

and-hour bill. Well, Davey, you must know that I am home every week end, and that I am always glad to see my constituents and, strange as it may seem, the number that called on me this week end, despite your invitation, was no larger nor smaller than calls on me every week end.

Oh! I know you must sell your papers, Davey, and in order to sell them you must have news and you must advocate some opinion, but why do you not get behind my House Resolution 310—to appoint a special committee to investigate and inquire into the proceedings which resulted in the quashing of the indictments of certain persons connected with the Philadelphia company for guaranteeing mortgages—and have that committee appointed to investigate why the indictments were quashed, or nolle prossed, and, incidentally, tell us what part, if any, your boy friend, Albert M. Greenfield, had in wrecking that company and how many of the widows and orphans, former bondholders in that company will go without their Christmas dinner this year?

Why do you not tell us, Davey, through your papers, why the W. P. A. in Philadelphia—that great humanitarian agency—has been made a political football at the expense of the destitute and needy of our great city, who are on relief and out of work through no fault of their own?

Why do you not tell us about the fat W. P. A. jobs that single men and women, and even State legislators, are given in Philadelphia while married men on relief in my district of West Philadelphia, with large families, must walk the streets looking for jobs that they cannot get because the organization, of which you are a part, will not give them its political O. K. or blessing?

Why do you not tell us, through the columns of your great papers, why the grand jury investigation of gambling in Philadelphia is being stalemated?

O Davey, why do you prate in your papers with printer's ink about liberalism and representative government while behind closed doors you force down the throats of the Democratic electorate your own stooges to do your bidding. Your man "Friday," Luther M. Harr, the present secretary of banking of the great State of Pennsylvania, is, everyone knows, at least in Philadelphia, controlled by Albert M. Greenfield and yourself. Try to sell or rent a piece of real estate for the banking department of our great State of Pennsylvania and see if you do not have to split commission with Greenfield's office.

I voted to recommit the so-called wage-and-hour bill because I believed the bill did not mean anything for the people of the Sixth District of Pennsylvania; that it did not mean anything for the State of Pennsylvania; that it did not mean anything for the working man in any part of the United States. It was emasculated on the floor of the House when the Labor Committee brought in 129 last-minute amendments and in a desperate attempt to pass it at any cost its sponsors agreed to exempt mining, milling, smelting, oil, agriculture, and what not, making the whole thing a sorry joke on the workers whose living standards it was designed to raise.

I am satisfied that the people of my district and of the great city of Philadelphia and that my colleagues here in the House still believe in intellectual honesty. [Applause.]

O Davey, you have great papers—you control three newspapers—what do they say? If I know anything they teach communism and are unfit to be in any home. Time and time again the Brooklyn Tablet, the leading Catholic newspaper in New York, has branded the New York Post and its publisher "Davey" Stern as anti-Catholic, un-American, and communistic.

It is well and truly written in the good book, "What does it profit a man if he gains the whole world and suffers the loss of his own soul," and I say to you now "Davey" Stern that I would rather go back to political oblivion than stultify and prosecute my own convictions. I come from the laboring class and I am proud to say that I still live, breathe, walk, and talk with the laboring class. I am for minimum wages and maximum hours. I am against sweatshops and will support a bill with a flat minimum wage of 40 cents an hour and with a maximum of 40 hours a week or less.

There will be a real bill introduced in the next session and with all the energy and ability at my command I will help to pass such a bill next session and not a meaningless gesture to labor as was presented on the floor of this House last week.

Bring on your reprisals, Davey, I will be waiting for you and until then I will continue to function down here in Washington for what I humbly consider is for the best interests of the Sixth District of Pennsylvania and the entire country. A merry Christmas. [Applause.]

At the request of Mr. KNUTSON, by unanimous consent, the time of Mr. STACK was extended for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLAND of Pennsylvania). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 25 minutes.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I notice by the RECORD of December 20, page 2532, that my colleague, Mr. COCHRAN, of Missouri, delivered some remarks dealing with certain affidavits that he had submitted to me, numbering six, in which the affiants denied they were members of the bund, and as to which, because of my colleague, JACK COCHRAN, I was willing to give the benefit of the doubt. I did not think it was necessary to encumber the RECORD with a speech for that purpose or to incorporate into the speech six affidavits in which these gentlemen flatly deny that they are members of this particular German Bund. Mr. Speaker, in the last year and a half I have incorporated in the RECORD many hundreds of names based upon thorough and careful investigation. I have always protected character and reputation in respect to any name I have inserted in the RECORD, and I say to the membership of the House that if out of these hundreds of names that I have buttonholed as Fascists and Nazis, or whatever I have called them, only six filed a protest, I think I have done a pretty good job.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Not now; I shall later. I am very much surprised at my good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK], one of the leaders, as the newspapers call him, of part of this House—I do not know what part—who injected a remark during the speech of my friend from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] when the latter asked permission to insert these affidavits in the RECORD. Mr. MAVERICK reserved the right to object, and this is what my colleague from Texas said, on page 2533 of the RECORD:

I think that when a Member puts names in the RECORD he ought to give his source of information. That has been going on week after week, without any foundation whatever.

I do not know what was in the gentleman's mind. I have always admired the gentleman as a man who at least understands something about legislative matters, particularly in respect to putting things into the RECORD, but, from the gentleman's own language here, it would appear to me that he is taking an indirect slap at me when he says:

I think that when a Member puts names in the RECORD he ought to give his source of information.

I say to the gentleman in all fairness that I am not attempting to indulge in any quarrel with him or with any Member, but if I had to give the gentleman the source of all the information with respect to the names that I put into the RECORD, there would not be a printing press in Washington large enough to print it, and there would not be ink enough to print it.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. In a moment. Members have always been welcome to come in and examine the files that I have pertaining to any individual in respect to whose activity I have illuminated the country. My office has been open. I want the gentleman to be fair. The gentleman surely does not expect me to turn around and put into the RECORD the source of information where one case might take up 50 pages of the RECORD alone, and in addition may expose certain people to bodily harm.

German-American

12/21/37

Mr. MAVERICK. Let me say this: If the gentleman puts information into the Record, we want to know whether it is mere hearsay. We do not doubt the gentleman's honesty and integrity, but when names of people are put in the Record whose honor and patriotism are questioned, it should be after an investigation, with the witnesses under oath. I do not think people should be libeled throughout the country by mere rumor. It is unfair.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MAVERICK. I believe the gentleman should give the full source of his information.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I agree with the gentleman, but when one report may take 20 or 30 pages, does the gentleman really want me to put that into the Record? Is it not enough for the House that I put the names into the Record and issue an invitation to every Member to come into my file room and examine the files if he desires to do so?

