

lutions adopted by the city of Portland on the Japanese question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an excerpt from the Jersey Bulletin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

THE LATE J. ADAM BEDE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the late J. Adam Bede was a friend of my father. I am constrained on that account not to be silent as I learn of his death.

That what I say does not run into a long lot of words is not to be taken as a measure of the respect I desire to show the memory of my father's friend.

Mr. Bede was a member of the Fifty-eighth to Sixtieth Congresses. During his service in Congress he made many friends and made an indelible impression on those with whom he was associated for all time.

A man of more than ordinary ability, fearless and fair, he was deserving of the genuine regard and respect of political friend and foe alike, and was so accredited.

I knew him in days gone by, and was more than pleased to renew the acquaintance and friendship during the last year when and while he was actively engaged in an effort to further the interests of the St. Lawrence River project, to which he knew I was unalterably opposed, as of the present.

I listened to his arguments, he knowing that I did not agree with either his premise or his conclusions. I told him just what I thought about the proposition, with which he unalterably disagreed.

These friendly controversial colloquies never raised a ripple of discord to disturb the friendly relations between us.

The more I saw of him the better I liked him and the more genuinely I respected him.

I am sorry to learn of his passing. Minnesota has lost one of its very able citizens and the country a man whose integrity was unquestioned, whose ability was far above the average, whose enthusiasm for and whose belief in those things for which he stood was as unlimited and as unchangeable as the mountains round about Jerusalem. We need and can ill afford to lose such men as J. Adam Bede.

(Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the

legislative business of the day has been disposed of and other special orders, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert therein a statement I made before the Committee on Public Lands.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD with reference to the late J. Adam Bede, to follow the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan may state his question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from an article in PM of Friday, April 10, 1942, captioned "Probe due on HOFFMAN," the following is quoted:

HOFFMAN is wanted for questioning by the Federal grand jury that already has indicted George Sylvester Vierick, Nazi propagandist; George Hill, FISH's former secretary-clerk; and several others for helping spread the gospel according to Hitler in the United States of America.

Farther down in the article is this sentence, which refers to two talks made on the floor of the House, one on January 27, the other on January 30, in the following language:

The Hoffman speech was titled "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes, or Roosevelt Is a Judas."

That statement is a deliberate falsehood, for the two speeches were entitled "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," and no reference to Roosevelt as a Judas was contained therein.

In the Detroit News, under date of April 10, is found this statement:

HOFFMAN, bitterly outspoken isolationist from Allegan, has, grand-jury investigators assert, either consciously or otherwise, let his speeches in the House of Representatives be used as part of an anti-Roosevelt, anti-British, anti-Jewish campaign, which, the investigators declare, is clearly subversive.

The foregoing statement is wholly false, for the speeches referred to, being those of January 27 and January 30, are speeches made in opposition to the effort of certain anti-Americans to cause us to surrender our independence, adopt a declaration of interdependence, become a part of a United States of the World, and lose our national identity.

The Detroit News article of April 10 contained this further statement:

Circulation of HOFFMAN's speeches was one of the activities of George Sylvester Vierick, recently convicted Nazi master spy, according to preliminary grand-jury developments last week. It developed late Thursday that HOFFMAN had supplied reprints of his "Roosevelt Is a Judas" speech to an anti-British editor in Omaha, Nebr.

That charge is false, insofar as it refers to my talks made on the floor of the House as a "Roosevelt Is a Judas" speech. Nor did Vierick, whom I do not know, ever, to my knowledge, circulate any speech made by me. Moreover, speeches made on the House floor can be purchased of the Government printer by anyone securing copies of the RECORD. Even Maloney might quote the Bible to justify his smear campaign, but that would not give him an air of sanctity.

The newspaper comments quoted above call in question my loyalty, my patriotism, my integrity, and raise a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair feels that the first statement read, to wit—

HOFFMAN is wanted for questioning by the Federal grand jury that already has indicted George Sylvester Vierick, Nazi propagandist; George Hill, FISH's former secretary-clerk; and several others for helping spread the gospel according to Hitler in the United States of America—

constitutes a question of personal privilege.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a propaganda sheet put out by the World Fellowship, Inc.; and two full-page ads, one from the Washington Star of January 5, and the other from the New York Times of December 18, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Permit me to preface my remarks by calling attention to the fact that under the law grand-jury proceedings are supposed to be secret; that no witness called before the grand jury is permitted to divulge the substance of his testimony. Nor is anyone, special prosecutor, grand-jury foreman, member of the grand jury, or court attendant guarding the deliberations of a grand jury, permitted, under the law, to disclose any of the proceedings of the grand jury.

Notwithstanding this strict rule of law, the purpose of which is to prevent those whose activities are being investigated from learning what is being done, it is apparent that the spirit, if not the letter, of the law is being violated by the investigators employed either by Special Attorney Maloney or the grand jury itself.

Much information has been given to the public through the press by those purporting to be acting for the grand jury. Note this statement from the Detroit News:

Circulation of HOFFMAN's speeches was one of the activities of George Sylvester Vierick, recently convicted Nazi master spy, according to preliminary grand-jury developments last week.

Just when and why did special grand-jury investigators disclose to the public press matters under investigation by the grand jury? Those who have read the Washington Post have noted with amazement the disclosure by that paper of grand-jury testimony. It would seem as though the Post's reporter had access to transcripts of the testimony. That should not be.

I suggest that the Speaker of the House appoint a committee to call before it the special attorney, Maloney, reporters for the Post, and the grand-jury investigators, and ascertain whether or not the present investigation is not being conducted as a smear campaign in an effort to defeat all those who, prior to December 7, might be considered as isolationists; that such a committee inquire as to whether or not the special attorney himself did not, when seeking an extension of the life of the grand jury, make the statement that, if he was given 3 additional months, he could defeat every Republican candidate for Congress who had been opposed to our entry into war.

I also suggest that the committee investigate and determine whether the proceedings of the grand jury have been secret, as required by law, and whether a reporter for the Washington Post has not, in some unauthorized way, obtained access to grand-jury records.

Let us return now to the charge made against me to the effect that the speeches made by me on January 27 and 30 are being used by Nazi agents.

Naturally, I have no way of knowing by whom and how those two speeches are being used. To that charge suffice it to say that the Constitution itself may be used and quoted from by convicted criminals; that it is a common saying that the devil can quote Scripture for his own purpose.

For those two speeches I make not the slightest apology. Those speeches were printed in the RECORD at the time they were made. Later, permission to revise them was given on the floor, as is stated in the reprint of the two when they were combined.

In my judgment, anyone who can find anything in either of those speeches—copies of which will be furnished to any Member desiring the same—which is disloyal, unpatriotic, un-American, must have a twisted and a warped mind or be in favor of surrendering our independence, hauling down our flag and becoming a principality or dominion of some world organization.

There is in those two speeches not one word which anyone who loves this country, who believes in our Constitution, who wants to preserve for our posterity the liberties and the freedom which we have enjoyed, can find any fault.

Those speeches have been referred to as Roosevelt Is a Judas speeches. That is a false statement. The reprint shows on its face that it is made in opposition to those who would destroy our national identity. The first one does use the words "a Judas," but it uses them in connection with the efforts of Clarence Streit and his associates, and I repeat that charge here and now that Streit and

those who would destroy our national identity are betrayers of our country.

If Prosecutor Maloney and the grand jury are really interested in exposing sedition and subversive activities, I suggest to him that the grand jury, by investigation, obtain answers to the following:

First. Are our drafted men fighting in foreign lands for the preservation of our national identity?

Second. Do those fighting men need supplies and munitions of war, such as clothing, guns, ammunition, tanks, planes, ships?

Third. Is it not true that one member of a family is drafted for active 24-hour service?

