

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1776) further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield to me to submit a unanimous-consent request, which I do not think will lead to debate?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. There has been a quorum call, and I believe that most Senators interested in the pending matter are present. I would not wish to make the request without their presence or the presence of some of them.

Mr. President, I should like to submit a request for unanimous-consent agreement for a reasonable limitation upon general debate on the pending bill and, if possible, on amendments. I would not suggest a restricted period of time that would not be ample for fair expressions of opinion, but this debate having gone on now for 13 days, including today, having been carried on in the House for 1 full week, public hearings having been held for approximately 5 weeks by both the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, I think it would be in order to express the hope that some agreement may be reached as to further debate upon the bill. I am sure we all recognize the importance of this measure, whether we are for it or against it, and the importance of permitting the Senate to reach a final conclusion upon the issues presented.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that, beginning tomorrow morning, no Senator speak more than once nor longer than 1 hour on the bill, or more than once nor longer than 30 minutes on any amendment thereto. If the request were granted, any Senator would be at liberty to speak, beginning tomorrow, a full hour and one-half upon both the bill and the pending amendment.

I am submitting the request in all good faith in the hope that we may bring to a conclusion—not immediately, for the proposed limitation would not do so, but at some reasonably early date—the issues involved to the end that the Senate may reach a final decision upon the issues presented by this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I had not been advised that the Senator from Georgia was going to make this request. I stepped off the floor for a moment, and did not hear all the Senator from Georgia had to say.

Let me say that on a matter of this tremendous importance to the destiny of the American Republic, I think the debate has been very brief. Certainly in my experience, and I am certain also in

the experience of every Member of this body, there has never been any debate in either House of Congress more closely and completely confined to the issues of the bill itself than has this debate.

Mr. President, recently I have heard some charges—I heard one on the floor of the Senate the other day by the Senator from Georgia himself—about a filibuster. Let me say that I do not believe such charges are justified. There has been no evidence whatever of a filibuster. When the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] was holding the floor the other day more of his time was taken up by questions and debate by the proponents of the bill, including the Senator from Georgia and both Senators from Kentucky, and other Senators, than was taken up by the Senator from Montana himself.

Mr. President, I do not think a limitation of debate at this time is justifiable. Certainly many amendments of very great importance are to be presented. So far as I am concerned, while I did not hear all that the Senator from Georgia had to say, and I may have occasion to revert to it later in the afternoon after I shall have read what the Senator from Georgia had to say, I am certainly not willing to agree at this time to any limitation of debate. Therefore I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in reference to the unanimous-consent request made just a moment ago by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, I wish to say that I expect in the course of my remarks this afternoon to make mention of matters connected with the subject matter of his request.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. With reference to the request which was made by the senior Senator from Georgia, I simply wish to say that I hope no such request will be made at any time unless there is a quorum call; and if a request of that kind is made while I happen to be absent from the Chamber, I hope some Senator on my behalf—if he does not wish to do so on his own behalf—will object to it.

A charge was made the other day by the Senator from Georgia intimating that I was filibustering because I spoke for 2 days. Of course, there was no foundation in fact for such a charge, because up to the present time I have never been a party to a filibuster in the Senate. However, I have seen many other Senators filibuster on pending legislation which was far less important to the American people than is the bill which is before the Senate today. I have seen them filibuster on legislation which the overwhelming majority of the Senate favored. Never before during the period I have been in the United States Senate have I received as many letters. I do not recall that, previous to this time, I have ever received a letter or a tele-

gram asking and demanding that Senators filibuster against a piece of legislation. Thousands of communications are coming to my office at the present time from every part of the country—not only from New York, Chicago, and Detroit, but from away out in the "sticks," from farmers and others who are saying that if there is no other way to defeat the bill now before the Senate a filibuster should be conducted against it.

I for one feel that they are justified in making such demands, because, regardless of how much the proposed legislation is sugar-coated, the more one looks into it the more he sees the cunning and the concealment in the bill, and the more he realizes how dangerous it would be to place it upon the statute books in a so-called free democracy.

Mr. President, I expect to fight the bill in any way, shape, or form that I can. I want to see the American people realize—because I am sure that a great many of them today do not realize—that the bill, which is presented to the Senate with the sugar-coated title of "Defense," does not mean defense for the United States at all, unless we concede that the defense of England is our defense, or that the defense of Singapore is our defense. On the contrary, it means the defense of some foreign country.

I do not wonder that some of the proponents of the bill want it jammed through the Congress at the earliest possible moment, because they know, as I know, that when the American people come to understand it in its details—if it is possible for them to understand it—there will be an uprising in this country against the bill such as has never before been witnessed in the United States.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. A quorum call had just been had, and I surveyed the Senate and saw that the opposition to the bill was well represented on the floor.

Mr. WHEELER. I did not know that.

Mr. GEORGE. The quorum call was immediately followed by consideration of a tax measure which did not provoke debate. I should not call up the matter, even for the purpose of submitting a request, if the Senator and other Senators opposed to the bill were not represented. The Senator may be assured of that.

All I have done is simply to ask for a reasonable limitation on debate beginning tomorrow. That has often been done in the Senate before, and I am sure it must often be done if the Senate is to function in an orderly way.

It seems to me that the request is altogether reasonable when we consider the length of debate already and the limitation suggested, which would give any Senator a full hour and a half for debate upon a pending amendment and the measure, whether or not he had already spoken, or whether or not he had spoken repeatedly.

That is all I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say that I was on the floor after the quorum call. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] had claimed the floor for debate on a very important measure which was under discussion in the Senate. I stepped out of the Chamber for a moment to talk to a constituent who had sent in his card, and by the time I returned to the Chamber the request was being considered. I understand that the Senator from Georgia had asked that I be notified. He had already made his statement, and I arrived just as the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], then temporarily in the Chamber, was about to put the request, whereupon I objected.

I have heard much talk about delay and filibuster. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], who has not been in the Chamber more than 3 or 4 hours during the past 2 or 3 weeks of debate on the bill, gave out a speech which was printed in the newspapers yesterday, and which I read yesterday. He then came into the Senate Chamber and delivered it again today, which seems to me to be a filibustering method. At the conclusion of his address he inveighed against any further discussion of the matter. When I sought to interrogate him he dashed out the side door. The Senator from New Jersey said he thought that anyone ought to be able to express any views he had on the bill in 20 minutes. After listening to the Senator from New Jersey today, I am convinced that he could have expressed his views without addressing the Senate at all.

I object to any suggestion on the part of the Senator from Georgia or anyone else that there has been any undue delay or unnecessary debate in connection with the pending bill. To my mind it is the most important bill which has been presented to the Congress of the United States certainly in the lifetime of any of us now present, and probably since the Civil War. We have had 2 weeks of orderly, germane debate, all confined to the issues and to the measure itself—at least on our side. I very much resent the suggestion that there has been any unnecessary delay of any sort in the consideration of the bill.

In view of the tremendous issues which may be presented in the amendments, I think it is unfair at this time to suggest a "gag" rule limiting any Senator to an hour and a half of further debate on the bill, and I insist on my objection.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield

Mr. WHEELER. I have read in the newspapers that two different Senators have said there ought to be cloture. Of course, if two-thirds of the Senators want to invoke cloture in the Senate, they can do so, and the others of us probably cannot help it. But it so happens that the Senators who have been talking most about cloture are those who have been on the floor of the Senate hardly at all. If some of the Senators who are talking so much about invoking cloture were to remain in the Senate and listen to some of the debates, find out what is in the bill, and study it, they might not be shouting so much for cloture.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, at last! [Laughter.]

Let me assure the Senate that I have been very happy to accommodate my friends in this body.

It would be difficult to conceive of a more dangerous mistake at this time in America than a filibuster in the Senate by the opponents of the lend-lease bill.

That is the opening paragraph of a most able editorial published in the columns of the News and Observer of Raleigh, N. C., from the pen of its editor, Hon. Jonathan Daniels, famed author and newspaperman.

I am thoroughly in accord with that statement; and, insofar as I am concerned, I shall not participate in any filibuster. Insofar as I can learn, those who share my attitude and who are opposing the passage of this bill have no inclination whatever to launch a filibuster on this occasion.

Initially, Mr. President, I desire to make it clear that there is a great distinction between a filibuster and legitimate discussion of any legislation. At this time I merely desire the opportunity to express additional opinions as to certain features of the bill which I heretofore have not undertaken to express.

Some ardent advocates of the bill have already in American street-corner participation in the debate taken the position at the opposite extreme that debate ought to be stopped. Of course, to cut off debate on this bill in order that democracy might be aided quickly would be a quick form of destroying democracy at home before aid of it in the world could begin.

Continues the editorial. With this view I am also in thorough accord.

The editorial from the News and Observer, of Raleigh, N. C., continues:

Opponents of the bill, however, face such an American mood. They have every right to express their opinions. Indeed, in reaching such an important decision as lies implicit in the bill, America needs their opinions. But taking the time necessary to voice opposition is one thing, filibuster would be something else altogether.