Mr. MAVERICK. Oh, well, the Nazi crowd, I understand, has some secret-service people. Maybe the gentleman has a secret service?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No.

Mr. MAVERICK. I say again, we do not doubt the gentleman's integrity, but we want to know the source, just as any congressional investigation, or when a man is under oath in a court. Rumor and hearsay is not sufficient.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have a lot of reputable Americans who volunteer their services.

Mr. MAVERICK. Is it like the Ku Klux Klan—secret?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No; it is open, it is not secret at all.

Mr. MAVERICK. Just put it in the Record. But what is the source?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We do not want to put in documents when one case alone would take up almost all of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and endanger certain people for giving information.

Mr. MAVERICK. Sure, I get crank letters all the time.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And I would like to show the gentleman some crank letters I receive. The gentleman would smile, reading them, but I do not even talk about them.

Mr. SHORT. I think we all agree with the gentleman from New York, that it is practically impossible to reveal the source of all information that he might have, but certainly the gentleman from New York should not object to my colleague from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] inserting these affidavits made by good American citizens, residents of my State and the city of St. Louis, who have suffered embarrassment and humiliation and financial losses because of the false charges made against them, and certainly the gentleman should not blame my colleague [Mr. COCHRAN] for encumbering the Record to the extent of doing justice to these men.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I appreciate what the gentleman says, and I have appreciated that, and their probable argument, before I put any name in the Record. As I said, I have always tried to protect character and reputation, and am not seeking to involve any innocent person. I am prepared, if I have committed a wrong, to publicly apologize, but I have not committed any wrong. What I have done is simply to say that A, B, and C are members of an organization in this country which is inimical to our form of government. Let me develop this point a little further.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. In a moment. I am willing to give these people, as my friend from Missouri said, the benefit of the doubt. I still make that statement.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I understand that my colleague from Missouri gave the gentleman from New York an opportunity to insert these affidavits in the Record, which he refused to do.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We are not quarreling about that. I am not asking the gentleman to strike these affidavits out. I am just discussing something that I want to call to your attention.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman says he is willing to give these people the benefit of the doubt. Does the gentleman realize it is a felony, in my State at least, to make a false affidavit? Should he not do more than give them the benefit of the doubt, and admit that he was in error?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. An affidavit is an affidavit in any State. If a man swears to an affidavit which is false, it is a felony, and he committed perjury. I understand that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman made the statement that these names were only put into the Record after complete and thorough investigation.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is right.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Another statement the gentleman made would give the impression that this investigation was not made by any Government agent, any Government officer, or Government authority. Are we to conclude that these names were put into the Record on the statement of individual citizens who have no connection with the Government in any capacity whatsoever, or no connection with the enforcement of law, either municipal, State, or Federal law?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Most of these names will be found in the records of the Department of Justice and the hearings in executive session of the committee which investigated un-American activities during the Seventy-third Congress.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield further? You say most of the names.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Now, let me answer the question. You are trying to get the source of why and how I proceed and what method I used to put the names in. Is not that what you want?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes, indeed.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Then why do you not let me answer your question?

Mr. MAVERICK. I want to say that I wrote to the Department of Justice, and they say they do not have this information and have not got these names.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The Department of Justice would not give you any names. The Department of Justice at this present moment—

Mr. MAVERICK. Will the Department of Justice give you information that they will not give me?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have given the Department some information along these lines; I have not asked them for any.

Mr. MAVERICK. Oh! Then it has not been validated by the Department, has it?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am not interested in that. I am telling you that most of these names you will find in the Department of Justice.

Mr. MAVERICK. Oh, you gave them to them, then?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Either I or someone else.

Mr. MAVERICK. We want to know whether it is certified information or not. The fact the Department of Justice has names sent to them is not proof of truth. Is it legal information? They say they have not got it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If you wanted definite legal information, you and my good friend from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] for whom I have great admiration, should have supported my resolution on April 8, then you would have had official, sworn testimony by now.

Mr. MAVERICK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And all of the information that you are now asking me.

Mr. MAVERICK. Do you mean to tell me that if I do not support your resolution I do not get official information from the Department of Justice?

I know better than that! I know I can get any information the gentleman can get. There is no discrimination against me.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I just want to tell the gentleman that everything I say or put into the Record is based upon careful study and investigation.

Mr. MAVERICK. Well, by whom? By whom?

Please give the source.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It is not done for the purpose of getting into the press as some gentlemen said on the floor of this House.

Mr. MAVERICK. Then you are not trying to get this into the press? You do not want this in the press?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not care whether this is in the press or not. I am not concerned.

Mr. MAVERICK. Well, then, do not accuse somebody else of wanting to get into the press.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It has been stated by some gentlemen on this floor, and I am looking at some of them now, that these addresses are only made on this subject to bust into the press.

Mr. MAVERICK. The gentleman knows that when we have an investigation there must be something official about it. You must have some big secret organization like the Ku Klux Klan or like the Nazi Bund making this investigation.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No, my dear friend. I just have my—

Mr. MAVERICK. What? Organization? What is your source? I do not doubt your integrity at all; but let us do it in the regular way.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is right. Will you vote for it?

Mr. MAVERICK. I do not know that I am going to promise to vote for anything. I will vote for it if it is right.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is what I want you to do. If it is right I want you to support it. I have thousands of Americans, veterans, who voluntarily, without compensation, give me certain information in their communities. I then try—

Mr. MAVERICK. Is it sworn testimony? What is the source? Who are they?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Some of the information is sworn to and some of it is not. Some of it is just information, which is being checked and rechecked by certain communities in every community in the country.

Mr. MAVERICK. What communities? And what is the information? Who is the head of this organization that is doing the checking?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There is no particular person. I have about six or eight thousand files dealing with subversive activities by certain individuals in this United States, including the gentleman's own State.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Let me finish my sentence.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman made a statement and I want to reply to it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Let me finish my statement.

Mr. COCHRAN. I want to challenge the gentleman's statement that he says an investigation was made with reference to the names that he placed in the RECORD of citizens of my city belonging to this organization. I challenge the statement and defy him to produce the investigators to prove it. I do this to learn who is responsible for the information furnished the gentleman about residents of my city.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No; I do not. If you will let me alone for a moment—

Mr. KNUTSON. I did not think so.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not yield further now. Walter Luedecke—let the gentleman come back and I will challenge him. I am ready to challenge him. Walter Luedecke is the worst Nazi that lives in St. Louis, a Nazi that has been trying to substitute his fascism for democracy.