Fourth. Is it not true that the brother or the father of the drafted man, when he seeks to aid in the production of the munitions or material the drafted man needs, is first required to pay a union before he can go to work?

Fifth. If a man can be drafted, as he is, to serve in a foreign land 24 hours a day in the fighting forces, why should his father or brother who remains at home be required to pay an initiation fee to a union when he seeks to work in support of the drafted man?

Sixth. What right has a union to require a man to pay an initiation fee and monthly dues as a condition precedent to national defense work?

Seventh. What, if anything, are you or the grand jury doing to end that unlawful, subversive conduct?

Eighth. Do you not know that exorbitant profits have been made by some corporations? If you do, what action are you or the grand jury taking to end that practice?

Apparently you are inquiring into my right to make a speech advocating the preservation of our National Government, the continuance of our Government under our Constitution.

Ninth. Why do you condemn such a speech and ignore activities which have actually interfered, and are today interfering, with the effort of our fighting men to preserve that Government?

If, in the opinion of Maloney, the speeches of January 27 and 30 are improper, why does he not investigate that portion of the press which carries the statement that those speeches are "Roosevelt Is a Judas" speeches? Why does he not call before the grand jury Stokes of the Washington Post and ask him to point out the words in that speech which states that Roosevelt is a Judas? Why does he not ask Stokes whether he, too, believes that the Stars and Stripes should come down, that our Declaration of Independence should be disregarded, and that we should become a principality of some foreign nation? Why does he not ask Stokes whether he is an American or whether he is a subject of some foreign nation?

Let him ask Stokes whether he believes that we should continue to remain the United States of America or whether we should become a part of a world group.

Let me add that I have no apologies to make for the speeches of January 27 and January 30; that I defy anyone to

find in them one word of disloyalty; one word that is un-American.

I have not now, I never had, any connection whatsoever with Vierick, with Hill, with Hudson, with Winrod, or anyone else who to my knowledge is circulating any pro-Nazi material. If any of those who have sent out copies of Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes are engaged in subversive or seditious activities, they are doing it without my knowledge and neither Prosecutor Maloney nor anyone else should criticize the fact that a patriotic talk such as Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes was given circulation.

The prosecutor has no more right to link me with any pro-Nazi agent than I would have to link him with a murderer or any other criminal who might be seen in the courtroom with him.

Let me reaffirm my opposition to all those, whether it be Special Attorney Maloney, Hudson, Winrod, Asher, or some stooge of Hitler masquerading as an American, who nevertheless seeks, in addition to the destruction of our Nation by force, to destroy that Nation by subversive propaganda asking us to surrender our independence, to haul down the Stars and Stripes and hoist in lieu thereof a foreign flag, be it the flag of Hitler or the flag of a world supergovernment.

For me, the Stars and Stripes and the principles they represent are good enough.

I ask Prosecutor Maloney: Does he favor the hauling down of the Stars and Stripes? Does he think it adds to the war effort to tell our people that we should surrender our independence and now join in a United States of the World? Does he believe that we should appropriate, as asked by World Fellowship, Inc., \$1,100,000,000 to form a superworld government, while we now need every dollar of our resources to win this war?

I was told this morning that the district attorney—we will call him Mr. Maloney hereafter—wanted me down before the grand jury at 10:30. I just came back late last night, and having work on the desk, I thought that the district attorney could wait until this afternoon, so I told him I would be down at 3 o'clock, and, graciously, no objection was made.

After you go before a grand jury you cannot disclose anything that happens there; the proceedings of a grand jury, of course, are secret. What has been bothering me of late is the fact that for some time the papers have been telling what the grand jury was doing and what the witnesses were supposed to have disclosed. For example, in this article this morning and in the press of the tenth, and of other dates, it is stated that according to grand-jury investigators I had been circulating or permitting somebody to circulate some of my material, someone who is an agent of the Nazi government. That statement is false. Now, where do the papers get that idea? How does the press know what the grand jury is doing? How do the boys of the press, how do the boys who report for the Washington Post know what things have happened, what proceedings have been

had before the grand jury? I would suggest to Maloney that he investigate some of his own investigators, and that hereafter the information that is given out be given out in accordance with the law and with grand-jury procedure, with which he is doubtless familiar.

Going now to these charges that are made and to the newspaper headlines which state that I made a speech entitled "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," that much of it is right. This is the rest of the title "Or Roosevelt as a Judas." I have copies of that reprint here, and I hope that every Member of the House will take one of them and see if they can find in that talk, which is a combination of two talks I made on the floor of the House, one on January 27 and the other on the 30th of January, any reference anywhere to the President as a Judas. The words "a Judas" were used, but how and where and to whom do they refer? Those two words have reference to Streit.

In the first part of the speech what was I talking about? I was talking about this group called World Fellowship, Inc., and another one, Federal Union, Inc. Here are the two of them.

What did those groups propose to do? We are in a war, a war which needs the efforts of every individual, yet that group seeks to distract the attention of our people by calling upon us at this time, a time of great national danger, to do what? To forsake and give up the Declaration of Independence adopted by our forefathers in 1776 and to adopt in place thereof a declaration of interdependence. They ask us, in effect, to haul down the Stars and Stripes and hoist in place thereof the flag of a superworld government.

The other organization, World Fellowship, Inc., came along, and they asked this House, through this circular, marked "Exhibit C," which every Member has received, to give the President of the United States on his birthday, January 30, and that is the date of the last speech, \$100,000,000—think of it—to be used for what? For the carrying on of the war? For the buying of munitions? For the buying of ships? No; no. They asked us to give \$100,000,000 to Tom, Dick, and Harry, men selected by the President as representatives of foreign nations, to form a United States of the World, of which we should be a part.

They go further and say that when the President has appointed these men—and who they will be no one knows—when he has appointed these men, and when they have written this constitution of the world government, which was to supersede or override at least, our Constitution, we were also to give to him by that same bill which they asked someone in the House to introduce, \$1,000,000,000 to be used at the discretion of these men to effectuate, to make active this United States of the World.

Is there any reason why every loyal American should not oppose with all his heart, with all his mind, and with all his strength an effort like that to betray our country?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield? I do not want to divert the gentleman from the course of

his train of thought. But it seems to me the thing that the Members of the House would be immediately concerned with is how the gentleman's speeches happened to get into this publication, whether they were with or without his consent. That is the crux of the thing.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Get into what?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Into this circular, referred to in today's Post, that went out all over the country. This circular letter is said to have contained a copy of the gentleman's speech in which he refers to the President and other people, and I think it may fairly be assumed he meant to class them with Judas.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Who?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The President of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not do any such thing.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Read it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, I have read it. I wrote it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If the gentleman did not call him a Judas, that is about the only thing the gentleman has not called the President.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Whatever I said about him prior to our entry into the war I stand on, sir.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. What we would like to know is how the gentleman's speeches got into that letter.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When the gentleman suggests that there is a disloyal thought in my mind, he is just drawing on his imagination.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I did not suggest that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When the gentleman even thinks, on the other hand, that I am going to accept all of the President's policies, he is mistaken, and I have heard the gentleman himself stand on this floor and criticize the activities of this administration.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I may do it again.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is no question about that. You have condemned just as bitterly as I have the wasteful spending of this administration; you have condemned just as bitterly as I have the hiring of these fan dancers, these boon-doggers, and teachers of horseshoe throwing, bowling, and all of those things.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. None of my speeches have ever been circulated by any subversive group. How did the gentleman's speech get into that letter?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is easily answered. You may just as well ask, How does anyone get a copy of the Bible when he goes to a hotel? There is a Gideon in many a hotel room, is there not? If you recited the Lord's Prayer on the floor of the Congress, is there any way by which you could prevent anyone, even a Nazi agent, from circulating it? I made those two speeches on the floor of the House. Certain women came into my office and asked if they could have copies of that reprinted. I was going to send out those speeches to the people of my district, and I did send them out. These women wanted copies. I said, "All right." One of them was just as good, just as loyal a woman who ever lived; the other

