

Our participation in the World War brought on the depression, the money cost of which is incalculable. The \$30,000,000,000 Federal debt, the increased cost to States for relief, the losses caused by undue depreciation of values, the loss of wages caused by unemployment and national income, which is perhaps not less than \$150,000,000,000, the increase in taxes, and so forth, easily adds up to more than \$200,000,000,000.

Three hundred billion dollars as representing the money cost to us for the part we played in the World War would not be too high.

Of far more serious import is the diseased state of our monetary and credit structure. I shall not go into this part of the picture. But let me say to the House, and to the people throughout the country, that my studies and observations of this part of our economic body lead me to make a diagnosis of a very, very serious affliction here. I consider it so serious that I feel sure the United States could not finance a long war.

More serious still was the fearful price we paid in lives and wounded and maimed. Nearly 40,000 of the flower of our manhood gave their all. Nearly 14,000 died of wounds. There were more than 53,000 combat deaths. More than 200,000 were wounded, though not mortally. Three hundred and fifty thousand five hundred and ninety World War veterans were left permanently crippled because of their service in the war.

What sacrifices would the mothers of this country be compelled to make if we were plunged into another war? Would our casualties be counted in the thousands, or possibly in the millions?

Suppose we should be forced to send our men to Europe to engage in this war. Suppose that which we all believe could not happen but which, judging from past experiences, might happen, namely our defeat; who then in this whole United States would rise up and admit responsibility for sending our troops to Europe? Where would our God-given 3,000 miles of ocean defense be then? What would become of America under those terrifying conditions? [Applause.]

Let us, from the standpoint of our own interests, thinking constantly of the absolute needs of our own country, look all of the facts squarely in the face. Let us endeavor to think this whole problem through before we act in this, to me, the most critical hour in the life of our Nation.

As for myself, the lifting of the embargo would be the setting free of powerful and uncontrollable forces that would make strongly for a repetition of 1917, only with more disastrous consequences.

From my studies I am convinced the United States cannot endure another such a war, economically or financially, and retain anything like the system of government and industry we have lived under and cherish. The forces of disruption

the cost of benefits to World War widows and dependents will be \$7,681,003,200. Civil War dependents from 1927 to 1937 received \$38 per month.

The total amount of disbursements to veterans, including administration costs, but exclusive of \$3,793,864,573 paid out in adjusted-service certificates, from 1918 to 1938, inclusive, was \$7,998,218,200. This is an annual average of \$380,867,533. Even though the plans providing \$60 a month for veterans after the age of 65, and benefits to all widows and dependents, go into effect, disbursements under the present set-up will be heavy for the next 10 or 15 years. An estimate of three to five billion dollars to cover this item would, I believe, be conservative.

During the year 1938 the net operating expense for all hospital and domiciliary facilities controlled by the Veterans' Administration totaled, in round numbers, \$50,000,000. (Veterans' Administration Report, 1938, p. 2.) Over 91 percent of the admissions in 1938 were World War veterans. (Veterans' Administration Report, 1938, p. 10.)

In all, a total of \$194,681,850 had been made available up to 1938 for the construction of hospital facilities. (Veterans' Administration Report, 1939, p. 13.)

Administration costs have averaged in the 21 years about \$77,000,000 annually. Numerous other cost items must be taken into consideration. There will be a large interest charge on the adjusted-service certificate fund, as well as the money borrowed to finance the construction of hospitals. There will inevitably be other extras. The sum of all these items will certainly pass the \$100,000,000,000 mark.

and chaos are already working strongly within our system. Another war would, in my opinion, create the necessary condition for the completion of these disintegrating forces.

I feel it my high duty to oppose, by every honorable means possible, the lifting of the arms embargo. [Applause.]

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely a fact, is it not, that Congress will be responsible if we become involved in the war?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is absolutely true.

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. CREAL. The gentleman stated that when we lift the embargo we are in war. When are all of the neutral countries now selling to both sides in the war?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I know of no neutral country that is selling to both sides.

Mr. CREAL. Well, to one side.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I know of no neutrals that are selling to one side. If the gentleman will read my address in the House on October 12, and my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD October 18, 1939, he will see that the prohibition of the sale of arms by neutral countries to belligerents is a common practice; that this practice has been growing steadily for a hundred and fifty years; and that the United States has been one of the most backward nations in this advancement.

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. FISH. Evidently there is a great deal of misunderstanding, or there has been a great deal of misstatement on this particular proposition. I say, without fear of contradiction, that there is not a single nation in the world that sells arms and ammunition to any of the belligerent nations—not one of the European nations or the other nations—and yet they want us to repeal our law in order to do something that no other nation does.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In 1931 the British Government established a complete arms embargo and the Scandinavian countries have all issued current complete embargo decrees. [Applause.]

ADJOURNMENT OVER

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KITCHENS). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Detroit Free Press.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE C. I. O. AND FREE SPEECH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House heretofore made the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(By unanimous consent Mr. HOFFMAN was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday, on the floor of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] very forcefully pointed out that the safety and the security of our Government, to a great extent, rested upon the observance of the right to free speech and a free press.

He might have gone further and have said with equal truth that neither the prosperity, the political, or the religious liberty of the citizen can endure unless the constitutional safeguards

Nearly all of the advocates of repeal strongly emphasize the "carry" feature. This is the principle sop they throw out to the people of this country for their support.

The President himself places special emphasis upon the need of the "carry" provision. In speaking of the present embargo provisions, in his September address, he said:

They furthermore allow such products of industry and agriculture to be taken in American-flag ships to belligerent nations. There in itself, under the present law, lies definite danger to our neutrality and our peace.

