

Albert F. Canwell

An Oral History

Interviewed by Timothy Frederick

**Washington State Oral History Program
Office of the Secretary of State
Ralph Munro, Secretary of State**

Washington State Oral History Program
Olympia, Washington 98504

© 1997 by the Washington State Oral History Program
All rights reserved. First edition 1997
Printed in the United States of America

ISBN 1-889320-05-6

“Cougar and Fawn” is printed with the generous permission of the author, Mary Kienholz.

Washington State Oral History Program, Office of the
Secretary of State, Legislative Building, PO Box 40243,
Olympia, Washington 98504-0243
Telephone: (360) 902-4157



*In memory of my wife Marsinah,
1914-1996.*

**Cougar and Fawn
(The Nation Imperiled)
To A. F. C.**

*Poor folded fawn, like our land lost in sleep
And disbelieving dreams, you'll never spring
Awake to stealthy, soundless paws that creep
Along dark limbs. Oh, sweet imaginings
That wrap your world in faith! Cocooned in wings
Like bats asleep in caves, you do not hear.
Must you still drowse and dream of trivial things
When dangers, known—though cloaked by night, are near?
When warnings on the wary air are clear?
God favors feet that follow forest ways—
Quick! Let your swift legs leap to spurs of fear!*

*Alone, the eagle, with a sterner gaze
From charcoal boughs etched black against the sky,
Sees moonlight in the stalking cougar's eye!*

M. Kienholz

CONTENTS

Foreword

Preface

Acknowledgments

Chronology: Albert F. Canwell

1. Family Background	1
<i>Tapes 1 - 8</i>	
2. Education	43
<i>Tape 8 (continued) - Tape 14, Side 1</i>	
3. Early Career	63
<i>Tape 14, Side 2 - Tape 20, Side 1</i>	
4. Concern with Communism	101
<i>Tape 20, Side 1 (continued) - Tape 26</i>	
5. Formation of the Canwell Committee	135
<i>Tape 27 - Tape 34</i>	
6. Canwell Committee Hearings	183
<i>Tape 25 - Tape 44</i>	
7. Later Political Campaigns	237
<i>Tape 45 - Tape 49</i>	
8. Disposition of the Canwell Committee Records	275
<i>Tape 50 - Tape 54, Side 2</i>	
9. The Goldmark Trial	301
<i>Tape 54, Side 2 (continued) - Tape 61, Side 1</i>	
10. Conclusion	341
<i>Tape 61, Side 2 - Tape 63</i>	

Appendices

A. Ancestors of Albert Canwell	353
B. Bills Sponsored by Albert Canwell	355
C. House Concurrent Resolution No. 10.....	357
D. Report of the Canwell Committee	361
E. Letters and Articles on the Canwell Committee	383
F. Letters and Articles, 1954 Congressional Election.....	387
G. Canwell Committee Records	391
H. American Legion Speech.....	403
I. ACLU-Washington Letterhead, 1962.....	411
J. Lee Harvey Oswald and the ACLU.....	413
K. Chronology: The United States, 1900-1995	415

Index	421
--------------------	-----

FOREWORD

This introduction and commentary is based primarily on information provided by former Representative Richard M. “Dick” Bond, of Spokane, who has known Albert Canwell for many years.

In 1946, Americans were thrilled that World War II was over. Most were unaware that their wartime ally, the Soviet Union, would become a bitter and hostile adversary. However, in the years following the war, many Americans came to believe that the Soviet government had been conducting a massive espionage campaign against America. In particular, they were concerned that the Soviet Union had successfully infiltrated or compromised a number of the agencies and departments of our federal government.

One of the first citizens of our state to raise these questions publicly—and forcefully—was Albert Canwell. In 1946, Al Canwell was elected as a Republican to the Washington State House of Representatives from Spokane’s Fifth District. During that campaign, he made two promises: To oppose new taxes and to do something about Communism in America.

With the help of Fred and Hazel Neindorff, Canwell drafted the concurrent resolution that established the Washington State Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities. This committee was patterned after the federal House Un-American Activities Committee and the similar California State Committee, both of which had just been formed.

In spite of his status as a freshman, Albert Canwell was able to get the concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature. He had the help of Speaker Herb Hamblen, also from Spokane. The committee was to consist of three members of the House and three members of the Senate, plus Representative Canwell as the chairman. It quickly became known as the Canwell Committee. Because of the controversy surrounding the committee, finding members was difficult. Senator Tom Bienz of Spokane, who was also the chairman of the Americanism Committee of the American Legion, was a big help in recruiting members.

Canwell’s resolution contained controversial provisions that were challenged and upheld in the State Supreme Court. For example, the committee was authorized to obtain confidential files from state agencies so long as the information was not publicly disclosed. In

addition, the State Patrol was allowed to remove unruly demonstrators from the proceedings of the committee.

Mr. Fritz Jewitt, a wealthy conservative lumberman, contributed \$20,000 to cover expenses of the committee. This enabled Mr. Canwell to travel to New York and Washington, D.C., and to bring witnesses to this state from the East Coast. The Canwell committee also held a joint meeting with the California State Committee to hear testimony from California Senator William Knowland and then-Representative Richard Nixon.

One of the major results of the hearings of the Washington state committee was to draw attention to the activities of Alger Hiss. In 1947, Chairman Canwell invited two newspapermen from New York –Howard Rushmore and J. B. Matthews–to testify before the committee in Seattle about Hiss. At this time, no one knew that Alger Hiss would later be accused of being paid by the Soviet government and tried as a traitor.

Another publicized event was the testimony of the ex-wife of Harry Bridges, president of the west coast longshoreman's union. She accused Bridges of being a Communist. Other witnesses accused several University of Washington professors of being Communists. Some of the professors were subsequently dismissed by the University.

In 1948, at the same time that much of the committee activity was taking place, Al Canwell ran for the state Senate. He lost in the general election. In 1950, he sought the U. S. Senate seat held by Warren Magnuson, but lost in the primary election. Following the 1950 census, an additional U. S. House seat was apportioned to Washington state. Canwell ran a statewide campaign for this new at-large position in 1952. He won the Republican primary but was defeated in the general election by Don Magnuson.

The purpose of this oral history is to present Albert Canwell's impressions, experiences, and memories, in his own words. He is an indispensable historical source for anyone studying the post-war period and the political debate that dominated it.

PREFACE

This volume is the sixth published by the Washington State Oral History Program since 1994. It is quite different from the others. The interviewing was not done by a member of our program staff, so the conventions and style of the interviews are unlike those we have previously published. The interview, which occupies sixty-three hours of tape, is longer than others we have done. Also, the transcription, copyediting, and substantive editing varied from our standard practices. Furthermore, Mr. Canwell's service as the chairman of the 1947 Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities was, and is, controversial. This is the first time the oral history program has published such an account.

An explanation of our present practice is in order. After our Legislative Advisory Committee selects an interviewee, program researchers gather extensive background material. We record interview series lasting approximately twenty hours. A verbatim transcript is prepared, and our copyeditor corrects grammar and punctuation. In the normal course of events, the interviewer and interviewee check accuracy and remove repetitions. Substantive editing is very unusual. The interviewee then writes a dedication and provides material for the appendices. The Department of Printing prints and binds the transcripts, and they are distributed to libraries and archives statewide. The original tapes, transcripts, and research documents are retained by the State Archives.