With this view I also am in accord. The editorial concludes with this very pertinent statement:

The right of men to voice and vote their conscience in so serious a matter as this one should not be questioned—should, indeed, be respected. But those who speak against surging emotion in a democracy should not threaten democracy with the rousing of the furies which a filibuster might mean.

Editor Daniels is right, eternally right, when he says that:

The right of men to voice and vote their conscience in so serious a matter as this one should not be questioned—should, indeed, be respected.

In pursuance of a portion of the aforementioned paragraph of the aforementioned editorial, I remind my colleagues that the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States reads:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Mr. President, never during my tenure

of office in the United States Senate have I known any debate to be more orderly and more consistently confined to the issue itself than the debate on the bill now under discussion, known as the lend-lease bill, which I formerly referred to as the "lend-lease-give bill." I agree with my distinguished colleague from the State of Missouri [Mr. CLARK] that we have confined our arguments on this bill exclusively to the issue before us. In this body there has been no evidence of personal antagonisms. Personalities have been entirely eliminated, and have not been found in any statement or statements made upon the floor of this Chamber, nor have they found or wormed their way into the arguments pertaining to the all-important issue now before us. We here upon the floor of the Senate recognize that each Member thereof has a constitutional right—under the first amendment to the Constitution—to give expression to his conscientious convictions; and we here in the Senate recognize that our colleagues' opinions are to be respected, realizing as we do that every man is entitled to his opinion. That is one of the fundamental principles of democracy. Free speech, unhampered debate, and orderly procedure providing the right of free speech and opportunities for debate are not only for the Members of this body but for the American people as a whole, as likewise provided by our Constitution.

We in this body recognize that every man has a right to his own opinion, and further recognize that each man's opinion is a conscientious one. Being tolerant persons, we do not become bitter with a colleague or colleagues because we may differ with him or them. We are all anxious to ascertain what is best for our country, and that is the only answer we are seeking. However, regardless of our high ideals and the respect that we in this body may have for the opinions of others, I have discovered and doubtless many others have learned during this controversy, if not before, that unfortunately there are some in this country who evidently do not believe in the provision of the Constitution which guarantees free speech. There are, unfortunately, those who evidently do not believe in a democracy, because many have challenged the right to our expressing our respective attitudes, and have publicly and otherwise challenged my right to give expression to my conscientious convictions. We do not challenge the right of our respective fellow Americans to express their convictions; and I, at least, am not going to criticize any Member of this body, or any citizen, for holding opinions contrary to my convictions on these grave questions.

Now, in further pursuance of the statement I have just made that evidently some people do not believe in free speech as provided by the first amendment to the Constitution, for instance, I have received thousands of communications in the form of letters and telegrams, a great majority of which come from my State, and a few of these telegrams evidence to my mind more convincingly

than ever that there are at least some people in my Commonwealth who have assumed the attitude that it is treasonable—highly treasonable—to express an honest, sincere, and conscientious opinion, if that opinion happens to be contrary to theirs. For instance, I have before me several telegrams which I should like to read.

The first is from—

DURHAM, N. C., February 20, 1941.

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senate:

I have heard you are being paid by Hitler and unless you can disprove this I shall tell it to the world. The burden of proof is on you. You visited Germany and Russia and you evidently fell by the wayside.

The next is from—

RALEIGH, N. C., February 22, 1941.

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senator:

We celebrate today the birth of a great American. We mourn today the demise of another American whose greatness only the Wheelers, Holts, Clarks, and Quislings may attest.

The third telegram is from—

CHARLOTTE, N. C., February 22, 1941.

United States Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS:

You have betrayed the people of the great State of North Carolina and the party you represent. Your stand on lease-lend bill should be the voice of the people instead of your individual opinion. You have placed yourself in the class with the Benedict Arnolds, Lindberghs, and Wheelers and your iron cross no doubt is already en route to you from the bandit Hitler.

The next is from—

DURHAM, N. C., February 22, 1941.

Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS:

Your obituary being written. Don't force me to the wake.

Another telegram is from—

IVANHOE, N. C., February 20, 1941.

Senator ROBERT REYNOLDS:

Deeply regret your unfortunate speech today. I assure you that a vote against lend-lease bill will be considered a traitorous act, and one which your former friends will neither forgive nor forget.

The next is from—

ROXBORO, N. C., February 21, 1941.

Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS:

Judas Iscariot, Benedict Arnold, Quisling, Pierre Laval, and appeasers in general all enjoy certain types of things. Do you also aspire to that group?

Another telegram is from Durham, N. C., which was received at a time when I had not definitely made up my mind as to what positively would be my position upon the bill. It is dated February 21, and reads:

Your telegram received—

I had sent a telegram to this gentleman when I had not definitely made up my mind as to how I should vote—

Your telegram received. We in Durham cannot understand your indecision on lend-lease bill. It is time to get off the fence and to do it blankety blank fast. If I publish your telegram in Durham—

That is to say, the telegram he had received from me advising that I had not definitely made up my mind as to the matter—

you can write Durham County off your map in 1944. I am giving you this advice as a

friend. I do not say this in the form of a threat, but I say honestly and frankly that 95 percent of the voting public in Durham will bury you deep if you oppose the bill. I would appreciate your sending me a wire that I can publish.

Immediately upon receipt of the telegram which I have just read I telegraphed my friend an answer, as follows:

In answer to your wire, I consider lend-lease bill one demanding thorough consideration of every Member of United States Senate, and I do not propose to be hastened to a decision by threats of any character from any source. I place my country far above any political ambitions I may have; and when I make up my mind, after hearing all evidence now being produced in our committee and hearing some arguments, both pro and con, on Senate floor, I shall then vote according to the dictates of my conscience and as I see it in the interests of the United States, as I owe allegiance to no other country other than the United States of America. You are at liberty to publish this telegram, and I trust sincerely you will bring about its publication through columns of the North Carolina press.

Highest regards,

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senator.

Mr. President, it is interesting to note that this gentleman who asked me to send him a telegram which he could publish has never published the one I have just read, or, if he has published it, I have never seen it or heard about it having been published.

However, on the other hand, I want to state that there are a large percentage of people in my Commonwealth who are in accord with my attitude and they, for the first time, are giving expression to their thoughts and convictions through the columns of the press in my State. Amongst those I have seen, I particularly am desirous of reading into the RECORD a letter written by Mrs. M. S. Scheffer, who resides in Catawba County, N. C., at Newton, dated February 25, 1941, and published in the public forum columns of the Hickory Daily Record, at Hickory, N. C. The letter reads:

Dear Mr. EDITOR: I suppose it would be unpatriotic and aiding Hitler if you would publish an article that a lot of people agree with Senator REYNOLDS in regard to his stand on the lend-lease bill.

I live in a rural section and know of at least 25 people in my immediate neighborhood that would be glad to send him a telegram of congratulation if they could afford it. We can afford to give billions of dollars to England but children from our rural sections do not have a chance to go to school 8 months in the year. They go for a half day 2 months in the summer and the same for another month in the fall in order to help their parents in the fields.

Present farm prices do not justify hiring help. I suppose the children are expected to work in the fields, stay home from school, be patriotic and glad to give to help keep the King and Queen of England on the throne.

Why do we have Congress if everyone is supposed to agree and be on one side? If you don't you are branded as a Communist, Nazi, "fifth columnist," and unpatriotic. I thought this was a free country and every one had a perfect right to their own opinion without being hounded about it.

In further reference to free speech, I wish to read into the RECORD now extracts from an article of Mr. Walter

Hildebrand, Washington correspondent of the Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News, dated February 27, 1941:

WASHINGTON, February 27.—

Another development in the State that fails to meet a responsive echo in the North Carolina delegation is the intemperate criticism of, and the strictures directed at the course that is being pursued by Senator REYNOLDS, who is opposing the lease-lend bill.

Members * * * are * * * of the opinion—

Speaking of the members of the North Carolina delegation, our 11 Representatives—

that a sustained campaign of abuse directed against the junior Senator is a mistake, politically, morally, or from considerations of patriotism. A campaign of this kind, it was said today, may in the first place react in favor of the intended victim, while there is always the possibility that time will provide vindication for the attitude currently assumed by Senator REYNOLDS as he sees his country approaching the brink.

Members of the State delegation, viewing the situation in some of its broader aspects, would like to feel that they would always be privileged to follow the dictates of their better judgment, even in times of stress and vast confusion in the world, without having their motives impugned. And once more, speaking broadly, members feel that if there is to be a war for the essential freedoms and especially for freedom of speech, everywhere in the world, they see no reason for making an exception of North Carolina or for establishing there an island or an area for the application of totalitarian restrictions.

It was recalled by the delegation spokesman today that Claude Kitchin was virtually crucified and the late Robert N. Page was driven from public life because they opposed our entrance into the first World War, and it has never been thought that this demonstration of ignorance, hate, and hysteria was anything for the State or for the Nation to look back upon with pride, for rarely has a State sent to Congress men who possessed a higher degree of intelligence or a more lofty, unselfish patriotism.