I am not arguing that the "carry" feature, if actually enforced—of which there is no assurance it will be if the proposed law is passed—might not be a help in keeping us out of war. What I am contending is, that this is not the purpose of the "carry" feature, but the real purpose is to lift the arms embargo and make it possible to sell war supplies to the belligerents.

Last July the President asked for the repeal of the arms embargo. Then he did not ask for the so-called cash-and-carry provision. Why? It cannot be because new conditions have arisen, because he told us in his address in September he "foresaw last January" what was coming which caused him to ask in July for a change in the neutrality law. His bill failed to pass. It was not until we were called to this special session that this lurid proposal was made.

How is it that in July he considered the repeal of the arms embargo necessary to the "cause of peace and in the interest of real American security" but did not discover until September that cash and carry, and especially carry, are vital to that interest and security?

How is it that in July the embargo provisions were considered by him to be "most vitally dangerous to American neutrality, American security, and American peace," and 2 months later he discovered that failure in having the "cash and carry" provision in the law was even more vitally dangerous to "American neutrality, security, and peace"?

Definite proof that the cash-and-carry provision has only been added as a talking point and to mislead the public was established when the advocates of the present resolution refused to accept Senator TOBEY's proposal to first enact the cash and carry and then debate the embargo.

The cash feature is put into the proposal to allay the feeling of resentment our people have against the failure of European nations to pay back the money they borrowed from us in the other war. Here is being perpetrated upon our people what appears to me to be the gravest injustice. In certain remarks I had placed in the RECORD on the 28th of last September I showed the utter fallacy of there being any cash, so far as payment in gold is concerned. No doubt gold will be used, since the belligerent group that would buy from us have between five and six billions of the yellow metal.

Insofar as payment in gold will be made, it will be another case of American workmen and producers giving away their labor, just as we did in the other war.

Whether the lifting of the arms embargo would involve us in the war, and to what extent, would depend on the amount of war supplies our Nation would sell. One of the belligerent groups is exceedingly desirous that we join them in their war. No one questions this. They have the gold to buy in almost unlimited quantities. We have the capacity to produce war materials in almost unlimited quantities. Knowing that the more war materials they would buy the more likely would we be to become involved in the war on their side, of course, they would buy in the largest quantities possible.

Suppose the embargo is repealed and the day thereafter England and France order five or ten thousand military planes,¹ fifty or one hundred thousand tanks of various sizes,² 100,000 tons of poison gas and war chemicals,³ and

other munitions in the same proportion, would we be in the war or would we not be in it? Of course, we would be in the war. And in my opinion we will have taken a dangerous step that could easily force us to send our soldiers to Europe again.

How it is possible to try to deny this in the face of our past experience and the facts before us is difficult for me to conceive.

I fear many of us labor under a desperately erroneous assumption, except for which we would perhaps all view the proposal before us in a truer light. That assumption is that Congress has the right, by vote, to declare war, that we would be just as free to make such a decision if we lifted the embargo as we would be if we did not lift it. Once the embargo is lifted, immense and powerful industrial and political forces will be set in operation which will inevitably make for our entrance into this war, over which this Congress will have no control whatever.

Before this House decides on final action in this matter let each Member ponder well over just a few things.

First, the money cost of the last war. The figures I am about to give you are explained in a footnote which will accompany my address.

The money cost up to the present time is, in round numbers, \$55,000,000,000.⁴ I estimate the future cost will run the total up well past the \$100,000,000,000 mark.⁵

⁴ Since varying figures have been given showing this cost, I deem it advisable to explain how I arrived at this amount. In the June 1930 Annual Report of the Treasury, table 58, beginning on p. 609, is given a statement of money costs of the World War to the United States Government to June 30, 1930. A reference to that statement shows it to be made up of four items—expenditures, receipts, assets, and net war cost.

On p. 612 are given the totals of these items. Under expenditures \$2,746,640,992.03 is given as the amount of interest on the war debt from 1918 to 1921. Revised to bring the amount up to date, this figure is \$12,032,000,000, which was obtained by taking the amount of interest on the war debt as of June 30, 1934, shown on p. 392 of the 1934 Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, as \$9,557,000,000; and, adding \$2,475,000,000, the interest at 2¾ percent on the approximately \$15,000,000,000 remaining of the war debt for the 6-year period from June 1934 to June 1940. (Treasury has no figures on interest on war debt since June 1934 report.)

Under receipts (foreign obligations June 30, 1930) the item of \$2,391,518,141.97 was changed to \$2,749,492,491. This was obtained from a Treasury Memorandum Covering Indebtedness of Foreign Governments to the United States, March 1, 1939, p. 12.

Under assets the item of \$7,747,000,000 (foreign obligations) was eliminated entirely. This for the simple reason there does not appear to be any prospect of collecting this money. The total indebtedness of foreign governments to the United States on March 1, 1939, was \$13,119,304,199, with an unpaid principal of \$11,435,645,170.

Another item, \$158,600,000 was stricken from the assets listed, due from the German Government, Account of Army Occupation (June 30, 1927). The German Government still owes \$181,867,133.36 on this account.

With these revised figures the total net war cost to date, excluding \$11,792,082,774 for Veterans' Administration disbursements for relief of World War veterans to June 30, 1939 (figures supplied by Veterans' Administration), and \$88,000,000 for settlement of war claims, act of 1928 (1934 Annual Treasury Report, p. 392), \$43,179,480,651. Including the two latter items, the total net money cost of the World War is \$55,066,563,433.

