

The men who can give the unemployed work are today harassed by vicious and restrictive taxes, fearful of the effect of Government extravagance, and worried to the point of paralysis by the specter of further Government interference with the normal flow of business.

We are drifting rapidly into another era of depression. This drift can be stopped; in fact, be reversed by the adoption of a business-recovery program such as the one we enclose.

That program represents the matured opinion of the businessmen who make up your constituency. We urge your most careful consideration and vigorous action in favor of its provisions.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ADIKES, President.

A PROGRAM FOR BUSINESS RECOVERY

As businessmen we recognize with keenest interest the desire of the President and the Congress to reverse the tide of business recession. And while we are in sympathy with many of the New Deal objectives, we are firmly convinced that those objectives can be obtained only through sound measures to bring about business and industrial recovery.

We, therefore, strongly urge upon the President and the Congress the immediate adoption of the following program, which will restore confidence in the future to the business interests of the Nation:

A. The undistributed-profits tax must be repealed. It is vicious in effect and restrictive upon normal business expansion.

B. The capital-gains tax must be repealed or sensibly modified. As it stands, it hinders the free flow of private investment moneys into productive channels.

C. The Budget must be balanced within the next year through sound economies in the Federal Government. Such economies are possible without crippling the necessary functions of government, neglecting those of our people in need of relief or adversely affecting business.

D. The Wagner National Labor Relations Act must be revised and clarified, its terms made equitable, thus fostering better relations between employer and employee. Labor unions must accept equal responsibility with employers in regard to the public interest.

E. The so-called wages-and-hours bill must be dropped. Such legislation would be unenforceable, except under a virtual Federal dictatorship over labor as well as business and industry. It would re-create the chaotic conditions prevalent under N. R. A., tend to raise what would in effect be State tariff walls and foster sectional differences.

F. Congress must reinvest itself with such of its constitutional rights and powers as were abrogated in the name of emergency.

G. Government and business must foster mutual respect and confidence, each for the other. Only by the establishment of such mutual confidence and respect will economic stability be achieved and the causes of industrial conflict and class hatred be removed.

This program for business recovery has been promulgated by the Chamber of Commerce of the Borough of Queens. Its provisions, if adopted, will restore confidence to the business interests of the Nation. All American businessmen, through their chambers of commerce, are urged to adopt it as their own and to take every means to force adoption by Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by Joel David Wolfsohn, executive secretary of the National Power Policy Committee.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD a speech delivered on October 4 of this year at the dedication of the Church Street Postal Annex and Federal Building in New York City, by Postmaster General James A. Farley.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if this is the James A. Farley who is the Democratic national chairman.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. This is James A. Farley, the greatest Postmaster General since Benjamin Franklin.

Mr. RICH. He has had more speeches in the RECORD during the past 4 years than any other individual.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

ELMER LEWIS

Mr. PETTENGILL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star of yesterday, under the heading "Capital Sidelights," by Will P. Kennedy, had a very fine tribute to Elmer Lewis, superin-

tendent of the House Document Room. I think it would be a courtesy on the part of the Members of this House, whom he has served so well and so efficiently, to have a unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including in the RECORD at this point this little tribute to Mr. Lewis.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

(Mr. DUNN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the National Manufacturers Association, and to include a short article appearing in the New Republic on that subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Colorado rise?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, to call attention to the fact that the Colorado delegation is here in full force this morning, all four Members being present, sitting in a row in brotherly harmony. [Applause.]

APPLAUSE

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. To ask how many times a Member in extending his remarks in the RECORD may include the word "applause"? One Member last week did that nine times. I thought six is the limit.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman submit that as a serious parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I regard it as serious, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The reporters of debates are the ones to insert "applause" in the RECORD, when it occurs on the floor of the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, is it permissible to insert "applause" in an extension of remarks; and if so, how many times?

The SPEAKER. The Chair feels sure that the gentleman from Minnesota, having been here for 20 years, is fully familiar with the rules with respect to that matter.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on the Consent Calendar today be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TEIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a recent magazine article written by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for a few moments and to present a request for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] would make his speech this morning, because it was my purpose to call his attention to the statement he made on the floor in the closing days of the last session, during the month of August, at which time he placed in the RECORD the names of a number of persons from St. Louis charging that they were members of a so-called Nazi group that he has referred to so often.

When I returned home some of those he had listed called on me and denied that they had ever had anything to do with such activities and could not understand how Mr. DICKSTEIN had secured their names. I then suggested that they prepare a short affidavit and that I would ask Mr. DICKSTEIN to place them in the Record, adding that if he declined I would seek permission to do so.

