

It would be criminal carelessness to pay no attention to these realities of the European situation. It is not statesmanship to let our emotions rush us to the conclusion that because Hitler and his regime are—and I say it frankly—evil, there is nothing for us to do but assist in annihilating them with bombs and artillery. Bombs and artillery will not remove the fundamental economic and social causes which produced Hitlerism.

This war is also a struggle for empire, comparable in every way to the long imperial wars by which England ousted France from world empire, and, before that, France ousted Spain. These titanic struggles are not settled in a few years, and not even by apparent victory in one war. They are conducted not only through war but also through peace; and there is no man on earth today so wise that he can know infallibly each turn to take in the maze ahead, much less know them all in advance.

In the midst of the revolutionary forces unfolding before us, it would be suicidal for us to dissipate our manpower, our resources, our democracy, in a struggle in Europe. Rather we must preserve our own institutions which at this time is a tremendous task in itself.

Not for one minute can we afford to lose sight of our American interest, our own national welfare. We may be sure that if we are not going to be jealous of our own national interest, that interest is not going to be served from London, Berlin, Paris, or Moscow.

Our national interest dictates that we stay out—all the way out—of the European mess, her own mess; a mess of her own making; that we decline to repeat that folly of another day; that we build our own strength, fortify our own democracy, and make ourselves ready really to help Europe when, perhaps crushed and bleeding, she will need a friendly and impartial and strong hand, not of war but of peace, from the United States.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, October 14, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Thou Lover and Saviour of men, to Thee we lift our hearts in prayer and adoration. As Thou knowest us altogether, we pray that if faith overcometh the world and is the victor, endue us with that faith; if it is better to minister than to be ministered unto, give us the will to do it; if love is better than hate and will help us to bear all things and endure all things, O give us that love. Merciful Father, comfort the sick; smooth every pillow of pain and quiet those who long for the morning. Bless Thy servants who sit in these places of responsibility and opportunity and all those who labor in quiet ways in the daily rounds of uneventful duty. In the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

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

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THOMAS BRACKETT REED

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, foreign news releases are constantly reminding and bringing vivid evidence to our attention in this peace-loving and liberty-dedicated Nation of ours that legislative and parliamentary processes and

principles of government are fighting desperately for existence with their backs to the wall all over the world. The Members of this great deliberative body are fully cognizant of the vital crisis which is presented to us in this development which may well mark the most retrogressive period of the world's history.

Therefore, it is particularly appropriate at this time that the attention of the Members of this House be called to the date, October 18, which falls on Wednesday next. This date marks the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Brackett Reed, who was a Member of this body for 22 years and who was Speaker of the House for 6 years. Thomas Brackett Reed was recognized as the outstanding parliamentarian of the entire world of his time, and his memory will ever be renowned for the constructive work and for the important changes which he innovated in the parliamentary and procedural routine of this great legislative body.

It so happens that I personally shall not be able to be present on October 18, because it is necessary for me to arrange the proper observances for a ceremony in his memory in Portland, Maine, the city of his birth. At the appropriate time I shall provide for the introduction of a resolution for the supplying of a permanent memorial whereby the present generation and posterity as well may be constantly reminded of the life and public services of this great patriot. However, I should be most remiss in my duty if at this time I did not arrange for time for suitable references on the floor of this House which Members may care to make on Wednesday. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that such time as may be required may be set aside on Wednesday, October 18, for addresses in memory of the works and the life of that great statesman and American, Thomas Brackett Reed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER] asks unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the reading of the Journal and disposition of other official matters on the Speaker's table, such time as may be necessary shall be set aside for memorial services in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Brackett Reed, late a Speaker of the House of Representatives. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the reading of the Journal and disposition of business on the Speaker's desk, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of previous orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS] may be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REED of New York. Does the Chair expect that Congress will be in session on next Tuesday?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will refer that matter to the acting majority leader the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], I may say that I am quite sure it would be satisfactory on this side to adjourn from

Monday to Thursday. I suggest the gentleman inquire of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES].

The SPEAKER. There are some special orders for Wednesday next.

Mr. REED of New York. I am asking for information in order to accommodate myself.

Mr. THOMASON. I understand from the Speaker's remark just made that there is a special order for Tuesday or Wednesday.

Mr. REED of New York. I ask unanimous consent that, after the reading of the Journal and disposition of other business on the Speaker's desk, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman to the fact there is one special order pending. Mr. REED of New York. Following that speaker.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I would be willing to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and follow him.

The SPEAKER. That matter can be arranged on Tuesday between the two gentlemen as to the priority of speaking. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of previous special orders, I may be permitted to proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] concludes on Monday next, I may have 10 minutes to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the other special orders have been disposed of today, I may address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of sugar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement of fact on the effect of section 2 (a) of the proposed neutrality law on Pacific Coast States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in this month's Readers' Digest.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein one of my own highway speeches.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by me.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the special orders for today heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is that today?

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. I ask that the time be made 35 minutes instead of 30, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is it agreeable to the gentleman from Montana that the request be so modified?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

Mr. THOMASON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Montana if during the course of his remarks he will yield for questions?

Mr. THORKELSON. I have always followed that practice, and I shall be pleased to do so.

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman does expect to yield, then, during the course of his remarks today?

Mr. THORKELSON. I do.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 20 minutes.

LET US KEEP OUT OF WAR

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, history has a way of repeating itself. The human family over and over and over again repeats the mistakes of yesterday and suffers the same punishments and remorse of those who made those mistakes in the past.

I venture the statement here today that no intelligent citizen can read the history of the developments that led us into the World War in 1917 and not be shocked to the depths of his being by the exact similarity of arguments and the exact parallel of developments during the years 1914 to 1917 and those of the present time, even to the difficulties in Mexico.

In discussing here today the question of keeping the United States out of war, I want to make it clear that I am not discussing it from the standpoint of any legislation which may be pending in the United States Senate. I want to take a broader, more comprehensive view of the whole question, because in the finality we must face this fact, that if there is a will on the part of the executive department of the Government to take us into war, that fateful step may be taken in spite of all the Congress can do.

Mark you, sir, I am not here charging that the will and the motive to take us into the war exist in any part of the executive department at this time. What I am endeavoring to say is that, even though the will to stay out of war be just as sincere and intense on the part of the executive branch of the Government as it is on the part of the legislative branch, the way is still so deceptive, so full of pitfalls and allurements, that we may find ourselves in a position where we can slip over the abyss and into the conflict almost without being conscious of the events that precipitated that development.

Mr. Speaker, it is generally believed in this country today, and that belief is being nurtured and encouraged by public statements by presumably responsible individuals, that Germany did not hesitate to sink our ships before we entered the World War and while we were still at peace. The implication is always added, of course, that she would not hesitate to do so now. I have not always seen eye to eye with Gen. Hugh S. Johnson, but he rendered this country a real service when he pointed out in his newspaper column recently that the only

American ship sunk by the Germans with a loss of American lives before we severed diplomatic relations with Germany was the *Gulflight*. But as General Johnson points out, the *Gulflight* at the time she was sunk was traveling with a belligerent British convoy. Because of this fact she was fair prey under every concept of international law.

As I said a moment ago, no one can read with an open mind the history of the developments leading up to our entrance in the World War and not perceive in our present course a shocking similarity.

As the Washington Daily News pointed out recently in an editorial, the developments which preceded our entry into the last war were roughly as follows:

The war started in 1914 and at that time the question of credits to foreign belligerents arose exactly as it exists today in the 90-day clause in the legislation pending before the Senate. It is all well enough to say that the 90-day credit is the usual commercial practice in international trade, but it is not the character of dealings we engage in with belligerents at the start that seems important or dangerous. It is the character of the dealings which evolve step by step and day by day until we find ourselves enmeshed with our money and our men in a world conflict.

THE DEADLY PARALLEL

You will recall that when the war began in 1914 President Wilson proclaimed neutrality. The French sought to enlist the aid of New York bankers to float a \$100,000,000 loan in the United States. The then Secretary of State, William Jennings Bryan, acting for President Wilson, announced the doctrine that loans to belligerents would be "inconsistent with the true spirit of neutrality." He further declared "money is the worst of all contraband, because it commands everything else." In that statement Secretary of State Bryan laid down a profound truth which is just as true today as it was the day it was uttered, and which had been as true since wars began.

The New York bankers then inquired if it would be permissible to make arrangements for the French to buy American goods on credit. The then counselor of the State Department, Robert Lansing, visited the White House and succeeded in persuading the President that although "loans" might be dangerous, "credits" were different.

