

Good Morning, Friends:

The two principal events in Washington during the week were passage of the bill extending the Lend-lease program by the House ~~and~~ of Representatives and the joint request by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the head of the Maritime Commission for Congressional <sup>enactment of</sup> ~~action on~~ a National Service law.

The bill extending the Lend-lease program for another year passed by the top-heavy majority of 334 to 21. All 21 of the members who voted "No" are Republicans, and <sup>all but one</sup> ~~20 of the 21~~ are from the Mid-west, which is just one more evidence that isolationism is still a strong sentiment in Mid-western states.

I remember the very long and hard fight we had in passage of the Lend-lease bill when it was first presented. <sup>early in the War,</sup> ~~in~~ The opposition was strong, loud, and determined. But the Lend-lease program has proved to be such a valuable instrument of war that the opposition can now muster only 21 votes in the House of Representatives. The Lend-lease program came into being as an effort to give aid to our allies and to avoid the pitfalls of not only a dollar and cent sale, <sup>of supplies to our allies when they actually didn't have the money to pay for</sup> ~~in the first place,~~ but also to avoid the political and economic dangers of a dollar and cent debt, <sup>settlement</sup> ~~between~~ allies after the war is won. By means of the Lend-lease program, we have put guns and planes, trucks and jeeps and every category of materiel of war into the hands of our gallant Russian, British, and Chinese allies, as well as into the hands of other peoples whose defense has been held ~~a~~ vital to our own defense. This investment in our National security and in the joint security with our allies has produced victories, to be sure; but it has also saved the lives of many



American boys as well as those of our allies. Perhaps in the great offensive for which our forces are now poised, it will prove its worth even more forcefully. Of course, the forces of Russia and Great Britain have been equipped principally from their own war industries, but it must not be forgotten that the forces of each have been strengthened and supplemented by supplies and services received from us. On the other hand, we have, in turn, received much aid from them <sup>in reverse lend-lease</sup> as well as from ~~Australia~~ and many other of the United Nations. <sup>Some Nations have given us as much as we have given them. We are receiving rubber from Brazil at the rate of \$2.13 per year. For example, our soldiers in England are receiving 20% of their food from L.B.</sup> This joining of men and materials in reciprocal and mutual helpfulness has

enabled the United Nations to strike harder blows against the enemy on every battlefield - in the air over Europe, on the Russian front, in the Pacific, in the Mediterranean, and in every theater of war. America's part in furnishing the tools with which to conquer the enemy is something of which this nation can always be proud. For example, we have sent over eight thousand airplanes to Russia, and they <sup>have been</sup> ~~are our~~ combat planes. They have been flown by Russian flyers against the Germans. We have sent to Russia 170,000 trucks, several thousand jeeps, many tanks, much ammunition. All of this has had a vital part in Russia's victories. ~~And~~ <sup>we</sup> can never forget that many ~~lives of~~ Russian <sup>boys</sup> ~~young men~~ have ~~been~~ <sup>lost</sup> ~~in~~ <sup>their lives</sup> fighting Germany <sup>with</sup> ~~while using~~ equipment ~~which~~ we sent them. And every plane, tank, or gun that the Russian soldiers can use in destroying the German army means ~~that~~ fewer American boys will have to die in <sup>the same way.</sup> ~~crushing the German forces.~~ <sup>Now</sup> Of course, when the war is over, we will find that a large amount of <sup>this</sup> ~~our~~ <sup>Lend-lease</sup> American property is overseas. ~~that will~~



We have not given it away. We have loaned its use without charge. Whatever there is left of it at the conclusion of the war, whether it be in Russia, Britain, Australia, or New Zealand, or in Germany or ~~in~~ Japan, ~~the~~ it will be the property of the United States. Of course, much of it will have been

*For instance, say ~~a~~ a Russian*  
destroyed and useful only as scrap. ~~a plane in which a Russian pilot~~  
*pilot goes up to fight in one of the planes we have*  
~~sent them and is shot down by the Germans, this wreckage~~  
~~plunged to earth and to his death~~ would be of no value to us except as scrap  
*I hope we never try to make*  
*out them pay for planes destroyed*  
*in combat.*  
and perhaps that would not be worth hauling home. Many of the trucks and many

of the jeeps will be worn out - some only partially worn - as will be the case  
*An amendment was offered to try to say how*  
*we should settle such questions.*  
with much of this lend-lease property. ~~Of course,~~ It would be useless for

us to try to say now what we are going to do with ten jeeps left in Liberia

or two bulldozers, <sup>left</sup> in New Guinea after the war. This <sup>sees</sup> indicates <sup>though,</sup> ~~just one of~~ *that we*

*will face*  
~~the many problems we will face~~ after the war. But after the war means after

victory has been won. That is our first task, and the Lend-lease program is

a vital factor in <sup>helping to bring</sup> ~~bringing~~ about that victory. That is why it passed the

House so overwhelmingly. That is why it was reported to the House unanimously

by the Foreign Affairs Committee which is composed of 14 Democrats and 11

Republicans. This bill has now gone to the Senate and it is expected to pass

there after the usual procedure of hearings and debate.



Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, and Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, issued a joint statement urging that Congress enact some form of a National service law. Participating in the conferences preceeding the issuance of this joint statement were General George C. Marshall, Army Chief of Staff, Admiral King, Commander-in-Chief of the United States fleet, and other high personages intimately connected with the conduct of the war.

This is not the first time that these gentlemen have requested the passage of a national service law. <sup>They have repeatedly done so.</sup> You will recall, <sup>too,</sup> that President Roosevelt, in his message to Congress in January, recommended the enactment of a national service bill. Congress has thus far refused to do so, and this joint statement, issued only last Thursday, has already received a cold Congressional shoulder.

The need for a national service law arises out of several factors. The first, of course, is the urgency of drafting more men into the armed forces. Second is the demand for increased production, and third is the reluctance of many men to leave non-essential occupations and go into essential war work. Let us briefly look at some of the facts relating to these three factors.

The nation has called eleven million of her men into the country's armed forces, but many more are yet to be called. For instance, before the end of the year, the navy, which is rapidly expanding with many new ships



soon to slide into the water, will need many more men. In fact, the navy and the coast guard and the Marine Corps together will require 635,000 more men

*this year.*  
~~in 1944.~~ At the same time, the army will need approximately 750,000 additional men as replacements, the army having reached its present complement. This

make a total of 1,390,000 more men to be drafted before this year ends *to say nothing of 1945.*

The greatest part of this number will be drafted from workshops, railroads,

factories, farms, and mines. Most of these men will have to be replaced

and more than that, new ones added. In other words, someone must step up

to the bench, and the lathe; someone must take the wrench and the hammer of

the war worker who leaves to fight, if war production is to continue. Someone

must step up to the plow and pick up the feed basket of the boy who is drafted

from the farm, if food is to be produced in needed quantities. But the

problem is more than merely replacing the drafted men. Production must be

increased. For instance, 200,000 additional workers are needed in the air-

craft factories alone. 5,000 additional workers are needed now for building

submarines; 18,000 more workers are needed immediately in the shipyards to

build landing vessels which our army must have if they are to take and hold

the invasion beaches. Eleven thousand men are needed immediately to build

oil tankers, to supply our troops with gasoline and oil. These are but examples

and they are examples of the need for men over and above the necessity of

replacing the 1,390,000 men to be drafted before this year is over.



Add to all of this, the possibility that out of the impending large-scale battles will come an urgent need either to increase production of some particular equipment or to build some new equipment to offset an unexpected development or invention of the enemy. ~~There is a lot of talk about~~

There is a lot of talk about drafting 4-F's. In other words, several people here are advocating that men who have been rejected for military service for physical reasons be drafted into work battalions. The government already has authority to do that. But, of course, the authorities would not want to undertake so drastic a measure without first submitting the question to Congress. And, besides, it would only be ~~piece~~ piece-meal at best. Why pick on the 4-F? What the nation needs and has needed every since this war began is a sensible over-all plan for utilizing our vital resources of manpower. There is no less obligation on a man, say 40 years old, to work where his country needs him than there is on a <sup>man</sup> ~~man~~, say 30, who has been rejected for military service because of some physical handicap. We've got to make this war everybody's war, and have some equality of sacrifice. Of course, there is really no way to bring about pure equality of sacrifice as between the man who <sup>lights</sup> ~~also~~ on the battlefield and the man who works at home. But the least we can afford to do in all fairness and justice is to require people on the home-front to do sufficient work to give the fighting man everything he needs not only to crush the foe but to save his own life in doing so, and, further, to require those who stay at home in the period of greatest national



income in the history of our country to do as much as they can toward paying for the war. When Congress declared war, it said: "To bring the conflict to a successful termination, all the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States." What Congress needs to do is to redeem that pledge. *And that is the principal means of the work, as I see it.*