Senator REYNOLDS may be all wrong—

That I admit, Mr. President, without hesitation—

it is frequently reflected here, but in any event he has been consistent since his stand against the repeal of the arms embargo, a step which he thought then, and still thinks, started the country down the traditionally easy road to war. He thinks passage of the lease-lend bill will be final and fatal, that it will prove the next to the last, if not the last, step to war. This deliberate judgment of the junior North Carolina Senator is today finding almost universal acceptance. Senator WHEELER read to the Senate the editorial contribution made to the New York Times today by Arthur Krock. This commentator wrote that, at the end of many months of official unreality the administration "is squarely facing the prospect of war." Krock added that the administration "conceding, almost openly, that the United States cannot give to Great Britain the degree of assistance required to defeat the Axis and deny, as during the campaign, that war can be a consequence. This is a factual report of a definite new attitude in Washington which emerges in any conversation with officials.

"With this calm though reluctant acceptance of the prospect has come a tendency to admit—almost in the open, too—that, since the purpose of the all-out-aid policy is to assure the defeat of the Axis, it must be carried out to the limit. In responsible quarters is now heard the candid opinion, which could

not be obtained a few weeks ago, that if American convoys are needed to deliver the products of the 'arsenal of democracy' to the British war machine, they should be furnished. And the same officials are beginning to say that, in this event, they will be furnished."

Distinctly, it is a war atmosphere that is prevailing here, and it is for this reason that Senator REYNOLDS is admonishing the people to stop, look, and listen. And Members of the North Carolina delegation feel that he is well within his constitutional rights in doing so. Members from other States, Democrats and Republicans alike, are sounding a similar warning without being taxed with treachery.

Mr. President, I have before me an article which I clipped from the Raleigh News and Observer of Raleigh, N. C., entitled "Opposition Has Rights." I had intended placing this article in the Appendix of the RECORD, but I wish to read it into the RECORD now in conjunction with the fact that the opposition has rights. This article, I might add, is from a gentleman who does not share my attitude.

OPPOSITION HAS RIGHTS

To the EDITOR: There have been many vicious attacks upon those who have opposed the pending lease-lend bill in Congress. Typical is that of Representative Withrow, of Rutherford—

Meaning Rutherford County, in North Carolina—

made upon the stand taken by Senator REYNOLDS. Representative Withrow charged that Senator REYNOLDS had disgraced North Carolina and the United States. He intimated that the stand taken by Mr. REYNOLDS only reflected the lack of patriotism on the part of the junior Senator.

Though not in agreement with Mr. REYNOLDS in his opposition to the lease-lend bill, I see no reason for feeling that such opposition is not perfectly consistent with an unqualified desire for the welfare of this country. When the time arrives that an American cannot speak the minority view without being subject to bitter accusations of un-Americanism, then we have no democracy to fight for; it is already dead. Of course, in these trying times it is easier to forget our principles of tolerance in denouncing those who oppose measures which we think expedient for our own welfare. But it is only in such times that these principles meet the acid test. And if our constitutional traditions of freedom and tolerance do not come through now, then it would seem that they are not very deep-rooted. More than ever, we need the voice of the minority sounded as a constant reminder to stop and take stock of ourselves. Of course, time is of the essence, and we must act and act quickly. But that does not necessarily mean that those of us who constitute the majority group are always dead right in every particular.

PHILIP E. LUCAS.

CHAPEL HILL.

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

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. NYE. When I was called from the Chamber a few minutes ago the Senator was reading some of the complimentary telegrams and letters he has been receiving from his State. I am delighted to know that the Senator has in his State editors and commentators who are ready to ascribe to him the honest motives that we know are his.

Has the Senator any notion where persons get ideas to the effect that some of us who are opposed to this bill must be in the reward of Hitler, or Nazi Germany, or some Fascist cause?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have not the slightest notion how anybody could have such ideas, or upon what they could base false and unwarranted accusations of that sort. The American people should not be mad with us. We are not mad with them. All we are doing is that which we think is best for the preservation of our country. I am not angry with our friends in the Senate who do not share our views. I am not angry with my fellow American citizens who do not share our views. As the Senator knows, all we are endeavoring to do is, as I have just stated, that which we think best for our country. We may be right; we may be wrong. Time only will tell.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that more and more I am inclined to be much more forgiving of people, even those who write anonymously in criticism of our position, charging allegiance to some cause other than that of Americanism. I am inclined more and more to forgive them when I see the kind of thing that is dished up to them at times by people presumably of some responsibility.

Only last Wednesday or Thursday one columnist wrote this in his column:

Finally, there is the opposition of the BENNETT CLARK, BURTON WHEELER, GERALD NYE, BOB REYNOLDS type. The administration does not question their intelligence, but it does doubt their sincerity. It sees the roots of their support as representing subversive forces in our public life.

I submit to the Senator that when columnists are preaching that manner of thing to the American people surely there are going to be among them those who feel they are quite justified in charging, as I heard the Senator charged in one of the telegrams this afternoon, with being on the pay roll of Hitler or of some foreign cause. I appreciate the opportunity the Senator has afforded me to make record of this scurrilous attack upon men who are only striving to do what they think proper to do in the interest of their country.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I merely happened to say that we are pro-American, and today many classify anyone who is pro-American as a Hitlerite or a "fifth columnist," or something of the sort.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The article just quoted by the Senator from North Dakota was written by a man who does not write under his own name but writes under an alias. I had always assumed he wrote under an alias because he was ashamed of his own name, but in the last few weeks I have become acquainted with some of his relatives, and I find that the fact that he writes under an alias is the only spark of decency, so far as I know, he has ever had. He is ashamed to put out the stuff he writes under his own name because he evidently comes from a decent family. I refer to Mr. John Franklin Carter.

When Mr. John Franklin Carter, who writes under the name "Jay Franklin," accuses me of being in the pay of any subversive element, I hurl that back in his teeth as an absolutely malicious lie. No one would print an article of that sort about Members of the Senate who happened to be in disagreement with his position who did not intend to print in his column, which I think is published now in only two or three papers, an absolutely malicious lie.

So far as being connected with any subversive elements is concerned, I have all my life been in favor of putting down subversive elements in the United States. I wore the uniform of the United States in one war, which is a good deal more than Mr. John Franklin Carter ever did, and I am perfectly willing to wear it in another war—though God forbid another should occur—which again is more than Mr. John Franklin Carter is willing to do.

I join with the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from North Carolina in condemning such scurrilous, outrageous, malicious libels as that which the Senator from North Dakota has quoted. I dare Mr. John Franklin Carter or anyone else to get within arm's reach of me and make any such remark.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am deeply indebted to the Senator from Missouri for his fine, straightforward contribution to the comments I have seen fit to make in reference to these unfair, malicious statements.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. BONE. There is nothing new or startling in public men being identified with something or other that is bad, by those who disagree with them. They had no such things as "fifth columnists" in the time of Jesus of Nazareth, but His critics tied Him in with everything that was then bad. It was either of Him or Paul that it was said he was "a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition among all the Jews." Sedition was a serious crime in those days, as now. It adds nothing to our security and to the stability of this Republic for men to substitute harsh personal indictments for at least an attempt to appraise. Criticism is always in order, but its reasons can rest in facts and not on personal likes and dislikes. Times like these always invite some criticism that is later regretted by its authors. It was true of the last war; it will be true of another such as we face.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator.

In reference to the communications I have just read, I sincerely trust that my remarks will not be misconstrued. I recognize that I am subject to criticism, as is every other man in public life. As a matter of fact, I have never attempted to clothe myself in raiment of white or place myself upon a pedestal of ivory. But there is a radical distinction between constructive, honest criticism, and charges of treason such as have been made in some of the communications I have received.

Mr. President, to repeat, we are all striving for a solution. We are all seeking that which is best for our country. We all have the same objective, namely,

keeping the United States out of war. Some say "it is a bill to get us into war." Some say that "it is a bill to keep us out of war." Some allege that it is a bill to turn the Nation into a dictatorship. Others say that "It gives the President more powers than he already has as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy."

Men differ honestly, and honestly differ upon just what the bill will do or will not do. I have declared against the bill. I may be wrong; those who do not share my views may be right. Time only will tell who was right and who was wrong. Insofar as I am concerned, I shall welcome the arrival of the hour when a jury of the great American public may render its verdict as to who was right. And anticipating "jury day," I shall retain in memory my remarks upon this all-important subject, to be submitted to a jury of the American public, when, in the future, the American public as a whole has been thoroughly informed—and at that future time I shall re-submit my remarks for consideration by the men and women of our Republic—as to whether I was right or whether I was wrong.

In further discussion of this bill entitled "A bill further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes," I wish today to devote my major remarks to the vital matter of promoting the defense of the United States, and not to that portion relating to "other purposes."

