

Mr. President, Members of the United States Senate, and fellow countrymen, this is the 20th day of February 1941. Since last Monday, February 17, we have been engaged in the discussion and debate of a bill entitled "A bill further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes." I daresay, in the outset, that this body has had before it but few bills that have actually received more genuine, sincere thought and consideration on the part of the Members of this body than H. R. 1776, now before us. I daresay that very few bills, if any, have ever been considered by the Senate of the United States during our tenure of office that commanded more conscientious attention and consideration than this bill, due to its immense importance to the one-hundred-and-thirty-odd millions of people constituting the population of our country. I daresay that its implications are probably more far reaching than those of any bill the Senate of the United States has been called upon to consider since the last World War.

In addressing the Members of the Senate I likewise saluted my "fellow countrymen" for the very reason that I am in high hope that my remarks may, at least in part, reach the ears of some who are not members of this body, and that when these remarks have been reduced to print I may be so fortunate as to have those pages read by some of our citizens, in order that my constituents of North Carolina and the American people as a whole, for whom we all have the profoundest respect, may be thoroughly advised as to my position upon this all-important issue, an issue which I believe to be of vital interest to our country.

My remarks are being recorded by the official reporter of this body, the United States Senate. They will be reduced to print. For that I am glad, because I want those printed words to stand as a record of my position upon this most vital question. Behind this position I shall stand, as to the best way to defend, preserve, and protect the fundamental principles for which our forefathers fought, and which principles were so clearly defined in the Declaration of Independence of 1776.

This bill bears the same number as the year in which our Declaration of Independence was signed, namely, 1776. In passing, I may mention the fact that my State of North Carolina provided three of the signers of this historical document—Joseph Hewes, William Hooper, and John Penn. At this juncture may I digress to say that, in my opinion, this bill, known as the lend-lease bill, No. 1776, has a double significance in that the first 1776 was the year of our Declaration of Independence, and now this bill, numbered "1776," acknowledges our dependence. On the one hand we have our Declaration of Independence of the year 1776, declaring our independence, while on the other hand this bill, No. 1776, if passed, admits and signifies our dependence upon the British Empire. I make this statement because, among other reasons, our present Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Frank Knox, virtually acknowledged that we are absolutely dependent upon Great Britain for our future safety

and protection. My recollection is that he stated to the Foreign Relations Committee that if England falls we fall, thus clearly admitting that our life and our future depend entirely upon Great Britain, from whom we obtained our independence after a bloody war during a period of 8 years' duration.

I respectfully beg to differ with Secretary of the Navy Knox and others who share his opinion in respect to our being dependent upon the British Navy for our safety and preservation. I shall unhesitatingly go further in asserting that if American men and women are so weak and so unpatriotic that they must depend upon any other nation of people as their first line of defense, they no longer deserve the respect of other nations. The truth of the matter is that Great Britain is more thoroughly dependent upon the United States than is the United States dependent upon Great Britain. In proof of this statement I remind the Senate of the historical fact that during the Napoleonic wars of 1792-1815 between England and France, when Napoleon was preparing an invasion of England, the British called upon the United States for all-out aid, fearing then conquest by Napoleon, who commanded the French forces. I shall later return to this particular episode.

In World War No. 1 of 1914, between Great Britain and her allies and Germany and her allies, after 3 years of fighting the backs of Great Britain and her allies were to the wall, and it was then that England again called upon the United States to save her from defeat. Historians tell us that had it not been for the aid then rendered Great Britain by our country she would surely have gone down in defeat. I shall later return to this particular point.

Now comes 1941. Great Britain, with her ally, Greece, is at death grips with Germany and Italy. Her back is again against the wall. She is again seeking our aid. She is once more beckoning to us from abroad. She admits that unless we again go to her immediate rescue she is lost.

In the face of these indisputable and historical facts I ask, Who is dependent upon whom? Are we and have we been dependent upon Great Britain for our continued existence? In view of the fact that we are constantly being called upon to give assistance to Great Britain in the form of energy, wealth, and the blood of our men in order to maintain the British Empire, it seems to me that Great Britain should acknowledge—if some Americans will not—that she is dependent upon us to maintain her world-wide empire rather than that we are dependent upon her for our continued existence. As to who is right or who is wrong—as to whether I am correct or whether those who hold the opposing view are correct—I submit as evidence only the facts as revealed by undisputed history.

Before discussing the bill now before us, H. R. 1776, which would provide all-out aid for Great Britain, let us return to the years 1808 and 1809, during the war between France and England. At that time Napoleon was the "Hitler" of

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. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, before submitting my remarks to this body I respectfully ask of my colleagues that I not be interrupted until after I shall have concluded making my observations in order that the continuity which I sought in the preparation of these pages before me may not be affected. At the conclusion of my remarks on H. R. 1776 I shall be glad to endeavor to answer any questions which any of my colleagues may care to ask or to provide full information upon or explanation of any particular phase of my remarks.

Europe. He was despised, detested, and feared as an aggressor and as a conqueror, as Adolf Hitler is today. That was approximately 132 years ago. Napoleon's legions were experiencing victory after victory. He had threatened and was planning an invasion of the British Isles. The British then feared the destruction of their empire by Napoleon, the then "Hitler" of Europe. As a result, England sought all-out aid from our country. At that time there was heated discussion of this question in the Senate of the United States. The people of the young American Republic were alarmed. They feared the downfall of the British Isles. They feared their conquest by Napoleon. Sympathetic Americans and the British spoke of Napoleon as the most ruthless tyrant that had stalked the European Continent since the fall of the Roman Empire. He was referred to as a murderer, an aggressor, and a tyrant, and as one who then sought the conquest of the world, as Hitler is spoken of today, with his boasts of world domination. The debate raged. Some Senators then favored all-out aid for Britain to save her empire. Then, as now, some Senators opposed.

Senator Pickering, of South Carolina, then a Member of the United States Senate, in the Senate Chamber here at the Capitol, said, in part:

If that power [France] swayed by that satanic genius, Napoleon, should win, would she not take Nova Scotia, Canada, Louisiana, the Antilles, Florida, and South America? After these conquests, would not the United States, the only remaining republic, be conquered?

Today it is argued by many sincere and conscientious men and women in the United States that if Hitler succeeds in invading England he will immediately launch a physical attack against the Western Hemisphere. They say that with the fall of Great Britain Hitler and his legions will proceed to take South America and then Central America, followed by a vicious, murderous attack on the United States. The same arguments used 132 years ago, designed and calculated to create fear in the hearts of the American people, are being employed today in this country. Even Mr. Wendell Willkie, the Republican candidate for the Presidency of the United States in the campaign of 1940, in testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate here at Washington, stated that if Hitler won he would launch an attack upon this country within 30 to 60 days. Mr. Willkie is an alarmist, and certainly no weight will be attached to his testimony. He made the statement—ridiculous in the eyes of every military man—that if we aid Great Britain to the extent of providing planes for her with which she can attain supremacy of the air, she will be able to reconquer all the territory taken by Hitler. Of course, we all know that Europe cannot be conquered from the air. To conquer or to reclaim conquered territory the foot soldier of today is just as necessary as was the foot soldier of Napoleon's day. Indeed, it would be easier to conquer a country by radio waves—by propaganda—than it would be to conquer or reconquer a territory with-

out the actual employment of soldiers on the ground.