He is a gentleman that, connected with the North German Lloyd Steamship Line, just became a citizen a year ago; and I have a file about this great distinguished American, Walter Luedecke, the gentleman who makes an affidavit saying he is innocent. It would seem that he never heard about German bunds, he never heard about a Nazi Party. He is one of the heads of the steamship company that does all the dirty work. All the propaganda is brought in through the steamship companies. Mr. Luedecke, the gentleman who

makes an affidavit it would seem never heard about a German bund! Why, he did not even know Fritz Kuhn—perhaps! This is the type of affidavits that are submitted!

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman told me about that. Who is the investigator who made the investigation? That is what I want to know, that is what those who made the affidavit want to know.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. I think the gentleman from New York has been doing splendid work in regard to these investigations. I was not very much interested at first, but I have followed him somewhat and read other matters along this line. The gentleman may not always be right but I think he is doing a good work.

Mr. COCHRAN. I agree with the gentleman from New York in that respect.

Mr. SNELL. This investigation of secret organizations in this country which are putting out teachings that are inimical to American institutions is good. I am against that type of organization. [Applause.] And I do not give a damn what country they come from! [Applause.] I think the gentleman is doing good work. He may be wrong in some things, but in general he is doing good work, and it is American work. [Applause.]

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] infers I am in favor of people trying to destroy our form of government he is placing me in a wrong light when he makes that statement. I did not state that the gentleman has not been doing good work. I think he has been doing good work, but if he secured these individual names through secret investigation I want to know it. If I have been imposed upon, and I do think I have, I want to know it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Out of 550 names only 6 persons deny that they are connected with the bund. I say that I have done a pretty good job. I may not make it 100 percent, but it happens that only six persons deny it, and I am willing to accept their affidavits.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is all I want the gentleman to do.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman made the statement just a moment ago that Walter Luedecke denied having heard of any nazism. In his affidavit he does not say that he was in ignorance of nazism.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I was just speaking figuratively.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman was talking rather loosely.

Mr. Luedecke denies having been a member of such an organization; and that, as I see it, is all that the gentleman from Missouri is bringing out. He does not say that he ever heard of nazi-ism or never heard of these German-American organizations.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am simply trying to convey to my colleagues what is going on. As I said, I am accepting his affidavit; but I still say that he is a Nazi, dealing with the North German Lloyds, and that his activities are not for the best interests of this country.

Mr. BOILEAU. I think the gentleman is doing a good service in bringing out the names of all who are engaged in un-American activities. On the other hand, I believe the House should have at this time a particular statement from him as to the source of his information. If American citizens are giving the gentleman the information, all right. Obviously, there must be some kind of organization getting this information; and in order that we may give proper credence to the gentleman, I think he should tell us who is assisting him in this movement.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. A moment ago I tried to explain a part of the source of the information.

Mr. BOILEAU. Is there any organization?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There are other angles to the source of information. I have received no appropriation from anybody.

Mr. BOILEAU. I appreciate that.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have not received a dollar; as a matter of fact, I have used some of my own money out of my own pocket to send secret messengers out to get certain information.

Let me develop the gentleman's thought. It means nothing to me. I am serious about the proposition. I have been begging this Congress for 3 long years, exposing these un-American activities and their leaders, and all I have received from a certain group in this House was abuse, until now the country is up in arms. You have nazi-ism, you have communism, you have the blues, and the whites, and the reds, and it is going on openly. What have we done about it in Congress?

Mr. COCHRAN. Did not the House give the gentleman some money for the McCormack investigating committee? Of course we did.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The House gave the McCormack committee \$30,000, and we were just about hitting gold when we could not get a renewal of the investigation. We were only at it for 4 months and could not get a renewal of authority to continue because some gentleman on the floor objected. Our investigators brought us the names of three or four thousand agitators, but we did not have time to develop what they were doing in this country. We were barred from continuing our investigation not only because of refusal to renew authorization, but because we found that the law itself was bad, for we could not subpoena a witness outside of the District of Columbia and hold him in contempt.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is the gentleman's own fault. If the resolution had been worded properly your committee could have required witnesses to testify, and so forth.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It had nothing to do with the wording of the resolution. It was a question of a defect in the law under which resolutions were passed.

Mr. DUNN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. In just a moment. We subpoenaed the Communist organization in New York City. Congress was not in session and they refused to produce documents and papers. They just simply refused. I applied to the district attorney of my district for an indictment under sections 131 and 136 of the Revised Statutes, but he found while the subpoena was not issued in the District of Columbia and Congress was not in session, he could neither force the Communist to appear before a congressional committee, nor to testify and to produce the demanded documents. We subpoenaed other Nazi spies and the same thing happened. We came back here to Congress and it took us a year or a little more to amend the law.

Dealing with the question of names and the authenticity of same, may I say our investigators brought in over three or four thousand names, and I refer to the investigators for the congressional committee of 1933 and 1934. These three or four thousand names were not followed up. We took only the public agitators because their names appeared as leaders. I have followed these names up with proper investigation, spending my own money, and with the help of fine patriotic Americans who have checked on their activities. We had Germans come to us and give us information about their own people. We kept on checking and rechecking. We just took those aliens which we believed to be in this country advocating a form of government inimical to our own. We took those who were advocating fascism.

Mr. BOILEAU. How many of those names were citizens of St. Louis?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We have forgotten about that.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman state just how many of those names were from St. Louis? The gentleman from Missouri states that six of those names are not based on proper information. Now, what percentage was from St. Louis?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I found out of the 3,000 perhaps 42, 43, or 45.

Mr. BOILEAU. How many were put in the RECORD?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. About 18.

Mr. BOILEAU. And the gentleman from Missouri has received affidavits from six.

Mr. DUNN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DUNN. May I say to the gentleman I have received three threatening letters. Two came from Indiana and one from Richmond, Va. These letters stated if I did not discontinue my bolshevistic activities, and if I did not discontinue supporting Roosevelt policies, some day I would be taken for a ride; that people would come to my home and appear to be friends and would take me out and dispose of me. They also said that some day I may be in a restaurant and someone would come in and put poison in my food and get rid of me in that way if I did not discontinue my bolshevistic activities as a New Dealer. I want to say to the gentleman and I want the world in general to know that I am not afraid of anybody in this world or the next world. I would rather be a dead man than go around living in fear that someone may poison me. I want to say that no Communist or no Socialist ever sent me such a letter.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. May I say to the gentleman that I also receive threatening letters.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I get letters threatening kidnaping, assault, and murder every day in the week. The gentleman must not mind that. We have a lot of foreign and domestic "crackpots" in this country.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman turn those letters over to the Department of Justice?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No. They are helpless.