Those affidavits were in possession of the gentleman from New York for several weeks. A few days ago he advised me, using his own language, "I am willing to give them the benefit of the doubt and concede that they did not belong to the organization, but I do not think I should put the affidavits in the Record." I then asked if he would object if I asked such permission. He said he would not.

Mr. Speaker, these people have lived in my city for many years. My investigation discloses they are law-abiding and highly respected and object that a Member of Congress should list them as belonging to this group.

It might be interesting to the membership of the House to know that several hundred thousand persons residing in my city were born in Germany or their parents were born in Germany. Their loyalty to this country is shown by the number that joined the armed forces of this country during the World War as well as by their daily actions.

As to this organization and its activities I know little, but I do know that just a few weeks ago they announced a national convention would be held in St. Louis. Immediately another group composed of loyal citizens of our country, many either German-born or of German descent, arranged a protest meeting. This protest meeting was held. The national convention was never held because they were denied the use of any hall or hotel in my city.

As I advised the gentleman from New York at the opening of the present session when he sought permission to place names of residents of a California city in the Record, that he should be extremely careful in accepting the word of others without thorough investigation. Of course, the Members realize I have no sympathy for any organization that is not in sympathy with our form of government.

I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to include them in my remarks—the affidavits I referred to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The affidavits follow:

STATE OF MISSOURI,
City of St. Louis, ss:
Christian Hauck, having been duly sworn on his oath, states that he is the president of the Hauck Bakery Co., located at 2801 North Seventh Street, St. Louis, Mo.
Affiant further states that he resides at No. 3641 Glad Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
Affiant further states that he is a naturalized citizen of the United States, and has been for 45 years.
Affiant further states that he has never, either directly or indirectly, participated in any Nazi organization meetings or has been a part, either directly or indirectly, in spreading any propaganda relative to Nazi organization, nor has he been directly or indirectly connected in any manner whatsoever with any Nazi organizations.
Affiant further states that the publication of his home address for a name other than his own in the Congressional Record August 19, 1937, on page 12049, has caused him much embarrassment in addition to the financial loss suffered by him.
Further affiant saith not.

CHRISTIAN HAUCK
Subscribed and sworn to before me this 21st day of October 1937.

Boaz B. Watkins,
Notary Public.
My commission expires October 4, 1940.

STATE OF MISSOURI,
City of St. Louis, ss:
Christian Hauck, having been duly sworn on his oath, states that he is the president of the Hauck Bakery Co., located at 2801 North Seventh Street, St. Louis, Mo.
Affiant further states that he resides at No. 3641 Glad Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
Affiant further states that he is a naturalized citizen of the United States, and has been for 45 years.
Affiant further states that he has never, either directly or indirectly, participated in any Nazi organization meetings or has been a part, either directly or indirectly, in spreading any propaganda relative to Nazi organization, nor has he been directly or indirectly connected in any manner whatsoever with any Nazi organizations.
Affiant further states that the publication of his home address for a name other than his own in the Congressional Record August 19, 1937, on page 12049, has caused him much embarrassment in addition to the financial loss suffered by him.
Further affiant saith not.

CHRISTIAN HAUCK
Subscribed and sworn to before me this 21st day of October 1937.

Boaz B. Watkins,
Notary Public.
My commission expires October 4, 1940.

STATE OF MISSOURI,
City of St. Louis, ss:
Water Luettecke, being duly sworn, upon his oath states that he was born in Bochum, Germany, on the 8th day of May 1908; that

STATE OF MISSOURI,
City of St. Louis, ss:
Emil Frei, being duly sworn, on his oath states that he was born in Dillingen, Bavaria, Germany, July 17, 1869; that he came to the United States in 1894, going first to San Francisco, and proceeding thence to St. Louis in 1897; that he has lived in St. Louis continuously since 1897, has developed and conducted and is now conducting a stained-glass and mosaic business there.
Affiant further states that he became naturalized as a citizen of the United States in March 1914 and has performed all his duties as a citizen since said date; that he has three children, all of whom were born in the United States and have resided in this country continuously; that he has never at any time since his arrival in this country engaged in any National Socialist (commonly called Nazi) political activities or any other foreign political activities of any kind whatsoever, nor has he at any time made propaganda for German Nazi or other foreign politics.

EMIL FREI
Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of October 1937.

NORMAN BEGMAN, Notary Public.
My term expires August 22, 1939.

STATE OF MISSOURI,
City of St. Louis, ss:
George M. Voges, being duly sworn, on his oath states that he was born in the city of Dresden, Germany, on February 25, 1878; that he came to the United States in 1909, proceeding immediately to the city of St. Louis, Mo., where he has resided ever since.
Affiant further states that he was married in the city of St. Louis on September 26, 1911; that the two children of his said marriage were both born in the city of St. Louis; that he became a citizen of the United States about 24 years ago and has ever since performed all his duties as such citizen.
Affiant further states that he has not at any time engaged in any National Socialist (commonly called Nazi) political activities or any other foreign political activities of any kind whatsoever, nor has he at any time made propaganda for German Nazi or other foreign politics.