President Wilson made his fatal mistake at this point. He assented to this view. The Allies started buying goods from us. By September 1915 these credits had operated in such a way that Mr. Lansing, who by then had become Secretary of State, sent President Wilson a confidential letter explaining how credits had operated that current year to give us an excess of exports to Europe over our imports from Europe of about \$2,500,000,000. Secretary Lansing in gentle, diplomatic language wrote the startling news to Mr. Wilson that our foreign debtors did not have the gold to pay their debts.

He pointed out that if payment were demanded Europe would be thrown into a "general state of bankruptcy," and he further called the President's attention to the fact that in America "industrial depression, idle capital, and idle labor, numerous failures, financial demoralization, and general unrest and suffering among the laboring classes" would result.

It was then that Secretary Lansing advised President Wilson to reverse the no-loan policy. "Our financial institutions," he argued, "have the money to loan and wish to do so." He further argued that we must maintain the credit of the borrowing nations, and that the result of this maintenance of the credit of foreign belligerents would be to continue our commerce "at its present volume * * * with the consequent employment of capital and labor and national prosperity."

At this moment there rings out from my memory these words spoken by President Roosevelt before the Congress on September 21 last in this Chamber:

From a purely material point of view, what is the advantage to us in sending all manner of articles across the ocean for final processing there when we could give employment to thousands by doing it here?

In that other day, Secretary Lansing said to President Wilson:

LXXXV—25

Can we afford to let a declaration as to our conception of the true spirit of neutrality, made in the first days of the war, stand in the way of our national interest, which seems to be seriously threatened?

I might say that at this moment the administration is saying to this Congress:

Can we afford to let a declaration as to our conception of the true spirit of neutrality, the embargo on arms and munitions of war adopted in 1935, 4 years before the beginning of this war, again confirmed in 1937, stand in the way of our national interest which seems to be seriously threatened?

Mr. Speaker, we have here an exact and deadly parallel case of reasoning and argument.

In his day Mr. Lansing had his way with the President. Mr. Wilson agreed that from a purely material point of view and to continue the employment of capital and labor, it would be well to reverse the no-loans policy and maintain the credit of the borrowing belligerent nations. One month later the first \$500,000,000 Anglo-French loan was floated by a syndicate headed by J. P. Morgan & Co.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what was the next step—the next natural, inevitable, and inescapable development, one which will be repeated under like circumstances in the future? It was this:

On March 5, 1917, our Ambassador to the Court of St. James, Mr. Page, advised the State Department that a world financial crisis was imminent. He said the Allied governments had to have immediately more money than any private agency in the United States could possibly provide, and that unless the money was forthcoming the great volume of Allied purchases from the United States would "be reduced to the lowest minimum" and "there may be a world-wide panic for an indefinite period." It seemed then to him that the United States Government itself must step in and make tremendous loans to the Allies to keep them going. To do this, Ambassador Page admitted, would be tantamount to a declaration of war against Germany, but he added, "Perhaps our going to war is the only way in which our present preeminent trade position can be maintained and a panic averted."

Again we hear an echo in this Chamber, "From a purely material point of view, what is the advantage to us in sending all manner of articles across the ocean for final processing there when we could give employment to thousands by doing it here?"

THE BLACK PAGE OF HISTORY

On April 2, 1917, less than 1 month after hearing from Mr. Page, President Wilson appeared before a joint session of the Congress and asked that the Congress declare war against Germany. On April 4 the Senate assented. On April 6 the House assented and made the declaration of war effective. We then began to pour in our men and our money. All this a few months after Mr. Wilson had been reelected on the slogan, "He kept us out of war."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we all know that black page in the history of the world. We all know the lying propaganda that emanated in a false and filthy stream from both sides in the conflict. We all know the unceasing efforts brought about to get every man and every American dollar possible into the conflict. We know, too, that when our boys had poured out their blood on foreign fields, and after we had poured billions of our money into the war, and when, finally, it was ended, we were given no territory—we neither asked for nor wanted it. We were accorded no gratitude, but we were condemned because we did not get into the war sooner, because we did not send more men. Our repayment for the money loaned to the Allies was the sneering epithet, "Uncle Shylock."

Those debts are unpaid today. They stand repudiated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we went into the last war our national debt as of June 30, 1916, was \$1,225,145,000. When we declared peace with Germany our national debt, June 30, 1921, was \$23,976,250,000. If we by some awful mischance get into this present war, we will go into it with a national debt of approximately \$45,000,000,000, and no man can say what our national debt will be if and when we come out of that war. Mr. Speaker, that debt will be so stupendous, the interest on the debt so great, as to constitute an intolerable

tax burden on our people. With this in mind, let our memory go back to the day when the President was a candidate for the high office he now holds, when he truly stated, "Taxes are paid in the sweat of the man who labors." Can the man who labors continue to exist if the present tremendous tax burden he bears is doubled or tripled, as it probably will be if we permit ourselves to be beguiled into another war which does not concern us?

Mr. Speaker, all Europe will, in all probability, within the next few weeks, again be ablaze with war—the most horrible war the world has seen.

Millions of young men in the ranks will die. Millions of others with broken bodies and shattered minds will remain to become a burden to themselves and to those among whom they live. We know from what has already happened that neither the women nor the children, the old nor the young, are to be spared.

It is estimated that there were nearly 40,000,000 casualties as the result of the last World War. Murdering devices had not then been perfected to their present-day efficiency. How many more than 40,000,000 are to die or to be wrecked in mind or body because of the present war madness which has seized upon the leaders of central Europe no one can tell.

With all the world a tinder box, we Americans should let our minds review the history of the past quarter century, giving special attention to our experience in trying to "make the world safe for democracy."

Conditions and propaganda are now strangely reminiscent of those other days. Let us remember that the present war is not our war. It is a war among peoples who have been warring upon each other so long as recorded history gives us information of them. Regardless of which side wins, other wars among those nations will follow as surely as day follows night. Our participation in the present one cannot change this. We now know from our experience in the last war that the battle "to make the world safe for democracy" was instead a battle to satisfy the greed of nations, a battle to assure profits.

LET US REMEMBER

Let us remember the Versailles conference and the treaties growing out of that conference.

Let us remember that many nations were represented there, among them this Nation.

Let us remember that every nation with the sole exception of the United States of America was there with greedy hands and heart, seeking and securing indemnities and territory.

Above all, let us remember that we and we alone asked for not one cent of indemnity, not one foot of additional territory.

Let us remember that we, and we alone, asked only that the peoples of the world live at peace with one another.

Let us remember also the 40,000 American boys killed in action in that war; let us not forget the 14,000 who died of wounds received in action, of the 192,000 wounded, or the 76,000 who died of disease, accident, or other causes.

Let us remember the more than 100,000 veterans who have died since the war, many of them the victims of their service.

Let us not forget the nearly 350,000 World War veterans who today, because of disabilities arising from their service, are receiving compensation from a grateful Government.

Let us remember the 41,000,000,000 of America's hard-earned dollars that were poured into that war to bring peace and security to the peoples of the world.

Let us never forget the utter futility of all our expenditures and sacrifices.

Let us not forget that our present unemployment, our reduced standard of living, the high taxes we now pay, and must in the future pay, are largely the result of our mistaken attempt of 20 years ago to "make the world safe for democracy."

Let us remember that if we indulge in another adventure into Old World intrigues and wars the price we will pay for that insanity will make the price we have paid, are now paying, and must in the future pay for the last one seem modest, indeed.

Let us understand once and for all that we can stay out of the present European war if we have the will to do so. Let us not be misled by the propaganda that will flood the country in the months to come. Let us just remember that we cannot correct the evils, the selfishness of individuals and of other nations, try as we will.

We can, however, preserve the peace of this country. That is our big job. We can accomplish this if we keep our heads and remember the priceless teachings of history.

ISSUES OF LIFE AND DEATH

Mr. Speaker, the issues here are the issues of life and death for millions of our men and women. The issues here are the issues of the continuity or the utter ruin of our great American experiment of a constitutional republic. The issues here are the issues of our entire economy. They are the issues of chaos and suffering, and a return to the law of the jungle, and the utter destruction of civilization as we now know it.

These are the issues, Mr. Speaker, which confront us, and I say to you this is no time for a veneer of politeness. It is no time for soft words and pleasing sentences. It is no time to close our eyes to realities. The time is here for the people of this Nation to look these stark, horrifying facts in the face and determine how best we can stay aloof from the conflicts of continental Europe, and of the Far East, and maintain our own Nation in civilization in some semblance of peace and prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to refer to my own personal history in this matter any more than to say that I volunteered to serve this Nation in two wars. By reason of that fact I think I may say that I cannot be justly accused of being a peace-at-any-price advocate, but I say to you that not only is peace the wisest course, but it is the cheapest course, and whatever material price in dollars and cents we pay in trade for staying out of this war will be a far cheaper price than we will have to pay for getting into it—and that to say nothing of the cost in human lives, human suffering, wrecked bodies and minds, widowed mothers, and orphaned children.