I did not know personally. Did the gentleman ever refuse anyone who came to him and wanted a copy of his speech?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I say right now we ought to be very scrupulously careful where our speeches go. I do not believe any Member of Congress ought to be permitted in this emergency to let anyone send his speeches anywhere. I think a Member of Congress ought to be permitted to send to his constituents whatever he wants to send under his own authority, but it is a dangerous thing in this emergency for us to permit speeches to be printed and promiscuously sent out in quantities to be circulated possibly for ulterior purposes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why, of course, for ulterior purposes. No Member of this House would send out speeches for ulterior purposes. Is it not true, as a matter of law and as a matter of fact, that I can order as many of the gentleman's speeches, and he can order as many of mine as he wants, if he pays for the printing?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is not true.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You can buy copies of the Record, can you not? And the Record will contain a copy of your speech.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman cannot have my speech reprinted without my consent at the Government Printing Office.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Wait a minute. Answer my question. Does the gentleman say I cannot send to the Public Printer and get a copy of the Record?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Oh, the gentleman can buy copies of the public Record.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman say that I cannot have as many reprinted as I wish?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman cannot, not by the Government Printing Office.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; but cannot I have them printed by anybody—an outside printer?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman's speech that was sent out was printed by the Government Printing Office and could only have been secured on his order, unless he gave someone else permission to have that reprinted.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is right about that, but answer the other question. When I get a copy of the gentleman's speech from the Public Printer, can I not at my own expense have as many reprinted as I want to?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Not in the form in which the gentleman's speech was circulated.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In any form.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Not at the Government Printing Office.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Some place else.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We are not talking about some place else.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman's speech came from the Government Printing Office. That is what he is talking about.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Sure it did.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. How did this association get quantities of the gentleman's speech?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will tell you in a moment. You answer my question. Can I not have the gentleman's speech reprinted at my own expense?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Not in that form.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In some other form, then. The gentleman knows I can.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I have been here 20 years, and I never knew a Congressman to have another Congressman's speech reprinted without his permission. I have not known it to happen. I do not think there is a Member of the body who would do it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is doubtless true. Speeches of Congressmen have been reprinted by other organizations at their own expense, not at the Government Printing Office, and the gentleman must be aware of it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman's speech, though, was from the Government Printing Office; it was not printed some place else.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not now. I want to tell him how these speeches got out.

I started to tell the gentleman how these speeches got out. I was ordering this reprint for circulation in my district, and it has been circulated in my district to every rural box holder. It is going to be circulated in my district to all of the city box holders in the district and, if I can get the names, to all of the individual voters in my district, because it has been charged as being a Roosevelt as a Judas speech, and that is not true. Moreover, no greater service can be rendered at this time than to inform our people of this effort to destroy our Government. I am going to send one to every voter in my district, to every voter, and let him read it for himself. Let each voter see for himself how false is the charge that it is not 100-percent American. Some in the district have read it and they do not put any such construction on it as has the gentleman. What our people say is that this is no time to talk about doing away with our Constitution, this is no time to talk about the hauling down of our flag, this is no time to talk about the surrendering of our national identity and becoming a part of a world supergovernment. Our people are all for the winning of the war but they will not support a movement to scrap our national existence. That is what they say at home.

When these speeches were ordered they came in. A woman who lives here in Washington—a gray-haired woman—came to the office, and she had a list of her friends in a book—printed. She asked me if she could have some of them to send to her friends. She sat down there at the desk and she directed those in franked envelopes to her friends, members of a patriotic organization. Is there anything wrong about that?

Not only that, but others that were sent out were sent out at the request of the people, all of whom I assume to be loyal Americans, who were contributing

to or paid the cost of printing them. The district attorney here, if he wants, or anyone else who wants to know who paid for them, can come over to my office and get that information. The files are open. The letters are open that they wrote me asking for them. I would be glad to have the gentleman read some of the letters that were written requesting copies of those speeches. The gentleman might get a different idea as to what the speech was, and the purport of it, and the effect of it if he would read some of these letters, undoubtedly from patriotic Americans who think this is no time to talk of lowering the Stars and Stripes.

So those speeches went out in the shape they are brought in here, not in franked enclosures but in franked envelopes to the people of my district. They went out to these people and whatever they did with them, naturally, I do not know. I never met this man Viereck and I never met this man Hill and I have no recollection of ever meeting Hudson or any of these other men named in the newspapers. Yet these papers charge that I, in some incomprehensible way, am hooked up with those men. That is a falsehood and every Member of this House ought to know it is a falsehood.

Going one step further, what is this man Maloney doing anyway? It was reported to me this morning when I got here that Mr. Maloney had made the statement—and you Republicans ought to take notice of this—he wanted another year and he finally got 3 months, and at that time the statement was made that if he could get a 3 months' extension he would get every Republican, defeat every Republican, who is a Member of this House and who had been an isolationist prior to December 7. I am telling you over on that side, too, that you men who have been isolationists or you men who have been critical, are going to meet with the same fate.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a very serious accusation. Upon what basis does the gentleman make that statement?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I make that statement on information conveyed to me this morning and upon the newspaper reports of his actions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; but will the gentleman state the source?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I will not state the source. If I did we would probably have that man before the grand jury.

Mr. McCORMACK. All right, the gentleman refuses, but the gentleman has made the statement that the Assistant United States Attorney—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Special attorney.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, he is connected with the Department of Justice and according to the gentleman he has said that, give him 3 months and he would defeat every Republican Member of the House. That is a very drastic statement and I think the gentleman ought to take the House into his confidence and inform the House the source of the statement and not leave it, as the gentleman

has, a statement based upon hearsay evidence. In other words, somebody has told the gentleman from Michigan, apparently, according to what he says, that that statement was made, and the gentleman refuses to disclose who told him. If the gentleman did, that would be the best evidence. As the matter stands now that is purely hearsay. Would the gentleman want to leave himself in that position?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman wants to leave it that way. That is a drastic statement, but it is not as drastic as what the district attorney down here is doing. Just why does the district attorney down here want to mention the name of Hill in connection with my name? Why does he want to mention the name of Viereck in connection with my name? Those speeches are a matter of public record, and the sending out of them is a matter of public record if he wants to discover the truth. The number of copies printed and the price paid are matters of public record. What is he after? He is making ammunition for the campaign. That is what he is doing. If he wants to investigate subversive activities, why does he not investigate these people who want to go into this Union Now? I am not the only one who objects to that. Here is the dean of the House who had something to say on that subject. Look at the RECORD, page 915, January 30, when I was talking about this matter, I said:

That organization would inveigle our citizens into a united states of the world where their property, their incomes, would be at the mercy of Old World politicians.

I see before me the dean of the House, who has served here for more than 30 years. Because of his age and training, he has had a wealth of experience. He must know what the people, at least the people of his district and in the great city of Chicago, are thinking. I would inquire of him now for the purpose of information only, and no other purpose, whether he feels that if this movement to create a supergovernment, this movement to make us one of either the United States of the World, or United Nations—if this drive continues—whether our people will continue to have the same faith, the same enthusiasm for the policies of the administration they now have?

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] asked if I would yield, and I said yes, and he said:

Mr. SABATH. I will say to the gentleman that I am of the honest opinion that the American people will never give up their independence and the rights and the privileges that come to them because of our independence. They cherish it, they will fight for it, and will never agree that it be in any way abolished or modified.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. I hope that on the floor of this House, because he has great influence here and with the administration, he will use his influence and his voice to speak against this movement.