⁵ Assuming an extraordinary supermiracle happens—namely, that the National Budget is brought in balance by June 1940, that it is kept in balance for the next 45 years (debt will be forty-five billions by then), that taxes will be sufficiently in excess of regular operating costs to pay the interest on the debt and retire the same at the rate of \$1,000,000,000 a year until it is completely wiped out, at 2½ percent interest, the remaining war debt (\$15,000,000,000) will cost \$8,625,000,000.

It is impossible, of course, to forecast with any degree of precision the future cost of these veterans' benefits. Sufficient data, however, are at hand to suggest something of what may be expected.

All veterans of the other wars—Civil and Spanish-American—after reaching the age of 65 years, receive \$60 per month. If this provision is made to apply to World War veterans, the estimated cost will be \$21,079,602,189. (Supplied by the Veterans' Administration.)

The present monthly benefit rate for service and nonservice dependents of World War veterans is \$38.12 and \$29.62, respectively (1938 Veterans' Administration Report, p. 71). The average annual number of Civil War dependents who received benefits from 1890 to 1937 was 226,980. (Supplied by the Veterans' Administration.) The number of men who served in the World War was about twice that of the Civil War. Assuming the number of World War dependents will be twice that of the Civil War, at \$30 per month

¹ Aircraft Year Book, p. 34, states 5,500 military planes can be produced a year.

² See America's Munitions, by Crowell, p. 154.

³ Chemicals in War, Prentiss, p. 85, shows producing capacity of war chemicals, which, no doubt, could now be greatly expanded.

protecting the citizen in his right to work, to own, hold, and enjoy property are maintained.

To the sentiments just expressed practically all of our people render lip service and all patriotic Americans give support without reservation. The gentleman used his laudation of the constitutional guaranty of the right of free speech and a free press as the vehicle to carry him to a bitter attack upon the Dies committee and to a defense of Government employees who are members of an organization which was founded by and whose activities are substantially controlled by another organization which advocates the overthrow of our Government by force.

The gentleman's condemnation of the Dies committee, his defense of the Washington members of the American League for Peace and Democracy, would have been more convincing had he heretofore condemned activities similar to those which he claimed the Dies committee practiced when other governmental agencies interfered with the right of free speech, a free press, and the civil liberties of American citizens, and had he been more accurate in his statements.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE]—and I am glad he is present now, I just sent word to him that I was about to speak—talked at length about the right of a man to join or not to join an organization. Time and time again has he stood on the floor of this House and spoken in favor of the C. I. O., which denied the right of a man to work unless he joined that particular organization—

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. And which disputes his right to join the A. F. of L. on the west coast, and still hold a job.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Will the gentleman yield at that point? If you are going to lie about me in the RECORD, I hope you will allow me to interrupt you.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not lie about you. I just told the truth about you.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I wish, if you are going to make misrepresentations about what I have discussed, that you will permit me to interrupt you at that point.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If I can have more time, I will be glad to yield. You had time yesterday.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I made no distinction in my befriending of any labor organization on this floor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, did you not talk in favor of the C. I. O.?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I have championed the C. I. O., the A. F. of L., and the railroad brotherhoods indiscriminately, not one as against another; and any cheap attempt on anybody's part—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 10 more minutes.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I will be glad to ask for it for you. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman may be accorded 10 more minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KITCHENS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I hope the gentleman will not mislead any of us into believing that I have taken the side of one great labor organization in opposition to another. My sole interest is in defending all organized labor, whether it be C. I. O., A. F. of L., or the railroad brotherhoods.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Are you through?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Have you not time and again stood on the floor and defended the C. I. O.?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Not as against any other labor organization.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Have you not time and again stood on the floor and defended the C. I. O.?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I have befriended it on two or three occasions when I thought they were in the right in respect to some fight that they were having with their employers.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did you not on the 30th of March 1937 stand on the floor for 20 minutes or more arguing that the sit-down strike was legal?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You did not?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right. I call the attention of the House to the RECORD on pages 2924 to 2929, inclusive, and I ask you, then, to form your own opinion whether I am, as the gentleman said, a liar or whether he knows what he is talking about.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Now, just a minute.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You have answered my question.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I did put in a statement, and I believe it was 5 or 6 minutes, and I extended it probably to a point where it would have taken up 20 minutes' time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is in the RECORD—in the body of the RECORD—and not in the Appendix.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Yes. I still stand by it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Sure. You still say that the sit-down strike is legal, do you?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. From a legal standpoint; yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You still say the sit-down strike is legal, do you?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. It is my opinion.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, there we are. Now we have the gentleman on record. He says that the sit-down strike, where men come in and drive other workers from their tasks because they will not join one particular organization is, in his opinion, legal. He says that the sit-down strike, where they crack the heads of the fellows who will not join that particular organization, is legal.

In the Congressional Directory of the Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, January 1937, it is set forth—and these biographies are usually prepared by the Member himself—that the gentleman "graduated from the University of Washington, Seattle, Wash., with A. B. and LL. D. degrees, and from Yale University, New Haven, Conn., with J. D. degree"—a legal education which anyone might envy and which, I am sorry to say, I never was able to acquire. The gentleman is not only a bachelor of arts, a doctor of laws, but he has the degree of doctor of jurisprudence.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Now, just a moment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What do you think of it?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. In view of the fact that you have brought my name into this so repeatedly, will you yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I will say to the gentleman that the faculties of 12 different law schools assisted me in preparing the brief which was put into the RECORD.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thought it was the gentleman's speech. I am glad to know he had a corps of ghost writers.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I say they assisted me in preparing a purely legal brief and not an argument justifying the sit-down strike as a fact. It was justifying it from a legal standpoint solely. That is the reason it was put into the RECORD.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, it is certainly interesting to learn that there are that many professors in universities who have so little common sense and so little common decency as to argue that one group of men can go in and take possession of somebody else's private property and retain possession, destroy it, drive men from their jobs, and keep them from their jobs, and argue that that sort of a proceeding is legal. I would like to have the gentleman put their names in the RECORD.

