

legitimate debate and unnecessary delay. The American people have been marvelously alert to the present crisis. They have kept abreast of swiftly-running events. We hoped for isolation at the beginning of this war. We came to see it as a dangerous, if not deadly, policy. From isolation we turned to the theory of insulation. We called for a citizen army, a greater navy, a larger armament, with all of which to seal the cracks and stop the breaches in the walls of our defense.

The Lease-Lend Bill is part and principle of the defense plans. It serves to strengthen our bulwarks where they are most vulnerable—that is to say, at the present place of battle.

And we hoped for neutrality, too. That hope was shattered—but not by us. To be neutral implies a contract, and a contract implies the trustworthiness of both parties. Will anyone say that the government headed by Adolph Hitler is trustworthy? That its treaties are binding? That its promises are kept?

So we abandoned neutrality—in self-defense. We took moral sides with the opponents of Hitlerism. Gradually we have come to see that England needs—she must have—more than our moral support. We traded her some destroyers; our factories sent over planes. We have reached the point of understanding that this is not enough. We must become, as the President has said, the arsenal of Democracy.

The Lease-Lend Bill is intended to make us just that. *Until* it passes, England fights on in a blackout of uncertainty. *Unless* it passes, her own spokesmen assert she certainly cannot win.

We know that. We can read it in the news. We have been told it by men whose good faith we could not possibly doubt.

The issue then is very simple. Anything which speeds the Lease-Lend Bill helps England. Anything which delays the Bill helps Hitler. Nothing could be clearer than that.

As to whether certain modifications in the proposed Bill ought to be made is a phase of the subject about which we need not quibble. If, without destroying the main purpose of the Bill, certain amendments should be adopted to carry out the mandate of our Constitution, then let those amendments be made. It can be granted that these are important details but details after all they are. The paramount issue still demands the first attention and immediate attention.

But it is asked—"Shall we give the President so much power?" Yes, while it is still *ours* to give—and *ours* to have back again when the crisis is past. When will the Republic of France have such power vested in the people? When will Holland and Belgium and Norway? It is the virtue of our system of government to be flexible for emergency. It is the proven wisdom of our past that responsibility in a crisis be handed to a chosen leader. Lincoln had it and Wilson had it. President Roosevelt comes straight from an election which gave a vote of confidence to his foreign policy. We