Preparing the Canwell tapes for printing was considerably more complicated. Interviews with Albert Canwell began before the law that established the present oral history program was enacted. In late 1991, shortly after the interviews were completed, the project was transferred to the new program. The tapes had been partially transcribed. Two more transcribers, under contract to us, finished that part of the task. The transcript was proofread by an independent historian, and copyedited by another two people, part-time members of our staff. Timothy Frederick, the interviewer, did not edit the final version of the transcript. Mr. Canwell, on the other hand, thoroughly reviewed the transcript and edited the interview more substantively than most interviewees. In particular, Mr. Canwell helped to shorten the transcript by deleting repetitious passages and some of the discussion of his early life that he judged to be of little interest to readers. To further shorten the transcript and make it more readable, several long documents that were read into the record have been moved to appendices. The appendices also contain letters, newspaper articles, and other documents that Mr. Canwell chose to accompany this volume. He selected the photographs, and the poem included in the front matter, written by his secretary, Mary

Kienholz. Mrs. Kienholz also entered all Mr. Canwell's corrections, and composed the index.

We wish to emphasize that this description is a brief summary of the efforts of many people, not all specified, who have been determined to see Mr. Canwell's narrative in print.

Mr. Canwell professes surprise that his legislative activities are a continuing source of interest to historians and others interested in politics. "I should not even be a blip on the radarscope of time at this late date. But still they write books shooting at me" (p. 235). The meaning of legislative investigations into un-American activities and their ultimate effect on our democracy continue to be debated. To some, Albert Canwell is a hero. To others, he was misguided.

This volume is not likely to settle such arguments. The Washington State Oral History Program hopes to document the formation of public policy in Washington State and to help citizens understand their political legacy by presenting the recollections of politicians with diverse points of view. It is for the reader to judge whether the present volume achieves these goals.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Washington State Oral History Program owes thanks to many.

It would not have been possible to publish this volume without the close collaboration of Albert Canwell and his secretary, Mary Kienholz. Mr. Canwell has been considerate, aware of our limitations and other obligations, and very patient. He and Mrs. Kienholz meticulously reviewed and corrected the 1,030 page transcript and supplied materials for the front matter and appendices. Hearing that we have no funds for indexing, Mrs. Kienholz quickly and competently provided one.

We appreciate the steady advocacy of Judge Mike Padden. Four years ago, when he was a state Representative, he offered to help us complete this project. Through all the delays that followed, he has been dependable and resourceful. Judge Padden put us in touch with former Representative Richard M. "Dick" Bond, who has known Albert Canwell for many years. Mr. Bond wrote a detailed, personal foreword which has been abbreviated for this volume. Nonetheless, we remain very grateful for his contribution.

Secretary of State Ralph Munro, Assistant Secretary of State Don Whiting, and Deputy Secretary of State Tracy Guerin have consistently supported our effort to publish this volume.

Members of our Legislative Advisory Committee have consistently provided encouragement, ideas, and political savvy. They are also invariably friendly and cheerful.

At present the committee includes Senators Eugene Prince, Sid Snyder, Shirley Winsley, and Al Bauer; Representatives Karen Keiser, Sandra Romero, Don Carlson, and Kathy Lambert; Secretary of the Senate Mike O'Connell, and Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives Tim Martin. Ex officio members are Mr. Warren Bishop, Mr. David Nican-dri, and former Senators Robert Bailey, George Scott, and Alan Thompson.

Our oral histories are printed by the Department of Printing. State Printer Lee Blankenship, Production Planner Evonne Anderson, Copier Centers Manager George Morton, Estimator Kelley Kellerman, Larry Krembs, and Logan Wheeler are experts. They are also kind, understanding, and reliable.

Others have generously given their time and skills: Russ and Tina DeMaris, Lawson Dumbeck, Clint Robbins, George Scott, and Al Chickering.

All of those named gave more than we asked. It is a privilege to acknowledge them.

CHRONOLOGY: ALBERT F. CANWELL

- January 11, 1907 Albert Franklyn Canwell is born in Spokane, Washington.
- July 3, 1941 Marries Marsinah Marshall. They will become parents of six children.
- 1946 Elected as State Representative for the 5th District, Spokane, Washington.
- March 8, 1947 House Concurrent Resolution No. 10 establishes the Joint Legislative Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities. Speaker of the House Herb Hamblen appoints Canwell chairman. The committee becomes known as the Canwell Committee
- January 27, 1948 The Canwell Committee convenes its first hearing at the Seattle Armory. The committee hears testimony about the subversion of the Washington Pension Union.
- July 19, 1948 The committee convenes its second hearing. Testimony focuses on subversive activities at the University of Washington.
- November, 1948 Canwell loses election for the 5th District Senate seat.
- January, 1949 The Canwell Committee issues its final report and recommendations.
- 1949 The committee records are moved to Olympia.
- 1950 Canwell conducts an unsuccessful campaign for the Republican nomination to the US Senate.
- 1952 Conducts campaign as the Republican nominee for the Congressman-at-large seat. Loses to Don Magnuson.
- 1954 Conducts a second unsuccessful campaign as the Republican nominee for the Congressman-at-large seat.
- 1955 The House of Representatives establishes a special committee to investigate the disposition of the Canwell Committee records.
- August 23, 1962 Canwell delivers a speech on the American Civil Liberties Union to the Okanogan American Legion.
- November, 1962 John Goldmark loses bid for re-election to the House of Representatives. Goldmark subsequently alleges that he was libeled by Canwell's American Legion speech.
- January, 1964 The libel suit against Canwell is dismissed, and the judge sets aside the jury's verdict.
- 1984 Canwell's Spokane office is the target of an arson fire, which destroys many of his records.

FAMILY BACKGROUND

Mr. Frederick: Your full name?

Mr. Canwell: Albert Franklyn Canwell. The Franklyn is spelled with a Y.

Mr. Frederick: And your birth date?

Mr. Canwell: My birth date is January 11, 1907. I was born in Spokane, Washington.

Mr. Frederick: Today we're going to have the opportunity to begin to explore with Albert his grandparents. And what we would like to do is begin with your grandparents on your father's side. And your grandfather's name please?

Mr. Canwell: My grandfather was James Canwell. His date of birth was September 19, 1840. He was born in Franklyn Plantation, Oxford County, Maine, and died in Buckfield, Maine, on April 12, 1876.

He had served in the Civil War and originally enlisted in the 5th Maine Infantry, Company A, but for a very short period—30 days or so. He then transferred to the 1st Maine Cavalry, Company H. That was his first enlistment there, I think on March 7, 1862. His second was March 18, 1864.

He was wounded two or three times, then went back into action. He was captured by the Southern forces and imprisoned. I believe he was at Libby Prison. I think he escaped from the prison, but that is just part of a history that we have heard over the years.

He developed health problems in his military service and died at an early age when his offspring were still mere children. My father and his twin sister were then raised by a member of the Fuller family, Ezekiel Fuller.

Mr. Frederick: And James' occupation?

Mr. Canwell: He was a farmer.

Mr. Frederick: Do we know what type of crops he raised, what type of farm he had?

Mr. Canwell: Well, the common crop there was potatoes. And that I think predominated, but they raised the

usual things, corn and the food that a family would consume. It was not, as I am aware, any sort of a commercial operation, it was as such small farms in Maine were.

Mr. Frederick: Potentially we're talking small cash crop, bartering, subsistence farming.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, by the way, he did raise cattle, also. Such a person was known as a "drover." They'd buy and sell cattle. But I don't think that was an extensive part of his life.