If this be the result of our university training, then we had better get rid of some of our universities and go "to the sticks" and on the farms for our education and get a little bit of common sense and good judgment once more.

Let these professors get out in the wide, open spaces; let them cut a few trees, saw them into logs, into stovewood

lengths, and then split those chunks. Let them get out on a farm and follow a plow or a drag in the dirt and dust. In the fall or springtime, let them get out on the fields and spread a few loads of fertilizer. Let them get a few callouses on their hands and get the kinks out of the wheels in their heads. Let the free, pure air of the country sweep away the cobwebs from their muddled thinking, and they will know what everyone else knew from the beginning—that a sit-down strike was illegal.

Without going into a review of the gentleman's activities on the floor of the House, the attention of the House is called to pages 2924 to 2929, inclusive, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 81, part 3, of the Seventy-fifth Congress, from which it appears that, speaking on a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] to investigate the sit-down strikes and to a bill which had been introduced to make a sit-down strike a violation of the Federal antitrust law, he said:

The resolution, the bill, and the remarks were predicated upon a single premise, that sit-down strikes are illegal. Mr. Chairman, I rise to challenge that premise.

The gentleman then further said:

Mr. Chairman, I base my contention that the sit-down strike is legal on three fundamental principles which are recognized by our court decisions and statutes as the law of the land:

First. The sit-down strikers are invited onto the premises of the company as employees, they remain employees during the course of the dispute, and they can in no way be considered trespassers.

Second. Employees have a property right in their jobs which the law entitles them to protect by appropriate means.

Third. The action of the sit-down strikers is justified under the law as is any other collective action by employees to better their conditions.

The gentleman then proceeded on the floor of the House to make an argument which covers almost five pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in an effort to prove his assertion that sit-down strikes were not illegal.

The gentleman knew, or he had reason to know, that sit-down strikers had seized and retained possession of factories in the State of Michigan. He knew that the Constitution of the United States guaranteed to a man, to a company, and to every other individual, natural or artificial, the peaceful possession of his own property. He knew that that constitutional right was being denied to the stockholders of the automobile plants of Michigan. Yet he defended the denial of that right.

He knew, or at least he had information which would lead every reasonable man to believe, that hundreds of working men and women in Michigan had been driven from their jobs and were prevented by violence from working at the jobs which were rightfully theirs and which enabled them to provide food, clothing, and shelter for themselves and their dependents. He knew that that conduct was in violation of the citizen's right to liberty and to hold and to enjoy property, for the right to work is property. Yet he stood on the floor of this House and denied that the deprivation of such rights was a denial of our constitutional guaranties.

He knew, or he had every reason to believe, that personal property was being destroyed by strikers; that working men and women who wanted to work were being assaulted and beaten by strikers. He knew that the right to enter private property and to cross public property for the purpose of going to jobs which were rightfully theirs was denied to citizens of Michigan. He knew that such acts were illegal, were unlawful, were a refusal to permit American citizens to exercise their constitutional rights. Yet he stood on the floor of this House and defended the conduct which deprived American citizens of the rights just enumerated and guaranteed by our Federal Constitution.

He knew that those acts were unfair; that they were unjust, and, if he knew anything about the principles of the common law or the wording of our statutes, he knew, or as a graduate of the University of Washington and the holder of the degree of doctor of laws, he should have known, that such conduct on the part of the sit-down strikers was not

only a violation of every principle of common law, of every rule of conduct laid down in the Constitution of the Federal Government, but was oppressive and tyrannical. And yet he stood here where I am standing now and defended that kind of conduct.

Wednesday the gentleman said:

Government employees, similar to all other citizens of this Republic, have the indubitable and inalienable right to join or organizations of their own choosing.

Yet when those sit-down strikes were on, the gentleman spoke in defense of the activities of the C. I. O., which denied to individuals the right to join an organization other than the C. I. O.

The gentleman further said (RECORD of October 25, 1939, p. 1426):

They have the right to hold and to express their own opinions on all subjects without submitting those opinions to any individual or Government body for approval. Government employees, no less than workers in private industry, must be permitted to exercise these constitutional American rights without coercion from any source or fear of losing their jobs as a consequence of such exercise.

But on the floor of this House the gentleman has defended the C. I. O., which denies to a worker the right to earn a livelihood unless he joins its organization. On the floor of this House he has defended the National Labor Relations Board, which has twice convicted Henry Ford of an unfair labor practice because he told the employees of the Ford Motor Co. and those who sought jobs there that they did not need to pay any organization for the right to work in the Ford Motor Co. plants.

Day before yesterday he criticized the Dies committee because it published the names of those who are members of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Twice on the 27th day of April 1937, as shown on pages 3881 and 3889 of volume 81, part 4, of the proceedings of the Seventy-fifth Congress, the gentleman from Washington voted in favor of giving to the public the names, not of public officials, not of officers or employees of the Federal Government, but of private individuals who had a net income over and above a certain amount.

Wednesday he objected to the publication of the names of those who belong to an organization which is controlled by an organization which advocates the overthrow of our Government by force.

Did the gentleman ever arise on the floor of this House and condemn the illegal seizure of private papers by the Hugo Black committee? Did the gentleman ever find fault with the seizure of private papers by the La Follette so-called Senate Civil Liberties Committee? Has he ever at any time objected to illegal search and seizure, to the denial of free speech or a free press when the interests of the Communists or the Communist Party was not involved?