Mr. DUNN. I turned mine over to the Department of Justice.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The Department of Justice is helpless.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In what respect?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have never received any report as to what they checked or what information they received, the reason being that most of the communications are anonymous.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Did the gentleman turn them over to the Post Office Department?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. They are helpless.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Why?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Because they have not force enough to carry on this work and because most of the mail is anonymous. We have an Intelligence Service in this country. The Intelligence Service consists of about a handful of men in peacetimes and they cannot compete with what is going on in this country.

Mr. EBERHARTER. If the Post Office Department cannot give the gentleman any help with regard to these letters, and if the Department of Justice cannot give him any help, why does he not get his private investigating agency to look into these threatening letters?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am not worried about the threatening letters. I did not mention that as a basis for my information. I did not appeal for protection nor did I ask anybody to be my bodyguard. I merely made that answer to my friend from Pennsylvania that you get them every day in the week. I received two this morning.

Mr. COLDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COLDEN. Not long ago the gentleman from New York inserted in the RECORD a list of supposed Nazi supporters in the city of Los Angeles and from the conversation with the gentleman at that time I got the impression he had no personal knowledge.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I had no personal knowledge?

Mr. COLDEN. Of these Nazis in Los Angeles.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Who told the gentleman that?

Mr. COLDEN. I thought the gentleman did.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No; I did not. I placed 116 names in the Record on the 17th of last month, and I want the Members of the House to know these 116 names were checked and rechecked. They were names which were submitted in the executive hearings of the select committee headed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] in 1935 and 1936. At that time the police and representatives of the Department of Justice gave us these names to investigate, and we checked and rechecked them. Not one of those people denied the charge I made a month ago when I listed the 116 names of people in California. The only answer was that Mr. Schwim, their Nazi leader, called me a Jew.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York may be extended 5 minutes in order that I may ask him a question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLDEN. What can be the final result of the gentleman's publication of these names of people in Los Angeles except to arouse feeling against these particular individuals, and then cause retaliation by people who object to the gentleman's point of view. It seems to me the final result is merely to arouse racial feeling. The proper procedure is to report these matters to the Department of Justice.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No. In Los Angeles 68 to 72 percent of these agitators were aliens. Only about 24 or 26 percent were citizens of the United States. The rest of them were aliens, who never wanted to become citizens and never applied for citizenship. I thought this situation ought to be called to the attention of the gentleman's community.

Mr. Speaker, I was hopeful of developing a more important point in regard to some propoganda against the United States Government, but in view of the lack of time I shall not have an opportunity to do so. However, I may say that the American Legion only a few days ago went on record in favor of the study and investigation of this whole question.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman wants to be fair. I do not believe the American Legion limits the question to the Nazis.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No.

Mr. FISH. The Legion wants to take in the Communists.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I did not make any limitation.

Mr. FISH. The Fascists, and all these "isms."

Mr. DICKSTEIN. All these "isms" the gentleman talked about yesterday. The gentleman spoke of all kind of dangers facing our country, Chinese, Hong Kongs, Japanese, and others, without discussing the Nazis. It seems the gentleman did not take them all in.

Mr. FISH. I may do that this afternoon.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. As recently as December 9 a statement was made by Fritz Kuhn, the Bund leader who contends that national socialism is the only solution for the world, which substantiated any accusation I have ever made against him and his group.

[From the Providence Evening Bulletin of December 9, 1937]

SOLID U. S. POLITICAL BLOC OF 18,000,000 IS BUND ARM—NAZI PHILOSOPHY FINEST FOR POOR, SAYS HERR KUHN

(By Paul Gallico, International News Service staff correspondent) NEW YORK, N. Y., December 9.—A solid political bloc of the 18,000,000 German Americans who are United States citizens, is the aim of the German-American Bund organized by Herr Fritz Kuhn with headquarters here.

This is the outfit which struck a snag in the little colonial village of Southbury, Conn., recently when it ran up against a group of hard-headed Yankee Aryans who objected to the establishment in their neighborhood of a bund recreation camp.

KUHN IS BAVARIAN

Herr Kuhn, the leader of a movement admittedly organized to fight the Communists and the Jews in this country, is a Bavarian, born in Munich. He became a naturalized American citizen in 1932.

An important part of the work of the bund is the Americanizing and naturalizing of Germans here so that they may come within the scope of the bund.

Kuhn is a large, forceful, powerful man. Facialy he resembles in a way, a younger, slimmer Goering. On one wall of his small office is a picture of Roosevelt. On the facing wall is one of Hitler. On a cabinet are five miniature flags hung from tiny standards. One of them is a blue pennant with "U. S." on it. The other four are swastikas.

"HELL" IN SALUTATION

Kuhn, as well as all of the men in Bund office, greet one another with "Hell" and the quick right-arm, palm-open salute.

Kuhn, in speaking of the Bund, stated flatly that it had no connection with Germany whatsoever, that neither he nor the members were under orders from the German Government, and that no oath of allegiance to Hitler or any other foreign power, or agents thereof, was required of the members of the Bund or the young children who attended the Bund summer camps.

Herr Kuhn quoted Hitler's "Mein Kampf" (My Battle): "The National Socialist movement is not to be exported."

ONLY ONE PHILOSOPHY

But if the movement is to be kept at home, the philosophy is something else again, is winged in fact, according to Herr Kuhn.

He glared like a prophet when he said: "The National Socialist philosophy is the finest for the true democracy of the poor. The philosophy is the solution for every human being because it deals only with individuals.

"Do you know why they are fighting us so? Because the Jews feel the force of National Socialist. It cannot be stopped. It is the only salvation for the world. They know that. It is sweeping Europe. It is the only true democracy."

Herr Kuhn charged that Germans were receiving unfair treatment in this country. And while he denied that his Bund had anything to do with the German party now in power, he was willing to say this: "Hitler has brought the German nation back out of the depths of poverty and despair. He has done something wonderful. I am a man who admires success. When something succeeds, as he has succeeded, it must be good."

EXPLAINS AIMS OF CAMPS

Herr Kuhn explained the aims of the camps. They were educational and recreational. They were for workmen of poor means so they could enjoy a Sunday in the country and to keep children off the streets.

There was a deadly earnestness about Herr Kuhn and everything he said.

Deponent departed with a fistful of pamphlets for home study, entitled variously, "Purpose and Aims of the German-American Bund," "Litvinoff," "The New Germany Under Hitler," "The Snake in the Grass," "Lifting the Pall, Germany and Hitler in Their True Light," and "The Truth About Spain."

SOUTHBURY, CONN., December 9.—This community had new zoning laws today—12 typewritten pages of them hastily slapped together. Town officers solemnly asserted the new regulations had nothing to do with the invasion of the Kettletown district by a unit of the German-American Bund.

