sec. 2. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority by section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful to export, or attempt to export, or cause to be exported, arms, ammunition, or implements of war from any place in the United States to any belligerent state named in such proclamation, or to any neutral state for transshipment to, or for the use of, any such belligerent state.

"(b) The President shall, from time to time, by proclamation, extend such embargo upon the export of arms, ammunition, or implements of war to other states as and when they may become involved in such war.

"(c) The President shall, from time to time, by proclamation, definitely enumerate the arms, ammunition, and implements of war, the export of which is prohibited by this section. The arms, ammunition, and implements of war so enumerated shall include bombs, torpedoes, poison gas, flame throwers, and the other articles enumerated in the President's proclamation No. 2337 of May 1, 1937, but shall not include raw materials or any other articles or materials not of the same general character as those enumerated in the said proclamation and in the Convention for the Supervision of the International Trade in Arms and Ammunition and in Implements of War, signed at Geneva June 17, 1925.

"(d) Whoever, in violation of any of the provisions of this act, shall export, or attempt to export, or cause to be exported, arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the United States shall be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both, and the property, vessel, or vehicle containing the same shall be subject to the provisions of sections 1 to 8, inclusive, title 6, chapter 30, of the act approved June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 223-225; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 22, secs. 238-245).

"(e) In the case of the forfeiture of any arms, ammunition, or implements of war by reason of a violation of this act, no public or private sale shall be required; but such arms, ammunition, or implements of war shall be delivered to the Secretary of War for

such use or disposal thereof as shall be approved by the President of the United States.

"(f) Whenever, in the judgment of the President, the conditions which have caused him to issue any proclamation under the authority of this section have ceased to exist, he shall revoke the same, and the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to the state or states named in such proclamation, except with respect to offenses committed or forfeitures incurred prior to such revocation."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Connecticut to instruct the conferees.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 181, nays 243, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—181

Alexander	Evans	Kunkel	Ryan
Allen, Ill.	Fenton	Lambertson	Sandager
Andersen, H. Carl	Fernandez	Landis	Schafer, Wis.
Anderson, Mo.	Fish	LeCompte	Schiffler
Andresen, A. H.	Fries	Lenke	Secombe
Andrews	Gartner	Lewis, Ohio	Secrest
Angell	Gearhart	Luce	Seger
Arends	Gehrman	Ludlow	Shafer, Mich.
Ashbrook	Gerlach	McDowell	Shanley
Austin	Gilchrist	McLaughlin	Shannon
Barry	Gillie	McLeod	Short
Barton	Graham	Maas	Simpson
Bates, Mass.	Grant, Ind.	Mapes	Smith, Conn.
Bender	Griffith	Marshall	Smith, Maine
Blackney	Gross	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Ohio
Bolles	Guyer, Kans.	Martin, Mass.	Springer
Bradley, Mich.	Hall	Massingale	Stefan
Brown, Ohio	Halleck	Michener	Summer, Ill.
Burdick	Hancock	Miller	Sweeney
Carlson	Harness	Mills, La.	Taber
Carter	Harrington	Mott	Talle
Case, S. Dak.	Harter, N. Y.	Mundt	Thill
Chapman	Hawks	Murray	Thomas, N. J.
Chipherfield	Healey	O'Brien	Thorkelson
Church	Heinke	O'Connor	Tibbott
Clason	Hess	O'Day	Tinkham
Clevenger	Hoffman	O'Leary	Tolan
Cole, Md.	Holmes	Oliver	Treadway
Connery	Hope	Osmers	Van Zandt
Corbett	Horton	Pfeller	Voorhis, Calif.
Costello	Hull	Pittenger	Vorys, Ohio
Crawford	Hunter	Powers	Weich
Crosser	Jacobsen	Rabaut	Wheat
Crowther	Jarrett	Rankin	White, Idaho
Culkin	Jeffries	Reece, Tenn.	White, Ohio
Curtis	Jenkins, Ohio	Reed, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Dirksen	Jenks, N. H.	Reed, N. Y.	Williams, Del.
Ditter	Jensen	Rees, Kans.	Winter
Dondero	Johns	Rich	Wolcott
Douglas	Johnson, Ill.	Risk	Wolfenden, Pa.
Dowell	Johnson, Ind.	Robison, Ky.	Wolverton, N. J.
Dworshak	Keefe	Rockefeller	Woodruff, Mich.
Elston	Kinzer	Rodgers, Pa.	Youngdahl
Engel	Knutson	Rogers, Mass.	
Englebright		Routzohn	
		Rutherford	