However, Mr. President, in those days, 132 years ago, there were in the Senate of the United States and elsewhere men who did not believe that our first line of defense was the British Navy, or that it was anywhere in Europe. There were those who firmly believed that our first line of defense was our own shores, in our own section of the world. There were those who believed that we should not meddle in Europe's affairs or participate in its wars—wars for conquest of territory or wars for the supremacy of the seas. At that time one American patriot, the second President of the United States, John Adams, who did not share the view of Senator Pickering, of South Carolina, and who had firmly embedded in the very depths of his heart the principle of "America first," said:

Our gazettes and pamphlets tell us that Bonaparte * * * will conquer England and seize command of the British Navy and send I know not how many hundred thousand soldiers here and conquer from New Orleans to Passamaquoddy. Though every one of these bugbears is an empty phantom, yet the people seem to believe every article of this bombastical creed and tremble and shudder in consequence. Who shall touch these blind eyes?

That is what he said 132 years ago, when the people of America were as afraid of conquest by Napoleon, the then Hitler of Europe, as they today are of physical conquest by Hitler of Europe.

From this it is easy to see that the same arguments that were presented in 1808 to 1809 to embroil us in the wars of Europe were successfully employed to involve us in World War No. 1, 1914 to 1918, and are today utilized to force us headlong into World War No. 2.

Let us revert to the last World War, which began in 1914. Three years passed, and 1917 arrived. The war was on in full blast. Great Britain's back was to the wall as never before. As in 1808, she called upon the United States for aid. Propaganda was employed more thoroughly than ever before in the history of the world. The radio then was not the powerful instrument in the spread of propaganda that it is today; but the pamphleteers, the printers, and the distributors of circulars were busy. Our newspapers and our magazines were literally filled with propaganda designed to involve us in the war. America was frantic. In 1917 its people were told, as they were told 132 years before, that if America did not come to the aid of Britain she would crumble; that the British Empire would be destroyed. The Hitler of 1914 to 1918 was none other than the German Kaiser, hated and despised and loathed, and described as a murderer of children, a rapist of women, a blood-thirsty aggressor. The war cry then was, "Down with the Kaiser!" We said we had no quarrel with the German people, or with their allies, for that matter, and that our quarrel was with the Beast of Berlin, who was then the Kaiser, as today many say we have no quarrel with the German people and their ally, but only with Hitler, the Beast of Berlin of today. It was Napoleon in 1807. It was the Kaiser in 1917. It is Hitler in 1941.

In 1917, when it was hoped to draw us into a war that was not ours, the propagandists said that American soldiers were being called upon to save democracy, to save Christianity, to preserve civilization, and to stop all wars for all time. Those were the battle cries. Those assertions were quite sufficient for the American people to rally and to fight because they believed that they were rallying to the banner of democracy, the banner of Christianity, and the banner of civilization. They fought to end all wars for all time, in order that the world might, after the destruction of the Kaiser, the Beast of Berlin, live in tranquillity and peace—"Peace on earth, good will toward men"—men of all the earth. We entered that war, after slowly but surely taking steps toward war before the sinking of the *Lusitania*, and then in we plunged.

Let us see whether the objectives which we sought were attained. We entered the war on April 6, 1917, and participated until the day of the armistice, November 11, 1918, a bare few months in comparison with those who had been fighting through the years, from August 1914.

I ask, did World War No. 1 save democracy? Let us look at the results. There was a revolution in Russia. The Czar and all the members of the royal family, hundreds of the royalty, and many thousands upon thousands were brutally and cruelly murdered, and there was set up in Russia a communistic dictatorship, today directed by Stalin, the dictator, said to be the most cruel in all the world.

Then, in 1924, Italian Black Shirts marched southward to Rome, Italy's capital, and set up a Fascist form of government, today headed by Mussolini, who in World War No. 1 fought in part on the side of Great Britain. Radical changes after World War No. 1 were brought about in all parts of Europe; and history reveals that, instead of World War No. 1 strengthening democracy, to the contrary, it weakened democracy throughout Europe and the world. Instead of strengthening democracy, as many contended in 1917 it would, history reveals that World War No. 1 weakened democracy and set it on the road to communism, fascism, and nazism, such as they have today in Russia, Germany, and Italy. So much for the preservation of democracy for which American youth fought, bled, and died.

Now, I ask, Did World War No. 1 save Christianity? Since the end of World War No. 1 one of the most vicious assaults ever recorded in history has been made upon Christianity by mass massacres and in other ways. Ambassador William Bullitt himself, several years ago, before a congressional committee in Washington, in testifying and in answer to a question directed to him by myself, stated that from three to four million Russian peasants were starved and murdered in the Ukraine section of Russia, which is immediately north of Odessa on the Black Sea. The world knows that in the Soviet Union religious worship is prohibited to its 180,000,000 people and that the churches of the Lord have been

destroyed, razed to the ground, or used for granaries in that vast Russian territory which covers one-sixth of the earth's surface and is ruled over by that despot, Joseph Stalin, to whom today we are making violent, ardent love.

In Spain there was fought a revolution, some say, between the goddess and those who worshipped the Almighty. Christians and Jews alike were murdered. Synagogues and temples of worship were burned and destruction of anything godly was rife. So in many other parts of the world vicious assaults were made upon Christians and those who desired to worship in the faith of their respective religions. I leave it for you, and you, and you, to say whether our participation in the last World War served to preserve or to strengthen Christianity.

Now as to civilization itself. From all evidence as recorded by modern-day historians, a solar-plexus blow to civilization was delivered after World War No. 1. Never before have we witnessed such dark, chaotic, unbelievable conditions as the 2,000,000,000 people of the world are experiencing today, at this very hour, when attempts are being made to draw the people of this continent into another bloodthirsty war, designed to maintain—what? The status quo, or to save an empire whose yoke we cast off in 1776, and which empire over the years has called upon us to save it at the expense of the wealth and blood and sorrow and distress of the American people.

Finally, as to stopping all wars for all time, we were actually told in 1917 that with the successful termination of World War No. 1, with Great Britain as victor, there would be no more wars. The American people as a whole are idealistic. They are the biggest-hearted and the most sympathetic people upon the face of the earth, as evidenced by their charity in every direction, even though in many instances that charity does not begin at home. They believed what they heard, what they were told, and what they read—at least, many of them did—and that evidently was the great majority at that time. So I ask, Did World War No. 1 stop all wars for all time? Let us see.