In considering the matter of further promoting the defense of the United States, we should, I aver, take into consideration the defense of this country from within, for the reason that the fundamentals of a defense program must of necessity be constructed upon solidarity and unity, and a firm structure here at home. By that I mean that we must first build solid, concrete foundations here in America. We must clean house here in America before attempting to launch forth in foreign fields to clean house over there. We must first see that democracy is safe here at home, and that its preservation is assured, before we go to Europe or any other part of the world to impose democracy upon those countries which have evidenced their unwillingness to adopt the American way of life.

I recall well the obligation which I assumed by oath when I entered the United States Senate, when I swore that I would defend my country against the enemies from within as well as against the enemies from without. The oath submitted to me and which I acknowledged reads as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter; so help you God?

That is the same oath, Mr. President, which you took also on the convening of the Senate on January 3, 1941. Recalling that oath, and the oath which I took on the convening of the Senate in 1932, when Mr. Curtis was Vice President, and

Mr. Hoover was President, and the oath which I took in 1939, I wish now to call to the attention of the Members of this body the statement by the sixteenth President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln, that "if this Nation is ever destroyed it must be destroyed from within." That statement was correct when he made it, it is correct now, and I am thoroughly in accord with the statement he made pertaining to the enemies from within.

As this fateful year of 1941 is now running its course our country is the battle ground of men and women, American men and women, fighting upon American soil the feuds of the Eastern Hemisphere—Europe and Asia—and I respectfully submit that, in my opinion, those men and women should be devoting their time, their thought, and their energies to a solution of our problems here at home.

Long ago the patriotic and far-seeing Abraham Lincoln recognized the fundamental truth that America's downfall, if it ever occurred, would take place internally and not externally. These are his words:

At what point then is the danger to be expected? I answer if it ever reaches us, it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher.

So I say, Mr. President, that today our danger is from within. We must eternally guard ourselves against the inroads being made upon our form of government and our American way of life by the enemies of this Government who are eternally boring from within. Nazis and Fascists, their spies and their saboteurs, Communists and their propagandists, all day and night, night and day, are making terrific assaults upon the very foundations of our Government.

Mr. President, instead of going across the ocean to make destruction of these "isms" which are constantly working toward our destruction here, I assert that we should devote our time and our energy to destroying these vicious foreign "isms" right here in our midst. As an example of what we may expect here, unless we check the inroads being made by our enemies right on American soil, we have only to cite what is occurring in foreign countries. As a concrete example, England's good friends, the Communists, are taking advantage of her distress to demand her submission to the Soviet Union. Only recently there was a widespread demonstration by Communists in London and other cities of the British Isles. Communism will no doubt triumph in England as a result of this war if and when the warring factions are so thoroughly weakened that they shall have destroyed themselves, thus providing the next meal for the Stalin vulture that soars over all England today awaiting the fateful hour. Moreover, if the war continues long enough, as I have stated, communism may triumph over all England, and some allege that if we get in the war communism might triumph in America, too—which is not exactly what the average American expects when he observes the war spirit being constantly

worked up by our good friends from alien lands, in moving pictures, and over the radio and through the press, anonymous literature, and what have you. But that is exactly what the average innocent American is going to get if we do not begin now to combat and to stop the enemies already here who are eternally boring from within, like termites, thousands of them, in their bold attempt to destroy America, and the cross, the little white cross over the newly made grave, will mark the spot where he will get it first.

Foreign nations have learned something from the persistent treachery of Germany and Soviet Russia. As I have just cited, even England has learned something. England made many compacts with Russia and Russia broke them all. England even tried to negotiate a treaty with Russia to encircle and crush Germany, but Russia led England along as though she had a ring in her nose, got all she could get out of her, promised everything, and did absolutely nothing. Russia today is actually the ally of Germany.

Now, Mr. President, in particular reference to the statement which I have just made to the effect that Russia today is actually the ally of Germany, I wish to say that I am opposed to any aid to Germany directly or indirectly. I am confident Russia is aiding Germany indirectly, if not directly, and to the end that Germany may not receive any aid from us indirectly through Russia, I am now submitting an amendment to H. R. 1776 which would prohibit this country providing any aid to Soviet Russia. The amendment reads:

Nothing in this act—

Referring to H. R. 1776—

shall be construed to authorize or permit the authorization or the granting of any aid to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Mr. President, I send this amendment to the desk and ask that it be printed, and I shall bring it up for consideration at the proper time when amendments are in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wonder if there are any people in this country who think that Russia is not engaged in this war. She most certainly is engaged in it—and actively, at that. She may not be fighting on the field just now. She may not even be for the moment engaged in swallowing little nations such as Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, parts of Finland, and Poland, but she is waiting for big game, bigger fish, and bigger suckers. She is working for universal communism and daily waiting for universal communism. The vulture soars over all Europe. For the present in England and Europe Russia prefers the role of receiver of stolen goods to that of the bold burglar. She is waiting for the time when America goes to war, when all our attention will be turned to Europe. Then when we shall have forgotten our problems at home and shall be busily engaged in conducting a foreign war her agents

here will become more active than ever.

Today we are tolerating communistic agitation throughout the entire Nation. There are schools and colleges teaching sedition, and innumerable Moscow organs are preaching dissension and dissatisfaction. There are communistic organs spreading everywhere disloyalty to our Government and our Union. We know this; the Dies committee revealed it; and yet we do nothing about it, submitting ourselves to the danger of being destroyed at home while devoting our time and energy to fighting a war in Europe. The American people are most patient in their sufferance of the activities of Nazis, Fascists, and Communists. Subversive doings have become a menace to the life of this Nation. In proof of this I have but to cite the fact that in addition to innumerable Communist dailies there are published in this country scores of weeklies and semiweekly newspapers, with many monthly and semi-monthly issues, and hundreds of Communist, Nazi, and Fascist publications. With cold realism, unmoved by sentiment, emotion, or sudden impulses, with only the "red" interests in mind, and professing no high purpose of saving civilization, Stalin has won every play since the European and Asiatic wars began. After 16 months of war in Europe and 3½ years in Asia, the "red" dictator has been the sole victor thus far.

While the leaders of warring and would-be-warring countries have their noses flattened against the picture and can see only one narrow segment, Stalin, within the walls of the Kremlin, at peace, looks over the gigantic game as a whole—which simmers down to "Red" against "White." His loot includes a third of Poland, all the Baltic provinces, a fifth of the former state of Finland, and all of Bessarabia.

Working in Stalin's favor are the distressing condition in Spain, the collapse of France, the sinking of the morale of war-weary Italy due to battles, and semianarchy in Romania.

There are increased Communist and Socialist labor movements in England. They have been marked by the suppression of two Communist publications and the People's Convention. There is a radical socialistic trend in Japan, actually sponsored by Konoye Matsuoka, the foreign minister. The Government is split, and there is fighting between the national forces of China and the Communists. This is spreading chaos and threatening the renewal of civil war. Finally, there is the unrest in India.

Stalin is the only statesman in the world who can truthfully say every day that the prolongation of the war is a day gained for the further undermining and collapse of the tottering capitalistic system. Russia's imperialistic future lies in the ruins and despair of Europe and the chaos of Asia. With Britain's food blockade against millions of hungry people and America's active entrance into the war, Stalin's victory might indeed become complete.

Communistic indoctrination is taking place in our schools and colleges, undreamed of by the average American. Communists have been making deter-

mined efforts to arouse in our Negro citizens a spirit of racial hatred, disloyalty, and revolution. For instance, I have before me a letter directed to my secretary, Wesley E. McDonald, by a gentleman on Capitol Hill, advising of anonymous literature which he received through the mail from Albany, N. Y., which is in reference to this very point. I read in part from this anonymous literature:

Miscegenation might produce a hardier race, but individual prejudices may delay it. However, equality is on the march. The South has given the supreme mandate for it and for the first time since Lincoln the Negro vote may be included with the solid South. The day may not be far when a Negro Governor of Virginia will be laying the cornerstone of a monument to Booker T. Washington on the present site of a statue of Jefferson Davis, a day when the vicious ban on Chinese immigration will have been lifted and labor will have replaced the parasitic and snobbish aristocracy that have cursed England and perpetuated to now the race problem of which we are only now finding the solution.

Does anyone think that any Negro in the Nation was a party to circulating such literature? Of course not. It was put out by the Communists. I want to say to the authors of this literature that they will be wasting their time and money in an effort to create trouble with our Negroes of the South, because they are law-abiding, patriotic citizens of America, and are opposed to any such doctrines as those proposed by the Communists.

The circular further makes a very vicious attack upon me, and suggests that I be defeated at the polls because I have persistently attacked the appointments of our President and "criticized our fellow citizens and democratic forces because they did not belong to the political faith of either of the major parties." I submit that I have at every opportunity attacked the objectives of the Communists, the Nazis, and the Fascists in this country, and shall continue to do so, because I, like every other Member of this body, am desirous of preserving American ideals and institutions. As to the truth of this assertion in the anonymous literature, I want to state that I have never opposed an appointee of the President seeking Senate confirmation.