NAYS—243

Allen, La.	Camp	Disney	Gossett
Allen, Pa.	Cannon, Fla.	Doughton	Grant, Ala.
Anderson, Calif.	Cannon, Mo.	Doxey	Green
Arnold	Cartwright	Drewry	Gregory
Ball	Casey, Mass.	Duncan	Gwynne
Barden	Celler	Dunn	Hare
Barnes	Chandler	Durham	Hart
Bates, Ky.	Clark	Eaton	Harter, Ohio
Beam	Claypool	Eberharter	Havener
Beckworth	Cluett	Edmiston	Hendricks
Bell	Cochran	Elliott	Hennings
Bland	Coffee, Wash.	Ellis	Hill
Bloom	Cole, N. Y.	Faddis	Hinshaw
Boehne	Collins	Fay	Hobbs
Boland	Colmer	Ferguson	Hook
Boren	Cooley	Fitzpatrick	Houston
Boykin	Cooper	Flaherty	Izac
Bradley, Pa.	Courtney	Flannagan	Jarman
Brewster	Cox	Flannery	Johnson, Luther A.
Brooks	Cravens	Folger	Johnson, Lyndon
Brown, Ga.	Creal	Ford, Leland M.	Johnson, Okla.
Bryson	Crowe	Ford, Miss.	Johnson, W. Va.
Buck	Cullen	Ford, Thomas F.	Jones, Tex.
Buckler, Minn.	Cummings	Fulmer	Kean
Buckley, N. Y.	D'Alesandro	Gamble	Kee
Bulwinkle	Darden	Garrett	Kefauver
Burgh	Delaney	Gathings	Keller
Burgin	Dempsey	Gavagan	Kelly
Byrne, N. Y.	DeRouen	Geyer, Calif.	Kennedy, Martin
Byrns, Tenn.	Dickstein	Gibbs	Kennedy, Md.
Byron	Dies	Gifford	Kennedy, Michael
Caldwell	Dingell	Gore	Keogh

Kerr	Mason	Poage	Starnes, Ala.
Kilday	May	Polk	Steagall
Kirwan	Merritt	Ramspeck	Stearns, N. H.
Kitchens	Mills, Ark.	Randolph	Sullivan
Kieberg	Mitchell	Rayburn	Summers, Tex.
Kocalkowski	Monkiewicz	Richards	Sutphin
Kramer	Monroney	Robertson	Tarver
Lanham	Moser	Robinson, Utah	Taylor, Tenn.
Larrabee	Mouton	Rogers, Okla.	Tenerowicz
Lea	Murdock, Ariz.	Romjue	Terry
Leavy	Murdock, Utah	Sabath	Thomas, Tex.
Lesinski	Myers	Sacks	Thomason
Lewis, Colo.	Nelson	Sasser	Vincent, Ky.
McAndrews	Nichols	Satterfield	Vincent, Ga.
McArdle	Norrell	Schaefer, Ill.	Vreeland
McCormack	Norton	Schuetz	Wadsworth
McGehee	O'Neal	Schulte	Wallgren
McGranery	O'Toole	Schwert	Walter
McKeough	Pace	Scrugham	Ward
McLean	Parsons	Sheppard	Warren
McMillan	Patman	Sirovich	Weaver
Maciejewski	Patrick	Smith, Ill.	West
Magnuson	Patton	Smith, Wash.	Whelchel
Mahon	Pearson	Smith, W. Va.	Whittington
Maloney	Peterson, Fla.	Snyder	Williams, Mo.
Mansfield	Peterson, Ga.	Somers, N. Y.	Wood
Marcantonio	Pierce, N. Y.	South	Woodrum, Va.
Martin, Colo.	Pierce, Oreg.	Sparkman	Zimmerman
Martin, Ill.	Plumley	Spence	

NOT VOTING—4

Curley Darrow Smith, Va. Taylor, Colo.

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pair:

Mr. Darrow (for) with Mr. Smith of Virginia (against).

Mr. CLUETT changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Virginia, Mr. SMITH, is unavoidably detained by illness. If present, he would have voted "no."

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Colorado, Mr. TAYLOR, is sick in the hospital. He sent word that if he were here he would vote "no."

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the last roll call may be corrected to show my vote of "no."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote whereby the various motions were rejected and to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. BLOOM, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, Mr. KEE, Mr. FISH, Mr. EATON.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House today, the Clerk of the House may be authorized to receive a message from the Senate on the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 306.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, our beloved colleague, Mr. DARROW, of Pennsylvania, is ill in the hospital. He has sent me the following message, which I shall read:

PHILADELPHIA, October 28, 1939.

To Whom It May Concern:

I favor strong neutrality legislation and reiterate the stand I have heretofore taken in behalf of the embargo on arms and ammunition and the appliance of the cash-and-carry principle to any other exportations to belligerents, believing this to be the best guaranty of keeping free of foreign entanglements and for the preservation of peace.