So I suggest to Maloney that he call before him the authors of those two-page advertisements and the author of this circular, who wants us to appropriate \$1,100,000,000 for the purpose of forming a world supergovernment; and I suggest that he find out who supplies their funds, and who gives them the list

that they send this material to, and what their purpose is.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very much interested in the gentleman's statement. I don't want to interrogate the gentleman from Michigan, but I am very much interested in the charge that he made, because if that is true, it is a very serious charge.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What charge?

Mr. McCORMACK. About the Special Assistant Attorney General's wanting an extension of time and his stating that if he had it he would defeat the Republicans. Of course, we know that is ridiculous, to begin with; that nobody could bring about that accomplishment; and I am concerned about that statement and, in fairness to a gentleman who cannot take the floor—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Whom does the gentleman mean—who cannot take the floor?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Maloney.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, he will have me down before the grand jury this afternoon, and you will see the whole thing spread through the newspapers in the morning, in the Washington Post.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the fact is the gentleman would not be down there except for these speeches that were printed by the Public Printer that had been used by the organization that was under investigation, so from that angle we have to look at the origin of them, and the gentleman is to blame himself; but coming back—

Mr. HOFFMAN. And what am I to blame for? Am I to be criticized because I insist upon the preservation of our national existence? I made a speech to that effect, it came into the hands of others who sent it out at their own expense with statements to which I do not subscribe. So I am told that even though the speech is patriotic, it should not have been made.

Mr. McCORMACK. Would the gentleman be willing to tell the House Judiciary Committee the source of that information?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I will keep it for Maloney if he wants it.

Mr. McCORMACK. What?

Mr. HOFFMAN. For Maloney. The gentleman knows him.

Mr. McCORMACK. I never met him.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He is the smear artist.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was he smearing when he convicted Vierick?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No, he was not; but even the devil himself has some good qualities.

Mr. McCORMACK. I investigated Mr. Vierick 6 years ago. He has always been a spy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did he not rewrite the President's speeches, or some of them?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know that the gentleman is any more correct in that than in the previous statement he made.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right. You say he did not. I do not know. That ques-

tion just shows you and the Members how easy it is to ask a question and leave a distasteful thought. The gentleman does not claim that I ever knew Vierick or met him?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not even going into that. I accept the gentleman's word for it. I am only concerned about the statement that he made, the charge about the Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, he has the grand jury, and he has the power of subpoena and the power of administering an oath, and he can get all of that information himself.

Mr. McCORMACK. I always believe in respecting character and reputation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then the gentleman better talk to Maloney.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am talking to the gentleman from Michigan. I do not know Mr. Maloney.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Neither do I—never met him.

Mr. McCORMACK. I give the gentleman one more opportunity—

Mr. HOFFMAN. You do not need to; I answer "No" now.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman want to disclose the source of his information?

Mr. HOFFMAN. You do not need to ask the question. I answer "No."

Mr. McCORMACK. Did this woman pay for the speeches?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Part of them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman state how much he purchased and how much she did?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I cannot tell without the record. If the gentleman wants to call my office, I will tell him. They paid part and I paid part.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman think that Congress should pass a law that would forbid the reprinting of speeches unless the Member who made the speeches paid for them, would be a good thing?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think that kind of a law in connection with a law which would prevent the bureaucrats sending out their propaganda might be a good thing, because we do not send out one fraction of what they do. Of late, for several years, Government funds have been used to popularize the pet theories of bureaucrats.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. FISH. I desire at this time to put into the RECORD a statement of a newspaper reporter giving a brief account of a dinner held recently at the Willard Hotel at which the speakers called for the liquidation of all leading noninterventionists by every possible means, including the Mann Act, income tax, or direct attack or smearing. The war is being fought to save America from Nazi methods and the fear of the gestapo, yet it is proposed by the overseas writers to outdo the worst features of Hitler's Germany to destroy freedom of speech and purge Members of Congress for trying to keep America out of war unless attacked, prior to Pearl Harbor. That is the surest way to discord and disunity and a disservice toward winning the war. At a

luncheon the other day Senator HIRSH JOHNSON came over to me and he was so mad he could hardly speak. He asked me if I had seen or heard about a certain dinner of the overseas reporters a week or so ago. I said I had not. Then he proceeded to tell me about it and asked me to look at what John O'Donnell wrote in the newspaper about it. This is what I found. It comes from the Washington Times-Herald of Monday, March 30, 1942. It is headed "Extract from 'Capitol Stuff,' by John O'Donnell, page 13, March 30, 1942," and it reads as follows:

Saturday night members of the Cabinet and Supreme Court were guests at the Willard of the Overseas Writers Association, and heard some bloodthirsty appeals, with much talk of concentration camps and treason, from ex-reporters now turned starry-eyed crusaders at so much per month or per lecture.

The American press which had opposed this Nation's intervention in the war before the Pearl Harbor attack were hammered lustily, with the anvil chorus led by the three former reporters of the Chicago Tribune.

The significant point is that such potent Roosevelt advisers as Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter—

I am told that Secretary of the Navy Knox was there also—

and the paid personnel of the official propaganda agencies applauded lustily such declarations as: "The American Senate must be taught the facts of life. * * * The important thing is to put an end to criticism of the Roosevelt administration by whatever means may be necessary. * * * Be ruthless as the enemy. * * * Get him on his income tax or the Mann Act. * * * Hang him * * * shoot him * * * or lock him up in a concentration camp."

Those in sooth are wild and whirring words. But the fact that they were proclaimed at a Washington dinner party before men who are directing the Nation's war effort and that they received an emotional administration claque, indicates the drift of the time. After all, there's a national election on the way. And a tighter censorship.

I spoke to Senator TAFT, who was nearby, and asked him what he knew about it. He said he knew about it and had a copy of it and thought it was disgraceful. I understand also that Senator VANDENBERG was there, and said that this account understates and does not do justice to what was said. When speeches like that are made and go out in the public press that they intend to get all the noninterventionists, particularly the leaders, and to purge them one way or another, stop at nothing, the time has come for the noninterventionists to fight back, and if we are going to be purged through the income tax, through attacks of that kind and smear attacks, it is time for the Congress to take some cognizance of it and to defend the right of free speech and of Members of Congress to send out and distribute their speeches.

I want these remarks to go right into the RECORD at this point.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield to me to ask the gentleman from New York a question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Very briefly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not to enter into a discussion, because remarks of that kind, if made, we would all condemn.

But as I understand the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], he is trying to connect up the administration because a few happened to be there, if they were there, when those remarks were made. They were made by one or two or three former associates, reporters, or whatever they were, of the Chicago Tribune. Is that right?

Mr. FISH. I was not there. It says they were formerly reporters on the Tribune, but Justice Frankfurter was there.

Mr. McCORMACK. Have you ever been present at a gathering when somebody made a statement that you did not agree with?

Mr. FISH. But I understand they were applauding the statements, which appeared in the press.

Mr. McCORMACK. Senator VANDENBERG was there?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. You would not say that his presence there gave any sinister aspect to it?

Mr. FISH. I think Senator VANDENBERG will speak for himself at the proper time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, yes.

Mr. FISH. He undoubtedly holds the same view I hold, and probably most other Members of Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. But Senator VANDENBERG was there the same as the others who were there?

Mr. FISH. But Senator VANDENBERG was not applauding those remarks.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is in a very embarrassing position to sell his point, particularly in view of the position taken by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] at this particular occasion.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot yield any further, Mr. Speaker. Replying to what the gentleman from New York said, those remarks just quoted by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] were made down here, as I understand it, at some dinner. Of course, everyone who was there who did not subscribe to them, nor is everyone who was there to be criticized because they were made. I am asking now how anyone can criticize me, how the district attorney can find fault with me because I made a speech in which there was not one word of seditious or subversive material, and that was sent out by someone else with his own views. How can you criticize any one Member of the House on account of that procedure? There is not a thing wrong with the speech. If there was something wrong with that speech, why did not somebody on the majority side object when it was made? Why has not somebody asked that it be stricken from the RECORD? It is a matter of public record. There it is. It has been in the RECORD since January 30 and not 1 of the 434 Members of this House has questioned it or asserted that it is not a patriotic speech. Because someone alleged to be connected with Hitler picked it up and sent it but I am called on the carpet.