Since the last day of the World War on November 11, 1918, wars and revolutions have raged throughout the earth—in China, Manchukuo, Spain, Ethiopia, and even in our own Western Hemisphere, in Bolivia and Paraguay; and as a result of these wars and revolutions which have taken place since the last World War it is estimated that more than 5,000,000 people have actually been killed, and millions of noncombatants—children, old men, and old women—have starved, suffered, and died. These facts cannot be disputed. So we know that World War No. 1 did not by any means stop all wars for all time, as it was claimed that it would.

Now, let us see something about the cost of war. It has been repeatedly stated that we are already in the war. Therefore, if we are already in the war, surely those who are to pay for the war are desirous of directing inquiries as to

what our last adventure in war cost. Let me say that if we are in the war, it may be and is directly attributable to the lifting of the arms embargo in 1939, because if the arms embargo had not then been lifted this very issue would not be before us today, and we should not be so close to war. So let us consider now, if you please, the cost of war.

Our brief participation in the last war, from April 6, 1917, until the day of the armistice, November 11, 1918, has so far cost the American taxpayers approximately \$57,000,000,000, and competent authorities tell us that before we shall have finished paying in full for our part in that war it will have cost the American taxpayers and their sons and daughters and their grandchildren and great-grandchildren no less than \$100,000,000,000. Here I want to say that even before we have paid for the last war there are many persons in this country who think we ought to go into this war right now.

The World War ended. When it did, we had approximately 2,000,000 troops in Europe. They finally were returned to our shores, all with the exception of those who are buried in French soil, and for which we paid annually to the Republic of France rental for the ground space, the earth, wherein our heroes of that war lie today, and whose last resting place is marked by a simple wooden cross.

Since then, instead of paying rental, we have purchased the ground wherein rest our soldiers of that war.

In combat during the World War we had killed only 50,000 men, and wounded only 234,300 men. Despite the fact that we only had 126,000 casualties in killed and those who died of disease and accident, and 234,300 men wounded, the United States is paying to those who suffered wounds in that war, and to the dependents of those who were killed in that war, more than \$254,000,000 annually. Today there are in our veterans' hospitals, receiving treatment at the expense of the United States Government, as rightly they should, approximately 66,000 veterans—more veterans of the last World War than were killed in action; and today, 22 years after the end of World War No. 1, there are more veterans of that war seeking admittance for hospitalization than there are accommodations available. This is the condition which exists virtually a quarter of a century after the end of the other war, in which we sought to destroy the Kaiser, who now from his estate in Holland watches the progress of the present war.

Let us see something about the interest in this matter of the veterans of World War No. 1. Let us take into consideration their interests.

If we permit ourselves to become involved in the present war in Europe, a war waged on the one hand by Hitler literally to steal more territory, which can be accomplished only by mass murder, and on the other hand by Great Britain to maintain the status quo by preserving for her all of her territory, which covers a large portion of the earth's surface, I am of the opinion that we shall be directly contributing to the destruction of American democracy.

Upon the shoulders of the American taxpayer billions of dollars in additional indebtedness will be placed; our Nation will be virtually bankrupt; we shall be responsible for the unwarranted murder of American soldiers; and we shall wind up with chaos, rape, poverty, disease, pestilence, unemployment, perhaps revolution, and serious assaults will be made on our present American way of life, if indeed it shall not be absolutely destroyed.

There are today 537,806 veterans or dependents receiving compensation and pensions as a result of the last war. If we become involved in this war, there will not be merely 50,000 dead and 234,000 wounded but the probabilities are that there will be hundreds of thousands dead and millions wounded. Every one of those wounded soldiers, and every widow of a soldier, and his dependents, will be entitled to compensation, as are the soldiers of the last war.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. If the Senator will pardon me, I should rather not be interrupted, because I am trying to maintain some continuity.

Mr. BONE. I should like to have the Senator explain how the capitalistic system could exist and face the impact of that debt.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall be happy to refer to that at the conclusion of my speech.

With the finances of the Government in the condition in which we find them today, with a deficit of billions of dollars added to the one hundred or one hundred and fifty billions the Government will owe at the end of this war, if we get into it, it will mean that the veterans of World War No. 1, and the widows and dependents of veterans of that war, will suffer a marked reduction in the amounts of money they are drawing monthly now, because the veterans of the present war, into which we are likely to be drawn, and their dependents, will be entitled to the same consideration accorded the veterans, their widows, and dependents, of World War No. 1. In other words, a veteran today drawing \$100 monthly would probably experience that monthly payment being cut down to \$15 or \$20 and in all probability much less.

After the conclusion of World War No. 1 we were referred to as Shylocks. We had advanced to Great Britain and her allies approximately \$22,000,000,000. Enthusiastic about the victory which we had aided in attaining, and being the big-hearted people that we are, we literally cut in half the indebtedness of the Allies, reducing it from \$22,000,000,000 to \$11,000,000,000, and of that sum not one penny of principal has been liquidated, and only a few dollars have been applied to the millions of dollars of interest that we should have been paid. Neither France nor Britain has even offered to cede to us any of their possessions in the Western Hemisphere to be applied on their World War No. 1 indebtedness, despite the fact that we need some of their island possessions in the Caribbean, such as Trinidad and Martinique, and in the Atlantic, such as Nassau, Bimini, Ber-

muda, and Newfoundland, as outposts, as well as a corridor over British Columbia, I might add, to provide us with a military and commercial highway from Seattle, via Vancouver, the capital of British Columbia, to Juneau, the capital of Alaska.

In further pursuance to our participation in the last war, and in appreciation of those whom we saved, let me call to the attention of the American public a statement alleged to have been made by Winston Churchill, the Prime Minister of England, to Mr. William Griffin, the editor and publisher of the *New York Enquirer*, of New York City, at London, after the end of World War No. 1, which statement Editor Griffin declares to be true. In a conversation which took place between Editor Griffin and Prime Minister Churchill in London, Mr. Griffin says that the Prime Minister stated that—

America's entrance into the war was disastrous not only for your country but for the Allies as well, because had you stayed at home and minded your own business we would have made peace with the Central Powers in the spring of 1917, and then there would have been no collapse in Russia, followed by communism; no breakdown in Italy, followed by fascism; and nazi-ism would not at present be enthroned in Germany. If America had stayed out of the war and minded her own business, none of these "isms" would today be sweeping the Continent of Europe and breaking down parliamentary government.

That is what Editor Griffin stated Winston Churchill said. Mr. Churchill denied it, and Mr. Griffin brought suit against Mr. Churchill, which suit, I am informed, is at this time pending in New York.