It is time for plain talk. By that I do not mean acrimonious debate, partisan disputations, or personal abuse. I concede that men may honestly differ in their views as to how best we may stay out of war, but I do not concede that there is any valid argument as to why we should get into this war, or any foreign war.

Let us not delude ourselves. You know and I know that if this war continues the pressure that will be brought to bear upon us to get into it will be intense beyond conception. All sorts of incidents, so-called, such as the sinking of some of our ships or the destruction of property of nationals, will be perpetrated, either by those who wish to blame such things on the enemy and land us in on their side or by the nationals and soldiers of those countries which hate us.

YOU AND I KNOW

You and I know, Mr. Speaker, that there will be pressure applied to this country to grant credits to foreign countries. You and I know, Mr. Speaker, that if those credits are granted they will never be repaid to us any more than the now defaulted war debts of the last war have been paid.

You and I know, Mr. Speaker, that when we get our money in in the form of loans and credits, then will come again the plea, the cry of desperation, as it came in 1917, that our creditors are bankrupt, and that if we ever expect to get our money back we must send our men in.

You and I know, Mr. Speaker, that if that ruse does not work there will come again, as in 1917, the cry that England and France are being beaten to their knees, and that as soon as they are conquered the Huns will be ravaging the shores of America.

You and I know, Mr. Speaker, that if we put our men and money into this conflict, if civilization survives at all, we will get out of the war precisely what we got out of the last one—nothing but abuse, hatred, ingratitude, and repudiation of what they owe us.

If it were possible for the United States to get into this war and actually fight a war to end all wars, or actually fight a war to make the world safe for democracy, and if those ends

could be accomplished thereby, we might then consider entering the conflict in spite of its enormous cost in blood and treasure. But, Mr. Speaker, I challenge any Member of this body to rise in his place and show any evidence whatever that will prove, or even indicate, that our going into this war will have any effect in making the world safe for democracy or even with putting an end to the thousands of years of quarrels and wars of the peoples of continental Europe.

Anyone who will study fairly and open-mindedly the distribution of minorities in the countries of Europe will be convinced of that which the foreign diplomats have always known and now know, namely, that Europe has problems which have never arisen in America, which never will arise in America, and which we cannot even understand, because they are so entirely remote from our geographical, our social, our religious, our political, and our economic concepts and conditions in the United States of America.

Of course, nobody at this particular moment will admit they want us to get into this war. I do not intend to discuss this phase of the question today, but I leave to your own common sense and judgment as to whether or not there are elements—and not inconsiderable elements—who do want us to get into this war for a variety of reasons.

Already we are beginning to hear the complaint that if we keep American ships out of the danger zones that more than a half of our tonnage must be tied up at the docks.

THE COST OF WAR

Mr. Speaker, I say to you that it is not only stupid, but it is criminal to attempt to measure our possible economic participation in this war in terms of profits. There is no such thing as war profits for any country or for the nationals of any country. What war and the destruction of war do not take while the war is going on, necessary taxation after the war will consume. For every dollar anybody can make out of the war the tax gatherer will in the future take a hundred or more.

Let me quote you a few figures from the last war.

The estimated money cost of the World War to the United States Government to June 30, 1934, was more than forty-one and one-half billions of dollars, as shown by the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934. Of course, the cost of the last war is not ended by any manner or means and will not be ended until the last individual two- or three-score years hence ceases to draw a pension.

Not only did the war cost us that much in dollars for actual outlay, but the World War was responsible for the depression, which has cost the people of this country far more than the actual cost during the conflict.

Think of this, Mr. Speaker: More than 5,000,000 men and women died in the World War on the side of the Allies. Including the fatalities among the Central Powers, more than 8,500,000 human beings were butchered to death. Almost 13,000,000 men and women were wounded on the Allied side during the war, and, with those of the Central Powers, a total of more than 21,000,000 human beings had their bodies blasted or their minds wrecked, or both, for the rest of their lives. The total casualties of the last war, Mr. Speaker, as of June 1928, were nearly 37,500,000 people, and nobody knows how many more would be disclosed if a toll had been taken of the civilian population and those who died through fear and grief were charged up to that war. Sherman said, "War is hell." Why, Mr. Speaker, war is a double concentrated essence of hell, and we want none of it.

WE MUST BE ON OUR GUARD

We must be on our guard in this Nation that the blaring of bands and the waving of flags and the lofty platitudes of the orators and the emotionalism aroused by cunning propaganda do not blind us to that awful toll of nearly 40,000,000 casualties. The human costs and the more than forty-one and one-half billion-dollar costs to our Nation alone, out of which this country got nothing but misery, agony, disillusionment, hatreds, and now another war.

I want for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to consider the favorite theme song of the pro-war propagandists. They keep telling

us over and over and over again that unless we go to the assistance of the British Empire and France and her colonial possessions in this war that Germany will beat the Allies to their knees, require them to turn over their naval and air fleets, and man and gun power, and that immediately after those victories the Germans will be shelling the cities on our shores and will be at work reducing us to a state of vassalage. Poppycock! I would like to ask if there is a Member of this body who believes any such poppycock as that. Why, Mr. Speaker, in a finish fight between the British Empire and France on the one side, and Germany, Russia, and even Italy on the other, the final result probably will be stalemate with all the belligerents bled so white of manpower and money power, and with their peoples so utterly bereft of morale, that all of them combined could not, as Lincoln once said, "Take a drink from the Ohio River or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of a thousand years."

If we intend to help a bewildered and dazed world back onto the highway of sanity, peace, good will, and prosperity, the only way in which we can do it is to stay out of this war, be prepared in kindness and brotherly love to bind up the wounds of the war-torn nations, and, above all, make democracy work so well in this Nation that those peoples cursed by the rule of dictators will want our kind of democracy too.

WHAT IS WAR?

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say to you that when we talk of going to war we are talking about sending the flower of our manhood and womanhood into foreign fields and trenches, into the hell of mud and slime, and the stench of death and decomposing mangled bodies hanging on barbed wire while vermin feast upon the bodies of the living and trench rats feast upon the bodies of the dead. That is what we mean, I say, when we talk of war. Mr. Speaker, the flags are beautiful as they wave in the breeze while thousands of uniformed young Americans with the rhythm of marching feet pass in review. The music of the martial band is inspiring and beautiful, the call of the massed bugles is beautiful in the autumn air, the cheers and the tears are all romantic, but, sir, war is not blaring bands, it is not waving flags, it is not clean, bright-faced uniformed boys marching rhythmically in parade.

War, Mr. Speaker, is the utter fatigue of sleepless nights; it is the utter misery of cold and wet and muddy trenches; it is the gnawing hunger that goes for days unfed; it is the miasmatic stench rising from the mud and mangled bodies of man and beast in the no-man's land of the battlefields. It is orphaned children. It is widowed mothers. It is bereft parents. It is men gone insane with hatred, fear, and suffering while God's sunlight is blotted out from the battlefields by the smoke of belching cannon and bursting bombs.

That, Mr. Speaker, is war; and again I say we want none of it. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SUGAR

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, what I shall have to say in the next few minutes will probably not be of interest to anyone of you here except those who represent sugar-beet-growing areas and who believe in diversification of the beet-sugar culture as it is woven into the farm operations of this country.

My remarks have to do with a piece of Government propaganda which was released in the form of a Consumer's Guide bulletin under date of June 1939, page 11, in an article entitled "A Quiz on Ice Cream." The particular language to which I refer is this:

The Federal Government's buying specifications require that ice cream contain at least 12 percent butterfat, at least 16 percent of sucrose (cane sugar), and not more than one-half of 1 percent high-grade gelatin.

The insistence on cane sugar is aimed at the possible substitution of other kinds of sugar for cane. The other varieties are less sweet than sucrose, and therefore must be used in larger amounts. Ice cream made from these other sugars must be kept at lower temperatures.

Mr. Speaker, this case now before us shows how highly destructive a Government propaganda agency can be to our individual free enterprise, upon which the Government depends for its revenues to carry on the activities of government itself. In this case the bureau in question is acting as a consumers' counsel, telling the consumer what to do. It issues a cold-blooded statement which in no way squares with the facts, and the effect of the statement destroys the productive interest of one group in favor of another group which may or may not have closer contact with agency of propaganda. If counsel is to be given, then that counsel must stick to the facts and at no time be controlled by a given branch of industry and thus give service to one group and at the same time destroy another group.

This agency, functioning as a branch of Government, had access to all of the facts. There was no reason for acting in the realm of doubt. The experts could be reached by telephone or by personal contact; and, as a matter of fact, I have been informed that some of the experts actually reviewed the language before the release was made. If this be true, it only emphasizes the importance of what I have said.