Calling attention to and exposing this movement to destroy our national exist-

ence; asking for unity under our own Government, allegiance to our own Government alone, serves notice upon Hitler that united our people will fight him to the bitter end. It might well be said that those who would suppress talks of this kind, who would condemn a Member of Congress because he objects to our domestic affairs being governed and controlled by a group of internationalists, lend encouragement to Hitler.

What about the loyalty of the paper PM, and of its reporter who falsely, as can be noted by every man who reads the speech "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," asserts that that speech was entitled "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes, or Roosevelt Is a Judas"?

What about the loyalty of the newspaper and its staff writer, Dillard Stokes, when in the Washington Post that writer stated that in the speech "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," President Roosevelt was called a Judas? Stokes knows that he lied when he wrote that, and it is apparent that he did it deliberately. He is so filled with venom that he must hate himself. Certainly the truth is not in him.

I see the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] sitting before me. Not long ago his name was coupled in a similar way in connection with proposed labor legislation. One of the papers out in our country, a Detroit paper, reported that Frankenstein told the convention of the C. I. O. that they might just as well accept the 48-hour week, because if they did not VINSON—he is the chairman of your Naval Affairs Committee—DIES, and Cox, and HOFFMAN would be happy men and Congress would ram it down their throats. I do not know why they are accepting it—probably because they find public sentiment swinging that way now. But to get back to this talk, get this paragraph:

While we are celebrating today the President's birthday we should have this other movement in mind. There are many of us who in the past have bitterly opposed some of the President's political policies. There are some of us who will continue to oppose those domestic policies while giving him support in the effort to win the war. There is none, however, who should in my judgment at least not be able and willing to join in the hope that God will grant him many happier returns of the day. We can all join the request that God give him wisdom, and strength, and courage to frown upon such efforts as the one which is here suggested.

Now, what is the district attorney after? What are these others, who made such speeches as the gentleman from New York referred to, after? What are they trying to accomplish? You know what they are trying to accomplish: They are trying to silence every single man who criticizes anything that this administration advocates. They are trying to suppress free speech, the freedom of the press. This drive seems to be a follow-up to the recent Biddle bill. The suppression of free speech is what they are trying to bring about. That is their purpose. And if we let them succeed then that is the end of representative government in this country.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I wish the gentleman, when he goes before the grand jury, would ask Mr. Maloney what has become of the investigation and the report that is due Congress on subversive employees on the Federal pay roll that has grown from 500 when the Dies committee first called it to the attention of the House, to 1,100 when the Attorney General asked the Dies committee for a report just this last year, and now the list has grown to over 3,000; and the Attorney General has not seen fit to give the report to Congress even though there is a positive mandate that they should give it? I would like to find out why the grand jury's attention has not been called to these subversive people on the Federal pay roll.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When I go before the grand jury they will be asking and I shall be answering. It will not be my privilege to ask anything or to suggest anything, and that is why I am making this statement today so that this afternoon after I have been before the grand jury and some fellows say, "Well, that is an executive session, but I wish you would tell us how they are getting along," what they ask you, what you said. I cannot tell them anything. I will suggest this further thing to the United States District Attorney, suggest it now, not when I go before the grand jury, but I am going to ask him a question here. I want him to answer this question. Our men are going to war, they need munitions of war. On this side of the highway goes a long unending line of American boys and men, the best in our country, physically. They are going, all of them, willingly and gladly, but they have to go whether they want to or whether they do not want to. They are going to be inducted to fight, to sacrifice their lives if need be, to serve 24 hours a day, 7 days in the week. Over on this other side of this same highway is an unending line of men knocking at the factory gate, but they do not get in until they come across with a stated sum of money paid to an agency which is not a Government agency. On one side of the street you march them down; you make them serve, you make them fight, and on the other side of the street the brothers, and the fathers who are seeking to manufacture clothing and implements of war, the guns, the tanks, and the ships, see this Government stand by and say to them, "No, you cannot go in and work in support of the man who has gone to war until you pay the organization of Green, or Murray, \$2, \$5, \$50, \$100, or \$200, and monthly dues."

Let some district attorney investigate that. There is something that is subversive. There is something that is not only seditious but is action which stops production. Do they want something real? Do they want to investigate and prosecute something that actually hinders the war effort? They need not fool around with the circulation of any speech I have made, if that is what they are after.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. If the gentleman cannot ask questions, in one of his answers he might make the suggestion that they worked around for 3½ or 4 years with Harry Bridges, who has destroyed hundreds of millions of dollars of property, who has destroyed the merchant marine, yet we have not had an Attorney General who has had the intestinal fortitude to take him. You have had a Secretary of Labor who has protected him, and all down through the Government they have protected him. Make some suggestion, if these men are anxious to have real government, why they do not go into their own Government and take men like Harry Bridges and Fritz Kuhn. If these birds want to know something, why do they not go into something real? Make some suggestions along that line.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The record shows over the last few years that some of these officials are not interested in the activities of the Communists; they are not interested in the racketeers; they are not interested in the men who by force and violence prevent other men from working in the defense of their country; they are not interested in the men who charge a fee for the exercise of patriotic efforts by others. Oh, no; they are not interested in that. They are interested in Republicans; they are interested in Democrats who have criticized some of the crackpot schemes and object to some of these crackpots, as the Democrats have designed them, being employed in Government offices.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I have tried earnestly and consistently since we got into this war to support every move of this administration which had any tendency to aid in winning the war. I have criticized, and I intend to criticize, those who want to betray our country and force us into an international superworld government, thereby doing away with our constitutional form of government and the hauling down of our flag. If the Attorney General or the district attorney, Maloney, can make anything out of that, or if anybody else can make anything out of that, they are welcome.

My people at home know what I have been saying. If they do not like it, if they do not approve of it, next November they will have the opportunity to express their will, and they will, you need not worry about that. If I do not come back, then you know the ideas I have advanced are not the ones to which they subscribe, or perhaps you will know that Maloney, Winchell, and a few more of that kind have succeeded in their campaign, and that I have been prevented from presenting my side of the argument adequately. However, I am satisfied. They told me at home when I was there, and I got a response when I spoke, bless your dear hearts, before an audience of U. A. W., C. I. O.'s, who wore the caps—they said they were not going to ask for time and a half or double pay. That is the U. A. W., C. I. O., that we have in the Fourth Congressional District. They are not going to ask for it. They said

they were not. That is the rank and file. Whatever a few leaders may demand, the workers themselves do not intend to ask anything unfair.

I am satisfied from that expression of opinion, as well as from the others that I got at home, that our people are more realistic about this war, are more ready to make complete sacrifice than are the officials here in Washington, and I intend to continue to do all I can along that same line.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RICH. May I say to the gentleman that we admire the stand he has taken.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Never mind that. If the gentleman has something to ask let us have it.

Mr. RICH. I wonder why the gentleman has to subject himself to a grand jury investigation. I admire the great courage he has in going down there.

Why does he have to submit to a grand jury that is trying to wreck him? It is not necessary.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have no reason to believe the grand jury is trying to wreck me, and no citizen of this country, least of all myself, should object, and I certainly do not, to going before a grand jury any time and answering questions. It is only a man who is guilty of some offense, a man who has violated some law, who objects to answering to the grand jury or to any prosecuting officer. I am going.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. Along the line the gentleman has been speaking, may I say that the people out in the country know what is going on. They are doing what they can to win the war. They know what is going on in Washington. Has the gentleman read the first article in the last Reader's Digest along the very line the gentleman is talking about, as to the great amount of time being spent in Washington in cocktail lounges instead of trying to win the war in Washington?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman complained a little bit about the construction I put on his speech, and this is the copy of the reprint he handed me. As the gentleman well knows, in the front of his first speech he, himself, put the subheading, "A Judas."