Mr. Frederick: Do we know his educational background?

Mr. Canwell: No, I do not know that. It was common at that time and place to acquire at least an 8th grade education, which was probably a little more sophisticated than what our 8th grade teaching is today. But I know very little about his educational background.

Mr. Frederick: His religion?

Mr. Canwell: Was Presbyterian, so far as I know. I think most of the family there—the Fullers and Canwells—were Presbyterians.

Mr. Frederick: And as you have mentioned he died in the decade of the 1860s?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, as a result of battle injuries and of the lung condition he had developed while he was in captivity down at one of the crowded Southern military prisons.

Mr. Frederick: Have you seen a photograph of your grandfather?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, and I have one, a very dim one. It was taken from a tintype. I think I could produce that. It's not a very good reproduction, but it is a Civil War photograph.

Mr. Frederick: From that tintype could you physically describe your grandfather?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I would say that he was a man of average height, probably 5'9" or 5'10", of average weight. He had dark hair and, like my father's, slightly on the curly side.

I have a photograph here of my father and his twin sister, which annoyed him all his life because the twin that looks like the boy is his sister, and *he* has the full crop of curly black hair.

Mr. Frederick: Was he clean-shaven?

Mr. Canwell: Yes.

Mr. Frederick: And, through family history folklore, was James a sober man?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, in fact that was a way of life in that New England area. They didn't go in much for drunkenness or tolerate it. They were a pretty straitlaced people.

Mr. Frederick: And James' ethnic background?

Mr. Canwell: It was English and Scottish as far as we know. Further back, the first Canwell who came here was either Italian or Spanish. I do not know at this point precisely what he was, but the story that we heard was that he had been a priest in Rome. During political unrest there he left Rome and went to England where he married a woman by the name of Canwell and took the Canwell name.

Now, that may be more myth than anything else. It's just what was the scuttlebutt in the family. The woman he married was English and Scottish. So if there's some Italian there or Spanish it may account for the curly hair, I don't know.

Mr. Frederick: And was James native-born?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, he was born in Maine.

Mr. Frederick: And your grandmother's name?

Mr. Canwell: My grandmother's name was Zipporah Fuller. Z-I-P-P-O-R-A-H Fuller.

Mr. Frederick: And where was she born?

Mr. Canwell: She was born in Hartford, Oxford County, Maine, on September 4, 1841.

Zipporah Fuller was ninth in direct lineal descent from Dr. Samuel Fuller of the Mayflower. That's what this Fuller enclave there in Maine was all about. They were all Fullers and direct descendants of Samuel, and made quite a thing of it. But the twins, including my father, were raised to maturity by Ezekiel Fuller, after which my father enlisted in the cavalry.

Mr. Frederick: And Zipporah's education?

Mr. Canwell: That I don't know.

Mr. Frederick: And you mentioned that her ethnic background was Scottish/Irish?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, that's as far as we know. There was some Irish, but predominantly Scottish and English.

Mr. Frederick: And do we have her death date?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, June 2, 1875.

Mr. Frederick: Did you ever have the opportunity to personally meet your grandmother?

Mr. Canwell: No, I never met any of the Maine and Massachusetts ancestors. My father left there when he joined the cavalry and he never returned.

Mr. Frederick: Was she alive at your birth?

Mr. Canwell: No, I don't believe so.

Mr. Frederick: And her religion?

Mr. Canwell: As far as I know they were Protestant and as far as I know Presbyterian.

Mr. Frederick: And have you seen a photograph of your grandmother?

Mr. Canwell: No, I haven't.

Mr. Frederick: Have you heard through family folklore a physical description of your grandmother?

Mr. Canwell: No, I'm trying to recall whether my father ever had much to say about that or not. I don't think he did. I do have a photograph of my grandmother here and I could show that to you.

Mr. Frederick: You do have a photograph of your grandmother?

Mr. Canwell: Of the grandmother, yes, and my father and his twin sister and their mother. I do have that.

Mr. Frederick: Do you recall if your grandmother passed away through natural causes?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I know that she did. She had never remarried.

Mr. Frederick: And from that marriage came the children, one of whom was your father. And his full name?

Mr. Canwell: His full name was Adelbert Lee Canwell, A-D-E-L-B-E-R-T.

Mr. Frederick: And his sister's name?

Mr. Canwell: His twin sister's name was Bertha Adele Canwell. She always went by the name of Bertie. I think her name was on her death certificate as Bertie, B-E-R-T-

I-E.

There was a younger brother. He was not raised by Ezekiel Fuller who raised the twins after the death of James Canwell. A son-in-law of Ezekiel's named Cyrus Metcalf took the youngest son and raised him. This son was named James Mellen Canwell, born October 26, 1874.

Mr. Frederick: And your father's birth date and death date?

Mr. Canwell: My father's birth date was March 10, 1869. He died on March 20, 1949, in Spokane, Washington. He was born in Buckfield, Maine, the same location where his father lived at time of death.

Mr. Frederick: And was he the oldest of the three children?

Mr. Canwell: Well, the twins were the oldest and there was later some debate about which one was born first. One was born on the 9th and the other one was born on the 10th, but it happened in the middle of night, so the date that we always accepted for my father's birthday was March 10.

Mr. Frederick: We can take the opportunity to begin to explore your father at a later time. I'd like to spend some time with you now with regard to your grandparents on your mother's side of the family.

Mr. Canwell: My mother was Ida or Ingeborg Christina Espelund, and she was born in Randall, Jewell County, northern Kansas. Her parents—I'll try to get it straight here—you want my mother's mother, that would be the grandmother, do you not?

Mr. Frederick: Yes.

Mr. Canwell: Now her mother's name was Brynhild Roen, B-R-Y-N-H-I-L-D R-O-E-N. My grandmother Roen was born May 16, 1846, in Rindalen, More Og Romsdal, Norway, and died in Long Beach, Los Angeles County, California, on October 21, 1927. She married John Christianson Espelund on May 11, 1874, in Concordia, Cloud County, Kansas.

Mr. Frederick: Do we have your grandfather John Espelund's birth date?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, my grandfather John Christianson Espelund was born on November 1, 1840.

Mr. Frederick: Do we have his death date?

Mr. Canwell: His death occurred October 31, 1917, in Burns, Laramie County, Wyoming, a town near Cheyenne.

Mr. Frederick: Do we know where John resided? You have mentioned Randall, Kansas, as the birthplace of your mother. Was he born in Kansas? Was he raised in Kansas?

Mr. Canwell: No, he was born in Norway. There were quite a number of Norwegian immigrants who came to this country about that time. Most of them went to Minnesota and Wisconsin, my grandfather and his family among them.

Then seeking free land and homestead opportunities, they went to Kansas and settled in north central Kansas around near the place known as Randall. They lived in sod shanties and it was a very primitive existence.

I can understand why that didn't appeal to grandfather Espelund. After several years, they packed up in a covered wagon and headed West. Where they were really heading for was Oregon, that was the "land of opportunity." All the great stories that they heard were about the free land, the big timber, the wonderful water, everything in Oregon, and so that's where their wagon train headed.

They arrived by covered wagon at Fort Walla Walla in 1881. My mother was between four and five years of age at that time and remembered well most of the adventure from Randall, Kansas, to Fort Walla Walla.