GEORGE P. DARROW.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REED of New York. Unanimous consent was granted to Members to extend their remarks in the RECORD. Does that include excerpts or brief quotations?

The SPEAKER. It does not.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the speech that I made today certain brief quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, and to include an editorial from a New Jersey newspaper.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include two letters and two telegrams, and my reply to the same.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein two brief editorials.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a letter upon the embargo repeal written by a former World War veteran.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, I received unanimous consent yesterday to place in the RECORD the last encyclical of the Pope. I am informed by the Printer that it costs more than is usually allowed. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at the point where the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY] concluded his remarks this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short statement on neutrality by citizens of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by supplementing the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole on March 28 and June 16.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by submitting one paragraph from an article by Frederic William Wile.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the question of unemployment.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PFELFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain excerpts on neutrality.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, Mr. O'CONNOR was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to quote two or three short passages from Washington's Farewell Address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech by Rev. Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., vice president of Georgetown University, Regent School of Foreign Service, on neutrality and American foreign trade, delivered at the opening session of the annual National Foreign Trade Convention, Hotel Commodore, New York City, on Monday, October 9, 1939.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects and include in one a letter to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and in the other a letter from Mr. Aubrey Williams.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point and include a letter I shall address to the committee of conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under the permission just granted me I include the following letter which I have addressed to the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on House Joint Resolution 306, in care of Hon. SOL BLOOM.

The first suggestion I have made is believed to be important, in view of the history of our entry into the World War. Certainly American passengers should not be permitted to travel on vessels laden with arms, ammunition, and implements of war, except at their own risk. In my humble opinion, no American vessel should carry such cargo consigned to a belligerent, or any agent of a belligerent, even though the destination may be a neutral port outside of a proclaimed combat zone.

My second suggestion to the conference is further set forth on pages 1253-1256 of the current CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington D. C., November 2, 1939.

To the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on House Joint Resolution 306, in care of Hon. Sol Bloom.

I

GENTLEMEN: I respectfully call the attention of the conferees to the fact that in House Joint Resolution 306 there is, apparently, no provision that will make it unlawful for American vessels to carry arms, ammunition, and implements of war, title to which has been conveyed to a belligerent under section 2 (c), when such cargo is destined to a neutral port which is not in a proclaimed combat zone; nor is there any provision making it unlawful for any American vessel so laden and consigned to carry passengers.

I believe that it has been the intention of the Congress and the American people to prevent the carrying of passengers on any vessels so laden and consigned, but particularly American vessels. I therefore respectfully suggest and recommend the insertion of a new subsection, to follow section 2 (a), containing proper language with that intent, and submit the following:

(b) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful for any American vessel carrying articles or materials listed in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 12 (1), to carry any passenger, except such passengers as may declare, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed, that such travel is solely at their own risk.

II

A further suggestion is respectfully submitted:

While for the purpose of conserving the material resources of the United States, authority exists in the Executive to recommend to the Congress that specific embargoes be placed upon the export of any material from the United States at any time, yet under condi-

tions of conflict between foreign states, such action may appear to have diplomatic significance. It is, therefore, respectfully suggested that the duties of the Munitions Control Board created under section 12 be broadened, and that the title of the Board be changed to the Munitions and Resources Control Board, and that in addition to its other duties, the Board shall keep a record of the exports of material resources, and obtain reports from other administrative agencies concerning the production, domestic consumption, and surpluses, if any, of such resources, and to render reports to the President and the Congress when it appears that the domestic supply should be conserved by either restricting or embargoing the export of such materials. Upon receiving such a recommendation, the Congress could take such action as might appear fitting.

One application in point is the present condition of the domestic stock of scrap iron, and the condition of our petroleum reserves. A recommendation made by the Munitions and Resources Control Board for the purpose of conserving domestic resources could have little, if any, diplomatic significance.

I have drafted, no doubt imperfectly, language intended to accomplish the purpose outlined, which will be found on page 1254 of the current RECORD, one copy of which is attached hereto.

Respectfully submitted.

CARL HINSHAW, M. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution from the National Association of Real Estate Brokers on the preservation of property rights.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent in extending my own remarks made this afternoon that I may include therein a telegram from pastors of the New England Conference of the Lutheran Augustana Synod, representing 35,000 members, against lifting the embargo.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein tables with reference to exports and national defense.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short letter from a farm organization.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in accord with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]. I wish to join him also that the safeguarding of our Nation against the extending of credits to the belligerents has not received the consideration by the Congress which is deserved. Indeed, in my opinion, the question has hardly been touched upon, though it is vital to the proper consideration of our own economic interests.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is correct in pointing out that neither the Johnson Act nor section 7 of the present bill safeguards our Nation against making loans to the belligerents.