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Who was the gentleman talking about?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Streit. Let me read the whole paragraph:

That war, the cost of which no man can estimate and which, if carried on according to present plans, will take the lives of millions of American men, the President and his supporters tell us is being fought to bring to other peoples the same right of independence and self government which we have enjoyed.

Then the next paragraph:

The hypocrisy of those who claim that to be the purpose of our present involvement in this war is clearly demonstrated when we

receive from them a petition to repudiate our own independence, surrender our existence as an independent Nation, and become a part of the United States of the World.

Note the words "from them."

That petition came from Streit and others, not from the President.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. So the gentleman was talking about Streit?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly, and Ickes up there. He signed the thing.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They were the two Judases the gentleman was referring to. The gentleman did not mean to call the President of the United States a Judas or hypocrite?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no. I never lack words when I want to criticize. If I intended to call the President a Judas I undoubtedly would have said so on the floor of this House. I had no such intention and I did not so state.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am glad to have the gentleman's affirmation that he did not mean to call the President a hypocrite or a Judas.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why, certainly not. That speech is entitled "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes." One distinguished gentleman up there in the Press Gallery, Crawford, of PM, said the speech was entitled "Don't Haul Down the Flag or the President as a Judas." There is no such implication in it. That is not the title of the speech—Crawford knew the title was "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes." Yet he deliberately stated that untruth. Why? There is not a Member on this floor who does not know that I have never hesitated to express my opinion here. If I had wanted to charge somebody with something, I would not do it indirectly.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman has been very gracious about permitting interruptions and I certainly have no ulterior motive in what I will say to the gentleman, if the gentleman will indulge me. The difficulty, I think, is not what the gentleman has said in his speech. I think the gentleman or any other Member of Congress ought to have the right to differ as emphatically as he wishes to differ with the policy of any administration. That is not the difficulty. I would be the last one to do more than just to take friendly issue with the gentleman upon what he might say.

The difficulty here has been that the gentleman's speech has been taken and diverted and distorted, according to his statement, from what it really meant, and put into the channels of subversive elements, then found itself in an envelope from a subversive group advising the people to secure arms and to prepare and be ready for a revolution.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not know anything about that. I never heard or read of anything of that kind until the gentleman just stated it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think the Members of this Congress ought to protect themselves from that. A Member of Congress ought to have the right to say whatever he wants to say and to mail it to his own constituents and to be prepared to take the responsibility. He should not be permitted to print things and put them in the hands of or even

permit them to get into the hands of elements that are going to divert and distort them and put them entirely out of their own meaning, and put such an interpretation on them as was put on this affair. It puts the whole House of Representatives under indictment, and it ought to be stopped by this body as a whole by some policy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In reply to what the gentleman from Virginia has said, I agree with all he has said, except one thing. The gentleman said we should prevent speeches getting into certain hands and from being distorted. I will be glad to learn how we can prevent distortion when we cannot anticipate it. How could I know that Cranford would write or his paper publish a false title to that patriotic talk? I would not knowingly send out any remarks of mine to any agent of a foreign power, or to anyone who I thought would give it to any foreign agent, or use it for an improper purpose. But here comes the difficulty. For example, the D. A. R. writes me for speeches. I feel flattered because the D. A. R. writes me asking for speeches, and so would every other Member, and they would admit it if modesty did not forbid. The D. A. R. is all right. No one questions its loyalty. Suppose one of the members of the D. A. R. asks me for 50 or 500 copies of a speech. I think the speech is all right. They do, too. I send it to them and they give it to someone else, thinking that that third party is all right. The speech ultimately finds its way into improper hands. These agents do not come out and advertise their activities. They work under cover. So it is that these things happen. How can that be prevented?

If this House wishes to adopt the policy for the duration of the war of denying to Senators and to its Members the right to express loyal, patriotic views in the halls of Congress, or, if it permits the making of such speeches, to deny to Senators and to Members of the House the right to send those speeches out to their constituents or, as has been here suggested, to other citizens of the United States whose loyalty is unquestioned, just because some of those speeches may fall into the hands of others who send them out with their own subversive publications, so be it.

If we adopt that policy, then, in fairness to our people, we should prevent the publication by administration spokesmen, by the press generally, of all information which in any way tends to criticize, unjustly or justly, anything that any Government official may do. Such a bill was recently before the Senate. It received but scant consideration.

The issue here today is whether or not free speech, speech which is not subversive, which is not seditious, which carries an argument for the preservation of our national existence, shall be suppressed simply because someone who is not considered patriotic, who may be found to be an agent of a foreign power, circulates that loyal, patriotic utterance.

As I stated not long ago, the devil himself can quote Scripture to serve his purpose, and it occurs to me that those who find fault with this particular speech

entitled "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," seem to be inclined to do that very thing. It occurs to me that they, rather than myself, are giving encouragement to Hitler; are telling him that we, as a people, are about ready—as we would be if their views prevailed—to give up our national existence.

Following are the three advertisements advocating a super world government:

EXHIBIT A

[From the New York Times of December 18, 1941]

TO WIN THIS WAR WE NEED UNION NOW

A PETITION ON THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS

That the President of the United States submit to Congress a program for forming a powerful union of free peoples to win the war, the peace, the future;

That this program unite our people, on the broad lines of our Constitution, with the people of Canada, the United Kingdom, Eire, Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa, together with such other free peoples, both in the Old World and the New, as may be found ready and able to unite on this federal basis;

That this program be only the first step in the gradual, peaceful extension of our principles of federal union to all peoples willing and able to adhere to them, so that from this nucleus may grow eventually a universal world government of, by, and for the people.

To the 30,000,000 Who Favor Union:

Thirty million American adults, according to the December Fortune survey, already believe the United States "after the war" should "join a union of democracies in all parts of the world to keep order."

If you are among those who agree we need union then to keep a potential aggressor from breaking loose, surely you must agree we need that union now to meet the powerful combination of aggressors already on the march.

We are now in one of those molten moments when the iron of basic policy can and will be somehow shaped. If we fail to form it in a union now we may all too soon find ourselves repeating the Franco-British tragedy. We may find that, while we put our time on lesser things, events were hammering the iron into another form, into an alliance with men and methods molded in a structure which only its collapse could change.

In union there is power

We must not let up for one instant in our prosecution of the war. We must unremittingly prosecute it. Organizing the power of the democracies is essential to that task. Organizing it effectively in a union will distract us no more from defense than improvising the cumbersome, entangling structure of an alliance.

There already exist carefully studied concrete plans for just the kind of emergency union that we need. These plans provide not only for representation responsible to the people and in proportion to self-governing population. They work out the details and assure the American people a majority in the union congress at the start.

Granted, the immediate extension of our Federal principles is practicable only with those of our associates in the war willing and able to combine on this basis. But it would be utter folly to delay applying them where possible simply because they cannot now be universally extended. Common sense says to unite at once with those practiced in democracy and to cooperate with the others the best way we can, until they too shall desire, and can apply, these Federal democratic principles.

Remember now what happened to the League Covenant after the war. Remember now the moral slump that always follows war, the return of petty politics. Consider now that if we merely promise union after the war, the Axis will drive their peoples on by reminding them of what a Senate minority did to the promised League after World War No. 1. But once the oppressed peoples see that this union is no dream but a living, growing, winning world United States, with a place in its Congress they may earn by regaining their own freedom—what a means we then shall have to wreck the Axis from within.