GEORGE M. VOGES
Subscribed and sworn to before me this 12th day of November 1937.

NORMAN BEGMAN, Notary Public.
My term expires August 22, 1939.

STATE OF MISSOURI,
City of St. Louis, ss:
Gustav A. Ashauer, being duly sworn, upon his oath states that he was born near the city of Munich, Bavaria, on January 4, 1874; that he came to the United States in 1889, proceeding first to the city of Chicago, where he was employed at his occupation of meat cutter.
That he went to sea, remaining about 12 years, and upon his return came to the city of St. Louis, Mo., in September 1906, where he has resided ever since.
Affiant further states that, as early as possible after his arrival in the United States, he executed his declaration to become a citizen and was naturalized 5 years later; that he has been variously employed in the city of St. Louis, and temporarily in the shipyards at Jacksonville, Fla., by the United States Shipping Board from June 1918 to April 1919; that upon his return from Jacksonville he was first employed for a time at Butler Bros. and later at Blackwell-Wielandy Book & Stationery Co.
Affiant further states that since April 1920 he has been employed by the United States post office in the city of St. Louis as laborer, performing the various duties assigned to him.
Affiant further states that he has resided continuously in the city of St. Louis since his return from Jacksonville in 1919, with the exception of a brief visit to Europe in the summer of 1928; that he was married in the city of St. Louis in 1918 to a native of what is now Czechoslovakia; that a daughter was born of this marriage who has received all her education in the public schools of St. Louis, graduating from the McKinley High School and now attending the Hadley Vocational School.
Affiant further states that, while he is a member of several German social organizations, he has never at any time been a member of any German political activities of any kind whatsoever, nor has he at any time taken part in any National Socialist (commonly known as Nazi) activities, either in the city of St. Louis or elsewhere, or in any German political activities of any kind whatsoever.

GUSTAV A. ASHAUER
Subscribed and sworn to before me this 17th day of November 1937.

DAVID F. CROSEN,
Notary Public.
My term expires March 28, 1941.

STATE OF MISSOURI,
City of St. Louis, ss:
Water Luettecke, being duly sworn, upon his oath states that he was born in Bochum, Germany, on the 8th day of May 1908; that

he arrived in the United States on July 2, 1928, proceeding immediately to the city of St. Louis, Mo.

That since June 1, 1929, affiant has been employed in the office of the Hamburg-American Line in said city of St. Louis.

That on March 4, 1932, affiant was married to a native of St. Louis and that one child was born of said marriage in said city of St. Louis; that he has resided in the city of St. Louis continuously since his arrival in 1928 as aforesaid, was naturalized as a citizen of the United States in September 1935, and has since said time observed and performed all his duties as such citizen.

Affiant further states that he has not at any time been a member of any German or German-American political organization, and has never engaged or participated in any National Socialistic (commonly known as Nazi) political activities or at any time made propaganda for Nazi principles.

WALTER LUEITTECKE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 17th day of November 1937.

[SEAL]

DAVID F. CROSSEN,
Notary Public.

My term expires March 28, 1941.

[Affidavit]

STATE OF MISSOURI,

City of St. Louis, ss:

Maud S. Barck, being duly sworn upon her oath, states that she is the wife of Dr. Carl Barck, with whom she resides at 3438 Russell Boulevard, in the city of St. Louis, Mo.; that she was born in the city of St. Louis on the 14th day of May 1870, received all her education in the public schools and at Mary Institute, in the city of St. Louis, and has resided in said city all her life;

Affiant further states that she was married to Dr. Carl Barck, a native of Freiburg, Baden, in the city of St. Louis, in 1891; that said Carl Barck was born July 29, 1857, graduated in medicine from the University of Freiburg in 1881, came to the city of St. Louis in 1882, where he was naturalized in 1891; that her said husband has practiced medicine in the city of St. Louis ever since 1882; has been for many years one of the outstanding ophthalmologists of said city; was, from the time of its organization, in about the year 1892, professor of ophthalmology at Marion-Stimms Medical College and thereafter, after its conversion into the medical department of St. Louis University, professor in said department and is now professor emeritus of ophthalmology of said medical department of the St. Louis University;

Affiant further states that the two daughters born of her said marriage received their entire educations in the public schools of St. Louis and at Washington University, of said city, and the University of Missouri, respectively, and that the survivor of said daughters is married to a native-born American of English extraction;

Affiant further states emphatically that she is not now, nor has she ever been, a Nazi agitator; that she has not at any time been engaged, either actively or otherwise, in the spreading of propaganda, either in St. Louis or elsewhere, designed to build up the foreign Nazi National Social Party of Germany in our country, as charged by one SAMUEL DICKSTEIN in the House of Representatives of the United States on August 19, 1937; and that she has never at any time been a member of any German-American political organization and has not at any time engaged in any German political activities, Nazi or otherwise, or concerned herself with the political affairs of any country but our own.