Enough along that line. Let us turn now to the statements made by the gentleman on the floor and see just how much reliance we should place upon his statements.

The gentleman just a moment ago said that I was a liar. I do not care to dignify the charge by a denial. The Members of the House are well able to determine, each for himself, the degree of reliance which they will place upon the statements made by each Member of the House. No doubt the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] spoke rather hastily. It is my recollection that the 11th verse of the One Hundred and Sixteenth Psalm reads something like this:

I said in my haste, All men are liars.

But for the sake of determining the accuracy of the statements of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] let me refer to the printed RECORD of the gentleman's speech which he made on the floor of the House day before yesterday. And this I do without thought of criticism but solely for the purpose of getting before the House the facts.

The gentleman from Washington said (RECORD, 1427) that the president of the local branch of the American League for Peace and Democracy and the national president of that organization told the chairman of the committee that the

league would be glad to surrender any documents requested, and yet immediately thereafter he said, referring to the committee:

They went down there, without any time, and seized those documents, which you know as a lawyer they had no right to seize.

If the officials of the league consented to the surrender of their papers, as the gentleman himself says they did, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] on the same occasion asserted that the papers were only brought before the committee "after full knowledge and consent of the league itself, and with written letters of consent on file in our records," just what foundation is there for the charge of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] that representatives of the committee seized documents which they had no right to seize?

Likewise, on Wednesday (RECORD 1428), the gentleman from Washington said:

Let me point out to the gentleman from Alabama that his committee accepted testimony to the effect that John L. Lewis was, for practical purposes, a Communist.

And that immediately thereafter the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] arose and said (RECORD 1428):

Let me say to the gentleman most emphatically that not one single witness who appeared before that committee ever testified that John Lewis is a Communist; not one from the beginning to this very moment has made that statement.

The records of the committee will show which of these gentlemen is correct. For myself, in view of the inconsistencies in the conduct of the gentleman from Washington and in view of his previous inaccurate statement, I prefer to accept the statement of the gentleman from Alabama.

Again, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] charged in substance, by innuendo, that the committee was unfair, in that it did not call as witnesses those against whom charges had been made. Again, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] answered him. He said (RECORD 1429):

Let me give the gentleman the facts. The committee addressed a letter to John L. Lewis giving him the privilege of appearing to deny any statement made by any witness with reference to the existence of communism in any part of his organization or movement, but he has not dignified the invitation with a reply.

Let me say further to the gentleman that any man whose name is mentioned in connection with this investigation who is charged with being in collusion with the Communists or any other un-American movement in this country will be extended every opportunity to appear there and deny under oath that testimony.

Let us come now to the merits of this controversy. On Wednesday the gentleman said (RECORD 1429):

What is the purpose of the chairman in giving out that list to the newspapers?

He answered his own question in this manner:

It appears to be obviously for the purpose of intimidating Government employees. It states in effect that we, a congressional committee, want you people to know you are jeopardizing your jobs. We know who you are, and we will get you when the time comes and when the hours seems propitious and appropriate. That is the effect of the published membership list on the Government employees affected.

He had previously said that the publication of the list could have but one purpose (RECORD 1426):

That is to intimidate the members, threatening that the penalty of refusing to resign may be loss of their jobs.

Let us analyze the situation. January 3, 1939, the Dies committee filed a report which was signed by every member of the committee, including the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY]. On page 69 of the report I find this statement:

The largest of the Communist "front" movements in the United States is the American League for Peace and Democracy, formerly known as the American League Against War and Fascism, and, at the time of its inception, as the United States Congress Against War.

Over on the next page I find the statement:

Internationalistic Communist organizers, such as Henri Barbusse and Tom Mann, were permitted by the United States Department of Labor to come from abroad to assist in launching this movement.

A little lower down I find:

Members of the league have been pledged to resist military training, to demand "total and universal disarmament, as proposed by the Soviet Union.

At the Pittsburgh convention of this movement in November 1937, its name was changed from the American League Against War and Fascism to the American League for Peace and Democracy. This organization is the American section of the World Committee Against War and Fascism (now the World Committee for Peace and Democracy).

The substance of this report—pages 69 to 71, inclusive—and of the testimony before the committee is that the league was founded by Communists, that it receives a contribution of something like \$2,500 per year from the Communist Party.

If, on January 3, 1939, it was the unanimous opinion of this committee, the members of which then were MARTIN DIES, JOE STARNES, JOHN J. DEMPSEY, HAROLD G. MOSIER, ARTHUR D. HEALEY, N. M. MASON, and J. PARNELL THOMAS, that the American League for Peace and Democracy had been founded by, and its activities were in a measure at least controlled by, Communists, why not criticize any member of that committee for the publication of the names of those who belong to the organization?

Taken apparently from a Communist Party organization, in this report appears this statement (RECORD 71):

It is significant that the Communist Party, more than any other labor group, has been able to achieve successfully united fronts with church groups. This is not due to any compromise with religion as such on our part. In fact, by going among religious masses we are for the first time able to bring our antireligious ideas to them.

Wednesday on the floor of this House the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], who is so earnest and who is so industrious and who we are all sure is sincere, made the statement (RECORD 1430):

I said, I believe that I was personally compelled to the conclusion, on the basis of evidence that had been presented to me and the committee, that this organization was substantially dominated by the Communist Party.

After hearing witnesses, who testified under oath, and presumably after consideration of that testimony and deliberation thereon, a committee of the House made a unanimous report and that report contains this sentence:

The largest of the Communist "front" movements in the United States is the American League for Peace and Democracy, formerly known as the American League Against War and Fascism, and, at the time of its inception, as the United States Congress Against War.