I do not see how it is possible for any Member of this House to object to the provisions of this amendment. It merely provides for a more complete guaranty against the extension of credits to belligerents than is contained in the Senate bill. If the provision in the Senate bill really intends to insure us against the making of loans to belligerents, as its advocates claim it does, then the Wolcott amendment should receive the hearty support of every Member of this House.

I have the information from a source that I consider reliable that the legal staff of the State Department has already surveyed the possibility of making loans to the belligerents

through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and that it has concluded that this is possible.

In this connection I now wish to recall to the Congress the amendment which I offered last February to abolish the Second Export-Import Bank of Washington in connection with a proposal that was up before us then to limit the loans of the Export-Import Bank of Washington to \$100,000,000. It should be recalled that both of these banks were created by Presidential decree and later confirmed by statute. I wish to recall to you that I pointed out then that the law as it stood limited the loans of the Export-Import Bank of Washington only and not any loans that might be made by the Second Export-Import Bank of Washington. At that time it was contended by the opposition to my amendment that the Second Export-Import Bank of Washington had been abolished, and therefore my amendment had no application. No proof was given that the Second Export-Import Bank of Washington really had been legally dissolved. I communicated with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to find out if the minutes of their proceedings shows that this bank was liquidated. They did not give me absolute assurance that it had been. I asked them to send me a copy of the minutes, but they failed to supply this.

At that time I also pointed out the following:

Let me call attention to another feature of this bill. As it stands at the present time, I contend that there is no limitation to the amount of funds that may be outstanding at any one time, because the power still exists under this law to recreate by Executive order this Second Export-Import Bank of Washington.

Thus it is seen that, whether the Second Export-Import Bank of Washington was actually liquidated or not, the fact that it could be created by Presidential decree in the first place still makes it possible to make loans in unlimited amounts through the Second Export-Import Bank of Washington, if it still exists legally, or through another export-import bank that the President might set up by decree.

The Wolcott amendment specifically provides for a prohibition against such a possibility. The importance of this point cannot be overstressed.

Of course, there are still other ways through which it may be possible to extend financial assistance to the belligerents. The powers of the Executive over the money and credit of our Nation are so complete as to make it possible for him to give almost unlimited financial assistance to them. The power which he has under section 8 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 to "purchase gold in any amounts, at home or abroad, with any direct obligations, coin, or currency of the United States authorized by law, or with any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated," and the power he has under section 9 to "sell gold in any amounts, at home or abroad, in such manner and at such rates and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the public interest" makes it possible for him to give financial assistance to the belligerents, limited almost only by the physical assets of our Nation.

In the stabilization fund the Executive has another source from which extensive loans may be made to foreign countries.

I feel that the Congress has been woefully neglectful of the financial and economic interests of our country in failing to give proper consideration to the great dangers inherent in our financial and monetary set-up as these may be involved in the bill before us.

Nevertheless a few of us, including the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wolcott], have striven hard to call the attention of the Congress and the country to the importance and need of considering this whole problem. A great many of us in Congress, as our records will show, have sought to take the powers over the money away from the Executive and return them to the people. That which the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wolcott] now offers here in this amendment is merely in conformity with these efforts. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein certain short quotations from editorials and letters.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a column by George Rothwell Brown in the Chicago American of October 23.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, Mr. KEFAUVER was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a statement from the Committee for the Protection of the Foreign-Born, as well as a speech delivered at the commemoration of the fifty-third anniversary of the gift of the Statue of Liberty to the United States by France.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD with reference to Elliott Roosevelt's dealing in military planes to the Communists in Moscow and a few excerpts from documents and testimony.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a newspaper article from the Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 3, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 7615. A bill authorizing the Bradenton Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Sarasota Pass where Manatee Avenue, Bradenton, if extended, would cross Sarasota Pass, County of Manatee, State of Florida; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. Res. 323. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to report to the House all the facts within the knowledge of his Department relative to Japanese demands that the United States customs officer salute a Japanese sentry at Honolulu; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1939

The Chaplain, Rev. Z^cBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, whose spirit of holiness and grace is the very breath of our souls: Make us to be deeply conscious of Thy presence as we face the duties of this day. Do Thou suggest, direct, control all that we design or say or do, that our powers, with all their might, may be dedicated to Thee for the advancement of Thy glory and the benefit of our country. Bless, we beseech Thee, with the spirit of wisdom our President; may he be sustained by strength from on high, as, in Thy sight, he devotes his life to the fulfillment of the exacting duties of his high and holy office. Guide us all in Thy way, O Christ, and mercifully show the fountain of knowledge to our thirsting minds, that, being free from sorrow and heaviness, we may drink in the sweetness of the life