I desire to read the letter from this gentleman who was kind enough to send my secretary this anonymous literature; and, by the way, I might add that I am informed that many here at the Capitol have also received copies of this vicious, untruthful, and scurrilous matter. The letter reads as follows:

MY DEAR MR. McDONALD: I am not one of those who see a Communist under every bush; but careful examination of this contemptible circular letter shows that it must have been sent out either by the Communist Party or by a combination between it and some organization devoted to stirring up race hatred and dissension in the South. Since its anonymous authors look forward to the day when there will be a "Negro Governor of Virginia," they seem to long for a return of reconstruction days, except that the misguided carpetbagger from the North is to be replaced by a representative from Moscow.

My reason for saying this is that in the paragraph in which Senator REYNOLDS has

the honor of being singled out from the other 95 Senators and marked for defeat, his chief offense seems to be that he "persistently attacked the appointments of our President and criticized our fellow citizens * * * because they did not belong to the political faith of either of the major parties." This vague reference, upon reflection, can only mean that he (Senator REYNOLDS) denounced certain Communist employees of the Government and called for their removal. Also, his successful and commendable efforts to have aliens registered and fingerprinted appear to have gotten under the skins of the courageous (?) authors of this circular, who are careful to conceal their identity, have the nerve to call for enforcement of the Constitution, and do not even dare use the word "Communist" when they refer vaguely to "political parties."

You will note that the envelope in which this letter was sent bears a 3-cent stamp, and it is evidently being sent to persons whose names are in the Congressional Directory.

By the way, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] told me that he received a copy of the letter.

If it turns out to have a widespread distribution through the South, the postage alone will be a very large item. It would be interesting to know who is furnishing the money.

In its appeals to race prejudice and hatred, its praise of miscegenation, and its final reference to possible bloodshed, this letter may appeal to some of the worst elements of our population; but it is not likely to influence the respectable colored population of North Carolina or any other State, most of whom must know what a faithful public servant Senator REYNOLDS has been. I congratulate him on the enemies he has made.

That concludes this letter.

Mr. President, as to communism even in the Nation's Capital, permit me to recall that a few days ago a man was found dead in a local hotel, with a pistol by his side. Some said he was murdered, but the official coroner's verdict was that he was a suicide. He was a former member of the OGPU, the dreaded secret police of Russia, who had come to this country and who had testified before the Dies committee. He disclosed the secrets of the OGPU and certain communistic activities in this country. He told the committee that he was constantly in fear of his life. Whether it was suicide or a murder, it is asserted by those who were close to this unfortunate man that if he did commit suicide he was driven to it by fear of the secret police. Then, just a couple of days after that, there was the murder of another former prominent secret agent of Russia in New York. These deaths show that the foul hand of Stalin even now extends to this country and right into our Capital. So much for the Communists for the present.

With the cooperation of the German-American Bund and its summer youth camps, the Nazis are teaching Hitlerism to the children of German-Americans who, having been born in this country, are American citizens. The boys and girls attending these camps sing hymns to Der Fuehrer and to the foreign land they have never seen. They listen to lectures on ideology, and so forth. By perversion of the Universal Postal Union, totalitarian agencies have distributed

thousands of tons of publications through the mails of the United States, at the expense of American taxpayers, calculated to create national disunity. On American soil the German-American Bund has organized military units, wearing uniforms—even though prohibited by law, I am told—suggestive of those worn by German storm troops, and they are trained and drilled in formations according to the regulations of the German Army. American-Italian Black Shirt legions, some 10,000 strong, with thousands of sympathizers, are today marching in America with the same resounding tread as that of the goose-stepping storm troops of the German-American Bund.

I hope an article I observed in the press this afternoon will prove to be true, and I desire to read it into the RECORD at this point. It was called to my attention by one of my colleagues. The article is from the columns of the Washington Daily News, the issue of Monday, March 3, 1941, entitled "German-Americans to Battle Nazi-ism":

GERMAN-AMERICANS TO BATTLE NAZI-ISM

NEW YORK, March 3.—German-Americans opposed to the Nazi philosophy were organized today into a Congress for Democracy to combat German propaganda and uncover German agents.

Speakers said the congress would have the double task of "defending democracy from the 'fifth column' and clearing the German-American name." The organization is open to all Americans of German birth or descent.

Wendell L. Willkie, whose ancestry is German, sent a congratulatory telegram.

I hope the Congress for Democracy will be successful. I hope it will be entirely successful in its fight against German propagandists in this country.

There are at present some 200 fascist organizations in the United States that are striving to discredit and destroy American ideals and institutions. They are busily engaged in training and instructing American youth in fascist ideals. Communists, Nazis, and Fascists are spending millions of dollars annually in propaganda and in other attempts to undermine and destroy our Republic. They have made systematic and continued efforts to sow among the naval and military forces of the Nation the seeds of communism, nazi-ism, and fascism. They have infiltrated into our schools, churches, youth groups, and every other organization into which they could find entrance. They, especially the Communists, have penetrated our labor unions, seizing important positions, spreading the seeds of discontent, and fomenting strikes that have fanned class hatred, resulting in loss of life and the destruction of property valued at hundreds of millions of dollars, and causing much suffering and sorrow.

They have secured employment in our airplane plants, munition factories, and shipyards, thus being in position to secure for their governments valuable information, and to commit acts of sabotage that would interfere with national defense in which we are so greatly interested.

They, especially the Communists, have secured Government positions that have enabled them to do effective propaganda

work and secure certain information for their governments. Swarms of Communist, Nazi, and Fascist secret and other agents have come into our midst. They have abused our hospitality and are taking improper advantage of the freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly permitted in this country. They are conniving and cooperating with spies, saboteurs, fellow-travelers, and fifth-columnists, including some of their country's consular and other accredited representatives in conducting subversive activities designed to discredit and destroy American ideals and institutions; all of this in an endeavor to weaken the confidence of our people in their leaders and kill their faith in the destiny of America, thus dividing the unity of American citizenship in the hope of undermining and finally destroying the foundations on which is established our Republic.

Recently, there was authored by a former United States Regular Army officer, now retired—Col. James A. Moss, president of the United States Flag Association, Washington, D. C.—The Declaration of Independence of Today, the closing paragraph of which reads:

Whereas the time has come when the security of the Nation and the happiness of its people require that these subversive activities be stopped, we, loyal citizens of the Republic, who believe in our democratic form of government and the American way of life, and abhor totalitarianism, voicing the sentiments of all patriotic Americans, do solemnly publish and declare that these United States of America should be free from all foreign "isms"; that there is in America room for only one "ism": Americanism. Therefore we call upon our fellow countrymen to rise and join hands in the great brotherhood of Americanism—with militancy in our hearts and determination in our souls, with vigor in our spirits, and strength in our arms, with the battle cry, "Foreign 'isms' must go"—wage relentless war on Communists, Nazis, and Fascists until they have all been driven from our shores.

This Declaration of Independence of Today was signed by a number of Members of the United States Senate, as well as by some of our outstanding patriotic American citizens.

The American people today are more interested in perfecting a strong national defense than at any time in the history of the Republic. This is due to the fact that wars of aggression are being waged in Europe and Asia. And I ask you, Mr. President, how can we perfect our defenses while we permit the spies, saboteurs, and labor agitators to carry on their insidious work without interference or apprehension until their dastardly acts have been committed. Then it is too late.

I submit, Mr. President, that our first line of defense at the present hour is to make certain that our vital industrial plants—which are turning out munitions and implements of defense—are protected, and that their uninterrupted operation is assured. This is no time for labor agitators clothed in the garments of Communists. This is no time for Nazi, Fascist, and Communist saboteurs. We must clean house now. We must apprehend and deport alien criminals, undesirable and alien enemies, if we are to

prepare ourselves against attack from within and from without.

We have seen what the Communists have done and are trying to do to England. We have seen what the infiltration of Communists from Russia and Spain, and Nazis and "fifth columnists" from Germany, did to France. Let us, therefore, take heed, profit by their experiences, and see to it that America is not destroyed by the same wolves and consumed by the same vultures.

This bill, H. R. 1776, is not, I respectfully submit, a national-defense measure. It is a bill for "other purposes." It has taken our attention from our own problems here and focused it upon Europe and Asia. It would provide "all out" aid for Great Britain, and if its passage should finally get us into the war, then it will mean "all in" for America.

Some say that we are already in the war, if actually we are not physically at war. I say we are, in a sense, in the war now, and at war because the man engaged in Europe in manufacturing implements of war is just as much a part of the fighting machinery as is the man who bears those weapons in the front-line trenches. If we are in and at war, then we are in and at war for the sole reason that by lifting the arms embargo, permitting us to sell arms to nations at war, we entered the war. If the arms embargo had never been lifted, if that part of the neutrality law had never been repealed, in my opinion we would not today be called upon to discuss the lend-lease-give bill, which provides for the manufacture, lending, leasing, and giving of more arms to belligerents across the sea.