But the regulations specify that the area within which the Bund has purchased 178 acres cannot be used for "recreational, camping, or drilling purposes." They forbid drilling with or without arms in the area "except by the regular armed forces of the United States."

Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen, a few months ago I warned you that fascism was taking big strides in this country by having poisoned the mind of many adults, as well as children, by their insidious propoganda. As the article referring to the speech made by the Honorable Harold L. Ickes disclosed, many prominent Americans are now waking up to this danger.

[From the Washington Times of December 9, 1937]

ICKES WARNS OF UNITED STATES FASCIST PERIL AT HAND—DANGER CALLED MUCH WORSE THAN KLAN

NEW YORK, December 9.—A warning against a new madness—the madness of nations in nightshirts—was sounded today by Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes.

At the same time a warning that fascism might result in the United States in case of another major depression was voiced by Floyd W. Parsons, publishing-house executive, in addressing the Personnel Research Federation.

This new menace threatens the liberties of this country far more than the Ku Klux Klan ever did, Ickes charged, in an address at the annual meeting of the Civil Liberties Union.

SEES NEW DANGERS

Calling Fascist aggressor countries "Nations in KKK Nighties," he declared:

"Fascism, whether of the right or the left, is the greatest threat in the world today. America, which survived as a land of liberty despite the madness of men in nightshirts, is far more dangerously threatened by a new madness of nations in nightshirts.

"Invading armies are sent across the borders of other countries which are so weak and helpless as to offer a helpless prey. The

Meagles and the klookarks now ride bombers, tanks, battleships, and submarines over a field of operation that is international."

STALKING HORSE

Wealthy and influential men with Fascist leanings are using communism in this country as "a wooden horse within the bowels of which fascism may enter the shrine of liberty," Ickes charged.

Denouncing "snipings at liberty," he listed persecutions of minorities for racial and religious reasons, the misuse of the militia and police in strikes, and abrogation of free speech and assembly by local officials.

In conclusion let me say that it is not only laws we need to curb un-American activities but a strong searchlight to focus the attention of our people on such activities and the persons responsible for them. Only if we know exactly how such activities are being carried on and by whom they are supported and directed can we pass laws that would deal the death blow to all the enemies of our democratic form of government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORD of California, asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for 5 minutes in order that I may answer the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have only 5 minutes myself. I should like to yield to the gentleman, but I have some important business to attend to immediately after I conclude my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, having in mind the necessity of the press to make observations, gather news, and inform the people, I have been reading with great interest the caustic comments made from time to time with reference to the lack of understanding, by Members of Congress, of many of the bills which are voted up. I have in mind, particularly, certain editorials and columns which have appeared in the last few days and which dealt with the farm, wage-and-hour, and housing bills as considered by this body just recently.

In looking back over the important acts of Congress since April 3, 1866 (skipping the World War period 1917 and 1918) I find that up to the beginning of the Seventy-third Congress the Members of this House, over a 67-year period had to deal with a total of 260 important laws or an average of only 4 per year.

Beginning with the Seventy-third Congress and running through the last 5 years, we have had to consider, as best we could under the circumstances, debate and vote on 185 important laws or an average of 37 per year.

Mr. Speaker, there are diligent men and women who are Members of this body. There are many of those who through persevering application and devoted and painstaking effort burn the midnight oil and labor early in the morning in an attempt to know what is going on about them and what is embraced in these far-reaching proposals.

In no way do I resent the comments of the press. But I would point out that if the work of the Members of Congress is prosecuted with careful attention and effort, they must necessarily engage in much research before casting their vote, or accept the statements of another who may not have thoroughly comprehended the meaning of the sweeping proposals for or against which a vote must be cast. National and international affairs move swiftly these days and I would remind the country that important measures cannot under such conditions receive the attention they did in years gone by when only an average of four important acts had to be considered annually, as against an average of more than three per month under present procedure.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a 280-word editorial dealing with a statement I presented here the other day, wherein I discussed the advertising program being carried on by the Secretary of the Treasury in connection

with the sale of baby savings bonds. This statement is taken from Editor and Publisher, the oldest publishers' and advertisers' journal in America.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

GREEK ORGIES, REDS, FASCISTS—LET US MEET THE ISSUES

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, this is Christmas time, and everybody is feeling very well; but I want to make a few comments on the address just delivered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]. I think his intentions are very good, but the results may not be so good.

In the beginning, I may say that whenever we have real problems to meet in this country, and it is true historically of all the nations of the world, we, as does the human race as a whole, generally devote ourselves to hunting bogeymen, in our case radicals, reds, Communists, or Fascists. The Romans hunted the Greeks, and if anything came up that worried our worthy Romans, the 100-percent Romans of the day charged the others with celebrating Greek orgies and having ideas subversive of the Roman state. Later, when things went badly, the Romans would burn or boil the Christians instead of meeting the real problems of the nation.

This is my general comment on the present situation—so instead of indulging in the sport of evading the issues, let us meet them and try to solve our problems.

THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—"IT MUST BE TRUE"—WE KNOW BETTER

The gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] has inserted various names in the RECORD. I have found that one of the cruelest and most brutal instruments anyone can use is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, especially when it is used in a more or less loose manner. Our responsibility to the people should forbid us hurting a citizen without the most unquestioned facts. Suppose one puts in the RECORD the name of a man, with a reflection on his citizenship or patriotism—who, say, has a little delicatessen shop somewhere, and whose name may be Hans Schmitt, or something like that—and people read that this man is a Nazi or a Communist, an enemy of this country.

The circulation of this information in the community in which the man lives affects him severely and may ruin him, although this information is not testimony sworn to before a notary public, as far as we know, or statements before a judicial tribunal of the United States Government. Ever since I was 21 and before I came to Congress, I have heard people say, "Well, that was in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so it must be true."

My friends, you know they had here in the RECORD a certain alleged pledge that the Knights of Columbus took about gouging the eyes out of and extirpating Protestant children, and burning, and all that sort of thing, and the Ku Klux Klan all over the country said that it must be true that these Catholics are going to burn up our children, because it is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. [Laughter.]

Now, we know among ourselves that there are lots of things that go into the RECORD that are not true. We know that about each other and the country ought to know that, too. I do not mean that as any reflection on any Member of Congress. I do not mean to say we are not all honorable men, but what we put in the RECORD is often the barest hearsay and only a mere opinion of a particular Member.

Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD can be a medium of education, peace, and good will. But if we do not guard the information in it well, it can be the greatest instrument of oppression in the country. So let us be careful what we put in it, especially when it concerns some individual who is either weak or friendless.