We have the statement of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], who is known to every Member of this House as a liberal; who, from the time he became a Member down to the present time, has spoken always against conservatism, against reactionism; who has given all too generously of his strength and his time to the so-called New Deal; who here day before yesterday, speaking, as he always speaks, on his responsibility as a Member of the House, solemnly declared, when the issue was squarely presented, that he was compelled—note that word "compelled"—"to the conclusion, on the basis of evidence that had been presented" to him and to the committee, "that this organization was substantially dominated by the Communist Party."

So it may be accepted as a fact that the American League for Peace and Democracy is but a tool of the Communist Party. There is no longer in America any doubt about the purpose or the objective of the Communist Party. That party is antireligious.

From 1865 down to the present moment, with but a short exception, on our coins this Nation has carried the motto, "In God we trust." Today the Communist Party proclaims religion to be a fraud, denies the existence of a God. Today, as from the beginning of its activities, the Communist Party advocates the overthrow of our Government by force.

Today, here in Washington, we have an organization, which the proof shows is substantially dominated by the Communists, who, in turn, if they had the power, would overthrow the Government which permits their existence.

No one advocates the publishing of the name of someone who does not belong to that organization. We all know,

however, how mistakes can be made. I agree with the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] that it is a grievous wrong to the woman. It is a grievous wrong when the gentleman rises and says that I am a liar, but I am passing it off on the theory that his judgment is wrong, that he does not know what he is talking about and his statement is so absurd, in view of the facts, that no one will believe it.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am sure the gentleman from Michigan would not be a party to publishing names that might assassinate character until the names had been investigated and it had been determined that the persons named were members of the organization they were accused of being members of.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I agree with the gentleman absolutely.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is exactly what I asked be done, and what they refused to do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But we have on the other hand the statement of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] yesterday. Now, he may be in error, but because a man makes a statement that is not true does not mean he is a liar. I have always been taught and I believe that a lie is something deliberately misrepresented. The other is a mistaken representation of fact. We all know that, we all know how such statements are made in argument. One or the other may be wrong, but it does not follow that the one who is wrong is a liar; he is just mistaken, that is all. That happens every day.

I agree with the gentleman from New Mexico that the list should have been checked and rechecked time and time again, but then when it was discovered that they were members I see no reason—and I ask the gentleman if he sees any reason—why the names of the members of this organization should not be published?

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. When the names were obtained the record did not show the positions they held in the Government service. The Dies committee took it upon itself to determine what positions they held. In one instance there was a lady by the name of Lamberton on the list. It turned out that there was a lady named Lamberton teaching in the Eliot Junior High School. The publication of this name caused her much distress, yet she did not even know of the existence of such an organization as the American League for Peace and Democracy. That is what I think is wrong about this thing.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If that be true, and I do not doubt it, it shows the necessity of checking. The name should not have been published if she was not a member. But such mistakes will occur and many times the innocent suffer for the acts of the guilty. If it develops upon investigation that this woman was not a member of the league, and that is a fact that can be easily ascertained, I am sure the committee will be the first to publicly acknowledge that act; to tell how the error occurred and to offer a public apology to her.

Should not the woman be satisfied with the public explanation as to how the error occurred and a statement from the committee showing that it was an inadvertence which the members of the committee regret?

That committee is doing a wonderful job. It has a difficult task. It has been bitterly opposed and there is no reason why it should be damned because, being human, it now and then makes an error.

Mr. DEMPSEY. More than that, she has been broadcast throughout this Nation as a member of such organization. This is assassination of character, something that cannot be rebuilt.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is one of the vicious things that goes with free speech.

Hundreds of thousands of American citizens have been vilified because we cling to the doctrine of free speech and a free press, and while that fact is no reason for character assassination, as long as we trust to the human faculties, as

we must, errors will be made and the woman should not think that she is the only one who has been done a wrong.

Perhaps she attaches undue importance to the incident. It may be true as well that enemies of the committee are using the incident to destroy confidence in the committee, and I am not intimating that the gentleman from New Mexico has that thought in mind, for I have not the slightest doubt but that he is loyal to the committee of which he is a member.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan, whom I have found to be fair about things always, that what I asked them to do was to take sufficient time to determine whether the list was proper or improper before they published it, and they refused to do it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. The request to take sufficient time to check the list before it was published came after the committee had voted to make the list public. If someone has been hurt and I have no doubt but what there is, the list as published was the membership list as kept in the office of the local chapter of the American League for Peace and Democracy and that list only. If there were mistakes of names being on the list that were not members, it was not the mistake of the Dies committee, it was the mistake of the records and the local chapter of that league. Please, therefore, do not blame the Dies committee if there were names on that list that should not have been on it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I would like to correct the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And the gentleman does not accuse him of being a liar either, does he?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] does not claim that the gentleman from New Mexico is one?

Mr. MASON. It was voted to publish the list.

Mr. HOFFMAN. A possible explanation of the whole incident, one which is consistent with the position taken by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], is this: That the list furnished by the local chapter of the American League for Peace and Democracy had on it the name "Mrs. Lamberton"; that in attempting to check this name against a list of Federal employees or employees residing in the city of Washington the name of a Mrs. Lamberton was found and her profession was given as a teacher in this high school, and some employee of the committee reached the conclusion that the Mrs. Lamberton teaching school was the same Mrs. Lamberton whose name appeared on the league's list.