The lifting of the arms embargo, has brought us to this critical and dangerous hour.

George Washington well and truly said, in his farewell address:

Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. * * * Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground?

As I have previously stated, I am against this bill because I believe it will take us closer to war, that it is just another step in that direction, and that it may lead us to a declaration of war, to which brink I pray God we shall not be carried.

When the war is over, whether we participate or not, we shall pay the price for our own indulgences. We shall pay the cost of lifting the arms embargo. Factories, thousands of them, today engaged in the manufacture of war materials, will close overnight. Millions of American workers will be turned upon the streets looking for employment, and then they will not only find themselves in competition with their fellow Americans seeking new jobs, but millions of aliens already here and thousands upon thousands of refugees seeping into the country will make the unemployment situation more acute. With six to ten million Americans unemployed today, with 6,000,000 aliens already here and many thousands more being permitted to enter, what may we expect when the collapse comes? Some say, revolution.

"It may be a violent change; perhaps even a revolution," editorially say the Washington Times-Herald and the New York Daily News of February 27.

Let us stop immediately the infiltration into this country of all from foreign shores, refugees and immigrants, for 10 years or until such time as every American citizen shall have been employed. Such a bill I shall introduce in the Senate when H. R. 1776 has been disposed of.

Mr. President, France fell. Those who profess to know say that her very vitals were destroyed by Nazi, Fascist, and Communist agents—saboteurs, propagandists, and spies—several years before France entered the war. The Republic of France itself permitted great legions of alien criminals, spies, saboteurs, and propagandists to enter the country. They put in their deadly work at a time when France was preparing for war which she knew was bound to come. These foreign agents did their job so thoroughly that when the fatal hour did strike there were thousands and hundreds of thousands of French people who did not care whether France resisted its aggressor or not; thousands of Frenchmen's love of country had been so weakened by the work of these subversive groups that they lost even the desire to defend their country in its hour of greatest need.

Let us take a leaf from France's book of sad experiences. Let us profit by her unfortunate downfall. Let us apprehend and deport immediately all alien criminals, undesirables, Nazis, Fascists, Communists, who would destroy our Government now as they destroyed France.

In order that those who have not been fully advised as to the activities of these alien enemies and subversive forces may be informed, permit me to call attention to the report of the Dies committee, now engaged in investigating un-American propaganda activities in the United States, filed January 3, 1941, which reads in part as follows:

The work of the committee has been carried on during the past year against a back drop of war in Europe and Asia on the one hand and a greatly heightened concern over national defense here at home on the other hand. In these circumstances it is almost inevitable that feeling among people of all sorts should be intensified. Many people who were formerly indifferent to the activities of foreign-controlled, antidemocratic, and un-American groups are now fully aroused * * *

In short, the committee warns against the possibility that a wave of hysteria may supersede an informed public opinion on matters which have to do with the subjects of its investigation. * * *

The evidence before the committee shows clearly that the agents of Moscow have, for the most part, tried to bore from within labor and progressive movements, just as the agents of the Axis Powers have, for the most part, tried to bore from within patriotic, conservative, and business groups. * * *

Certain aspects of the European picture have served to clarify the nature and purpose of the chief totalitarian regimes, i. e., Stalin's and Hitler's. This clarification has now reached a point where no justification can be found for those who persist in remaining attached to the Communist and Nazi movements or their front organizations. The illusion that Stalin's regime was a progressive one and that his leadership was the world's best protection against the spread of nazi-ism has now been exploded by Stalin

himself. His government today stands forth as one of naked opportunism, conquest, and power politics. The illusion that Hitler's regime was a conservative barricade against the spread of communism has been effectively dispelled by the fuhrer himself. His government, too, stands forth as one of brute military force aiming at unlimited expansion of the Third Reich, and ready to employ whatever appeals to class hatred as suit his program.

Three aspects of the European picture are worth noting in this connection. The Stalin-Hitler Pact of August 1939 dealt a shattering blow to whatever prestige their respective agents and followers enjoyed in the United States. It remained only for Stalin to attack Finland, and to annex the whole or large portions of five other neighboring countries to show unmistakably that Stalin is no better than Hitler. Finally, we have the spectacle of Hitler's attempt to place himself at the head of the European poorer group as the champion of the "have-nots" against the "haves." Mussolini's and the Mikado's wars of aggression long ago stamped them as second-rate international bandits. Today, the four totalitarian dictators are revealed clearly for what they have been from the beginning. * * *

Those who believe unreservedly in the democratic form of government, whether they look upon themselves as progressive and pro-labor, or as conservatives and pro-business, will not hesitate to separate themselves from the totalitarian movements and their numerous front organizations. America should proceed with a united effort not only to build an impregnable defense, but also to solve our pressing domestic problems. * * *

Both Stalin and Hitler have made it plain that their strategy in achieving their objectives in the United States includes the use of Trojan horses or "fifth columns." * * *

The evidence which the committee has gathered bears abundant testimony to the fact that throughout the years there has been a major purpose of the Communist Party to attempt to bore from within the ranks of American labor in an effort either to turn labor organizations into its political tools or to disrupt and destroy them. The Nazis tactic, on the contrary, has been to have their members gain as many important positions as possible in the industries of America and to gain favor with management rather than work within the ranks of organized labor.

Which bears out the statement I have just made in reference to the Communists, Nazis, and Fascists boring eternally from within, in an earnest effort to destroy our form of government, and impede our national-defense progress.

Mr. President, here I digress to say that the foreign elements, Communists particularly, which have crept into our labor organizations, are largely responsible for the impeding of national-defense developments and labor troubles which are occurring throughout the country today. This is due to Communists, Nazis, and Fascists having gained key positions in many of these labor unions—so, in the near future I shall introduce a bill which I hope will be of benefit to labor itself, which proposed legislation will make it unlawful for any labor union or other labor organization to have as an agent or officer any person who is not a citizen of the United States, who is a Communist, Fascist, or member of any Nazi Bund organization, who has been at any time within the past 2 years a member of or affiliated with any Communist, Fascist, or Nazi Bund organization, who is ineligible to hold public office or who has lost his

rights to United States citizenship by reason of conviction of a felony.

I introduced such a bill in the Senate last year, and I believe that if it had been enacted at the last session of the Congress, by today we would have been rid of the Communist, Nazi, and Fascist elements which have wormed their way into labor organizations, and that we would not be harried to death with the difficulties we are experiencing at this hour.

The Dies report continues:

It is of basic importance to understand the exactly opposite purposes of the American labor movement on the one hand and the Communist Party on the other. The aims of the American labor movement are to improve the conditions of the American workers and over a period of time to secure for them a better and fuller life and a place of partnership in the industrial life of the United States. The purposes of the Communists on the other hand are in the words of Stalin to make the unions a school of communism, to increase in every possible way the antagonism between wage earners and other sections of the population and to prostitute the labor movement for the use of the party in carrying out various of its international plans even if in so doing the welfare of the particular group of workers in question may suffer as a consequence. Hence, wherever Communists have gained a foothold in the labor movement they have sought by every means at their command to remove from office any leader however devoted to the welfare of the rank and file workers he might be who has refused to cooperate with the party line * * *

Wherever the conditions of life of any group of workers are most distressing there is presented the vert sort of opportunity which the Communist desires; for example, the neglect on the part of other sections of the population of the plight of many thousands of migratory agricultural workers, coupled with the fact that many of these people had recently suffered the experience of being driven from their farms, constituted the fertile soil in which it was possible for the Communist Party to become a moving force in the organization of the United Cannery, Agricultural Packing, and Allied Workers' Union, of which Donald Henderson, an avowed member of the Communist Party, is the head.

In the wake of war there follows unemployment, poverty, pestilence, illness, and, in many instances, revolution. These are the seeds from which the trees of communism spring, grow, and thrive. Today in this country we have millions of unemployed. Today in this country we have millions of unfortunate people on relief. Today in this country we have millions of children who are undernourished. Today in this country we have men and women who are improperly housed and improperly clothed and improperly fed. Today in this country we have problems as a result of misfortunes which will prove fertile soil for the Communists unless these conditions are corrected, and unless the conditions of the masses are improved. We must now attack these problems here at home, because, just as the Dies committee recited in the foregoing paragraph of its report, which I have just finished reading, the Communists are striking just where and when our unfortunates are weakest. The Communists are putting in their deadly work now as related by the Dies committee, but their work will be more deadly

and more devastating after this war, if we become involved in it, or even if we do not become involved in it, when millions upon millions of God-fearing men and women will be walking the streets in search of employment. Poverty and want and illness and pestilence will stalk the land. Again I warn, we had better solve our problems here before we attempt to solve other people's problems "over there."