Now let us return to the bill before us, and endeavor to analyze it as I see it.

To repeat, the bill is entitled "A bill to further promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes." The bill before us, now under discussion, is generally known to the American public as the lend-lease bill. I read now from the bill:

An act to promote the defense of the United States.

Let us see as to whether or not the terms of the bill entitle it to be designated as "an act to promote the defense of the United States." It is a bill—

To manufacture in arsenals, factories, and shipyards any defense article for the government of any foreign country.

To sell, transfer, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of (which means to give) to any such foreign government any defense article.

To repair, outfit, or recondition any defense article for any such foreign government.

To communicate to any such foreign government any defense information.

To release for export any defense article to any such foreign government.

It goes on further to state in section 6 that—

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time out of any money in the Treasury * * * such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this act.

All of which means that all these articles of defense and maintenance which the bill proposes to sell, transfer, exchange, lease, lend, or give to Great Britain and other foreign countries are to be paid for by the taxpayers of the United

States of America, which may amount to billions of American dollars.

Section 3 of the bill provides that, "Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President may" do so and so. This virtually means that the President has a right, according to my interpretation, to declare null and void, destroy, repeal certain laws without the consent of Congress, such as the Neutrality Act.

It strikes me from a reading of the bill and from analyzing it that instead of the bill being entitled "A bill further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes," it should be entitled "A bill for other purposes"—or, in other words, a bill for the defense of the British Empire at the expense of the lives of American men and at the expense of the American taxpayer, and for the preservation of the British Empire, without any consideration for the preservation of the United States. It should be referred to not as the lend-lease bill but as the lend-lease-give bill.

Mr. President, before we decide, by the passage of this bill, to give our defense articles, which we so badly need here at home, to Great Britain, let us consider our own plight, our present condition. If a man were told that just without the threshold of his home there were armed burglars bent upon robbery and murder of those in his home, I wonder whether he would be so foolish as to take his arms and munitions around the corner and give them to a neighbor who was being assaulted or expected to be assaulted. It seems to me his interest would lie in protecting his blood and kin, the members of his own family right there in his own household.

We have just voted to increase the national indebtedness to sixty-five billions, by far the highest that this country has ever known, and perhaps exceeding the national indebtedness of any other country of the world during peacetime or any other time. We have not yet paid our debts incurred as a result of the last World War, in which we participated. We have millions of unemployed despite our immense national-defense program, the largest any country of all the world at any time has ever undertaken in peacetime. We have millions unemployed, despite the fact that we have approximately 3,000,000 persons on the W. P. A. rolls, despite the fact that an estimated 4,000,000 are employed by the Federal, State, county, city, and other local governments, despite the fact that we have 300,000 young men in the C. C. C. camps, and despite the fact that millions are being provided with direct Federal, State, county, city, group, and individual relief.

Mr. President, why do we not think about our own unfortunates, our own poor unemployed here at home? Why do we not think more of charity to our own instead of to others?

This morning I read the Merry-Go-Round column by Drew Pearson and Bob Allen, a column which is published daily in the *Washington Times-Herald*. It deals with our present condition. I wish to read the portion that comes under the heading "Defense Grapes of Wrath":

California no longer has a copyright on the Grapes of Wrath. Its drama is being reenacted the country over as a great footloose army of migrant workers moves on defense centers in quest of jobs.

It is one of the most serious problems faced by defense executives. Yet they have done relatively little about it. Over 3,000,000 destitute, mainly from rural sections, have hit the road in the last 6 months looking for defense jobs. Seven cities alone—Charlestown, Ind.; Corpus Christi and Orange, Tex.; Radford, Va.; Detroit; Boston; and the Norfolk-Newport News, Va., area—have attracted more than 250,000.

Only a fraction find steady employment. The rest eke out a half-starved, hand-to-mouth existence, depending largely on odd jobs and private charity. Many States have "settlement laws" which bar migrants from relief until they have lived a certain length of time in the State.

An example of what footloose job hunters are up against is the Lockheed aircraft plant at Burbank, Calif., where the average weekly number of job applicants is 2,050, of which 1,450 are turned down for lack of training. Lockheed officials estimate 75 percent of those rejected are from outside the State.

The unemployment crisis is so acute in some Texas towns, where cantonment construction is under way, that migrants assemble each day in "bull pens" (vacant lots) to be hired. A "bull pen" in Brownwood, Tex., site of a National Guard camp, averages from 500 to 1,000 jobless a day.

Living conditions of the tent-town wayfarers are unbelievably bad and, due to housing shortages, are not much better for those lucky enough to find work. At Mineral Wells, Tex., where Camp Walters is located, many workmen sleep in crowded dormitories, equipped with one shower, four water faucets, and one toilet for 60 men.

United States Public Health officials are at a loss to explain why the lack of proper sanitation among defense migrants has not resulted in widespread disease. However, only two minor epidemics of flu, in Louisiana and Texas, have been reported so far.

I add, fortunately, such are not conditions here at home.

We are referred to as the richest nation upon the face of the earth. We have many persons wealthy in their own right, among whom are innumerable millionaires, some of whom made their fortunes out of the last war. On the other hand we have the great masses, constituting the millions upon millions of God-fearing, hard-working men and women who earn their living from day to day by the expenditure of their energies and by the sweat of their brows, as clerks in stores, in small businesses, and in factories. These millions constituting the masses are after all the ones who will be called upon to pay the price of war if unfortunately we become involved in this one. So it is of them that I think. It is within them that my interest lies, because their interest is America's interest. America's interest is their interest. The first and only interest that I have in this bill is the interest of the United States of America. I owe allegiance only to the United States and to no other country upon the face of the earth. With me it is America first, last, and always. I think that before our masses, including the sharecroppers of the South, the laborers in our textile plants, the small wheat farmers of the Middle West, the white-collared men of the stores and offices, and the women of the mills and shops, are called

upon to pay for a war in Europe, which I declare is not theirs, the British Empire and its people, with their nobility, their millionaires, their estates in England, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, and every other part of the world where the British flag remains supreme, should be called upon to strip themselves of their hunting lodges and castles, their hounds and their falcons, their horses and their dogs, their jewels, their cash, and their securities. Before the one-gallused, overall-clad farmer or laborer of this country is called upon, with all of us, to pay by way of increased taxes in the form of income taxes, contributions, and perhaps eventually in the form of a general sales tax throughout the Nation, which will reach all from the poorest man to the richest, British citizens of great wealth should be asked to contribute. Why should a poor cotton farmer of the South, or an humble wheat producer of the West in America be called upon to pay for the war in Europe, while those possessed of great wealth throughout all the British Empire are continuing to enjoy their comforts in their castles, their sport in their lodges, their horses following the hounds, their costly motors on the highways, their jewels on their gowns, their fabulous incomes from their stocks and bonds, while the little men in America, those whom we have forgotten for the time being, are being called upon to fight somebody else's war and either give their blood for somebody else's cause or deny themselves and their families the comforts, and perhaps even the necessities of life?