I defy the Consumers' Counsel, or any of the others on his staff, which intermingles New Deal propaganda with data in articles bearing titles bound to attract general public interest, to show me anything in the Federal Government's buying specifications which require cane sugar in the manufacture of ice cream or to show me where the word "cane" appears in the specifications.

I hold here in my hand the Federal Government's buying specifications, more correctly identified as EE-I-116a, being the Federal Standard Stock Catalog on Federal specifications for ice cream, sherberts, and ices.

The catalog, which is current, and which I obtained from the Procurement Division of the Treasury today, was issued on April 20, 1939, and the article did not appear until June 1939. If the Consumers' Guide wanted to present the facts, why did not they get a copy of the specifications; or, if they did possess a copy, why did not they print the truth?

Ice cream specifications are given in paragraph E entitled "Detailed Requirements." It states this, which does not conform to the statements I have just read from the Consumer's Guide:

Ice cream shall be the pure, clean frozen product made from sweet cream, milk or milk products, sugar and harmless flavoring, with or without certified food color, with or without gelatin and/or other edible stabilizers, and with or without eggs. Flavors may include vanilla, chocolate or cocoa, caramel, almond, coffee, mint, maple, butterscotch, or other approved flavors; fruits may include strawberries, pineapples, peaches, cherries, bananas, figs, raspberries, or other approved fruits; nuts may include walnuts, almonds, filberts, chestnuts, pistachio, or other approved nuts; and confections may include macaroons, sponge cake, marshmallows, candy, etc.; as may be called for in the invitation for bids. The flavor of the finished products shall be pleasing and characteristic of the flavor specified in the invitation for bids. The finished product shall contain not less than 14 percent by weight of sugar—

And so on. Compare these notes when you have access to the RECORD, and see the absolutely erroneous information and the misrepresentation of fact which is contained in the Consumer's Guide. This bulletin is issued by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and paid for by the taxpayers of the United States, including those who farm in the sugar-beet growing areas of the Northwest and the Central West.

Going on to some of these other specifications, I now refer to Federal Standard Stock Catalog Z-P-631 of March 31, 1931, giving detailed requirements with reference to preserves, fruit, which, according to this catalog, "shall be made from not less than 45 percent fruit, and not more than 55 percent sugar (sucrose)."

Nothing is said about cane sugar.

Catalog Z-P-191 of May 26, 1931, dealing with canned peaches, states:

Cans shall be well filled with fruit, which shall be packed in clear sugar (sucrose) sirup testing not less than 24° Brix at time of cut-out at a temperature of 60° F.

Nothing is said about cane sugar.

Catalog JJJ-S-791 of March 31, 1931, dealing with sugar, beet or cane, for use by the Army, Navy, and other Govern-

ment departments, under the heading "Material and Workmanship," states:

Shall be a pure product obtained only from sugarcane or sugar beets, and manufactured under modern sanitary conditions. Shall be free from any deleterious material or contamination from any source.

The Government standards call for sugar, beet or cane. There is no discrimination between the two commodities.

Standard Stock Catalog Z-J-191, of March 31, 1931, covering jellies, fruit, states this, and these are specifications of the purchasing departments of the Government:

TYPE, VARIETIES, AND GRADE

Jelly shall be of the type prepared from fruit juice (or, where applicable, strained water extract) and sugar (sucrose), in approximately equal proportions of such fruit juice (or strained water extract, when applicable) and sugar (sucrose).

Nothing is said about cane sugar as against beet sugar.

The War Department does not differentiate between cane and beet sugar when it purchases sugar for the use of the Army. It merely advertises for sugar. The same is true in the Navy Department. Their specifications can be, and are, met by both beet and cane sugar.

I have had the research division of the Library of Congress searching for some official evidence that cane sugar is better for ice cream than beet, or for any other general purpose. They could not find such a report but on the contrary advised me authorities in the Bureau of Home Economics of the Department of Agriculture informed them there was no difference in the food value.

The Food and Drug Administration, now formulating ice-cream standards, informs me beet and cane alike qualify for ice-cream standards.

In another bulletin published by the Department of Agriculture, Farmers' Bulletin No. 1637, we find this language at the very beginning of the bulletin:

Sucrose, the sugar of commerce and kitchen, is extracted from the tissues of the sugar beet and the sugarcane. Whichever plant it comes from, the product, when pure, is identical in all properties and for all purposes.

A recent study has just been released by the United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering, made by Mr. E. K. Ventre and Mr. S. Byall and Mr. H. Hall. These studies were put into operation several years ago. It was my good fortune to have a part in establishing the studies. They are highly technical and of interest to research students and those who are engaged in manufacturing that which requires the technical use of sugar.

The American Canners' Association have laid down specifications as to the type of sugars that will meet their requirements for the canning of fruits and vegetables, and in quoting from this report I shall show the specifications which they have published for manufacturers of sugar with reference to the total aerobic thermophilic spores that may be contained in sugar sold for the use of canners.

For the 5 samples examined there shall be a maximum of not more than 150 spores and an average of not more than 125 spores per 10 grams of sugar.

For the aerobic flat sour spores—and, incidentally, these spores are the things that cause spoilage in fruits and vegetables after they are canned—of the 5 samples examined, there shall be a maximum of not more than 75 spores and an average of not more than 50 spores per 10 grams of sugar.

For the anaerobic sulfide spoilage spores there shall be present in not more than two—40 percent—of the five samples and in any one sample to the extent of not more than five spores per 10 grams of sugar.

For the anaerobic thermophilic hard swell spores there shall be present in not more than three—60 percent—of the five samples and in any one sample to the extent of not more than four—65-plus percent—tubes—method for testing.

This has to do with the method of testing.

This report, which was published as late as August 1939, deals specifically with tables on pages 11 and 12 of the report and shows that out of 77 samples of beet sugars drawn that with reference to the flat sour spores 43 samples do not even show a trace, although the canners' specifications provide

there may be up to 75 spores, or an average of not more than 50 spores for 10 grams of sugar.

Therefore with the thermophilic spores test and the aerobic spores test and the anaerobic spores test all samples met the test with the exception of three samples. They were Nos. 3816, 3835, and 3867.

Those who are familiar with the technical use of sugar know very well that these spores often get into the sugar after the sugar leaves the factory.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is it not a fact that the American white sugar is more highly refined than imported white sugar?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; that is true because of the methods used in purifying and in processing; that is, extracting the sugar from the cane juice, because your imported sugars are brought from sugarcane areas.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. And the gentleman is speaking now of white sugar?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am talking about white sugars; yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. With respect to those numbers the gentleman refers to, the gentleman does not know whether that is imported sugar or whether it is American sugar?

Mr. CRAWFORD. These numbers I am dealing with today are strictly beet sugars.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Then let me ask the gentleman this question: There is then a differential, and we do have a more highly refined sugar than the imported white sugar; and is that differential taken into consideration in fixing the tariff on imported sugars?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not believe it is, because the purification test on the imported white sugars from the offshore areas as tied into the tariff law, in my opinion, does not cover that fine point. As you step up the degree of purity in your raw sugars that are imported into the country under your tariff laws you will find that that is taken care of. In other words, it costs more to refine the white sugar that is turned out—that is the grade I mean—from the beet-sugar mill as set forth in this analysis than it would cost to turn that sugar out if it met only the purification characteristics of the imported white sugar that comes in from our offshore areas. So to that extent I would say that the gentleman's position is correct, and that that is something that should be taken into consideration in the wording of a tariff law.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. And that leads to another question. We could reasonably infer, then, that it is costing us more to refine our sugar than it is the sugar refined in the countries from which we import sugar.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In the offshore areas, yes; because of the method used in the process.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does the gentleman consider that an important factor to be taken into consideration?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do; because the theory of your tariff is to provide for the difference in the cost of production. You might say, What causes that? In the islands they use the vegetable-filtering compound, while in the seacoast refineries they use the bone char filtering compound. The initial cost of putting in the bone-char equipment is so much greater than for putting in the vegetable-filtering equipment that it enters into the proposition from the standpoint of fixed capital. You can renew your supply of vegetable-filtering compound, I believe, for less cost than you can renew your bone-char filtering compound.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. CLEVINGER. If we were to step over to one of our Connecticut Avenue shops and buy some of their most expensive imported confectionery or some food, would that be made of cane or of beet sugar?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The chances are 99 out of 100 it would be made from beet sugar, and here is the reason for that. Back about 1812 Napoleon established the beet-sugar industry in France, and made it an obligation on the part of the

people to produce beet sugar and to consume it. That went on up to the point where they exported it. So did Germany. Germany developed a great beet-sugar industry.