The Dies committee concluded with legislative recommendations as follows:

Legislative recommendations: The committee realizes the difficulty of reaching and curbing certain phases of un-American and subversive propaganda and activities through legislative action. In view of our findings and the origin of these activities, we submit the following recommendations as a partial legislative program:

1. The enactment of legislation to bring about the immediate mandatory deportation of alien spies and saboteurs.

Mr. President, last year I introduced a bill providing for the very same objectives, but unfortunately it was not acted upon. I intend to introduce a similar bill during the present session of Congress, and I hope we may secure action in conformity with the recommendations of the Dies committee.

I continue to read the legislative recommendations of the Dies committee:

2. The mandatory deportation of aliens who advocate any basic change in the form of our Government.

I understand that a bill already has been introduced to cover that recommendation.

3. The enactment of legislation requiring that all employees and officials of our Federal Government be American citizens.

Mr. President, the third recommendation of the Dies committee which I have just read, which, if I may be permitted to repeal, is to the effect that legislation should be enacted requiring that all employees and officials of our American Government be American citizens, should most certainly be carried out, but I am going further than that. Of course, I think every employee of the Federal Government should be an American citizen, and I shall later introduce legislation to that effect, but for the time being I think our Federal Government should not employ any Communist, Nazi, or Fascist, regardless of his citizenship, and to that end I am now submitting an amendment to H. R. 1776 which would bar the employment by our Government of any Communist, Nazi, or Fascist. The amendment reads:

No person who is a Communist, Nazi, or Fascist, and who is employed in any department or agency of the United States on the date of enactment of this act shall, after such date, be permitted to remain in such employment, or be paid any compensation out of funds available to any such department or agency.

In this connection, Senators will probably recall that the Dies committee in a previous report stated that there were some 500 or more Communists in the employ of the United States Government then, and I have no information to the effect that they are not still in the employ of the Government.

Mr. President, I send the amendment which I just read to the desk and ask that it be printed and lie on the table. I shall bring it up at the proper time when amendments are being considered and debated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I now read the fourth and fifth legislative recommendations of the Dies committee, as follows:

4. Withhold all Federal financial support from any educational institution which permits members of its faculty to advocate communism, fascism, or nazi-ism as a substitute for our form of government to the student body of these educational institutions.

5. The enactment of legislation to outlaw every political organization which is shown to be under the control of a foreign government. As long as these organizations have a legal status in the United States, it will be difficult for any agency of the Government to deal with them. We now know that they furnish the legal apparatus for the operations of saboteurs and the window dressing for espionage. The committee believes that legislation can be worked out to outlaw such organizations and that this will in no sense constitute a violation of the Bill of Rights, since such legislation would only affect organizations controlled or directed by foreign countries.

In this connection, Mr. President—that is to say, in particular connection with recommendation No. 5 of the Dies committee report to the effect that all alien political parties and organizations be outlawed—last year during the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, on June 12, 1940, I introduced in the Senate a bill, S. 4132, to outlaw the Communist Party, the German-American Bund, and all organizations, groups, or individuals associated therewith who seek to overthrow the Government of the United States by force or violence through the advocacy of criminal anarchy, criminal communism, criminal nazi-ism, and criminal fascism.

I foresaw even then, before the Dies committee report was filed, what was taking place in this country, and as a result thereof I introduced the aforementioned bill. Let me add that I propose to reintroduce the same bill to outlaw the German-American Bund, the Communist Party, and all other similar organizations as soon as the pending legislation has been disposed of.

6. The enactment of legislation to stop all immigration from foreign countries that refuse to accept the return of their nationals found under American law to be deportable from this country. This legislation is made necessary by the fact that some foreign governments have refused to accept their own citizens who have been ordered deported by the United States Government.

For more than 5 years I have been vigorously insisting upon the immediate mandatory deportation of alien criminals and undesirables, and to that effect I have from year to year introduced legislation, but, unfortunately, no action was taken upon this legislation. I am glad, however, that the American people now recognize that alien criminals and undesirables should be deported; but, unfor-

tunately, in many instances, it is too late for such legislation as I have proposed in the past 5 years, for the reason that so many of the countries of Europe conquered by Hitler or taken over by Stalin refuse to receive back their criminals and undesirables now in this country. Nevertheless, I shall reintroduce my bill during the present session, and we shall see what becomes of it.

7. As previously stated in the body of the report, the committee recommends the passage of added legislation to place restrictions on the distribution of totalitarian propaganda, when that distribution involves any cost to the American taxpayers, and when such propaganda emanates and is shipped from foreign sources.

8. We recommend that the statutory period during which citizenship papers can be revoked under existing law be extended to at least 10 years.

9. Due to the fact that the committee has discovered that many members of foreign-controlled organizations have traveled on American passports which have been fraudulently obtained, the committee feels that the statute of limitations should be extended from 3 to 7 years. This is made necessary because of the unusual difficulty in apprehending those who resort to the use of fraudulent passports within the period of 3 years.

Mr. President, in reference to the ninth recommendation of the Dies committee as to fraudulent passports, I wish to bring to the attention of this body an editorial from the columns of the Charlotte Daily News, of Charlotte, N. C., entitled "Browder to Prison—What About Bridges?" I am very happy, indeed, to see that at last the Charlotte News, which has always criticized me very severely for expending my time and energy in fighting the Communists, and which from time to time has very severely criticized my stand upon restricted immigration, when we have very few Communists and very few aliens in North Carolina, has been awakened to the fact, as evidenced by its editorial, that the motes have finally been plucked from its eyes.

The editorial reads:

Barring the receipt of Executive clemency—of which there is small chance—Comrade Earl Browder must begin a 4-year sentence in Federal prison. The Supreme Court of the United States has upheld the Communist leader's conviction, and that, we suppose, is that.

But Browder was neither convicted nor sentenced for leading a party which is directed from Moscow and seeks the overthrow of these United States. Apparently there are no acts outlawing communistic activities. He was convicted and sentenced for a simple passport fraud.

Browder's case brings into bold relief that of bounding Harry Bridges, the stormy petrel of the Pacific coast. Bridges, a radical labor leader and an alien, has created much more trouble than has Browder. One attempt was made to deport him on the grounds that he was an alien Communist. But Madam Secretary of Labor Perkins appointed a Harvard Law School dean to hear the case, and after several months of testimony Bridges was allowed to remain with us. Now the Department of Justice is trying its hand at deporting Bridges, and what manner of success it will have is anybody's guess.

Getting rid of an alien these days is a difficult task. Oh, yes; one Jivatode, a Raleigh alien, was deported several months ago. But Jivatode was a harmless newsboy—not a Communist.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator mean to intimate that the change of position of Mr. Bridges with regard to the administration had something to do with the change of attitude of the administration toward his deportation? The Senator may remember that he took a little part in the last campaign.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; I recall that he was somewhat interested then. My recollection of him, of course, dates back to the first difficulties he brought about openly for the attention of the general public, in San Francisco during the ship strike.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator think that Mr. Bridges' campaign activities explain the change of attitude on the part of the administration?

Mr. REYNOLDS. As a matter of fact, I really could not say what has brought about the change. I might state at this juncture that last fall when we were discussing the selective-training bill, one night about 10:30 I offered an amendment calling for the immediate deportation of Bridges, and some of my colleagues then prevailed upon me to withdraw the amendment. They stated then that it would hold up the bill, and they did not think it was quite germane to the bill. Others stated that the F. B. I. was investigating the activities of Mr. Bridges, and that they were sure he would be out of the country in 30 days. So I withdrew the amendment at that time; but Mr. Bridges is still here. He is still very active.

Mr. President, as for the latter portion of the editorial in reference to "bouncing Harry Bridges, the stormy petrel of the Pacific coast," I unhesitatingly assert that probably no single individual in the United States has more thoroughly hampered national-defense progress in this country than has he; and my answer to the inquiry by the Charlotte Daily News, "What about Bridges?" is that to the bill now under consideration, H. R. 1776, I propose to introduce an amendment which will provide for the immediate and mandatory deportation of alien Harry Bridges.

If this is a national-defense bill, then why not rid ourselves of non-American citizens—alien, communistic agitators—who are interfering with the construction of a national defense which is enthusiastically desired and demanded by the American people?

Therefore, Mr. President, I now present an amendment to H. R. 1776 providing for the immediate and mandatory deportation of alien Harry Bridges. The amendment reads as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to take into custody forthwith and deport forthwith to Australia, the country of which he is a citizen or subject, the alien, Harry Renton Bridges, whose presence in this country the Congress deems hurtful.

I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be printed. I shall also bring it up at the proper time, when amendments are being considered and debated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I feel confident that all the Members of this body on both the Democratic and the Republican sides will be extremely happy to learn that I have presented this amendment for the reason that it will provide them with an opportunity of voting as to whether they want Harry Bridges to stay in this country and to continue to interfere with our national defense or whether they want to put him out of this country and send him back to Australia, where he belongs.