I know that today many fear to make mention of the riches of the British Empire, which calls upon us to pay for her war. But I hesitate not, because I am interested in my country. I am more interested in my country, which I love, than I could ever be in myself or any ambition I might ever have.

This is a serious hour to every man, woman, and child, and to their offspring in the generations to follow. This war is being waged on the one hand by Great Britain. That means the British Empire. The British Empire means territory in every section of the world, including Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and India. It is said that the richest men of all the earth, not even excepting our own Henry Ford, are to be found in far-away India, a country having a population of 375,000,000, most of whom are Hindus. The leader of millions of them is a man by the name of Gandhi, who for years has been seeking the freedom of his people as we sought freedom from Great Britain prior to the Revolutionary War.

In India there are the kings, known as the maharajahs, possessed of billions in estates, cash, securities, jewels, and what not. In Canada there are immense ranches, and there are millionaire munitions manufacturers who today are turning out arms and implements for their own Empire, and are demanding "cash on the barrel head" in payment, while we are being asked to lend, to lease, and to give—and virtually being frightened into it—when no such request

has been made by Great Britain of Canada.

In addition to the great wealth to be found in the Empire, Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau tells us that Great Britain has about \$3,000,000,000 here—although many well-informed financiers say that this figure is nearly ten billion.

They want us to give them something. Let me digress at this point long enough to give a homely illustration. Many of my colleagues walk daily from the Capitol down Pennsylvania Avenue. Many of them are accosted by poor, unfortunate men who are hungry, destitute, and shelterless. If some afternoon, after the close of the day's session of the Senate, some Senator should be approached on the avenue by a poor, ragged, unfortunate beggar—one of the millions spoken of by Drew Pearson and Bob Allen—and the approach by that unfortunate man were to be made with an empty outstretched palm in the right hand and a \$10 bill in the left, the Senator would not be so hasty about giving him a quarter for a sandwich and a cup of coffee after seeing the \$10. Nor would he, with a \$10 bill exhibited, make a request for a quarter. He would put the \$10 bill in his pocket; and it is perfectly reasonable to believe that those who are calling upon us to give are not going to evidence the tremendous wealth of which they are possessed.

At any rate, untold billions can be secured by the British Empire from her dominions and colonies; and why should not Holland and Belgium contribute some of their billions in the Dutch East Indies, in Borneo, half of which is owned by Great Britain and half of which is owned by Holland; in Sumatra, Bali, Java, the main islands of that group? Why, then, should not Holland and Belgium contribute some of their billions in the Dutch East Indies, Africa, and elsewhere, where are to be found great quantities of rubber, tin, and oil?

Here let me digress again to call attention to a matter pertaining to the riches of Great Britain. In South and Central America—here in the Western Hemisphere—the British have tremendous investments in railroads, meat plants, docks, electric-light companies, street railways, textile plants, shipping lines, and a hundred and one other financial interests. British investments in that part of the world to the south of us are tremendous. As we all know, the British were largely responsible for the development of the Argentine; they have big investments in Chile; they have mining and oil interests from Mexico southward. Why should not they be called upon to turn over to us their stocks and bonds in these innumerable mammoth enterprises as security for the loans we are proposing to make, or in payment of the goods and implements of war that we are proposing to give? Or is it that we simply want to give away everything we have—give away the money and the property of the American people—in many instances without the consent of people who are just as much interested in the financial condition of our Government and the preservation of our Gov-

ernment as are those who want to give everything we have to those who again ask for all-out aid?

Mind you, Madam President and Senators, in reference to the investments in that portion of the world in this hemisphere, Senators who have traveled in South America and Central America have observed British investments and the development thereof on every hand, not only in Mexico, where millions upon millions are sunk in oil and mining enterprises but in the countries of Central America, and in virtually all the countries of South America, principally, according to my observation, in Peru, in Chile, in Argentina, in Brazil, and even in the smaller republics of Paraguay and Bolivia. Yet some seem to be blinded to the security that our friends across the seas are in a position to give.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Madam President—

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARAWAY in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sorry; I had forgotten that the Senator asked not to be interrupted.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I did ask not to be interrupted; but if the Senator wishes to ask a question, I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It occurred to me that it might illuminate the Senator's point if I pointed out that even Mr. Morgenthau reported to the Foreign Relations Committee that the investments of the United Kingdom in Central America and South America alone probably have a knock-down value of \$4,000,000,000.

Mr. REYNOLDS. \$4,000,000,000?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator very much. I thought the amount exceeded that figure. I am very grateful to the Senator for his statement.

All these requests are being made in the face of the fact that Great Britain and other European countries have absolutely refused to pay or to consider paying any part or parts of the interest on the billions of dollars we let them have during World War No. 1—and this further in the face of the fact that Great Britain, Holland, and Belgium have billions scattered over the face of the earth. It is interesting to note that notwithstanding the reported scarcity of ships in which to carry munitions and planes from this country to Great Britain, she continues her normal commercial trade with South America in nonessential war materials.

Some will argue—and do, for that matter—that Great Britain favored us by giving us the privilege of constructing at our own expense outposts on the islands of Trinidad, Jamaica, and Newfoundland; but it must be remembered that on these islands we shall be called upon to purchase from the owners of the land acreage sufficient for the construction thereon of these outposts, fortifications, and air bases. It must be remembered that millions of American dollars are to be paid for the construction of these outposts on some one else's territory—on Great Brit-

ain's territory—that in the construction of the outposts nationals of Great Britain will be provided employment, and that in the maintenance of the outposts the millions we shall spend annually for the upkeep of the posts and their personnel in the form of soldiers, sailors, and aviators will benefit the populations of those British Isles. Last, but by far not least, we must remember that the outposts which we are to construct at the expenditure of millions of our own money are our outposts on lease, but, on the other hand, they are for the protection of British property itself.

We, of America, rather felt that another war was going to take place in Europe. I think all of us did. The one that is raging there today is not really one between the totalitarian states and the democracies. It is a war in which we find on one side Great Britain, a democracy, and her ally, Greece, which is a dictatorship. When, several years ago, the Grecian people were privileged to decide by plebescite whether they desired a dictatorship or a republic, they voted 10 to 1 for the dictatorship; whereas, on the other hand, we find only totalitarian states, Germany and Italy.

We in America rather felt that there would be another war in Europe, another war for power and supremacy of commerce. We knew it was coming, but we did not know when. It came in 1939. I did not expect it until 1940 or perhaps 1941. But, anyway, it came.