Mr. Frederick: And you'd mentioned that when he eventually left the Walla Walla area that he returned to Kansas.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, he returned to Kansas; I think it was for a brief period of time, and I would suppose it was for the purpose of probably settling some real estate problem or something like that because he did not settle there or stay there. Then he went West again, went to Wyoming. I think he might have occasionally visited back in Walla Walla and College Place, because he did somewhere along the line endow the college with real estate that he owned in that area.

Mr. Frederick: You were mentioning that John Espelund died in the Cheyenne, Wyoming, area.

Mr. Canwell: Yes. John Espelund died at Burns, Wyoming, which is near Cheyenne. But he, with his family, had wintered at Fort Walla Walla intending to go on to the Oregon Coast. Then when they started their journey again they got down to about Wallula where the going was so rough; this tremendous Columbia River was in front of them to cross. They went back and stayed in Walla Walla and settled near there.

My grandfather raised cattle and horses. He had one of the first cattle brands in the Oregon Territory. There were many of them at that time, but he had one of the early ones. His farm was right on what became the Washington-Oregon border, so a lot of his records and his taxes were paid in, I think, Umatilla, Oregon. Then later they became identified with Walla Walla County and City. But their farm, if you go down to where the Whitman Monument is, if you were to look right straight south, their farm was right there at the foothills of that range of hills right on the Oregon-Washington border.

But, anyway, he raised cattle and horses, particularly horses. He raised both draft horses and saddle horses. He supplied horses to the remount service at Fort Walla Walla. There was a cavalry unit there and that's where he met my father. He then habitually brought his favorite daughter with him when he'd come there to bring produce to the fort, or horses and whatnot.

Mr. Frederick: Do we know when John Espelund came into the country from Norway?

Mr. Canwell: It was prior to 1874. We have a cousin in Norway who did a lot of research on the family and branches of it, who would have that information. We do have a book of his. However, the Roen family was part of that early group that came from Norway to America. I think they came from an area near Bergen.

There's a great deal of confusion when you start looking into the genealogy of Scandinavians; they didn't all take the family name. And some of them, when they came here, didn't speak the language, so they'd have a tag on them telling where they were from. The Immigration Department would then give them the name of that locale. It's a very difficult thing to trace your family if they came from Norway or Sweden or Denmark. There were a lot of them who came here. There are more Norwegians over near Seattle than there are in Norway.

Mr. Frederick: Can we describe physically, John Espelund?

Mr. Canwell: Yes. He was a typical Norwegian. He had a slight beard, was not a large man, average size I would say, not fleshy. I can produce a picture of John and his family—the whole family.

Mr. Frederick: And his religion?

Mr. Canwell: He was a Seventh-day Adventist. I don't know just where he connected with them, but it was a matter of almost a family feud. Most of the family were, of course, Lutherans. And this contingent was pretty much Adventist. When they got to Walla Walla they set up a colony there that still exists around College Place.

Anyway, that was his religion and he was to me a very interesting character. My dad would describe him...they had a lot of trouble with the people around the area there. They were French Canadians, the early settlers were. And they didn't look kindly on any newcomers, particularly Norwegians. So they had quite a lot of feuding back and forth.

My father said he'd ride out there to the farm sometimes and the old man would be plowing. He'd be walking along reading his Bible and wearing a six-shooter. Either one he'd give you, either one you wanted, and he was very good with both. That was his attraction, I think, to my father at the fort. They both had an interest in shooting. My father would get a feed bag full of cartridges and they'd go out in the sagebrush and practice.

Mr. Frederick: It sounds like your father respected his father-in-law—or future father-in-law.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, he did. They were very, very fond of each other and I think the old man was—he wasn't so old then—but he was very happy to have his favorite daughter marry my father.

Mr. Frederick: And can we describe physically your grandmother Brynhild Roen?

Mr. Canwell: Ah, well, almost all the people back at that time and period looked and dressed alike. It was quite common for women to wear these "Mother Hubbard" hats and long dresses.

My grandmother came out from Kansas, of course, with the covered wagon contingent. Both she and her mother walked most of the way. Once in awhile they'd get on the covered wagon, but the wagons were pretty heavily loaded. And so they were rugged people. They were real pioneers. You didn't have an opportunity to become overweight in those days. There wasn't that much food and there was too much work to do.

So I would say she was an average Norwegian immigrant, a very attractive blonde, as most of them were, and I would say an attractive woman.

Mr. Frederick: And her height?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, I would say she was—I'm guessing—that she probably was about the same as my mother, which was about 5'6" or 5'7". She was not a tall person.

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: From what you heard from your father, what was John's emotional make-up?

Mr. Canwell: He was a very stable man, but a very determined one. One who knew what he wanted to do and what he wanted to believe, and he didn't particularly impose it on anybody else, but he was not a man to crowd too much. He was well able to handle any situation that he encountered. He was very much a free spirit.

I think that is what motivated him. Many of those people who left Norway and Europe in general were that type. They were the cream of the crop. They were restless but they were not, as was often the case in southern Europe, the criminal types or ones who were trying to get away from the law. They were stable, sound people who saw no future in their homeland. There just wasn't that much land. And so an opportunity to go to America siphoned off the most aggressive people. They just up and left and, whenever they could, they found a way to this country. They became, I think, among our very best citizens.

And he was that type. He had a high regard for the law but he didn't want too much of it imposed on him either. He was just a good American. He probably worked at it a little too hard; he wouldn't let his children speak Norwegian. He made them learn the English language and wouldn't even let them talk Norwegian at home, with the result unfortunately that they grew up not even knowing their native tongue very well. My mother didn't even have an accent, but she could understand a little Norwegian and German. Anyhow, that was what he was. He wanted them to become a part of this land and this country and its way of life and its freedom. He taught that sort of thing; taught it and demanded it of his children.

And he tried to get the best for them. They had established a hospital and a nurses' training facility at Walla Walla very early and my mother was a nurse. She left her nurse's training just before graduation to marry my father. But she was a very competent nurse, almost a doctor; she was imposed on by all of the neighbors of whatever race whenever they had babies to deliver and all of that sort of thing.

But that's the sort of performance that John Espelund wanted of his children. He wanted them educated. He wanted them to be good Americans. And at the same he was still a restless person. When finally he felt there were too many people in Walla Walla, he packed up and went to Wyoming. I sort of lost track of him there.

Mr. Frederick: Did you have an opportunity to meet John?

Mr. Canwell: I never did, no. As far as I know he never came to Spokane. They were in correspondence with my father's family quite a good deal. In fact, when my father acquired the land up there by Mount Spokane, John sent up a great assortment of fruit trees from the Milton Nurs-

ery, which were planted up there. And he gave them a team of draft horses that were really not practical for that hill country farming, but they were beautiful animals. He provided harnesses and things that would cost a fortune today. That was the sort of thing he did.

Mr. Frederick: Do we know when John moved from Walla Walla to Wyoming?

Mr. Canwell: I don't have that information right at hand and I've been trying to calculate recently when it was, it must have been, oh, I suppose 1910 to 1915 or along in there. They went to Wyoming and then some of the other members of the family or relatives moved there, too. Some of them went into the sheep business. One of them would make a fortune in sheep and then he'd go to southern California and lose it in real estate. Then he'd go back and raise more sheep. He knew sheep, but he didn't know real estate.

Mr. Frederick: And what region of Wyoming are we speaking of?

Mr. Canwell: Around Burns, Wyoming, near Cheyenne.

Mr. Frederick: And so he did pass on in Wyoming?

Mr. Canwell: He died in Wyoming.

Mr. Frederick: And your grandmother's emotional make-up?