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

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator think we should stop with the deportation of Harry Bridges when there are several thousand other persons who are in the same category?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator from Maine very much for his remark. I say to the Senator that year after year, for more than 5 years, I have introduced in the Senate bills providing for the deportation of alien criminals and undesirables. I have introduced bills along the lines mentioned in my discourse this afternoon; and I recall that I once discussed upon the floor of the Senate more than 3,000 so-called hardship cases, cases relating to alien criminals who had been apprehended, who had been arrested, who were either in jail or out under bond. I tried my best to have them deported, and the laws under which they were arrested were sufficient for their immediate deportation; but the Secretary of Labor, Madam Perkins, who then had charge of the Immigration Service of the Government, refused to deport them.

At that time I went down to the files and brought to the Senate about 300 of the cases, and read them. Those persons were alien criminals in the country; and if we had deported them then, they would not be here now.

However, as I stated a moment ago—no doubt before the Senator came in—it is almost too late now.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; I heard the Senator's statement.

Mr. REYNOLDS. As I have said, it is almost too late now; because Hitler has conquered many of the countries of Europe, and Russia has taken over the rest of them; and Hitler and Russia—why, even they, those bandits themselves—do not want the scum we have here. Hitler and Stalin say, "No; you keep them. You have them. You housed them, you fed them, you protected them. You said, 'We do not want to send them back, because it may hurt their feelings.' Now we have charge of the country they came from. You people of the United States continue to feed and house and protect them, because we do not want them, and we are not going to take them back."

So it is just about too late to do it.

In regard to what the Senator is now

stating—and I thank the Senator very much—a few years ago I introduced a bill providing for the registration and fingerprinting of all aliens in the United States. I was "cussed" from one end of the country to the other for introducing such a bill. Some persons said it would interfere with civil liberty. They said I was un-American. Finally, however, such a bill was passed by the Congress—not my bill, but a bill introduced by Representative HOWARD SMITH. The bill did not even come from the Immigration and Naturalization Committee; it came from the Committee on the Judiciary, and was sponsored on the floor of the Senate by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

If such a registration and finger-printing bill had been passed several years ago we would not today be having trouble with saboteurs and spies in this country; but every time anyone gets up and says something for the benefit of America and tries to do something for his own country, a number of persons say that he is a "fifth columnist," or that he is un-American, or something else. At times it becomes a little discouraging.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In view of the Senator's remarks a moment ago about Harry Bridges, and inasmuch as there has been some discussion in the Senate about the effect of the proviso "Notwithstanding the provisions of any other act," I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that I have made some examination—although not so extensive an examination as I would have made if time had permitted—and up to date I have found only one other bill in which was used the expression, "Notwithstanding the provisions of any other act." That was the bill passed in the last session by the House, providing for the deportation of Harry Bridges.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; in the last session such a bill was introduced in the House by Representative ALLEN, according to my recollection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So far as I have been able to determine, that is the only precedent.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator very much for his remarks.

As I say, in the last session of Congress a bill providing for the deportation of Harry Bridges was introduced by Representative ALLEN, a very able and most patriotic Representative from the Commonwealth of Louisiana. That bill was passed by the House with very few votes opposing it; but the bill never came up for a vote before the Senate. I am glad to have the opportunity to present such an amendment to the bill now under consideration, because I am confident the Members of this body will be glad to let the American people know by their record vote that they do not want Harry Bridges in this country, and that they are not going to stand for him.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I desire to ask the Members of the Senate: Shall we profit by the unfortunate experiences of France, Belgium, Holland, Luxem-

burg, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Norway, Finland, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Bessarabia, Austria, Rumania, and now, as a matter of fact, Bulgaria; or shall we prove to be the gullible, easy prey that Stalin and Hitler and his cohorts believe we are?

Instead of depleting our own national defense here at home by continuing to send our arms abroad and by crusading and fighting over there to crush nazi-ism, communism, and fascism, with the idealistic purpose of saving democracy in that part of the world, I respectfully urge that we determine to refocus our attention and devote our time, our energies, and our wealth to the actual defense of this country and to the business of saving democracy here.

Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article which I have before me entitled "Mexico Hears Claim on El Paso," dated Mexico City, February 26. It has been stated that the Latin American countries do not appreciate our unneutral position, nor do they appreciate the fact that we made several pacts and agreements with them in regard to matters of hemispherical defense and also world interests, which some allege may be affected by that position. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

MEXICO HEARS CLAIM ON EL PASO

MEXICO CITY, February 26.—Commotion was caused in the chamber of deputies Tuesday by a demand that Mexico take advantage of the United States' apparent preoccupation with thoughts of war to demand cession of a section of El Paso, Tex.

Deputy Jose Betancourt Perez, a professor in the University of Mexico, demanded the Government list Mexico's claim to the Chamizal section of El Paso in the agenda of matters to be discussed by Ambassador Castillo Najera with Assistant Secretary of State Sumner Welles.

He noted for the record that 34 years ago a Canadian arbitrator had awarded Chamizal to Mexico and set its value at \$50,000,000, but nothing had ever been done about the transfer.

"This is the moment for Mexico," the deputy argued. "Now that weak countries mean something in the world situation, now when the United States is preparing for war, now when the United States needs the aid and sympathy of all the peoples of America—now is the moment for Mexico. The Government and the people of America may be sure the people of Mexico will not believe in the good-neighbor policy as long as the United States fails to fulfill its obligations to Mexico."

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have before me an article entitled "Bill To Aid British Causes Much Puzzlement for South Americans." This article I clipped from the columns of the Wilmington, N. C., Daily News of March 1, 1941. I submit the article in conjunction with the very able address made the other day by the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], when he attacked the lend-lease bill from the standpoint of its affecting our friendly relations with South America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without

objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

BILL TO AID BRITISH CAUSES MUCH PUZZLEMENT FOR SOUTH AMERICANS

(By Peter Edson, The News, Washington correspondent)

WASHINGTON, February 27.—A few new angles on United States relations with South America have bobbed up as the European and Oriental comets of crises move along their orbits with blazing tails.

Principally, there is puzzlement as to where the lease-lend bill will leave the South Americans. If hemisphere defense is to be the big thing, and a large part of the United States defense effort is intended to prevent the Nazis from taking over South America, then where, the South Americans wonder, will help come from for them.

Argentina, for instance, not so very long ago decided to abandon German, French, and British planes for its air force, and standardize on American aircraft—because the United States would be able to make deliveries. But the Argentine Republic has had an order on file with United States plane makers for months, and hasn't been able to get deliveries.

To the charge that South America is being dominated by the Nazis now, the Sud Americanos reply that they have more fear of what the "fifth column" will do in the United States than they have in Latin-American republics.

BRAZILIANS SAY THEY CHECK NAZIS

There has been particular concern about Nazi penetration in Brazil, but the Brazilians claim that they have a much better stranglehold on the German menace than have the people of the United States. German pamphleteering and newspapers in the United States go practically unchecked, but whenever a German language newspaper in Brazil prints foreign news, it is required to print in the next column a literal translation in Portuguese, Brazilian national language.

Similarly, all radio broadcasts in Portuguese or German, to the German people of Brazil, are restricted almost entirely to music and entertainment. News bulletins are limited to simple statements of fact. No comments.

Efforts to improve commercial relations with the South American republics are just about where they always were. Every discussion on this subject sooner or later comes to the stone-wall argument that we can't trade with South America because the raw materials that they formerly sold to Europe—wheat, meat, cotton, corn, and sugar—are the commodities which the United States already has in abundance.

What has perhaps been overlooked is the possibility that the southern sister republics might try a little more selling of their excess groceries to each other. Travelers who come back drooling about the tenderness and juiciness of Argentine steaks will tell you in the same breath that the best filet mignon in the other South American countries is obtainable by slicing off the sole of your own shoe. Recently, an air-express shipment of steaks was sent over the Andes as a publicity stunt. It was front-page news, and it did result in an effort to drive cattle herds from Argentine into Chile for slaughter.

Spreading Yankee culture is still much on the trial-and-error basis, with emphasis on the error. Grapes of Wrath, which was to educate South America about American life, was a terrible floperoo. The people just wouldn't believe it was a true picture of life in the United States of America. Mistakes in staging, such as putting palm trees in the Andes or Argentine cowboys in Brazil, leave the cousins very disgustado; but with experts on every lot in Hollywood now, that may be overcome.

Best idea so far seems to be to send a string of stars on personal-appearance tours. Dorothy Lamour is dying to go, at Government cultural-relations expense, and should fix everything up dandy.

How much good the Government loans will do remains to be seen. Palms—hands, not trees—are supposed to be out all along the line. One big problem will be to keep the American loans from helping finance foreign competitors, particularly the British, whose trade in South America has always been way out in front of United States commerce.

One plan, which you will hear more of, and which will give you an idea of how some people in Washington are thinking, is to take all the British assets in Latin America and have them pooled under some joint custodianship like the Habana Conference of 21 American republics, already organized to take over administration of British territory in the Western Hemisphere should Britain falter.