Prior to the breaking out of the present war, the British people themselves knew that another world war was coming, and they knew that it would be a war similar to World War No. 1, a war for power and for the supremacy of commerce and the seas.

In this connection I might add that several weeks ago there appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate Gen. Robert Wood, who is chairman of the board of directors of Sears, Roebuck & Co. Many Senators were present and heard his statement. General Wood served overseas during the World War. He is a member of the American Legion. He served as Quartermaster General of the United States Army during that war. He—Gen. Robert Wood, World War hero, American—testified before the Foreign Relations Committee as follows:

In 1936 I was a luncheon guest at the home of Prime Minister Churchill in his house in London, England, at which time Prime Minister Churchill told me that Germany was getting too strong, and that Great Britain ought to crush Germany.

As will be noted, that statement made by Prime Minister Churchill was made only 3 years before the beginning of the present war, which broke out in Europe on September 3, 1939.

That was perhaps the most important statement made by any witness who testified before the committee of either the House or the Senate interesting itself in foreign relations. Why? Because it proved that this war is a war for power, for supremacy of the seas, and the balance of power in Europe. General Wood stated that in 1936—I repeat it because of its importance—that when he was a

luncheon guest in the home of Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of the British Empire today, in London, England, Winston Churchill told him that Germany was becoming too strong and she ought to be crushed. What did he mean by that? Let us see.

The British people, as a result of their experience in the last war, felt that there was going to be another World War. They recognized that Germany was becoming too strong, in fact so strong that there was danger of the balance of power in Europe being wrested from them by Germany, and that, I contend, was the thought in the mind of Winston Churchill at the time of his conversation with General Wood, and, no doubt, was responsible for the statement which he, Prime Minister Winston Churchill, made to General Wood to the effect that Germany was becoming too strong and had to be crushed.

The British people as a whole, as a result of their experience during World War No. 1, recognized the power and the tremendous benefit of propaganda. We here certainly recognize it. They had during the World War perfected propaganda, so to speak, that had succeeded largely in propagandizing the American people into that war in which we participated. So they talked about it; they thought about how they would make utilization of propaganda when England again became involved in a war in Europe. They figured on how it would be possible to propagandize us and to take us into another one of their wars. In these discussions pamphlets were written and books were printed. I have one in mind [exhibiting], a volume entitled "Propaganda in the Next War." It was written by an Englishman whose name is Sidney Rogerson, and published by Capt. Geoffrey Bles, of the British Army. I am told the book has been withdrawn from sale in America since the beginning of this war. The authors of this volume, in part, state, page 146—listen to what these British Army gentlemen say about us in this book, which was written by English Army officers and published in London, England, by the British press—

The American is the great champion of the oppressed—

And he is—

which may explain why he is so frequently taken in by the "hard luck" story of London confidence tricksters.

We are big-hearted. I hope we will not continue to be so big-hearted as will finally result in our entire destruction.

On page 152 these British authors state in this book published in England:

If anything is certain about the next war—

That is the one that is now raging— it is that we shall have France as our ally in chief, if not as our only certain ally outside the British Empire.

France was her ally.

These men seem to know what they were talking about.

At page 148 these gentlemen of London say, in talking about America:

Though we are not unfavorably placed, we

shall require to do much propaganda to keep the United States benevolently neutral. To persuade her to take our part will be much more difficult—so difficult as to be unlikely to succeed. It will need a definite threat to America—a threat, moreover, which will have to be brought home by propaganda to every citizen before the Republic will again take arms in an external quarrel. The position will naturally be considerably eased if Japan were involved; and this might, and probably would, bring America in without further ado. At any rate, it would be a natural and obvious object of our propagandists to achieve this, just as during the Great War they succeeded in embroiling the United States with Germany.

In pursuance of this paragraph from the book entitled "Propaganda in the Next War," on page 150 thereof we find the following statement:

They—

Meaning the United States—

should be the first to be allowed to "shoot" pictures of air raids in order that a proper volume of pictorial "horror" will be available in one of the few countries where "atrocious propaganda" will still be operative.

This book was published in London by Geoffrey Bles, No. 37 Essex Street, Strand, London, England. Up at the top here I read:

The Next War. A series edited by Capt. Liddell Hart.

And this book, entitled "Propaganda in the Next War," by Mr. Sidney Rogerson.

These British Army men, the authors or editors of this publication, further state:

There remains the United States—the great neutral.

In the next war, as in the last, the result will probably depend upon the way in which the United States acts, and her attitude will reflect the reaction of her public to propaganda, properly applied.

The British Army officers who authored this book were right when they stated that America is the great champion of the oppressed, and that we fall for hard-luck stories. They said, you will note, that we should be the first to be permitted to make pictures of the horrors of war, which pictures have been made in abundance and published generally throughout the United States, such as motion pictures and still photographs made by Mr. Quentin Reynolds, a magazine correspondent, who prefaces his lectures by stating that he is neutral, but all who have heard him state that he makes the strongest plea for our entrance into the war that they have ever heard.

British propaganda has swept the American people off their feet. As stated by the British authors of the book from which I have just quoted, we are more subject to propaganda than are the peoples of any other nation of the world, because of our charity and consideration for others and our big-heartedness.

Propaganda, as we all know, is a powerful weapon, and may be used as a keen, vicious instrument. Today, patriotic Americans who believe in the American way of life, who consider America first, who are interested only in the defense, protection, and preservation of Americanism, are branded by some as dupes and "fifth columnists."

Thomas Jefferson once said:

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

Today it has become a major crime in the United States of America to be an American. Those who speak and act as Americans should be instantly pounced upon and then sneered at as dupes or agents of foreign powers, hostile to the Republic. They are immediately branded as being un-American. They are declared to be pro-German, and some go so far as to say that they are traitors.

This mode of attack upon American patriots in thought and deed is nothing new. It was put into ruthless operation in the Revolutionary War against George Washington and those who, under and with him, were risking their lives and everything they had to the end that America should be emancipated from trans-Atlantic chains and enabled to live her own life in her own way, safe from all foreign interference and all foreign influences.

If we are drawn into this war, Americans should not blame Britain, but should blame themselves. If we were in Britain's place we would do everything in the world that we could to bring in this country or any other country, by propaganda or otherwise, to save our own hides.

We Americans are entirely too prone to blame Britain for the brutal warring campaign to which our country is being subtly subjected. Instead of blaming Britain, should we not rather condemn ourselves? If we were as true to our own interests in all things and at all times as Britain is to hers, we should not be confronted with the fateful crisis which we are now facing. Therefore, instead of blaming Britain, let us give her the high credit that is her due. Let us merely take a leaf, or rather many leaves, out of her book, and apply to our own land the mighty lessons which they teach. In our efforts to succor America, it is vital to bear in mind that when Britain seeks to have us fight her battles and pay her war losses she is actuated solely by an anxiety to do what will redound to her own benefit. We must honor her for eternally serving her own interests. If we allow ourselves to be exploited by her, the fault lies with ourselves, and the remedy likewise lies with ourselves. So let us stop blaming and scolding and denouncing Britain, and profit by her example of self-loyalty to the fullest extent.