COMMUNIST AND FASCIST HUNTING DOES NOT END DEPRESSIONS

Now, let us talk about the present situation. The Dickstein committee before went out and hunted Communists, and I think it was found there were something like 25,000, or maybe 35,000 or 40,000 Communists in this country. Well, are all the 127,000,000 American people to stop everything and get worried about what 25,000 or 35,000 Communists are going to do?

The same is true of these so-called Nazis. I am told there are only 4,000 in the country, but say there are 100,000. Are they going to run the rest of us 127,000,000 Americans out of our country? Are they going to take our Government away from us?

So far as I am concerned, I look with the greatest contempt, with the greatest sickness of the stomach, at these Nazis going around and marching around and goose-stepping at these camps. [Applause.]

I think it is the most contemptible and the most un-American thing I know, but I have confidence in the public opinion and the common sense of America, even of the men and women who come from Germany and Russia and Poland and other countries, that they are not going to try to overthrow this Government. [Applause.]

Moreover, they cannot overthrow this Government. This is the strongest government in the whole world, and in spite of its faults, probably the best. The people are better satisfied in this country than anywhere else. Why, Mr. Speaker, it is ridiculous to say that a few misguided people who have come to this country can do anything that would really affect this country.

LET US STOP THIS RACE TALK

Mr. Speaker, let me offer a common-sense suggestion: Let us stop talking about this business of different races in this country. In this country we have more racial tolerance, I believe, than in most any country in the world, and the Jewish people are in a better situation here than elsewhere. For their good, for the good of those of German extraction, for the good of those of Russian extraction—and all three racial groups are occasionally treated with great unfairness—let us drop the question.

I believe that the Congress of the United States and the people of the United States ought to look with scorn and contempt upon any foreign organization, no matter of what government or race, that seeks, either indirectly or by force, or by illegal methods or even by bad manners, to inject itself, as foreigners, into our American concerns. I believe that well-considered public opinion will repudiate these presumptuous persons and groups.

Organizations of a foreign background, based on sentimentality, upon history, culture, or racial pride, are of benefit to the culture of this country. It is only when really foreign organizations act in conjunction with foreign governments in an un-American way that they should be disapproved.

NAZIS CONTEMPTIBLY SMALL MINORITY

The percentage of persons who are Nazis in this country and go about the country goose-stepping and making supreme monkeys and asses of themselves are a contemptibly small minority. They wanted to hold a convention in St. Louis and it was met with such a unanimous outcry by citizens of that community, a majority of whom are of German extraction, that the Nazis stayed out of town, for they knew they were unwelcome as hell itself.

Let us do nothing that might cause racial feeling by wasting time on these small minorities, which are misguided and have no influence, and then the Germans, Poles, Jews, the Catholics, and the Protestants, and all the rest, can live together like free-born Americans, and then we can save ourselves from many of the misfortunes of other countries. [Applause.]

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am for that.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would my colleague be kind enough to tell me what his topic is to be?

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, it will have something to do with good cheer and the spirit of the season.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then I shall take pleasure in remaining.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] has an obsession, and it seems to be growing on him. He is taking a little band of Nazis led by an egotistical jackass, and, by a liberal use of his imagination, building them into an organization that is going to threaten—indeed, is threatening—the future of the Republic. Time after time he has arisen on this floor to state that if he were to print all of the information that he has about the Nazis in this country there would not be enough printing presses in Washington to print it. My God, what kind of a filing cabinet has the gentleman? The fact of the matter is that this Nazi organization that he raves about consists of approximately 4,000, who have been utterly repudiated by official representatives of the German Government.

Mr. MAVERICK. The gentleman says that he has files on the State of Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not doubt that, but I dare say they exist in the gentleman's head.

Mr. MAVERICK. And I will bet that the gentleman has about five Nazis in his State.

Mr. KNUTSON. If we have that many I do not know it. I have never met one of them in my life, to know it. Each time the gentleman takes the floor he tells about how impotent the Government is to deal with this subversive influence. He tells us the Department of Justice cannot do anything about it, nor can the Post Office Department do anything about it. Mr. Speaker, if this Government has broken down it has broken down during the incumbency of the gentleman's own party. We could handle such a situation when we were in power. Indeed, local authorities can and would deal with it if any danger existed.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. GOLDEN. The gentleman from Minnesota has overlooked one factor in this country. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] put into the RECORD the names of several Nazis from my district. I never heard of one of them, but I have in my district a number of organizations known as the American Legion, every post of which is a shrine of patriotism; and if there are any dangerous Nazis in my district, it would not be necessary to call on the Department of Justice, or even Mr. DICKSTEIN, for they would be taken proper care of at home.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is absolutely right. The gentleman from New York has from time to time inserted into the RECORD the names of alleged Nazi adherents in this country. On yesterday the gentleman from St. Louis [Mr. COCHRAN] inserted in the RECORD a number of affidavits from fellow townsmen who had previously been designated as Nazis by the gentleman from New York. Each and every one of these affiants swore that he had at no time been a member of that organization. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] tells us that he showed these affidavits to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] and asked him to insert them in the RECORD as a matter of common justice to those whom he had wronged. This the gentleman from New York refused to do.

Has the gentleman from New York ever stopped to consider the grave injustice that he is doing in making such wild and baseless charges? As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK] so well pointed out a few moments ago, it would be possible for some enemy to turn in the name of an upright, loyal citizen against whom he held a grudge as a

member of some subversive order and how an aroused community might drive that individual into bankruptcy through boycott or even visit violence upon him.

Mr. Speaker, I serve notice here and now that no more of these lists are going into the RECORD without being supported by substantiating evidence. I say this to protect innocent people. So far as I am concerned, we have had enough of race-baiting in this House and I do not care whether the baiting be directed against Jew or gentile, Catholic or Protestant, black or white. It has to stop.

What the gentleman from New York wants to do is to have this House create an investigating committee, with himself as chairman, with perhaps \$50,000 to \$100,000 at its disposal, so that they may galivant about the country, stop at the best hotels and have their names smeared across the front pages of the newspapers, telling the country what good work they are doing in saving us from a danger that is purely imaginary. He says he does not want any publicity for himself. Oh, no, the gentleman does not want any publicity! He shrinks from it—he is a shrinking violet, but as a violet he looks more like a sunflower to me.

Mr. MAVERICK. You do not mean a Landon sunflower, do you?