Let us say that it is a case of mistaken identity; that it was an error on the part of an employee of the committee. Let the committee so state, if that be the fact, and let Mrs. Lamberton and her friends forget it. Any other course but tends to ruffle the tempers of all connected with the incident and to give aid and satisfaction to those who oppose the committee's efforts to expose subversive activities.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The following morning I talked with the chairman, the gentleman from Texas. The list had not been as yet published, and I told him he was in error. I asked that we have an executive session so that I might give him the information which I had. The meeting was called for 10:30. I received a long-distance call about 10:25, and reached the committee room at 10:33, 3 minutes after the committee went into session. Notwithstanding that our colleague from California [Mr. VOORHIS] called attention to the fact I wished to be heard, the gentleman from Illinois said "We have waited until 10:30, and I move that the chairman carry out the instructions." Three minutes later, if you please, That is the courtesy extended to a member of the Dies committee who has something which he thinks is important, namely, the saving of innocent people from being attacked by a committee of this Congress.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I want to make this statement: The gentleman from New Mexico came to the committee meeting at 10:40, 10 minutes late, and after all this had been transacted, Mr. DEMPSEY. Did the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] ask you to wait?

Mr. MASON. Yes; he asked that we wait, and we refused to wait.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is exactly the point I am making.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Getting back to the question I asked the gentleman from New Mexico, if these people are members of this league, does the gentleman see any objection to publishing their names; and if so, why?

Mr. DEMPSEY. If they are members of the league, and have knowledge that it is a Communist front organization, certainly not. If they are members and are innocent of that fact—and I did not know until I became a member of the Dies committee—then I see an objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I agree with the gentleman. I am offering a bill today which reads as follows:

A bill to prevent the payment of Federal funds to any person who advocates, or who is engaged in, or who is a member of any organization which advocates, or is a member of any organization which is affiliated with any organization which advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force, or which is controlled in whole or in part by any foreign government or any agency of any foreign government.

Be it enacted, etc., That no part of any appropriation which has been heretofore made, or which shall hereafter be made, shall be used to pay any part of the compensation or the expenses of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States or of any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States, who, directly or indirectly, advocates the overthrow of the United States Government by force, or who knowingly joins, or who remains for a period of 20 days a member of, any organization which advocates the overthrow of the United States Government by force, or who remains for a period of 20 days a member of any organization which is founded by or whose activities are controlled by any individual or any organization which advocates the overthrow of the United States Government by force, after he has knowledge, or has reasonable cause to believe, that such organization of which he is about to become a member, or of which he is a member, either advocates the overthrow of the United States Government by force or is affiliated with another organization which advocates the overthrow of the United States Government by force; or who becomes, or continues to be for a period of 20 days, a member of such an organization whose activities are directed or controlled, directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, by any foreign government or the agency of any foreign government; or who becomes, or continues to be for a period of 20 days, a member of an organization which was founded by, or whose activities are controlled or directed in whole or in part by, an organization whose activities are controlled in whole or in part by any foreign government, after he has knowledge or reasonable grounds to believe that such foreign government controls in whole or in part the organization of which he is about to become, or of which he is, a member, or controls in whole or in part the organization which controls in whole or in part the organization of which he is about to become or is a member.

Mr. HOOK. Who is going to be the judge? You?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would not presume to do that, and, on the other hand, I would not leave it to the gentleman from northern Michigan either. I would let the courts decide. I would let good, common sense decide that.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not unless I can get more time. I want to make another point.

Mr. HOOK. Just for a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. HOOK. Does not the gentleman think it is about time that even Members of Congress restrain themselves as purveyors of false information?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know of any Member of the present Congress who ever knowingly was a purveyor of false information. I have found my colleagues to be honest, to be conscientious, and I regret that the gentleman should charge that any Member of Congress has been guilty of giving out false information. In my judgment, the charge is hastily made. Have you ever felt that restraint yourself?

Mr. HOOK. Yes; I have.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why do you not practice it then?

Mr. HOOK. When I hear you, I think of it right along.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You know, when a man does not have a good argument he calls a name—a childish device. The gentleman cannot cite a single instance where I ever knowingly gave out false information and I do not believe that he can cite a single instance where any Member of this Congress ever knowingly gave out false information.

I have not the slightest doubt but that, if the gentleman ever heard a political opponent making a false statement, he would forthwith challenge him on the floor of the House, but so far, he has not successfully done so.

To resort to the calling of names is a confession that consecutive, constructive thinking has ceased and that the one using that method has come to the end of his argument.

Let us get back to the proposition which was being discussed.

The American League for Peace and Democracy which, it has been shown, is a tool of the Communist Party, has among its members Federal employees, who, because of their position in the Government service, have an influence wholly out of proportion to that which they would have as private citizens.

The gentleman from Washington said that the purpose of the publication of this list of names was to serve notice that the members of this organization were jeopardizing their jobs by continuing as members.

I will go one step further. In fact, I have today introduced a bill which would prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds for the payment of compensation to any employee or officer of the Federal Government who belongs to an organization which teaches, or who belongs to an organization which is affiliated with and controlled by any organization which teaches the overthrow of our Government by force.

This position is not a denial of any constitutional right or privilege. It is not a denial of the right of free speech or of a free press. It is not a denial of religious freedom. It is just plain, ordinary common sense applied to the doctrine of self-preservation.

Here we have a Government which we love, cherish, and on which our hopes for our own economic, political, and religious freedom are founded. Here we have an organization, the Communist Party, which advocates and teaches openly the overthrow of this Government of ours by force. Here we have the American League for Peace and Democracy which was founded by, and is being used by, this organization which teaches the overthrow of our Government by force. Here we have in Government service a group of people, some of them high in official position, who belong to that organization which is being used by the Communists who advocate the overthrow of our Government by force.