Our first line of defense is here at home, not thousands of miles away. And the simple truth of the matter is that Britain herself does not believe that our first line of defense is "over there." She does not believe some of the things she is telling us, and she rightfully holds in contempt all those who do believe them.

I confess to the accusation that I am an isolationist. I believe that we should look after America first. I believe that we should first settle our problems here at home. I believe that all of our energies should be expended in the interest of our country. Some call us continentalists, some appeasers, some "fifth

columnists," some traitors, some pro-Nazis, but whatever they call us, because we are interested in America first, our view upon the issue of saving America for Americans still prevails in our hearts and minds.

Now, let us see as to whether or not we have actually been swept off our feet by the hurricane of propaganda. On the 31st of October 1935 the world was at peace. Some black clouds were hanging over Europe. There were rumblings of another war to come. We in America remembered the cost of our participation in the last war. We wanted to stay out of any future wars of Europe, recognizing then, in August of 1935, that the quarrels of Europe and the wars in Europe for power and supremacy were none of our wars.

On August 31, 1935, we passed what is known as the Neutrality Act, and amongst other things that Neutrality Act, that law, recommended by the President, sponsored and signed by the President, prohibited our selling any arms, ammunition, or instruments of death to any country which in the future might become involved in war, and be designated as a belligerent. That was fine. I voted for it. The majority of the Members of this body voted for it. The majority of the Members of Congress voted for it. Ninety-five percent of the American people were for it. The President of the United States not only advocated the passage of the bill but made statements favorable to the bill, and signed it. We were then on an even keel. We then had all our wits about us. We were not then being propagandized. We felt safe after the passage of that bill, realizing that our sale of war materials to the nations at war in Europe in 1914 to 1917 was largely responsible for our being drawn into the war.

Then came World War No. 2, which broke out in Europe on September 3, 1939. England declared war on Germany at 11 o'clock in the morning of that day, and England's proclamation was followed by a declaration of war by France at 3 in the afternoon of the same day.

Immediately after the declaration of war on September 3, 1939, the President of the United States called a special session of Congress, which convened in Washington in September of 1939, less than a month after war had been declared in Europe. The President then suggested and recommended a repeal of the law which prohibited us from selling arms, ammunition, munitions of war, and instruments of death to nations at war. Propaganda had then hit this country. We were being subjected to propaganda. In this body, the Senate of the United States, we debated for weeks the question as to whether or not we would repeal the law passed in 1935 prohibiting the sale of arms and munitions to nations at war. Propaganda developed terrifically and rapidly. Pressure was brought to bear from every hand. To make a long story short, the Congress of the United States voted to repeal that law, a law it had passed in 1935, thereby voting to place instruments of death in the hands of those at war in Europe.

I voted against the repeal of that law;

and I wish to say now that if we are in the war, as some have said we are, we are in it for the sole and only reason that we lifted the arms embargo. I voted against the repeal of the arms embargo despite terrific pressure. I voted against the repeal of the arms embargo which we had established by law 4 years before, when the world was at peace; and I felt then as I do now, that if we should repeal the law lifting the arms embargo and again engage in selling war materials to warring nations in Europe it would simply mean that we would open the gates and take the step that would set us on the road which would lead to war, and I so stated my position at that time.

Remember, everything was quiet, peaceful, serene, and lovely in the summer of 1935. There were no wars raging in Europe. There was no propaganda here; and by the arms-embargo legislation we said, "We shall never again sell arms to any warring nation." We said, "That got us into trouble before, and it will get us into trouble again." So in the summer of 1935, when we were at peace with the world, and the world was at peace with itself, and we were on an even keel and had our wits about us, we said, "Let us protect ourselves so that we will not be swept off our feet when war does come." But, unfortunately, it did not have that effect, for less than a month after the declaration in Europe of the present World War, World War No. 2, on September 30, 1939, we were called upon to repeal—and we did repeal—the law we had passed for our safety. Why? I voted against the repeal of that law.

Since the repeal of the arms embargo, since we, by those actions and votes in 1939 decided to sell arms to a nation at war, we have, step by step, been proceeding down the road which leads to war, daily getting nearer and nearer to the brink of war.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat that I felt then and feel now that when we lifted the arms embargo we opened the gate and took the step which actually put us on the highway leading directly to war.

Some say that if this bill shall be passed we will topple over into the abyss of the war itself. Again I say that I contend now that had we not nullified the neutrality law of 1935, had we not in 1939 lifted the arms embargo, permitting us to sell implements of death to nations at war, today we would not be in the position in which we now find ourselves—perilously, dangerously close to war.

Some say that the passage of this lend-lease-give bill for the benefit of Great Britain will not take us any closer to war. I do not know. I have only my opinion.

Some say that the passage of this lend-lease-give bill will not get us into war. I do not know. Some say that the passage of this lend-lease-give bill will get us into war. That I do not know. It remains to be seen whether the passage of the bill will get us into war. But I do know that we cannot strengthen our own defenses by giving, lending, or leasing to any nation our implements of defense.

Mr. President, I, like you and every Member of this body, have been more thoroughly concerned about the great question before us today than I have been about any other question that has ever brought real, serious, troubled concentration to my mind. In considering this matter I, like you, have absolutely eliminated any thought of what might be said about how we vote. That does not matter to you and it does not matter to me, because we, as Senators, shall be here only a short time and are quickly forgotten. I recall honorable men, great patriots of this country, who during my tenure of office gave their lives in behalf of our country, who died serving the people, and the week after they died one never heard their names mentioned. We as Senators may amount to a great deal in our own respective opinions. We may like to have our pictures published in the newspapers, and to be pointed to, and to have it said about us, "There goes a Senator." We know how short are our lives, but every one of us who loves his country is desirous that it shall live on and on forever, and I know that everyone in this body has prayed that the great Almighty God above would lead him in the right direction, to act solely in behalf of and for the welfare of his country.

Mr. President, after pondering for weeks and listening to all the evidence and the many eloquent speeches from Members of this distinguished body, all of whom I admire and whose sincerity I deeply appreciate, I pray to the great God above that we shall never lose our American form of democracy. If ever I was impressed with the worthwhileness and the benefits of American democracy, free speech, and the fairness of American people in debate, I have been impressed with them during the continuation of consideration of the issue before us. The debate has been orderly and friendly, because we in America recognize that every man is entitled to his opinion about every question, and it would not be the American form of debate unless there were differences of opinion. But we all earnestly hope that those differences of opinion will serve to aid us, whether we are on one side or the other, to find the best answer to the question, the answer which will best serve our country and our people. That is all we seek.