Mr. CLEVINGER. And millions of those people have never tasted cane sugar.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Tens of millions of people in central Europe have never seen a pound of cane sugar, because it is practically commercially prohibited from coming into all of the beet-sugar areas of Europe. They have produced a great deal of sugar and they have exported lots of sugar.

Mr. CLEVINGER. So that beet sugar has met the test, thousands of them, from the candy manufacturers and the ice-cream manufacturers to everyone else.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; from the candy and ice-cream manufacturers and the vegetable canners and the confection manufacturers, and so on down the list, and any technical man who takes a report of this kind and studies it sees immediately why it does meet the test, and in the years gone by I have gone into the laboratories of the manufacturers and consumers of sugar all over the State of Ohio and worked with them on this very problem. I have gone into some places where the manufacturer said, "I cannot use your beet sugar at all." And where did he get that idea? He got it from the propaganda put out, and which was just as highly destructive to the beet-sugar industry as this article here is. I should say this in justice to the Department. They have today admitted to me that this is an erroneous statement, and they state that they propose to correct it, and they should correct it; but this shows how you have to guard the operations of these departments when they start putting out propaganda in behalf of Government bureaus and Government operations.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Would the gentleman say that this is just another piece of the age-long struggle to stigmatize beet sugar that we face today in the sugar-growing areas and have for years?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think it is a continuation of it, and you might say, for instance, that the cane-sugar people did not write that article. I do not say they did, but somewhere in the past there was planted in the mind of the person who did write this article the thought that beet sugar is not sucrose, because this article says that the insistence on cane sugar is aimed at the possible substitution of other kinds of sugar for cane, and that the other varieties are less sweet than sucrose. It brings up a technical proposition there and says, in substance, that beet sugar is not sucrose.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Could you tell us specifically who wrote the article?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I cannot give you the name of the party. However, Miss Mary Taylor, editor of Consumers' Guide, frankly admitted this morning the article was prepared in the Department and that the copy was read by some of the so-called authorities in the Department before it went to press.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. But it is somebody from the Department?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes. You can find out exactly who wrote the article by calling the Consumers' Guide Department down there.

As a further example of the apparently consistent effort which is being made by Government bureaus and agencies to destroy the sugar industry of the continental United States, I wish at this time to refer to Bulletin SI-1, entitled "Sugar Beets and the Sugar Act," released on or about the 16th of last July. Its contents consisted of such a vicious attack upon the domestic beet-sugar industry that it became necessary for the Department of Agriculture to suppress it and stop all distribution of the bulletin before the 22d of the month in which it was released. Let me point out, however, that the distribution was not stopped until political pressure from the sugar beet growing areas was brought to bear on the administration. Such steps on the part of Government are a continuation of the program which has been operating

in this country in recent years and which results in a weakening of the private-enterprise system upon which the Government necessarily depends for its revenue. It should be clear to everyone that democracy as we comprehend it cannot exist without our private-enterprise system. The progressive weakening of the private-enterprise system paves the way for a substitution of bureaucratic despotism for the free economy which we have heretofore enjoyed.

Now, here is a further illustration of what is going on. Here is a speech given by Mr. Thurman W. Arnold, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, before the National Petroleum Association. You know, they say sugar and oil do not mix, but they mixed in this case. This was on September 13, 1939, Hotel Traymore, Atlantic City, N. J.

The Assistant Attorney General, in my opinion, went far out of his way to sock the beet-sugar industry right on the head when he made this presentation. Now, remember, this was about the time we were all getting excited a few days ago in connection with advancing prices.

Mr. Arnold says:

To give you an idea of the temper of the people today, I will read a few of these wires, selected at random.

Those are wires that had been sent to the Department about catching the profiteers:

Here is one from the treasurer of a small manufacturing company:

"Profiteering seems to have gotten off to a rapid start with sugar refiners accepting no business and local jobbers asking ridiculous prices. * * * As manufacturers using a fair amount of sugar we are being severely penalized. * * * I believe you in a position to remedy this unfortunate situation."

Here is one from a farmers' union—

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PACE). The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is discussing a very important subject and I ask unanimous consent that his time may be extended an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore granted, the gentleman from Montana is entitled to recognition.

Mr. THORKELOSON. I will be glad to take my time after the gentleman has finished.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio that the time of the gentleman from Michigan be extended 10 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then the Assistant Attorney General proceeds to quote another telegram:

Request the Department of Justice to make immediate investigation as to the reason for the sharp advance in prices of sugar. * * * In Michigan local merchants and wholesale grocers complain that they cannot secure sugar from the sugar refineries only in very limited quantities. This being canning season both consumers and producers of vegetables are compelled to suffer. * * * We appeal to you for help in the interests of both producers of fruits and vegetables, and consumers.

Well, what was the situation then? We had a quota law in operation in this country. Friends of mine throughout the country had their warehouses filled with sugar, but the quota law specified that those sugars should not be sold until subsequent to the opening of business January 1, 1940. Of course, the average fellow who did not know the details would assume that if my friend from Iowa, for example, Mr. GILCHRIST, had a warehouse full of sugar and did not offer it for sale, that he was trying to profiteer; but he was carrying out the orders of the United States Government. That grew so bad until planned economy, functioning through Secretary Wallace and the President, canceled the quota law, which they had a right to do. When the quota law was canceled sugar began to move; but the Assistant Attorney General and the Department of Justice, knowing those facts, come along and throw out the impression that all you have got out in the State of Michigan, where I live, is a bunch of sugar racketeers, trying to profiteer on the people of the country. It is not true, of course.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. CLEVINGER. In substantiation of what the gentleman has just stated, one of the sugar plants in my district was given a quota as low as 4.74 percent of their last year's production, and no one less than 9 percent. The livelihood of more than 3,000 farmers in my district depends upon sugar. They were allowed to sell less than 9 percent in my district. I give you that in confirmation of what you are saying.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Thank you. This brings down to date conclusive evidence of my opinion that planned economy cannot partly function successfully. If you have planned economy, you have to have it 100 percent. Here is a case where planned economy, put into operation by this Congress, through Government officials, was one or two weeks behind the psychological reaction of our people to the war situation wherein the people wanted to buy. They wanted to buy, and the stocks were not available, because they were tied up in warehouses under the quota law. After the pressure became so great out in the country and people sent in their telegrams to the Department of Justice charging racketeering and profiteering, then planned economy comes along and functions and says, "Let us erase the quota"; but it comes too late.

The harm is already done, according to the Department of Justice, because—I repeat, quoting Mr. Arnold—"it has already taken millions in tribute and has already embarrassed thousands of small-business men." You cannot pull the trigger fast enough. If you are going to have private enterprise on the one hand, you cannot have a successfully operated planned economy at the same time, and this case proves it, in my opinion.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact that sugar is an essential part of our national defense, and that in America we produce less than one-third of the sugar we consume?

Mr. CRAWFORD. When the gentleman says "America," I take it he means the continental United States.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Yes; continental United States.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. And is it not a fact that taking advantage of the American people during the last World War the Cuban sugar monopoly raised the price of sugar so that our American consumers had to pay as high as 35 cents a pound?

Mr. CRAWFORD. It resulted in that price being paid by the consumers in this country for refined sugar.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. In view of this fact and the new European war, should not the Congress enact legislation to repeal the existing New Deal sugar laws which are adverse to our American sugar producers and consumers, and adverse to a proper American national defense? The New Deal sugar program is beneficial to the great Cuban sugar monopoly which is an important power behind the throne of the New Deal, and which has its spokesmen firmly entrenched in the Government departments. Our American markets should be preserved for our American sugar producers to the full limit of their capacity to supply it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Here is an illustration, referring again to Mr. Arnold's statement: There is nothing in this statement which referred to the fact that on the outbreak of the war the other day Cuba withdrew from the markets of the United States. Come over to my office and I will show you the market reports which are the accepted bibles of the trade. Cuba withdrew from the United States market; and bear in mind that we depend upon Cuba under this control system the gentleman just referred to for, in round figures, 2,000,000 tons of our annual sugar supply. Cuba, of course, has the technical, legal right to withdraw from the market; but where does it put the consumers of sugar in this country when Cuba does withdraw? It subjects them to such exploitation as may develop under the withdrawal from the market. If England and France bid a higher price for raw sugar in Cuba than you bid, you do not get the Cuban raw

sugar. Cuba can sit there today and play the United States against England and France. She is already doing this, and the price of raw sugar is beginning to work up and up and up; and, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has pointed out, during the last war the price of raw sugar worked up to where it reached \$23.50 per 100 pounds and refined sugar went up to \$35 per 100 pounds on the consumers' table in the central West. I paid \$35 for a 100-pound bag myself, and I was in the business at the time, but the domestic supply was exhausted, and I had to pay that to get it. This illustrates what Cuba can do under the present situation.