In union there is peace

How many, many lives we shall save by this great expeditionary idea when once we give it life. It will be fighting for our sons day and night, awake or sleeping, for it will be fighting, too, for the sons of German, Italian, Japanese mothers, who know not what they do. It will be fighting for us far behind the enemy lines, where our warplanes rarely reach. No dictator can clamp his hand upon it, or be certain it will not one day be fighting for us in his staff itself.

The surest way to shorten and to win this war is also the surest way to guarantee to ourselves and our friends and foes that this war will end in a world united states. The surest way to do all this is for us to start that union now.

"We implore you (as the English workmen implored Lincoln to free the slaves) not to faint in your providential mission. While your enthusiasm is aflame and the tide of events runs high, let the work be finished effectually. Leave no root of bitterness to spring up and work fresh misery to your children."

As citizens to our fellow citizens, we recommend this proposal to your serious consideration.

Grenville Clark, Gardner Cowles, Jr.,
Russell W. Davenport, John Foster
Dulles, Harold L. Ickes, Owen J.
Roberts, Harry G. Scherman, Wm.
Jay Schieffelin.

THE UNITED STATES ITSELF BEGAN AS A WAR MEASURE

We the people of the United States have once more reached a time to try men's souls. Let us not mistake this moment nor the nature of this test. Lincoln measured it for us when he said, "We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth."

Here stands the free principle that the state—the world—is made for all men equally. We hold its citadel.

There rises the despotic dogma that one man is the state. In Berlin is centered the direction of its far-flung land, sea, air, and undercover forces, highly centered behind a ruthless master plan.

Disunion was the European way

How much longer can we let our answer be the same old fatal answer—divided navies, divided armies, divided production, divided counsels, divided actions, divided democracies * * * falling underneath a common yoke? Shall we risk answering with an alliance? Stake our all upon this method that has already brought catastrophe to France and Britain?

We recognize already that we must unite the power of all our 48 States. We recognize that the British must unite the power of all their Commonwealth of Nations. We have not recognized—and we must at once—that we need above all to unite the whole arch together. We must unite both sides upon a keystone. Then the common burden will but unite us more.

An arch without a keystone can be no arch of triumph.

What shall the keystone be? Let us seek guidance from those master builders who raised our own citadel of freedom.

They, the people of our Original Thirteen States, once faced the problem we face now. They had never before united in any way for any purpose. But when their common freedom was at stake they did not try to save it with 13 independent armies or even with a supreme interallied council. Instead, with revolutionary vision and vigor, they invented a new and stronger keystone.

They set up at once a common government. They gave that Government the power to make war and peace for all.

They gave it the power to name one common commander in chief.

And they issued through it a resounding declaration of the universal and eternal common principles of human freedom on which they proposed to build a new world.

Thus, in the midst of war, they created the United States itself as a war measure.

They then developed this emergency war policy into a permanent way to keep the peace among their States by adopting a more perfect Union in our Federal Constitution.

Union is the American way

Since then every American generation has boldly extended these principles of freedom through union to more states and more people of all kinds.

Canada, Australia, the Union of South Africa have already adopted these same principles. Britain showed its faith in them when it begged France, tragically too late, to change alliance into union.

Here, then, in our own American principles of Federal Union lies the time-tested answer to our problem. Here lies the way to win this war, the peace, and the future. We are not so feeble that we cannot achieve greatly, as our fathers achieved before us. Let us then take up this task at once and turn this great danger into a great opportunity. Let us begin now a World United States.

Federal Union, Inc., A. J. G. Priest, chairman; Clarence K. Streit, president; E. W. Baldur, director; P. F. Brundage, secretary; John Howard Ford, treasurer; Patrick Welch, acting director.

EXHIBIT B

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 5, 1942]

IN UNION NOW LIES POWER TO WIN THE WAR AND THE PEACE

A PETITION

That the President of the United States submit to Congress a program for forming a powerful union of free peoples to win the war, the peace, the future.

That this program unite our people, on the broad lines of our Constitution, with the people of Canada, the United Kingdom, Eire, Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa, together with such other free peoples, both in the Old World and the New, as may be found ready and able to unite on this federal basis.

That this program be only the first step in the gradual, peaceful extension of our principles of federal union to all peoples willing and able to adhere to them, so that from this nucleus may grow eventually a universal world government of, by, and for the people.

THE UNITED STATES ITSELF BEGAN AS A WAR MEASURE

We welcome President Roosevelt's conferences with Prime Minister Churchill, and the "Declaration of United Nations." We must prosecute the war unremittently. Organizing effectively the power of the free peoples is essential to that task. We value highly conferences and temporary measures to provide more unified action immediately. But in meeting this need let us, in the present formative period, take care to open—not close—the way to immediate union of the democracies within the broader anti-Axis coalition.

Conferences, agreements between heads of governments, alliances, supreme interallied councils—valuable as they may be—these are not union, but substitutes that have already failed democracy. The British and French relied on them. They had a unified command. They agreed to make no separate peace. But they based their unity on two sovereign governments, acting in alliance, not on a united sovereign people acting in union through a common government. And their alliance collapsed.

Alliance failed the British and French

Prime Minister Churchill sought salvation then in the American way of union. He implored France to join Britain in this declaration of union:

"* * * France and Great Britain shall no longer be two nations but one Franco-British Union. The constitution of the union will provide for joint organs of defense, foreign, financial, and economic policies. Every citizen of France will enjoy immediate citizenship of Great Britain; every British subject will become a citizen of France * * * During the war there shall be a single war cabinet, and all the forces of Britain and France, whether on land, sea, or in the air, will be placed under its directions * * *"

Now the responsibility is ours, either to create or defer too long that common community or state, whose importance Mr. Churchill stressed in the Senate December 26. Shall we begin with the British back where they began with the French? Or where they left off—with an offer of union now, the old, war-tested United States way?

Organizing the democracies effectively in a union need take no longer than organizing them in an ineffective alliance or supreme war council, and will safeguard their national rights far more securely and equally. There already exist carefully studied concrete plans for just the kind of emergency union that we need. These plans provide for representation responsible to the people and in proportion to self-governing population. They work out the details and assure the American people a majority in the union congress at the start.

The Soviet States have a common government

Granted, immediate extension of our democratic Federal principles to all our war associates is impracticable. But common sense says to unite at once with those practiced in democracy while cooperating with the others in the best way we can, until they desire and can apply our principles.

We gain from the fact that all the Soviet Republics are already united in one government, as are also all the Chinese-speaking people, once so divided. Surely we and they must agree that union now of the democracies wherever possible is equally to the general advantage. Victory depends in no small part on sea and air factors, now divided between Britain and us, whose nature requires a common government even more than do the land factors in Russia and China, vast and important as they are.

We the people of the United States have once more reached a time to try men's souls. Let us not mistake this moment nor the nature of this test. Lincoln measured it for us when he said, "We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth."

We recognize, already that we must unite the power of all our 48 States. We recognize that the British must unite the power of all their Commonwealth of Nations. We have not recognized—and we must at once—that we need above all to unite the whole arch of democracy.

An arch without a keystone can be no arch of triumph.

Union Is the United States Way

The people of our original Thirteen States once faced the problem the democracies face now. They had never before united for any

purpose. But when their common freedom was at stake they did not try to save it with 13 independent armies, or even with a "supreme interallied council." Instead, with revolutionary vision and vigor, they invented a new and stronger keystone:

They set up at once a common Government. They gave it the power to make war and peace for all.

They let it name one common Commander in Chief.

And they issued through it a resounding Declaration of the universal and eternal common principles of human freedom on which they proposed to build a New World.

Thus, in the midst of war, they created the United States itself as a war measure.

They then developed this emergency war policy into a permanent way to keep the peace among their States by adopting a more perfect Union in our Federal Constitution. Since then, every American generation has boldly extended these principles of freedom through union to more states and more people of all kinds. Canada, Australia, the Union of South Africa have already adopted these principles. Britain showed its faith in them when it offered union to France.