Mr. KNUTSON. This thing has gotten to be a huge joke. The constant tirades of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] are not taken seriously by any one but himself, and I now say to the gentleman that if he keeps on agitating and building up a spirit of race hatred in this country something may happen that all of us are praying will never come to pass in America, as it has happened in a number of European countries, causing misery and suffering to countless thousands of innocent people.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is speaking in behalf of a resolution that is pending before the Committee on Rules, introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] surely a fine American, to investigate this situation. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] would not be the chairman, he would not accept the chairmanship and has no wish to be even a member of the committee. If the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], who always takes the floor when this question is raised, with a certain German element in it, will direct his remarks to the resolution introduced by that great American, Mr. DIES, of Texas, he would be in better form.

Mr. KNUTSON. And may I reply to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules that the resolution he refers to is not now before the House, therefore, I cannot address myself to it very well. None of the preceding speakers have addressed themselves to the resolution. I have lived among Americans of German extraction all of my life. I do not believe there were any finer soldiers in the World War and I call upon the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK] to confirm me in that statement.

Mr. MAVERICK. My company commander was a Jew, and was killed right beside me in the Argonne Forest.

Mr. KNUTSON. Regardless of race or creed, they were all good Americans of German extraction and are among our very best citizens. What I am deploring is this constant baiting of one class and setting it against another. That is un-Christian and un-American and the sooner we stop it the better it will be for the entire country. I know that the thinking Members of the gentleman's own race will subscribe to that suggestion. In closing let me say that I am opposed to all subversive activities directed against this Government and our people, and shall do everything in my power to put a stop to it. [Applause.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]. On the con-

trary, I discussed this question with him on numerous occasions, because it so happens that I am on the committee that would have to approve a resolution for expenses for a special committee. I have offered the gentleman some suggestions as to how he might make some progress in this matter. I am just as much in favor of getting out of this country any aliens who do not believe in our form of government and want to tear it down as the gentleman from New York or any other Member of this House or any other citizen of this country. As I stated yesterday, in the closing days of the last session the gentleman from New York placed the names of some people who are residents of my city in the RECORD as belonging to this organization. I did not know one of them personally. The fact of the matter is, not one of them lives in my congressional district. They or their representative came to see me and told me they were libeled, blackmailed, and that they had never belonged to the organization. I really felt sorry for them. So would you. I said, "The thing for you to do is to prepare an affidavit and send it to Mr. DICKSTEIN." They said, "What good will that do?" I said, "Send it to me, then, and I will give it to him." If he does not place it in the RECORD, in view of the fact that it is an affidavit and the affiant knows that if you perjure yourself you can be convicted of a felony and sent to the penitentiary for 7 years, if you will send them to me and he does not place them in the RECORD, then I will ask permission of the House to do it." And that is just exactly what I did.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. In just a moment.

Now, it so happens that this organization announced a national convention to be held in my city a few weeks ago. I will tell you how much activity there is in my city among them. They could not even get a hall in which to hold their meeting. Nobody would rent them a hall. I do not know how active they are in other parts of the country. If they are active and doing what the gentleman says they are doing, something should be done to stop it. As far as my city is concerned, and as far as these people who sent me these affidavits are concerned, I think I was justified in placing them in the RECORD, because it has caused them a great deal of embarrassment among the people they have lived with, some of them for over 30 years. Remember also they are all citizens of this country, not aliens.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I did not disagree with the gentleman. I worked with the gentleman. I said that I had no objection to what he did, but I was not going to put them in the RECORD at all. I said I would give them the benefit of the doubt. I have made that statement very plain.

Mr. COCHRAN. I just desired to make myself clear. As I said before, and as I say now, I have offered the gentleman from New York some suggestions, and I think if he will follow those suggestions he might get a resolution passed by the House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended 1 minute that I may ask him a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DELANEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I was grateful to the gentleman and many more fine gentlemen on this floor who are willing to cooperate to bring about a cleaning of house, irrespective of any particular race. America! That is what I am after, and I will fight while I am in Congress for America.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Did the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] to insert those affidavits in the RECORD?

Mr. COCHRAN. I stated so in the RECORD yesterday, and the gentleman from New York did not deny it.

Mr. KNUTSON. But he refused to do it?

Mr. COCHRAN. He said he had no objection to my placing them in the RECORD.

Mr. KNUTSON. That was very kind of him.

Mr. COCHRAN. And I placed them in the RECORD and the gentleman did not object.

[Here the gavel fell.]

RECESS

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 3:30 this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DELANEY). The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 3:30 this afternoon. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the majority leader tell us what he has in mind and what is the reason for standing in recess for the next hour or two?

Mr. RAYBURN. Senator BARKLEY has just left here, and he thinks that in all probability the Senate will pass the housing bill by 3 o'clock. They will ask for a conference. My thought was that we not adjourn now, but stand in recess, and that we immediately agree to the conference and then any others who want to speak will have an opportunity to do so, and after that is done, we can have the sine die adjournment resolution passed and adjourn sine die.

Mr. SNELL. I want to say to the distinguished majority leader that as far as that program in itself is concerned, I have no objection, but I want it definitely understood that if we let this housing bill go to conference there will not be any conference report brought back here before we adjourn, because a great many Members who are deeply interested in that bill have gone away. I understand the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency [Mr. STEAGALL] is out of town and the ranking minority member is leaving town this afternoon.

With that understanding, the statement made by the gentleman from Texas is agreeable to me.

Mr. RAYBURN. I will say to the gentleman that we realize the situation, and when this bill goes to conference it is my purpose then to ask unanimous consent, the same as was done on the farm bill, that the conferees, if they desire, may sit during the adjournment of the House.

It is my intention as soon as it goes to conference to introduce the resolution to adjourn.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to secure permission to speak for 10 minutes at the expiration of the recess.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, if any Member desires to submit a unanimous-consent request for permission to address the House, I will withhold my request for the time being.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes upon the expiration of the recess.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, the Members of Congress need have no fear of our country being undermined if we do away with the sweatshops, and child labor, and the slum districts, provide work for the unemployed, and pay them a saving wage.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

THE HOUSING BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DELANEY in the chair). The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 3:30 p. m. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I call the attention of the majority leader to the fact that the Senate committee struck out title I of the Housing bill, which eliminates the rural suburban sections and the owners of low-priced houses from participation in the benefits provided in the bill. If the bill comes back to the House with the benefits to these small-home owners eliminated we are going to try to instruct the conferees not to agree to leave that provision out, or to stand by the House bill. We are not willing to send this bill to conference with the little fellow eliminated.

Mr. RAYBURN. He certainly is not eliminated from the House bill, and both bills will be in conference.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but we want to instruct our conferees.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman can defeat sending the bill to conference, of course, if he wants to.