Mr. Canwell: Well, from everything I ever heard she was a very stable person, hardworking, who, like all of those people, did their sewing and knitting and cooking, and tended to family affairs. They didn't know there was anything else they were supposed to do. From everything that I ever heard, she was a responsible person.

Mr. Frederick: And you have a photograph of your grandmother?

Mr. Canwell: I think that her photograph is in the one that I told you I have here of my grandmother and the whole family.

Mr. Frederick: And your mother's full name?

Mr. Canwell: It was Ida Christina Espelund. She always used the Christina, rather than the Ida, but the name Ida came from her Norwegian name. I think it was initially Ingeborg, which was the name of her grandmother, Ingeborg Larsdatter Hansen, but they translated it to Ida. She used her middle name, Christina, all her life. My father called her Chris. We have a daughter who is named

Christina and she looks just like my mother. We must have been psychic when we named her Christina.

Mr. Frederick: And your mother's birth date and death date?

Mr. Canwell: My mother's birth date is April 18, 1876. And she died April 26, 1967 in Spokane.

Mr. Frederick: Regarding that overland trek from Kansas to Walla Walla or the Oregon Territory, did she talk about daily routine?

Mr. Canwell: She had a lot of recollections of the journey. It was a matter of rolling their covered wagons 12 to 15 miles a day at best. And it was very rugged going. They would see almost nobody other than those in the wagon train. Oh, occasionally they'd see Indians. And that was about the extent of their contact with people until they got to Salt Lake in Utah. They reconditioned there and stayed for awhile, I suppose a month or so. My mother always was so fond of Salt Lake. The thing she remembers was that suddenly there were children all over the place; these Mormons had lots of kids. And they were treated very well there, but the trip itself was a very, very rugged thing. You could only carry a certain amount of food or staples, flour and a few things like that. Game was obtained along the route wherever it was possible.

I remember an interesting story she told. There was one man in the group, the covered wagon family, who was a very mean, abusive man. He didn't get along with anybody and he wasn't liked by anyone. One day his horses got loose and one of them got into the back of their covered wagon and was eating the flour. That was, of course, one of their most valuable commodities, but this man just took a singletree and hit this horse over the head and knocked him down. Then he picked up a boulder and he was going to beat the horse's teeth out. My grandfather and others stopped him. They held a sort of barrel-head court martial and banned him from the group. And he had to leave the covered wagon group. I always thought that was quite a dramatic thing. And that's one of the things she remembered well.

But she'd described the fact that they would see Indians off in the distance. They were never certain whether it would be a hostile group or attack, but nothing like that came about. The Oregon Trail was, of course, heavily used by that time and certain cavalry troops would go back and forth so that the Indians, other than some that got too much booze or something, were no real problem.

There was a certain amount of game and deer. I don't remember that they ever shot any bison but I think they were around. Their food was largely what they started out with. Once in awhile there was some outpost where you could buy some flour or salt or things that you had to

have. But nobody was going to get overweight on the diet they had. My mother was between four and five years of age, so she was quite young, but remembered it distinctly.

Mr. Frederick: So that trip was conducted in approximately 1880?

Mr. Canwell: Well, they arrived in Walla Walla in 1881. I don't know the date that they started out, but, as I would say, they just rolled their wagons west at the most 15 miles a day, so a person could figure back about when they left Kansas. I think there were four or five covered wagons that were part of this family connection—a Norwegian group. I don't know where the rest of them went. I know that my family ended in Walla Walla.

Mr. Frederick: Your mother was in the area in 1881—the Walla Walla area.

Let's take the opportunity now to list the children of the union of John Espelund and Brynhild Roen, one of them being your mother. If it's possible, list with the senior and work our way to the junior.

Mr. Canwell: I'll try to identify them that way. The children are in their chronological order: The oldest one was Aaron Espelund. Aaron was born on February 28, 1875, and died in Spokane at our place on Mount Spokane on April 25, 1913.

Christina, my mother, was born April 18, 1876, I believe at Randall, Kansas, and died in Spokane on April 26, 1967.

Elizabeth was born September 12, 1877, and died in November of 1913. I do not have the precise date.

Mr. Frederick: Do you know the cause of death?

Mr. Canwell: No, I don't know the cause of death of any, other than my mother and her brother Aaron.

Martha is the next one, born December 7, 1878. She died May 20, 1964.

Joe or Joseph was born December 28, 1882, and I do not have the date of his death.

Hannah was born October 16, 1884, and she died January 21, 1942. And John, Junior, was born September 17, 1886, and died on January 19, 1962.

I believe this includes all the children of John Espelund, my grandfather, who was born in Norway.

Mr. Frederick: Let's take this time right now to jump back over and spend some time with your father who was orphaned, potentially some time in the late 1860s or 1870s? Orphaned in the sense that his father passed on. His mother was still here.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, she had the problem of raising these children and it was a very difficult situation. Her family, the Fullers, were well-established there. Ezekiel took the responsibility for raising the twins. And so—trying to think of the precise dates involved there...my father was born on March 10, 1869...I was trying to determine just when his father died, but they were still small children.

Mr. Frederick: What was Ezekiel Fuller's occupation?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, farmer. I think that nearly all of them were farmers. The people who went into the shoe business and that sort of thing were, well, they were a little different people. They were commercially—there were seafaring people and there were people who went into shoemaking. That sort of thing became a big industry there, but as far as I know none of my ancestors were involved in that. Some of them were fishermen, but I just have very sketchy information on that.

Mr. Frederick: During those early years did your grandmother remarry?

Mr. Canwell: She didn't remarry, no. And I have no information about what her social life was. All I remember is that my father felt that old Ezekiel came from a family of eight or ten, mostly boys, and all their names started with E, and he was Ezekiel. I don't know what all the others were: Ephraim and everything else that you could think of that started with E or originated in the Bible.

But, anyhow, the life was very restricted. I can remember my father was not much of an ancestor-worshipper because of this. He got such daily doses of the fact that he was fortunate to be a Fuller. And he thought a whole lot of his father, respected him and he had a distinguished military experience, so he didn't adjust too well to old rigid Ezekiel's thinking and regimen.

When he could, he enlisted in the cavalry. His father had been in, I believe, the 1st Maine Cavalry in the Civil War. So anyway that was obviously his goal and his way of getting away from there. He did distinguish himself in the military, much more so than most enlisted men did.

Mr. Frederick: When he was living in the Fuller household, did he have an opportunity to attend school?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, and I don't know the particulars except that his writing would indicate that he'd had a pretty effective education. It seemed to me that someone said that they had a school operated by the nuns. And they were sticklers for good penmanship. He and his sister attended.

Mr. Frederick: Did your father ever relate to you the

age that he joined the United States Army?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I have the precise information. He joined the 1st Cavalry on March 9, 1892. Troop H of the 4th Cavalry. And he joined at Boston. He then went from there to their distribution base in, I think, Missouri—and was assigned to Arizona; I think that's where he had requested to go in the first place. I grew up knowing all about Arizona and all about Alaska and a little bit about New England. As far as he was concerned there were no other places.

But he did have service in Arizona. He served at the various ancient forts there: Fort Apache, Fort Grant and Fort Huachuca. And he never bragged. He was not a person to boast much and as I say, he wasn't much of an ancestor-worshipper, although he knew he had some very distinguished ones.

He had a natural talent for marksmanship. The only thing I ever heard him brag about was that he had established a record at, I believe, Fort San Carlos that nobody ever beat. He'd racked up perfect scores in all classifications. I remember he had a cigar box full of medals and things that he had won for shooting. That he could do very well.