Here, then, in our own American principles of Federal Union lies the way to win this war, the peace, and the future. We are not so feeble that we cannot do what our fathers have already done. Let us then turn this great danger into a great opportunity. Let us begin now a World United States.

As citizens to our fellow citizens: We recommend this proposal to your serious consideration.

Robert Woods Bliss, Grenville Clark, Gardner Cowles, Jr., Russell W. Davenport, John Foster Dulles, Harold L. Ickes, Owen J. Roberts, Daniel Calhoun Roper, Wm. Jay Schiefelin.

THIRTY MILLION AMERICANS FAVOR UNION

Thirty million American adults, according to the December Fortune survey, already believe the United States after the war should join a union of democracies in all parts of the world to keep order.

If you are among those who agree we need union then to keep a potential aggressor from breaking loose, surely you must agree we need that union now to meet the powerful combination of aggressors already on the march.

To refuse to recognize this so as to avoid controversy will not save our sons, any more than failure to recognize that a germ caused diphtheria saved life in the past.

Remember now the moral slump that always follows war, the return of petty politics. Consider now that if we merely promise union after the war, the Axis will drive their peoples on by reminding them of what a Senate minority did to the promised League * * * after World War No. 1. But once the oppressed peoples see that this union is no dream but a living, growing, winning world United States, with a place in its Congress they may earn by regaining their own freedom—what a means we then shall have to wreck the Axis from within.

How many, many lives we shall save by this great expeditionary idea—once we give it life. It will be fighting for our sons day and night far behind the enemy lines. No dictator can be certain it will not be fighting for us in his staff itself.

The surest way to shorten and to win this war is also the surest way to guarantee to ourselves, and our friends and foes, that this war will end in a union of the free. The surest way to do all this is for us to start that union now.

"We implore you [as the English workmen implored Lincoln to free the slaves] not to faint in your providential mission. While your enthusiasm is aflame, and the tide of events runs high, let the work be fin-

ished effectually. Leave no root of bitterness to spring up and work fresh misery to your children."

Federal Union, Inc.; A. J. G. Priest, chairman; Clarence K. Strett, president; E. W. Balduf, director; P. F. Brundage, secretary; John Howard Ford, treasurer; Patrick Welch, acting director.

EXHIBIT C

In Time of War—Prepare for Peace—World Fellowship, Inc.

(Started in 1918—the Armistice year)

A continuous world government convention centers in its new year-round world fellowship center (388 acres, six buildings)—inviting people of all countries, races, classes, creeds, and conditions to develop "ideals for world government, of, for, and by the people."

On New Hampshire 16, 5 miles south of Conway. Address for mail, telegrams, bus, railway, freight, express: Conway, N. H. Telephone Madison 4-22.

CHARLES F. WELLER,

Founder and President.

EUGENIA WINSTON WELLER,

Secretary.

(The two general executives.)

LOUIS A. BOWMAN, Treasurer.

(LaSalle National Bank, Chicago, and Carroll County Trust Co., Conway, N. H.)

L. I. PUTNAM, C. P. A.,

Auditor.

To Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America:

We ask the Members of the Senate and House to take the three steps presented here for your consideration. We shall be glad to appear before any committee of the House or Senate or before a joint session to answer any and all questions.

We hope these two joint resolutions will be introduced and passed by Congress on the President's birthday, January 30, 1942. A present to him, to us, to the world.

CHARLES DAVIS, C. E., D. ENG.,

Founder-Trustee, World Government Foundation and Honorary President World Peace Association, Jenkins, Minn.

CARL A. RYAN,

Secretary-Treasurer.

(With over 300 cooperating organizations in 56 countries.)

Approved by:

CHARLES F. WELLER,

Founder and President, World Fellowship, Inc.

GEORGE C. DIEHL,

Chairman, Executive Committee, World Government Foundation.

DARWIN J. MESSEROLE,

Director of Legislation, World Government Foundation.

STEP 1

To be enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to set up and create a Federation of the World, a World Peace Government, under the title of the United Nations of the World.

Whereas we hold these truths of be self-evident:

1. Peoples, savage or civilized, have never lived together save under some form of government.

2. All governments exist by their successful organization and use of the spiritual, intellectual, and physical forces of mankind.

3. A government losing control of these forces fails.

4. Village, town, city, county, provincial, and state governments do not ask the abandonment of the other governments or the

national government for them to exist, for each is supported by and dependent for its very existence on the others, as they will be under a world government.

5. Lack of government means chaos in its territory—hence world chaos and its wars throughout the ages.

6. The world without a government has always been and always will be at war until there is a world government in control of the spiritual, intellectual, and physical forces needed for its existence.

7. As with villages, towns, cities, counties, provinces, states, and nations a world government can bring " . . . on earth peace, good will toward men," a goal worthy of the efforts of all mankind.

8. Peace—not war—makes for the safety of mankind.

9. Peace—not war—makes for the preservation of mankind.

10. Peace—not war—makes for the well-being of mankind.

11. Peace—not war—makes for the prosperity of mankind.

12. Peace—not war—makes for the world trade of mankind.

13. Peace—not war—makes for the profits of mankind; and

Whereas belief in these thirteen self-evident truths makes it necessary at the present juncture of human affairs to enlarge the bases of organized society by establishing a government for the community of nations, in order to preserve civilization and enable mankind to live in peace and be free: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress of the United States of America does hereby solemnly declare that all peoples of the earth should now be united in a commonwealth of nations to be known as the United Nations of the World, and to that end it hereby gives to the President of the United States of America all the needed authority and powers of every kind and description without limitations of any kind that are necessary in his sole and absolute discretion to set up and create the federation of the world, a world peace government under the title of the United Nations of the World including its constitution and personnel and all other matters needed or appertaining thereto to the end that all nations of the world may by voluntary action become a part thereof under the same terms and conditions.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated the sum of \$100,000,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary to be expended by the President in his sole and absolute discretion to effectuate the purposes of this joint resolution and in addition the sum of \$1,000,000,000 for the immediate use of the United Nations of the World under its constitution as set up and created by the President of the United States of America as provided in this joint resolution.

The President may appoint such committees and summon such advisers, from any part of the world, as he may deem necessary to effectuate the foregoing purposes with all convenient speed.

STEP 2

(Should be taken the same day as step 1)

To be enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to create a world government

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and

purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions or legislatures in three-fourths of the several States:

"Article 22. Creation of a world government

"SECTION 1. The United States shall have power to create, ordain, form, set up, establish, join, enter, unite with, and become a part of a world government.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to put into effect and to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

STEP 3

When step two has been ratified by the people of the United States of America, acting through the legislatures of our 48 States or Congress will have the power, under section 2 of article 22 of the Constitution of the United States of America, to enact the needed legislation to provide for the entrance of the United States of America into the world government set up by our great President and to provide for the election of our representatives therein and other matters.

These three steps are not the scraps of paper of Wilson's fourteen points, the League of Nations, the Atlantic Agreement, the 26-nation agreement, the Rio Agreement? (If they grab at this straw?)

None were enforced and none can be enforced for the peace that all mankind wants and prays for.

These three steps are concrete, definite, enforceable, and create a world government with power to preserve peace.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to answer a statement that was made.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I have just listened to the declaration of the gentleman from Michigan. I cannot accept, without challenge, one statement he made with respect to a man whom I have known for many years, a man who is my friend, a man who holds the respect of the bar of the State of New York, and is considered one of the most able prosecutors in the country, Mr. William Power Maloney. I am certain, although I have not had any occasion to discuss the question with him, that Mr. Maloney has never made any such statement as attributed to him by the gentleman from Michigan. I am certain that it is an untruth. I know that at the proper time and in due course I shall be able to refute the serious implications of this unwarranted allegation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with the problem of surplus commodities and the C. C. C. camps.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a constituent.