The gentleman from Wisconsin asked me if I were in favor of correcting the law so that the farmers of the United States can grow such sugar beets and such sugarcane as they desire to grow toward filling our sugar needs. Is that the gentleman's question?

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. That is the exact question. Such a principle is a true American principle. It is about time the representatives of the American people thought of America and Americans first instead of a bunch of international sugar racketeers in foreign lands.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Especially if there is going to be a 3- or 4-year war ahead of us in Europe.

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. The price of sugar might then go to 50 cents a pound if we permit the New Deal to continue to serve the Cuban sugar monopoly and help it strangle our own American sugar producers.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We should begin to think of where we are going to get our own needs supplied.

Mr. GILCHRIST. If the gentleman will permit an interruption, I believe he has not answered the other question yet.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman for reminding me. I am in favor of correcting our law so that the American people under the American flag—that means Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, continental United States—beet and cane—can grow such sugar as they want to grow for the American market. Then if we have not got enough let foreign countries supply the balance.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. GILCHRIST. What does the gentleman say about our duty toward Cuba? Do we owe a duty to the Cuban people as a result of the Spanish-American War, that we entered into to rescue those people from the terrible conditions then existing in that island? Do we still have the duty we then assumed; does that duty still exist on our part to protect the Cuban people economically?

Mr. CRAWFORD. If we are to construe that situation as a moral responsibility or duty, or some form of charity, then I think we should go at it on a constructive basis and bring about conditions that will induce—and, if necessary, use a little bit of economic force—induce the Cuban people to diversify their agricultural operations and cease to rely upon a strictly one-crop economy, namely, sugar. I think our situation in Puerto Rico could be greatly relieved if we would have the Puerto Ricans diversify their agricultural operations. But Puerto Rico is our territory. But as long as you let Cuba and the Philippines continue as one-crop islands, you might say, or set of islands, dependent upon the United States sugar market, somebody is going to suffer, either in the continental United States or in those islands, and the chances are that the poor people in the islands will do most of the suffering because of the exploitation of absentee-ownership operation on a one-crop economy. So we have probably a moral responsibility to use our efforts in correcting the very thing we have helped to build. We also have poor people here in this country—farm families, if you please, whose total gross income amounts to less than \$500 yearly for the entire family. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein excerpts from Government publications.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by printing a speech made by a former Member of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKEKELSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman begins his remarks, I wonder if he would yield for a question or two by me?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman in the course of the remarks to which he expects to address himself today. I rise at this time to make an inquiry, more than anything else. I observe from the daily RECORD that on Wednesday, October 11, beginning at page 598, there appears six small-typed pages of an extension of remarks by the gentleman from Montana, purporting to be a letter signed by Col. E. M. House, and addressed to the Right Honorable David Lloyd George, from the British consulate in New York City on June 10, 1919, in which Colonel House, in effect, proposed, as the gentleman from Montana suggests, an "invisible government" for world domination. May I ask the gentleman if this is the late Col. Edward M. House, of Texas, and one time an intimate of President Wilson?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. That is who it is supposed to be; yes.

Mr. THOMASON. Supposed to be? Does the gentleman have positive information that it is the same Colonel House?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. What does the gentleman mean by "positive information"?

Mr. THOMASON. I do not mean to question the good faith of the gentleman, but, having known Colonel House more or less casually and quite well by reputation, I am anxious to know the authenticity of this letter.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I think if the gentleman will read the letter, if he will review the things that happened since the letter was written and what happened before the war; if he will take into consideration that the Prince of Wales was over here dancing around after the war, as stated in that letter; and if he will take other things into consideration, I think he will find that the letter is authentic in the manner it is written.

Mr. THOMASON. Will the gentleman state for the benefit of the Members of the House, many of whom have serious doubts about the authenticity of the letter, from what source he obtained the letter and what evidence he has of its authenticity?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. The gentleman may read the letter and draw his own conclusions.

Mr. THOMASON. I have read the letter with amazing and unusual interest. Knowing Colonel House and his life work in a way, I, along with many of my colleagues from Texas and, I believe, many of my colleagues in the House have serious doubt about the authenticity of the letter, and I therefore would welcome the gentleman placing in the RECORD some evidence of its authenticity.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. The letter has been published. The letter, of course, does not itself refer particularly to England. It refers to the power that rules England. Let me give the gentleman a little history.

Mr. THOMASON. Does the gentleman have the original of this letter?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. No; I have not.

Mr. THOMASON. Can the gentleman tell me if the original did bear the date line "British Consulate at New York City" and if it was signed "Col." E. M. House?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I presume it does.

Mr. THOMASON. Does the gentleman have any evidence of that fact?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. No.

Mr. THOMASON. Will the gentleman furnish to the House some evidence of the authenticity of this letter?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. May I refer you to the American Publishing Society, Bremerton, Wash.

Mr. THOMASON. I do not mean to trespass upon the gentleman's time, but may I say in that connection that Colonel House is not here to defend himself, and I think a rank injustice may have been done a very distinguished citizen.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. It is not a rank injustice. I do not care if the man who wrote that letter came from Texas or anywhere else.

Mr. THOMASON. But he was a great American citizen, and it is the rankiest kind of an injustice if this is not a genuine letter signed by him. I want to know if Col. E. M. House signed this letter, and if the gentleman will be kind enough to furnish to the House evidence of that fact. I do not know whether it is his genuine signature or not, but I do not hesitate for one minute in saying that I have very serious doubt about it. I think, in view of that doubt, the gentleman ought to furnish evidence of its genuineness and its authenticity to the House, and I will ask him if he will not do so.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. The fact remains that the history in that letter speaks for itself.

Mr. THOMASON. I am not speaking of the contents of the letter. I want to know if Col. E. M. House signed this letter.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I did not see Colonel House sign the letter, but the letter contains factual history which proves itself, and the publishers who published this letter employ the following title:

British Secret Service Report, 1919. The answer to all questions about how, when, and who caused America, "the richest nation on earth," to have a depression.

Mr. THOMASON. Will the gentleman say that he has evidence that Colonel House did sign the letter or that there ever existed a genuine, bona fide letter of that kind that was signed by the late Colonel House?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I do not know that positively; no.

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman will not say that it is genuine, then?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. No; except as far as history speaks within the letter itself.

As one reads this letter, the importance of it stands out boldly, for many of the incidents mentioned in the letter are known to us today. We know we have a world movement for an international government which was actually supposed to be started in the League of Nations. It failed because we did not support this plan in the United States. When we consider the means of propagandizing the United States as set forth in this letter, the letter itself becomes even more significant, because we know the very things which are mentioned in this communication actually have happened in the United States; and the peculiar thing is that it is happening again today. As I said following the letter, disregard the source and destination, and I meant that. It is not a question of reflecting on the personalities of any individual, but is instead a synopsis of events during and since the World War. Many of us are familiar with these events, and the value of the letter may be found in this knowledge.

I am somewhat familiar with this movement, as it began with the life of Cecil Rhodes, and was later taken up by the Carnegie Foundation. Reference to that, of course, may be found in many publications.

The serious plight of England in 1916 is known today. For the success of the Entente, it became very important that the United States join that war, not only in order to sustain credit which had been extended to the powers, but also to join them actively with manpower. There was little interest in this in the United States at that time, and none before.

I shall now quote from page 6, *World Jewry*, for February 22, 1935:

BALFOUR DECLARATION—SECRET FACTS REVEALED

In fact, the British and French Governments had entered into a secret pact, known as the Sykes-Picot Treaty, from the names of the representatives of the parties—Sir Mark Sykes and M. Georges Picot—for the purpose of dividing Palestine, giving the

northern half to France and the southern to England. In this pact there is no suggestion of any Jewish interest in Palestine.

That was the situation in the late summer of 1916, when Sir Mark Sykes, then Under Secretary of the War Cabinet (with Amery and Ormsby-Gore), held a conversation with Mr. James Malcolm, a member of the Armenian National Delegation who was of such invaluable help to the British Government in eastern affairs.

Sir Mark told Malcolm that the War Cabinet was greatly disturbed at the failure, up to that time, of all efforts to enlist the practical sympathy and help of the United States. The French Government had sent a special emissary, without success. Italy had tried to use the influence of powerful Italian citizens in the United States of America, but to no avail. He had thought of enlisting the substantial Jewish influence in the United States, but had been unable to do so.

The leaders of Anglo-Jewry, lay and clerical, whom he had seen, did not seem able to give him effective help. It might be that the Jewish hatred of Czarist Russia was so strong as to make it impossible for American Jews to be other than pro-German.

Malcolm informed Sykes that there was a way to make American Jews thoroughly pro-Ally, and he knew of a man in America who was probably the most intimate friend of President Wilson. Through that man, if through anybody, the President's mind could be turned toward active participation in the war on the side of the Allies.