Mr. Frederick: My figures show that he joined the military at approximately the age of 23.

Mr. Canwell: I was trying to figure that out. I thought he might have joined as soon as he was legally eligible, but I do have the date.

Mr. Frederick: 1892?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, that's the date that my son gave me, and it was researched. Then he transferred from the 1st Cavalry to the 4th Cavalry and that is when he was assigned to Fort Walla Walla. At Fort Walla Walla they were putting together the Glenn Expedition, the expedition to survey and map Alaska. So largely from the United States Cavalry, they selected an elite group to go up there and do this job and he was one of them. At Walla Walla, when he was accepted for this assignment, they then wanted him to have some medical training so he transferred to the hospital corps or medical corps and was sent to Fort Vancouver where he obtained cursory medical training.

Mr. Frederick: Do we have the date when he was transferred up into Walla Walla?

Mr. Canwell: Ah, yes, I should have that here somewhere. He enlisted in—let's see—he was transferred to the hospital corps on November 3, 1896, and what year he actually came to Fort Walla Walla I don't know. I'd have

to dig on that a little bit. I'd have to figure back; I think he was at Fort Vancouver two years and he went to Alaska in 1898.

The Glenn Expedition surveyed and mapped Alaska largely in the Cook Inlet area, but they did map the entire Alaskan Purchase.

It was quite unusual for an enlisted man to get any recognition in the military in those days because most of the records were written by what they called "shavetails" or the young officers who were out to make a career. They'd say, "captain so and so, or lieutenant so and so, went some place with so many enlisted men." They never bothered to name them. But my father seemed to rack up a pretty good record with Captain Glenn, enough so that he named a glacier up there after him, the Canwell Glacier.

There were pictures of it all over National Geographic and several other magazines just this year, photographs taken of the Aurora Borealis from the Canwell Glacier. As I was growing up I knew that they had named something after him up there, but he didn't talk much about it. My son who is in the Special Forces parachuted with his H team onto Canwell Glacier without even knowing the history of it.

The precise year that he came to Fort Walla Walla, I don't have at this time.

Mr. Frederick: Have you heard under what circumstances your father met your mother in Walla Walla?

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

Mr. Canwell: Well, John Espelund, my grandfather, provided produce and remounts to Fort Walla Walla from his farm. So he was back and forth to the fort from his farm quite a bit. After he became acquainted with my father, they became very good friends. He, I think with malice aforethought, began bringing his favorite daughter with him to some of these visits. Well, anyway, it was under such circumstances that my father and mother met.

My mother was, I believe, at the time taking nurse's training at the hospital. They had the Adventist Hospital in College Place or Walla Walla. It was in that area.

And so they were married. They ran off to a little town north of Walla Walla called Dixie, and it's still down there. Then they, as I recall, came to Spokane on their honeymoon. They were married September 20, 1897, came to Spokane and established a residence here for my mother while my father left for the Glenn Expedition in Alaska for which he had been selected.

Mr. Frederick: It sounds like potentially then that the courtship was several years?

Mr. Canwell: I would say that it extended over a year or

two anyway. They had time to become well acquainted and for John Espelund to become well acquainted with my father and evaluate him and vice versa. The two hit it off very well, John Espelund and my father, because of the two having this overriding or overwhelming interest in shooting. My father and John Espelund would go out in the sagebrush and shoot jack rabbits and whatnot. So it became sort of a friendship between the two. I think that the old man decided that "this is the man to marry my daughter." I don't know that anybody ever said that, but that's the way this thing shaped up.

I always understood that my mother, Christina, was his favorite daughter. I could, of course, understand why—a most remarkable person. I suppose everybody says that about his mother, but out of the two or three outstanding women I ever knew I think that she is the greatest of the lot. She was a beautiful, intelligent, industrious person and devoutly religious, but practical and sensible.

I remember our—I don't know whether this is the time to go into it—but when we moved to the place up in the Mount Spokane foothills area it was a very primitive place at that time and it took a woman of real substance to do it—to put up with the rugged life there. I remember certain things like my mother and her Singer sewing machine. It seemed to me it was going all the time. During the same time there's a steamer of hot water heating on the stove. She was forever doing laundry and forever sewing.

We had sheep and we saved the wool; I can remember her washing the wool and carding with these hand carders. Then she would make crazy quilts or comforters. She would sew these things together with these wool pads. For many years we had those comforters. They were delightful and effective, but they were the product of my mother's genius and endeavors. She was working all the time. And it was a rugged life.

I remember highlights of life in the foothills; I must have been about five, and the logging companies were coming in there and cutting the big timber. It was a beautiful area and they cut down these trees. I would watch them fell them and even at that time I had a very sorrowful feeling about it. Typically, there were a lot of rough characters who came in with the logging operations.

I recall one incident distinctly where this man, a very mean-looking character, came up to our door and asked for a cup of coffee. My mother was fearful of the situation and she said, "Well, you'll have to get your coffee from the neighbor. You go over there and he'll make one." And this lumberjack, if that's what he was, said, "Well, I want you to make me some coffee," and he was becoming obviously somewhat quite oppressive.

My mother signaled to me or whispered to me to get the rifle. We kept a .22 rifle and my dad's 30-30 on the racks above the door. I got a chair and got the .22. There was a chipmunk running down a rock wall and my

mother aimed at it and blew it to pieces.

This character said, "Oh, you shoot, don't you?"

My mother said, "Yes, and I'd just as soon shoot a man."

And so, he took off and she was shaking for an hour afterwards. She was really frightened, but she did her thing there and I think had he continued aggressively, she would have stopped him. But she was normally a very peace-loving person.

Mr. Frederick: Have you heard through family folklore why your mother and father settled in Spokane?

Mr. Canwell: Ah, the only thing that we could ever put together on this was that he had been up here and looked around and the hills around Spokane were very similar to the area he came from in Maine. While he never said so that I know of, that's the conclusion that several of us drew after seeing the Maine area where he came from.

Mr. Frederick: When he and your mother came into the area, shortly thereafter he would be moving on in that expedition to Alaska, did he settle her, your mother, in town or did he purchase that, if I can call it—the homestead?

Mr. Canwell: No, the place in the hills came later. He settled her here in Spokane. I think there was a little house out on College Avenue and that's near where the courthouse is. That was about the city limits in those times. The city wasn't very large. She lived there, I suppose, until he came back to Spokane. Then I believe that he went to work for the Merchants' Police. It was a private police organization that provided a service to the merchants and others.

Mr. Frederick: Now, we'll have an opportunity to go into that at a little later time. He settled your mother here in town. Was it a boardinghouse?

Mr. Canwell: No, it was a residence house, a small residence. I don't know whether they bought it or rented it. I suspect it was rented.

Mr. Frederick: And then did he return to Fort Vancouver?

Mr. Canwell: In 1898 and 1899 he made two trips to Alaska with the Glenn Expedition. His enlistment expired at the end, I think, of 1898 and he was up there during that time and during the gold rush period. He came back and then signed on again with Captain Glenn as a private citizen and then was up there in 1899. All together he did two years of duty in Alaska.

Mr. Frederick: On that first trip to Alaska with Captain Glenn, what was your father's duty?

Mr. Canwell: Well, he was signed on for two reasons. They selected these men somewhat like they select the First Special Forces Group today. They picked men who had particular attributes and characteristics and talents. In his case they obtained most of the team from the cavalry. They wanted men who had experience packing, that knew how to throw a diamond hitch and so on. But they had him go to Fort Vancouver for medical training because that was to be part of his assignment.