Mr. RANKIN. We do not want to take a chance on that important feature of the bill going out.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. The gentleman must understand that if he pursues that course he will defeat the opportunity of sending the bill to conference now.

Mr. RANKIN. Not at all; the House can instruct the conferees now as well as at any other time.

Mr. RAYBURN. Not without a quorum.

Mr. RANKIN. The point of no quorum would not be raised unless a roll call is demanded. We cannot have the little fellow eliminated from the bill. The farmers and the home owners in the small towns are as much entitled to these benefits as are the large home owners in the big cities.

Mr. SNELL. I am with the gentleman so far as that is concerned.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas that the House stand in recess until 3:30 p. m.?

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 3:30 p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 3:30 o'clock p. m.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. The Senate is making progress in its consideration of the housing bill. The most controversial matter seems to be the reestablishment of title I of the House bill, which has been reinserted in the bill by the Senate by a vote of 46 to 22. [Applause.] The Senate believes it will be through in 15 or 20 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the completion of the address by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] the House stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

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

Mr. SADOWSKI. Reserving the right to object, was title I restored in exactly the same language as adopted by the House?

Mr. RAYBURN. That is my understanding.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes over and above the 10 minutes already allotted me.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I spoke yesterday at some considerable length on the Japanese situation. The situation has changed practically over night. We wake up this morning and find that the Chinese Government is now under control of the Communists, which completely changes the picture. There is no question about the facts. It is admitted that the Communists in China have taken over what remains of the Chinese Government.

Mr. Speaker, that brings up another question, whether we want to aline ourselves with a communistic government to further communism in China or elsewhere in the world. I make these few remarks at this time to show it is advisable for us to proceed slowly with reference to foreign commitments. It is advisable for the American people to remain cool, calm, and collected, and get all the facts and analyze them in a sane way instead of permitting ourselves to be inflamed by propaganda, whether it is from Communists or foreign nations, which inspires hatred and hostility against Japan or any other nation.

Mr. Speaker, I have arisen during the closing hours of this session to speak about one of the bloodiest massacres and atrocities in recent history, that occurred in the Dominican Republic on the 3d of October this year, at which time from 2,500 to 12,000 Haitians were butchered in cold blood right at our doorstep.

On the 3d of January 1936 the President of the United States, in a message to Congress, had this to say:

Among the nations of the great Western Hemisphere the policy of the good neighbor has happily prevailed. At no time in the four and a half centuries of modern civilization in the Americas has there existed—in any year, any decade, or any generation in all that time—a greater spirit of mutual understanding, of common helpfulness, and of devotion to the ideals of self-government than exists today in the 21 American Republics and their neighbor, the Dominion of Canada.

Then the President goes on at great length, you will remember, arraigning the autocratic and dictatorial forms of government which exist in Europe and elsewhere in the world. Of course, as we know the situation in the South American and Central American countries, more than half of these so-called republics have a dictatorial form of government even more drastic than that which exists in Germany or Italy at the present time.

The American people are filled with resentment at the death of several American sailors who lost their lives on the American gunboat that was attacked by Japanese airplanes, but right in a neighboring republic occurred one of the most hideous massacres in our time without scarcely a reference in the press. Why it has not been featured in the press I do not know. It may be on account of the fact that the victims belonged to the colored race.

These Haitians were living across the border in the Dominican Republic. They were peaceful people. They were farmers and cane cutters. There was no question of border disputes or hostility between the Dominican Republic and Haiti. But all of a sudden on the night of October 3 of this year members of the army and the police force of the Dominican Republic attacked these peaceable and defenseless Haitians—men, women, and children—and herded them like animals to slaughter.

They were taken out upon the customs docks at Monte Cristi, which I and other Members of Congress have visited, and there these helpless men, women, and children were knocked on the head and thrown into the sea to be food for sharks; yet there has not been a single protest in Congress or by the administration that I know of. There has been practically nothing in the newspapers, and still we continue to talk about the good-neighbor policy which exists in South

and Central America. Why, if the same number of American citizens in proportion to population had been butchered in cold blood across the line in Canada, it would have meant the killing of 140,000 Americans overnight.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Is the gentleman endeavoring to give the House the impression that we should be more concerned over the death of Haitians than the death of our own American citizens?

Mr. FISH. Not for a minute. I am backing the administration in its protest to Japan and demands for apology, compensation, and guaranties; but may I say to the gentleman that the lives of the colored people are just as precious to their families as those of white people are to their families?

We have extended a sort of friendly supervision over Haiti and the Dominican Republic, but after this inhumane mass murder how can we continue to talk about the neighborly spirit which pervades South and Central America. I cannot find in all the history of this continent or anywhere else for the last 100 years any massacre which compares with this one for cold-bloodedness in the butchery of human beings. I believe that the black man is just as human as the white man and suffers just as much as the white man, and that he means as much to his family as the white man means to his family. This base and revolting crime is simply incredible and mere words and remonstrance is mockery unless they lead to action.

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

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. I understand the government of the country which is accused of this atrocity has denied it in toto. I wonder if the gentleman has any authentic information whether this atrocity was actually committed or whether it is more or less of a rumor or charges which are unfounded.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman would not make that statement if he had followed the situation from the beginning. This did not happen yesterday. What I am talking about is something which happened 2½ months ago, about which everybody in the State Department knows. I have talked to the State Department or I would not be here speaking now. It has written evidence from the Episcopal Bishop of Haiti, a white man, who has gone into Santo Domingo or rather, as we call it, the Dominican Republic, and made an investigation which substantiates all these charges. This is the most outrageous atrocity that has ever been perpetrated on the American continent. It is true there is a question as to the number of people slaughtered. The Episcopal Bishop puts it at the lowest figure, 2,400. The Haitian Minister here puts the figure at 12,000. President Vincent, of Haiti, puts it at 8,000. There were somewhere between 2,400 and 12,000 human beings killed in a kind of mass murder and with the greatest barbarity.

I do not think anybody in this country or in Haiti denies the fact that the floodgates of hate, cruelty, terror, lust, and slaughter were let loose for 3 days there. If any Haitians escaped at that time they have hunted them down for the last 2 months, and when they were found in their hiding places they were taken out, tortured, and killed. If any soil has been soaked and is reeking with the blood of innocent people it is the soil of the Dominican Republic at the present time.

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

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is not leaving the impression these were white people who killed these colored people is he? He is not attempting to leave that impression, I hope.

Mr. FISH. I have not discussed that issue.

Mr. RANKIN. As a matter of fact, they are all colored people.

Mr. FISH. No; they were Spanish and mixed bloods.

Mr. RANKIN. The people on the island of Haiti are all the same kind of people, virtually, whether they live in Haiti or San Domingo.