ZIONIST MOVEMENT AS THE KEY

Malcolm said further: "You are going the wrong way about it. The well-to-do English Jews you meet and the Jewish clergy are not the real leaders of the Jewish people. You have forgotten the existence of the principle of nationality. * * * Do you know of the Zionist movement?"

Sir Mark Sykes admitted comparative ignorance of Zionism, and Malcolm continued: "You can win the sympathy of Jews everywhere in one way only, and that way is by offering to try and secure Palestine for them. * * *"

Sir Mark, thinking of the Sykes-Picot Treaty, said that such a move was impossible. Malcolm insisted that there was no other way, and urged a Cabinet discussion. A day or two later Sykes told him that the matter had been mentioned to Lord Milner, at that time a very influential member of the war Cabinet, who had asked for further information. Malcolm pointed out the influence of Judge Brandeis, of the American Supreme Court, and his strong Zionist sympathies. If Sir Mark Sykes could obtain from the war Cabinet an assurance that help would be given toward securing Palestine for the Jews, it was certain that Jews in all neutral countries, especially the United States, would become pro-British and pro-Ally.

The Cabinet could not give any definite promise, but advised Malcolm to open negotiations with the Zionist leaders. This, Malcolm said, was impossible, as he could not go to them empty handed. It would be sufficient if Malcolm were convinced of the sincerity of the Cabinet's intentions, so that he could go to the Zionists and say, "If you help the Allies, you will have the support of the British in securing Palestine for the Jews."

This appealed to Sir Mark, but he saw grave difficulties. In the first place, France was counting on the Sykes-Picot Treaty. France would have to be persuaded to support the idea of Palestine for the Jews. Then there was the Vatican—Sir Mark himself was a Catholic—which would not support a scheme which meant placing the Christian holy places under Jewish control.

Malcolm replied that these difficulties must be overcome if the Allies wanted the help of the United States. Palestine meant Jewish support, which was becoming increasingly necessary.

That is exactly what happened in 1916, which was instrumental in alining us on the side of Great Britain in the World War. It was that influence from England, where the "invisible government" is sitting today, that brought us into that war. As I said, after quoting the letter, the important point to bear in mind is the information which the letter contains. However, we do know that there was a Mr. House, adviser in the Wilson administration, and it was the same administration that allowed the United States to become involved in the World War. We also know that Colonel House is supposed to have written a book—Philip Dru, the Administrator—which is a peculiar book, and that he is also credited with having written *Gabriel Over the White House*.

Mr. THOMASON and Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin rose.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Let me answer the gentleman from Texas first. I know the gentleman is trying to clear Colonel House, but let us forget Colonel House.

Mr. THOMASON. No; I am just pleading for fairness to a distinguished man who is now dead.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. That is all right.

Mr. THOMASON. I want to know if I understood the gentleman correctly that it did not make so much difference about the genuineness of the signature, because that was not so material. I say out of respect to a man who is not here and cannot speak for himself, and to place a letter

of that kind in the RECORD without some evidence of its genuineness and authenticity is unfair, and I maintain that the gentleman ought to provide this House with some evidence that the late Colonel House signed that letter.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I want to give you the facts about what happened during the World War, which I know about, and also what is happening today, which I also know something about. I do not think it makes very much difference, because the question today is not the reputation of any man and it is not a question of the character of any man. We know we were deceived during the World War, and we know we are being deceived today, and the question now is to prevent this country from getting into a war that we have no business to be in, and that is my purpose.

Mr. THOMASON. In that connection, does the gentleman think this is a very appropriate time to be stirring up race and religious prejudice in this country in view of world conditions?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I want to inform the gentleman that I am not interested in creating racial hatreds, and I would not have mentioned this Balfour declaration if the gentleman had not forced me to do so. I have more information on this subject, which I am not going to insert in the RECORD, because I do not want to create racial hatreds, but if a choice must be made between obscuring facts and the protection of the United States, I shall reveal such facts as long as I can stand on my feet.

Mr. THOMASON. Day before yesterday the gentleman expressed his great hatred for Great Britain. I assume, of course, that also extends to the Canadians, and I am wondering where in the present world crisis his present sympathies lie.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I did not express my hatred for Great Britain. I said I had as little use for her as any other European power.

Mr. THOMASON. I think the gentleman said he had less use for her.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Well, I will grant that.

Mr. THOMASON. I wonder where the gentleman's sympathies are today in the present crisis.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Let me answer this other gentleman. Will you state the question again?

Mr. THOMASON. In view of the gentleman's expressed hatred for Great Britain, now when we are at least talking neutrality, and I hope not idly, I am sure every Member wants to do the best thing to keep us out of the present war. Does the gentleman mind stating where his sympathies are in the present world crisis?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. My sympathy is right here in the United States of America, and if the gentleman will read my remarks in the RECORD he will find just exactly where I stand. I am opposed to all European powers because I know them a darn sight better than you do.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact that the same international tribe which plunged us into the World War in the name of "making the world safe for democracy" is on the move now with propaganda to plunge us into the present war in the name of "saving world democracy"? Instead of making the world safe for democracy in 1917, 1918, and 1919 we made America safe for Old Man Depression and the rest of the world safe for dictators.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

It is now my desire to call attention to more propaganda issued by the invisible government through its movies. It is the play called Thunder Afloat. It is the same propaganda we had during the World War, which is now beginning to align us again on the same side as we were in 1917.

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

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Pardon me, but I want to finish this.

I shall answer the gentleman at a later date and bring forth some facts that may prove interesting to Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out the importance of the information in the remarks of my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 12, page 344. He enumerated neutrality acts from the seventeenth century on, which represents considerable research into the neutrality problem. Each and every one of the neutrality acts that he enumerated consisted of embargoes on the sale and transportation of contraband, particularly war material. In our Neutrality Act it is called the arms-embargo clause, and it is that that the President asks Congress to repeal.

Is it not strange that over a period of several centuries neutrality acts have confined themselves entirely to arms embargoes or prohibition of sale and transportation of guns, ammunition, and other war material? Is it not equally strange that after these hundreds of years this administration comes forth with an idea diametrically opposed to that which all nations have applied for these many years? The President, in the Neutrality Act, speaks of neutrality in the same manner that he enumerates the benefits to be derived from the act, such as safety, peace, and protection of life. All of these are obviously used for one purpose—to disguise the real intent of this legislation. It makes this bitter pill palatable so that it will be swallowed by Congress.

Neutrality is a status we establish and announce to nations at war, by which we pledge ourselves to help neither one side nor the other. This can be passed before war is declared or after war is declared, for we have a perfect right to stop sale of arms and all war material at any time we choose to do so. That is what these nations have done for hundreds of years, so they could be impartial, so they could be fair, so they could treat all nations at war alike and remain neutral. It is that type of neutrality that has allowed Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Switzerland, and other European countries to remain neutral even during the World War. Not one of those nations set aside safety zones for its own shipping. Not one of them declared war zones. Not one of them attempted to regulate foreign ships in its harbors—to investigate them and to fine them. As a matter of fact, each of those nations knew its place, which is something that we have yet to learn.

Let me call attention again to this point: Neutral ships, Scandinavian ships, have already been sunk by submarines, and no doubt those ships were engaged in carrying contraband to the powers which are now at war with Germany. Are Norway or other Scandinavian countries complaining because of the loss of such ships? No, indeed. In carrying contraband cargoes to enemy powers they accept the risk of such trade and, without complaint, take the consequences if they are caught.

May I now again call attention to our Neutrality Act? Congress can enact neutrality legislation without inviting criticism of foreign powers if we follow the custom that other powers have followed for 200 years. What is that custom? It is to declare neutrality by enforcement of an arms-embargo clause on such material as would be an aid to nations at war, one as much as the other. In passing legislation of this sort we are not concerned with the fact that one nation might have a navy and another one might not have the same type of a navy. That is none of our business. It is, however, our business to be neutral, and neutrality can only be maintained by sale to all on exactly the same basis or else by denial of sales to all on exactly the same basis.

Now, then, the question—if we actually want to be neutral—is whether or not we should be bound to the policy of no sale or whether we shall choose the policy of selling war materials. As we look over history again we find that all nations which established neutrality selected a neutrality policy of no sale of arms and ammunition to any power at war. The reason, of course, is obvious, for it is a greater safeguard for maintaining neutrality.

It is for that reason that the arms-embargo clause was incorporated in the Neutrality Act in the last session of Congress, for that clause was the only neutral part of the act.