While he was up there they had, I think, two doctors with the expedition and the Spanish- American War broke out. These doctors were called to service in the Philippines and so that left my father as essentially the medic with the expedition. About all he had to do, as I say, is set bones, pull teeth and give the natives some physics, some various remedies, but mostly it was a matter of giving them a good dose of physic because of their type of diet. But, anyway, he had medical training and he was very competent.

Fortunately so, because when I first started school I was playing ball and I got hit right on the bridge of the nose with a baseball. It flattened my nose and by the time I got home it was all swelled up. My father took a probe and probed around and straightened the bones and the passage out, as any competent doctor would have done and it was very successful. If I still look kind of funny it's because maybe it didn't get all the way straight.

Mr. Frederick: Did he ever relate to you stories regarding the passage? Where was the passage from?

Mr. Canwell: In Alaska you mean?

Mr. Frederick: In terms of the lower states, where did they depart from?

Mr. Canwell: They departed from Vancouver and they stopped in Victoria—the ship stopped there for final loading on of supplies and refurbishing. There was an interesting story in connection with that. The group, of course, were there to take advantage of the town and the bar and so on.

There was also a contingent of British soldiers there. They met in this bar area and started out quite affably, but there were toasts given to the Queen; then an American soldier toasted George Washington and some drunk said, "You know what we do with George Washington's picture in the Old Country. We put it in the toilet."

And some American said, "Yeah, if there's anything that would do the job for an Englishman, it's George Washington." Only he was more explicit—and the fight started. It was a knock-down-drag-out thing, a furniture-

breaking thing, like you'd see in a movie scene. The gendarmes came in and put them all in jail. And the captain of the ship, Captain Glenn, I guess, had to get them all out. And so that was their send-off from Victoria.

Then they proceeded to disembark up there in Cook's Inlet. They had mistakenly taken a lot of horses thinking that they could use pack horses up there. But there was so much marshy land and stuff that horses were impractical and then they replaced them with mules that were quite practical. That was the beginning of the thing. The ship loaded at Vancouver and then proceeded up to Victoria and Alaska.

Mr. Frederick: And it would have been a steamship?

Mr. Canwell: Yes. I'm not sure that was the Valencia, but I rather think it was. The Valencia later went down. It was one of the ship casualties up there. There was quite a lot of that sort of disaster.

There was so much traffic to the gold rush and these ships were brought in to service that were not adequate. They were into waters where they were unacquainted. I think the highest tide in the world is in Cook's Inlet. Ships would become involved there with riptides and such things and go down.

I know that's what happened from the correspondence that he sent to my mother about where he had placed the income in the bank that was lost. I think on the way out one of the ships went down and they threw all of their cargo overboard. One of the things that my father had was a trunk full of photographs that were taken on the expedition and he managed to save that.

I still have a box full of photographs that were from the Glenn Expedition. If I live another hundred years, I'll get a book that I've started to put together on the Glenn Expedition and use those photographs. But he had some mementos and things from the Indians and pieces of Alaska coal which were unusual and things like that.

Mr. Frederick: And what was the purpose?

Mr. Canwell: The purpose of the Glenn Expedition was to survey and map Alaska. I don't remember the year of the purchase of Alaska, but it was just a blind purchase, nobody knew anything about it. So they decided on this exploratory expedition to survey and map the area and that's what the expedition was all about. They had expert personnel in their packing and that sort of thing. They had cartographers who do the map making.

And I have a memento that my father brought back that was a deck of cards drawn by the cartographer. They ran out of playing cards and he took a little notebook and made this deck of cards. I thought I might give it to the University of Alaska or somebody, if they have such exhibits.

Mr. Frederick: Did your father talk about how extensive those travels were on that first trip?

Mr. Canwell: They covered the Cook's Inlet area very thoroughly. They worked all the way up to what is Fairbanks and to the Yukon River. They did not explore up in the frigid area, they just didn't get that far. Their surveys and their work were largely in the Cook's Inlet area, and that was very thoroughly explored and mapped. I think they did a very reliable job, and they identified things that are still accurate and still used.

I don't know how Captain Glenn happened to name this glacier for my father, but I heard a couple of stories that my father was either chasing a bear across there, or a bear was chasing him or something that gave Captain Glenn an idea that it ought to be named the Canwell Glacier. In any case my father did some fairly unusual things for which there was a record made. Captain Glenn's lead mule with all of his notebooks and everything on it slipped and went into a rushing torrent of a stream. My father at grave risk of his life jumped in after it trying to save the records. He was not successful, but it was quite a valiant effort and that is mentioned in one of the narrative accounts of the expedition. Things like that I've gathered wherever I've found them.

It was noted that he and another member of the expedition were isolated out in an area where rain had fallen and they couldn't traverse this glacial area. They spent 30 days in this isolated cove and the only thing that they had to eat was a goose that my father shot with his revolver. But some of those things are recorded in the narratives that are left by officer members of the expedition.

He was that sort of person and he never talked much about it. I did know that there was a lake somewhere up there that Captain Glenn let him name for my mother, but I never could locate it. Somewhere it has been lost in the records. But the Canwell Glacier is still there.

Mr. Frederick: And did he return within about a year from that first trip out?

Mr. Canwell: I believe that he did return briefly and then I think he discussed this expedition with mother and signed on. Glenn wanted him to go back for another year and he did. I think he just briefly touched down in Spokane, but I'm not even sure that he did get back here; it may have been two years before he got back.

Mr. Frederick: Is the correspondence from your father to your mother during that period still within the family?

Mr. Canwell: The correspondence and a great many mementos were destroyed in a residence fire in a house we had here in Spokane. Unfortunately a great many of those things were lost—correspondence, photograph al-

bums, family Bibles. I don't remember how we saved this box full of Alaska photographs, but there were a few things like that salvaged. The house was totally destroyed.

Mr. Frederick: Did your father make the arrangements with the paymaster on the first trip or the second trip?

Mr. Canwell: On the first trip.

Mr. Frederick: And would you please recount that?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I believe that my parents came to Spokane on their honeymoon and he was about ready to leave for Alaska. It was a very hurried thing. My father went to a local bank and made arrangements with the paymaster to send his monthly pay here. And he completed that, I believe, with the paymaster with the information where it was to go. The banker was to deposit this directly to my mother's account or she was to know it was there.

But somehow the banker soon figured that she didn't know, because she never came in for it. So while the checks were sent by the paymaster to the bank, they were never credited to their account and never reached my mother. As I say, had my father ever known that, there would have been one less banker because he would not have tolerated it. But he had no idea that had happened. My mother was so hurt; she just thought he had neglected her. It was a horrible thing.

And during that time her first child was born. This one died, I did not enumerate this birth in telling you how many children there were. There was an infant death and I believe she died while my father was still in Alaska—a very tragic thing. My mother said that she never was completely happy afterwards, it was such a sad thing. She was here alone, a first child, and a very unhappy occasion.

Mr. Frederick: Those first several years, did your grandfather and grandmother come up here to visit with her?

Mr. Canwell: As far as I know they never came to Spokane. Transportation was an entirely different thing in those days. To come to Spokane from Walla Walla you would have to do it by coach. The railroads, I think, to Pasco and down through that way came in later. I don't know just what year. But for them to have come to Spokane would have been quite a task. I can remember things pretty well from the time I was about two and a half years old. I do not recall at any time ever meeting them or seeing them.