It is not only foolish, but it is unpatriotic to permit those who belong to such an organization to remain on the public pay roll. Why should we tax our citizens for the support of our Government and then use a portion of that fund to pay compensation to our Federal employees who belong to an organization which is being used by the Communist Party in its drive to overthrow the very Government which gives them the bread and the meat that they eat, the clothes which they wear, and the shelter which protects them from the weather?

Even the ignorant Hottentot, the Bushman of South Africa, has sense enough to throw out of his village those who would destroy it. We, with our boasted civilization, with all of our education, are so dumb that we lack either the ability to understand the activities of these traitors to our country, or we lack the courage to incur their ill will.

As one who believes in American institutions; as one who believes in loyalty to the Government which enables me to live and enjoy political and religious freedom, I ask for the expulsion from Government service of all of those, be they of low or high degree, who by their membership in this or any other organization, or by their approval, join hands with the traitors to our Government who would overthrow it by force. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended 15 minutes.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that there are at least 10 more special orders for this afternoon. I have not asked for one moment of time up until today. We will have to run until after 6 o'clock today. I shall not object to this request; but if anyone hereafter asks for additional time, I shall be compelled to object.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield, Mr. Speaker.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial appearing in the Washington Post this morning.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct some typographical errors in the speech I made that appears in the RECORD of October 23.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Chicago Daily News entitled "Red Milkmen," which I think will be very interesting.

Mr. COX. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman will broaden his request to include the membership list of the so-called League for Peace and Democracy, about which so much has been said.

Mr. GEYER of California. I certainly will not.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Georgia want to go into the RECORD the names of those who are not members of this league?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if the statement issued by the gentleman's committee means anything, it means that the present members of that committee were advised of the communistic activities of the league more than 12 months ago.

Mr. GIFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I make this observation. Why not have this list printed? The remedy is simple. Those on the list can explain whether or not they ought to be on it. Their character is not assassinated, except for a moment. The remedy is simple.

Mr. GEYER of California. I certainly will not.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], is recognized for 45 minutes.

NEUTRALITY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, never in my lifetime have I felt so humble or so inadequate to the task of analyzing my own convictions as I do now in approaching the problems of setting a course of international policy in our country. In this hour of anxiety, with problems at home and

abroad, one can appreciate the dismay of Wordsworth, who on taking stock of England's problems several generations ago exclaimed, "Milton! Thou shouldst be living at this hour." We too in our search for light and guidance might well hark back to the Father of our country and say, "Washington! Thou shouldst be living at this hour."

But it is our problem. It is the problem of this generation. We are invested with authority by the American people and we must find the solution.

I address myself to the membership today, not in a spirit of empirical wisdom but in a spirit of inquiry. The bill now pending before the Senate has been not yet molded to final form. In completed form, its effect and purport may be materially modified before it reaches this body. Until then, final judgment must be withheld as befits a conscientious legislator.

It is to be presumed, however, from all available observation and conjecture that the arms embargo will have been deleted from existing law when the bill reaches us, and to that subject I would address my remarks.

I live in a town of 18,000 people. It has 1 newspaper. The editor and publisher is one of the keenest, ablest, and most human newspapermen in America. He has a sense of human values and maintains the common touch.

On the front page Editor McNaughton carries a daily column in bold-face type. In his column of October 3, 1939, he carried this story. While riding on a train on Friday, September 29, a man whom he had never seen before said to him: "If EVERETT DIRKSEN votes on Hitler's and Stalin's side when the embargo vote comes up, he ought to be driven from public life. DIRKSEN may have a lot of letters asking him to vote against changing the embargo, but nobody in all the world is wanting him to vote that way as badly as Hitler; and if he does vote with Hitler, we red-blooded Americans ought to cut off his political life right there."

The following afternoon Editor McNaughton was standing in front of his newspaper plant when a good friend of his came by and said: "If EVERETT DIRKSEN votes to lift that embargo—why, why, I've voted for EVERETT ever since he began running for anything, but if he votes to lift that embargo I'll get out in person and I'll beat him the next time he runs if it's the last thing I do on earth."

My colleagues, those two examples illustrate the cleavage in public thinking today. Most of you are experiencing the same phenomenon. Measured in terms of political repercussions in the future, it may be a bit disconcerting. Be of good cheer. When Abraham Lincoln left Springfield, Ill., on February 11, 1861, in an hour of crisis, to assume the direction of this Government his fellow citizens presented him with a silken banner on which was embroidered the ninth verse of the first chapter of Joshua. It reads:

Have I not commanded thee? Be strong and of good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed; for the Lord thy God is with thee, whithersoever thou goest.

In a way, it is a bit tragic. As if political threats and threatened reprisals will solve the problem before us.

This sentiment has its compensations. It stimulates thinking. It develops resolution in an hour when resolution and clear thinking is needed. It finally dissolves all fear and renews all faith. Only one thing is of importance. The present and future welfare of this country—your country, my country—must be the sole consideration for the votes we cast. With whatever of purpose and of light has been given me, I am ready to resolve the issue.

With all the earnestness of my soul I have sought truth and light by which to resolve the question which comes before us. Like you, I have examined the mail and given ear to the prayerful and fervent appeals of fathers and mothers and young men, in many of whom there lingers a vivid recollection of the last war. I have talked with my comrades, the veterans of the last war, and with those young men who will be veterans of the next war if ever we should again be embroiled in conflict. I have talked with fathers and mothers. I have talked with businessmen and farmers. I have talked with men who worked in mines and mills and with men who are on