Let us now analyze our own legislation. The Neutrality Act of 1939 gives the President or Congress the power, by a joint resolution, to serve notice that a state of war exists among certain foreign states—notice which is useless and unnecessary. After having given this notice, however, things begin to happen. The President then assumes command and declares that a state of war exists among foreign states, which is none of his concern and none of our business. Such foreign nations may not like this, even if he is correct. At any rate, they have a perfect right to object to the President's proclamation. The legislation further grants power to the President to declare war zones safety zones by negation; to set aside potential neutral areas in the Pacific, in the China Sea, and to declare lakes between us and a belligerent power open for commerce; the assumed power of patrolling hundreds of miles at sea, which we have no right to do under international law, except as a measure of mercy for ships in distress. It gives him the power to detain foreign shipping in our ports, investigate, and demand bond if he believes they have engaged in commerce not agreeable to his views. This act in itself is full of dynamite, because a foreign nation may object to it, and that in itself would be paramount to an unfriendly act, and therefore the very incident that could catapult this Nation into war.

The power granted to the President in the so-called Neutrality Act is incorporated for no other reason than to allow him to align the United States up in the next war, if it is to come, with England and France.

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

Mr. THORKELSON. Yes.

Mr. PITTENGER. The gentleman is talking now about the bill that the House passed?

Mr. THORKELSON. I am talking about the bill now under consideration in the Senate.

Mr. PITTENGER. The Senate bill or the House bill?

Mr. THORKELSON. The bill before the Senate.

It is my opinion, if we pass a neutrality act that is actually neutral, as the word implies, it will prohibit the sale, shipping, and transportation of arms to all powers at war on exactly the same principles that neutrality legislation had been written in the past. If Congress will confine itself to this type of neutrality, I am reasonably sure that the war which is now in the making in Europe will stop. There will be no war, because it means that England and France will have to fight it alone, and they are not going to do it. So if we pass sensible legislation we will do the world a lot of good, because we will be able to enforce peace by being honestly and sincerely neutral ourselves.

Conceding that Europe wants to commit suicide and go on with the present war, which is entirely its own business and should be no concern of ours, the fact that we have established an embargo on arms leaves us strong when they have fought themselves weak and exsanguinated. In this position we can be of greater aid to them than we would be in joining in this holocaustic destruction of civilization and the human race.

I therefore object to giving the President this unconstitutional power, the power of a dictator, not for peace, but for war.

It is our solemn duty to provide neutrality for the United States so that we may remain at peace. We can do that by enacting a neutrality act placing embargoes on all war material to all powers at war, prohibiting transportation in our own ships to nations at war. In providing legislation of this type belligerent powers will be more inclined to respect the right of our ships to maintain trade with neutral nations. If such neutral nations are located in war zones, due notice should be given to all belligerents of the cargo carried in our ships. It is obvious, if we carry contraband cargo of war materials to such neutral nations as I have mentioned, it may not be for their own use but for transshipment to nations at war. In such event the ship is liable to seizure by the blockading power. Let us not forget that the English blockade of Germany today is not only against war material but

against all commodities—food and war material consigned to Germany.

During the World War, England laid down a very tight blockade on Germany. No foodstuffs and no war material. As a matter of fact, nothing was allowed to pass through that blockade. The ships that tried to run the blockade were captured and taken to an English port, the cargo confiscated and used by Great Britain for her own purposes.

I mention this as a point in contrast, for there is so much discussion here today about nazi-ism, fascism, and anti-Semitism that one who opposes the subversive activities which are now undermining our Government is immediately called Nazi, Fascist, and anti-Semitic by the Communists or those engaged in such subversive activities.

Let us now look at this from the angle of the Central Powers. They were, during the World War, and are today, suffering from an airtight blockade, not only of war material but of all foodstuffs as well. Great Britain is not worrying about whether or not the civilian population in those countries is starving, lacks medical care, are ill-clothed or ill-housed. With Great Britain, it is a case of winning the war, and permit me to state it is exactly the same case with Germany.

Germany had no surface fleet or navy. She was forbidden by the treaty of Versailles to build such ships. She has submarines instead. Germany will use such submarines to blockade British ports, and, not having a harbor to which she may convoy intercepted merchantmen, they are sunk so that the enemy will not benefit from cargo carried in such ships.

During the World War, Great Britain had the so-called Q or X ships, camouflaged craft that looked like a merchantman but was in reality an armed vessel. When a German submarine hailed such ship the camouflage was struck and guns went into action, and the submarine was sunk without any further consideration. The crew aboard the submarine did not have an opportunity to save their lives, so what is the logical thing for such craft to do? When the enemy discovers such warfare it can only retaliate by sinking on sight merchant craft that is bound to English ports.

It is not a case of favoring one side or the other, but let us be just and treat all sides alike. I favor an arms embargo on all war material, and, of course, on such articles as powers at war designate "contraband," with no credit to either side or any nation at war. It is their battle. Let them pay for it. They will discover sooner or later that wars are unprofitable to all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.), in accordance with the order heretofore made, the House adjourned until Monday, October 16, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1103. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting chapter III of part 3 of the Commission's over-all report on the study of investment trusts and investment companies, made pursuant to section 30 of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 (H. Doc. No. 279), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7126) granting a pension to Mary Pauline Payne, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII,

Mr. VOORHIS of California introduced a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 391) to restore to Congress the sole power to issue money and regulate the value thereof, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

5748. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of Alice G. Kessens and 30 other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5749. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. John Allen and 60 other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5750. Also, petition of Clayton Klopfenstein and 50 other citizens of Howe, Ind., opposing repeal of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5751. Also, petition of Morris Baker and 75 other voters of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing any change in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5752. Also, petition of O. W. Kruse and 25 other residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the embargo on arms and munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5753. Also, petition of Mrs. W. Tood Seitz and 20 other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5754. Also, petition of Lillian M. Fonner and 20 citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing any change in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5755. Also, petition of Ethyl Blass and sundry citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5756. Also, petition of G. M. Patterson and sundry citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5757. Also, petition of Louis A. Frantz and sundry citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., urging strict neutrality and no entanglements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5758. Also, petition of William A. Stockmann and sundry citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., urging a policy of strict neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5759. Also, petition of E. N. Wedertz and 80 other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing any change in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5760. Also, petition of Thomas P. O'Connell, Jr., and 30 other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5761. Also, petition of Mrs. William Vunora and 25 other voters of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing any change in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5762. Also, petition of George W. McCoy and 25 other residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing revision of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5763. Also, petition of Albert Henning and 25 other residents of Fort Wayne and Avilla, Ind., opposing revision of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5764. Also, petition of Fred H. Koopman and sundry other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5765. Also, petition of the Men's Club of the Grace Evangelical and Reformed Church, Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing any change in the present Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5766. Also, petition of the Reverend R. F. Hart and 60 members and friends of the Methodist Church of Monroe, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5767. Also, petition of W. Mortimer Cole and 50 members and friends of the Methodist Church, of Cromwell, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5768. Also, petition of Rev. John Hagen and 50 members of the St. John's Lutheran Church, Fort Wayne, Ind., objecting against the proposed repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5769. Also, petition of Rev. H. J. Jordan and 20 residents of Garrett, Ind., opposing modification of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5770. Also, petition of the Reverend Lorance Rodenbeck and 175 residents of Garrett, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5771. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Corunna and Garrett, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5772. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. George Heck and 35 other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5773. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. John J. Deagen, Fort Wayne, Ind., and 30 residents of Fort Worth, Churubusco, and Columbia City, Ind., opposing revision of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5774. Also, petition of J. C. Maier, of Fort Wayne, Ind., and 50 citizens of Decatur, Hoagland, Monroe, Geneva, and Pleasant Mills, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5775. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Burns and sundry other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing any change in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5776. Also, petition of Ira A. Summers and 117 voters of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing revision of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5777. Also, petition of Aubrey Tuttle and sundry other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5778. Also, petition of 25 citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing revision of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5779. Also, petition of Mrs. Ralph L. Jones and 35 other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing any change in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5780. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the American Humane Association, urging that horses and mules be included among shipments forbidden as contraband of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5781. Also, resolution of Hill Post, No. 39, Catholic War Veterans of the United States, urging their representatives in Congress to vote against the lifting of the embargo on arms to Europe and against the cash-and-carry plan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 4, 1939)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O loving Master, who didst come into the world not to be ministered unto but to minister, and didst say to those for whom Thy Father's kingdom is prepared, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me." Be graciously pleased, we humbly beseech Thee, to bless the work of the Red Cross, with its high and holy mission to mankind, as it ministers to the dread agonies of a suffering world. Do Thou regard, O blessed Christ, the sleepless tossing, the numb despair of the sick and dying, the penitent and the impenitent. Spare them, dear Lord, and succor those that tend them, working through them and within them, that they may share the sleep of all God's tired children—long, sweet, sound, and deep as love—until the breaking of the everlasting dawn. Amen.