I wish to compliment our leader. I am not throwing any bouquets. I feel the urge to speak of him because I think he is deserving of that which I am about to say. The same sentiments have been expressed many times. Although I do not share his views, I know that he is as conscientious in his position as I am in mine, and he has been as fair with those on the other side as any man could possibly be. He has shown us every possible consideration. As a result of the fairness which he has shown, his friendly feeling toward those who do not share his views, and his brotherly love for those who are likewise interested only in the cause of America, I think that after we have spoken our parts and made a record of our stand upon this all-important matter the vote should be cast. So far as I am concerned, I shall be ready to vote when the leader of the majority

and the leader of the minority agree that the vote should be taken.

The question with me is, Would the passage of this bill take us closer to war? I do not know. There is an honest difference of opinion upon this subject; but, insofar as I am concerned, I am not willing to take the chance of moving my country closer to a war which is not ours. Therefore I shall vote against the bill.

If, after the passage of this bill, the time shall arrive to take the last and final step—I mean a declaration of war by this body—I serve notice now that I shall never cast my vote to send American manhood across any ocean to fight in any war for the preservation of any foreign nation or empire.

Unfortunately, our thoughts, our interest, and our attention have been diverted from our homeland and its problems and focused upon Europe. Instead of devoting our time, energy, and money, and our interests to the saving of the world, we should today be devoting our charity to our own orphans, to our blind, to our ill, to our undernourished, to our unemployed, to our social fabric, to the perils that beset us here in the form of Communists, Nazis, and Fascists, who are eternally boring from within in a vicious endeavor to destroy our American democracy.

So, Mr. President, instead of going across the Atlantic to destroy nazi-ism and fascism there, I say that we should destroy nazi-ism, fascism, and communism right here in our midst. Members and agents of such forces are working night and day with the sole objective of destroying our country. Before we enter this war—that is to say, according to some, before we pass this bill—we should be careful of every step. I believe it is time for us to do some solemn thinking about this country's future in relation to the world. If we are to be a glorified sort of supersnooper, peeping through other countries' windows, then we must also be a supersoldier, fighting Britain's battles for her in the Pacific and probably the Atlantic also. We should take into consideration the consequences of the passage of the bill. With such thoughts in mind, I respectfully call to the attention of the Members of this body a paragraph from an editorial published recently in the columns of the *Charlotte Daily Observer*, of Charlotte, N. C., which reads as follows:

WARMONGERING

America must take abundant caution in these critical and hysterical times to keep its shirt on and not commit reckless and unwise acts that would virtually be tantamount to an act of war, and thus force the Axis Powers to do what they clearly wish to avoid for as long as possible, and that is to recognize the United States as an active belligerent.

That is the closing paragraph of an editorial from the *Charlotte Daily Observer*, of Charlotte, N. C., which I had inserted in the Appendix of the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* a few days ago with the unanimous consent of those present.

Mr. President, in quoting editorials from newspapers of my State only, I wish to read to the Members of this body a most excellent and timely editorial published in the columns of the *News and Observer*, a daily newspaper of Raleigh,

N. C., edited by Hon. Jonathan Daniels, son of our American Ambassador to Mexico, Hon. Josephus Daniels, former Secretary of the Navy, who is the owner and publisher of the *News and Observer*. The editorial is entitled "Without Risk of Men," and reads as follows:

"We do not need the gallant armies which are forming throughout the American Union," says Winston Churchill. "We do not need them this year, nor next year, nor any year that I can foresee." There is every reason to believe that Mr. Churchill spoke sincerely. But he spoke in a plea for aid also, a plea in which, as the spokesman of a brave people at the greatest crisis in their existence, he weighed every word he used. Without resorting to the least misrepresentation, he spoke words which he hoped would move—as his words did—listening Americans.

This suggestion, often made in America also, that America can give its treasure without risking its blood, needs examining. England does need troops from far off. If it did not, Australians would not now be fighting in North Africa. It will not soon need more men in England, but already Hitler makes disturbing motions in the Balkans toward a possible new battleground in the Near East.

If America determines to go to the aid of an assailed democracy, no fear of war will deter it. But America should not move in aid under any illusion that it can serve only with money and materials and with no risk of men. Any move toward war is a move toward men fighting—toward American armies fighting in any or every part of the world.

The people of the United States are deluding themselves if they act in the thought that they can be rescuers and stay-at-homes at the same time.

The editorial concludes:

America is in the midst of a decision making which should be made in brave recognition of danger to be gallantly faced. If we are going to save the world, we cannot count on saving our skins at the same time.

I repeat Mr. Daniels' closing paragraph in the editorial:

America is in the midst of a decision making which should be made in brave recognition of danger to be gallantly faced. If we are going to save the world, we cannot count on saving our skins at the same time.

I assert that a more prophetic or truthful or timely statement was never made by any editorial writer during these days than "if we are going to save the world, we cannot count on saving our skins at the same time." If the mothers and the fathers of America are bent upon sending forth their fine, brave sons, their flesh and blood, to conquer or reconquer portions of the world, they cannot count upon their being returned, except perhaps in death. They cannot count upon contributing continually in implements of death to those whom we are desirous of serving and at the same time save the hides of their own sons.

No Member of this body detests dictatorship any more than I do, whether it be of the Communist, Fascist, or Nazi brand; but as I have said, instead of going abroad to destroy those "isms," concerning which I have talked for hours upon the floor of this chamber, year after year, I think we should first make sure of their destruction here at home, as I have repeatedly and consistently and almost daily, over the years, advocated in

my attack upon nazi-ism, fascism, and communism.

In conclusion, I desire to state that I am not opposed to giving aid to England as is now provided under existing statutes. However, I am bitterly opposed to any subterfuge or any circumventing of the present statutes by any type of legislation such as this for which we are now being called upon to vote.

There is no Member of this body who abhors war or hates war more than I do; and I intend to do everything in my power to keep our country from becoming involved in this war. I am opposed to this bill, H. R. 1776, because I am convinced that its passage may lead us directly toward, and to, a declaration of war—and into the war.

In every county of my State and in virtually every State of the Union I have repeatedly stated that I would never vote for any bill which I thought would lead us toward war—that is why I voted against lifting the arms embargo—and that I would never vote for a war declaration that would send our men to foreign shores. Therefore, in view of those pledges and in view of the fact that I voted against lifting the arms embargo, which I thought would put us on the road to war, and which has done so, and in view of the fact that I am conscientiously of the opinion that the passage of this bill will certainly take us closer to war, and in order to maintain my consistency and carry out my pledges, I shall cast my vote against this bill. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]