MAUD S. BARCK.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 29th day of November 1937.

My term expires August 22, 1939.

[SEAL]

NORMAN SEGEMAN,
Notary Public.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a bill introduced by me and also an editorial appearing this morning in the Washington Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

MR. LEWIS W. DOUGLAS

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore made, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, some days ago the newspapers of the Nation gave much publicity to an address by the Honorable Lewis W. Douglas, former Director of the Budget, ex-Congressman, and now president of McGill University, Montreal, Canada, which was delivered at the one hundred and twenty-first dinner of the Economic Club, of New York.

In his address Mr. Douglas suggested that businessmen see eye to eye with the policies of our Secretary of State in the extension of reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. Douglas suggests this "process of enlarging markets may inflict pain on certain groups," and asks, "But will they not be willing to suppress their own private interests for the benefit of the public welfare?"

Mr. Speaker, in reading the address delivered by Mr. Douglas I recall another impassioned plea made by that gentleman a few years ago while he was serving in this body as a Representative from the great copper-producing State of Arizona. The question of suppressing private interests for the public welfare was seemingly quite important in those days, but a different ox was being gored. At that time Mr. Douglas said:

I say that because of the effect of this foreign competition upon the copper-mining industry in Arizona practically every other industry within the State suffered.

The plea by Mr. Douglas can be found, Mr. Speaker, on pages 845-848 of the hearings before the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate considering the Revenue Act of 1932. It is from the statement of Congressman Douglas I now quote:

The evidence that has been adduced here this morning shows that because of the great pressure of foreign production of the copper-mining industry of the United States, at least almost all of it, is faced with extinction. At least one great State of the Union and all of its people are faced with complete and absolute impoverishment. Permit me to give you a picture of the fiscal condition of the State of Arizona, and here may I interpolate that though I speak of the State of Arizona solely this morning, what I say is true or true in varying degree of 13 other States? I speak of Arizona because I know more of the conditions within that State than elsewhere. The copper mines, the railroads dependent solely upon them, and the communities that have been built up around them in the State of Arizona pay 56 percent of the total taxes of the State, which represents \$12,000,000 toward a total State budget of \$21,000,000. If the State of Arizona be deprived of that \$12,000,000 there will remain, Mr. Chairman, but \$2,000,000 after servicing the public debt and its political subsidy. Is that not conclusive evidence that at least one State is faced with permanent bankruptcy?

Thus did Mr. Douglas make a strong plea for adequate tariff protection to the copper industries of his State.

He further went on to say:

I am here pleading the cause of the American producer. I am here pleading the cause of American commerce, of American communities that depend entirely upon this great industry. I am here, sir, pleading the cause of the American miner.

Thus it was that Mr. Douglas pictured the ruin and bankruptcy which was sure to follow in his State unless adequate tariff protection was extended to the producers of copper.

All of this happened in April 1932. What combination of circumstances could possibly have changed Mr. Douglas' viewpoint?

Does he today find conditions materially changed from those of 1932? Are we not still importing, duty free, copper and copper ores to the value of approximately \$3,000,000 a month? Have we not in the first 10 months of this year imported, duty free, copper and copper ores to the value of over \$39,000,000? Would not this copper, if produced in American mines, have furnished employment to thousands of workers who otherwise are idle?

Mr. Speaker, changed associations of times work to change our outlook upon social and economic problems. Regardless of the opinions, however changed of Mr. Douglas, there can be no argument that the time has come when we must choose between abolishing the poverty that is in America and the mingling of it with the poverty of other nations.

This is the big issue today. Are we to break down our economic nationalism and substitute a system of economic internationalism? Are we to share the wealth of America with the poverty of Europe and the Far East? Are we to continue at home a system of subsidies to nearly one-half of our people to keep them in indigence and idleness at the expense of those who work and produce to pay the taxes? Shall we embark upon a program of domestic agricultural and industrial expansion that the field of greatest economic necessity—the supply of food, clothing, and housing—must be developed to care for all of our citizens?

Wisdom and economics point to the latter course as the pathway to a new prosperity.

If tariff protection is good for copper, why not for all other domestic products that come in active competition with