I place some of these dates by piecing things together. I know that we moved to this farm property up near Mount Spokane in 1909.

Mr. Frederick: She must have felt that she was forsaken at that point in time with the birth of that first child?

Mr. Canwell: Well, she certainly felt that she was being neglected. But communication between Spokane and Alaska was a very primitive, uncertain thing. He was out where you didn't mail letters. And such information as he had transmitted was lost.

Mr. Frederick: And above and beyond that, too, it would have probably shaken her, with regard to her standing with her God. She was probably very much alone.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, she was. I think one of her sisters stayed here at Spokane with her part of that time. And which one it was...I think it was Martha, but I'm not certain.

Mr. Frederick: We haven't taken the opportunity to describe the brothers and sisters of your mother.

Mr. Canwell: Well, the only one I knew was her brother, Aaron. He lived with us for a time in the place up in the hills and was killed in an accident up there when I was six. A limb blew out of a tree and hit him on the head. It was what they called a "widow maker" in those days. And that was a very tragic thing, too. There were no doctors up there and my father was gone at the time it occurred—a very unhappy thing.

It was a severe blow. If Aaron had not been a very, very rugged, strong individual, he never could have walked from the scene of the accident to the house. He was almost unconscious. He never really recovered. When my father returned, he was unable to find a doctor who could assist. Uncle Aaron died a day or two later.

There was a little rock garden sort of place near the house that had some trees and I would go out there to play and build make-believe pastures or cow pens, or other things. You'd go through a trash heap to find a dish that had been broken that might have a colored pattern in it or something, and you would improvise; they became toys. With a little fantasy they became real; that's the sort of thing children do. I'll never forget I was in my little particular play area when my uncle Aaron came walking by there with his head and face all covered with blood. That is one of the things I remember about the little play area that I developed which was strictly mine.

But there were other sisters and brothers whom I didn't know: Her brother, John, and sisters, Hannah and Martha, and there may have been another one. I do have a picture of the whole family.

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: Your father was back in the Spokane area in approximately 1900.

Mr. Canwell: About 1900, I'd say.

Mr. Frederick: And he had fulfilled his contract with Captain Glenn and made a decision in time not to re-enlist and/or to contract with the United States Army at that point in time?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, he, like, I suppose, every soldier...professional soldiers all wanted to be farmers. So I think that probably moved him a little in not re-enlisting. At that time I think he'd explored around the Spokane area a little and, oh, first he built a house out on the north side. It's the place where I was born. Somewhere along the line then, he found this place in the hills that was available and he sold or traded this house in on it.

Mr. Frederick: During that period what did he do to make a living?

Mr. Canwell: Most of the time he worked for the Merchant Police. I don't recall anything other than that.

Mr. Frederick: Now, was that part time or was that shift work?

Mr. Canwell: No, that was full time. Part of it, I remember, he worked a night shift, because I remember he was a very, very light sleeper. My mother would have to keep us all quiet so he could get a little sleep in the daytime. He was such a light sleeper, if you moved a curtain he'd awaken. So it was a real problem; I remember that part of it. I remember he used to come home early in the morning and he'd throw his cap on the bed where I was playing. Then he'd unload his revolver and throw that over there for me to play with. Some of those things are just highlights.

Mr. Frederick: So it sounds like then that he was with the Merchant Police for a considerable number of years?

Mr. Canwell: Quite a bit of time. I think after we went up in the hills, we'd come back to live in town once in awhile when it became too rugged up there, so there was a little intermittent living in town and living up there.

Mr. Frederick: I was thinking that he would be back in the Spokane area about 1900; you were born in 1907, your first memories would be at two and a half or three, so we're up into about 1911 or 1912.

Mr. Canwell: Well, I remember distinctly going up to the place in the hills the first time. It was in the fall. I was

about two and half years old and we rode the conveyance that was provided by the logging camp that went up the road below our place. So we had to walk from there up, oh, nearly a mile to get to where our house was. I remember walking along with my mother on that trip. And I remember the beautiful tamarack trees. It was in the fall and they'd turned yellow. We finally got up there to this place and there had been a garden planted up there. There were tomatoes just ripened along the fence. I remember that distinctly and I know that was in 1909—in the fall of 1909.

Mr. Frederick: Do you remember the house in town on the north side?

Mr. Canwell: Not from that period of time. I visited it later and subsequently, after we'd moved back into town, we rented a house on the street right across from this or right back of it. So I became acquainted with the house and whether it's still there or not I don't know.

Mr. Frederick: Okay. So your first memories then are from—if I may use the phrase—the homestead.

Mr. Canwell: Most of my first memories. Then there were times that we'd live back in town for awhile. My mother had a good friend, family friend, of the Gwydir family. Major Gwydir was a "Buffalo Bill" type. He had a goatee and wore a buckskin suit and had been an Indian agent here. His wife was a delightful and long-time friend of my mother's.

We were visiting at their house, my mother and I, and it was out here near the courthouse. This lady's grandson had been sent upstairs as punishment for some infraction, so when my mother and I arrived there I was sent to entertain him upstairs. We got to playing around, we found a revolver there and the outcome of the situation was I was shot through the arm. As I was telling someone the other day, my first shooting scrape occurred when I was four and a half years old.

But, anyhow, they took me down to the emergency hospital and I remember that part of it. A doctor put a probe through my arm, cleaned it out, put my arm in a sling and told me not to use it. Well, I probably had a better instinct about medicine because I'd go out in the park and take the sling off and play and it healed quickly. The bullet just went through the fleshy part of my arm.

Mr. Frederick: What caliber was the revolver?

Mr. Canwell: I believe it was a .41. The news story probably mentioned it. I have it somewhere. My mother always kept the story that the news reporter wrote up. The remarkable phase of the report was that I never cried. And that was characteristic of me as a youngster. Nobody

could make me cry. In that particular instance they were all surprised that this wound was bleeding and everything and I didn't seem to mind. The facts of the case are, in an injury like that, it's numb anyway. You don't feel anything. Emotional reactions have nothing to do with the injury. But, anyhow, Major Gwydir's son shot me. And if it had been my turn to shoot, I think I'd have gotten him.

But we were playing holdup and the boy told me to put up my hands, so I did. I told the reporter this. He told me to "hands up" and when I "hands upped," he shot me. But it didn't discourage my interest in firearms, which became a habit of mine.

Mr. Frederick: I can just imagine the chagrin that created downstairs for those two women.

Mr. Canwell: Oh, my mother, of course, was competent to handle the situation. The other woman was hysterical, the mother of the boy. And then she was scared to death of the publicity involved. She gave the wrong name of the boy that did the shooting. But fortunately my mother was a nurse. I don't know how many gunshot wounds she had cared for, probably none, but she was able to temporarily bandage this and get me down to the emergency hospital.

Mr. Frederick: Let's take the opportunity now to physically describe your father.

Mr. Canwell: My father? My father was, well, in the first place he was a very attractive man. But a person with a high regard for the law and that sort of thing. He would not break the law and he was not aggressive. But I always felt he kind of had a chip on his shoulder, hoping somebody would knock it off. He was a very self-possessed, very determined individual.

To describe him best, I suppose, I'd go back to our time up in the hills. The place was peopled by refugees from Tennessee and other places whose main talent was moonshining. There's only one thing those hillbillies respected, that was somebody who could shoot better than they did. So my father immediately had very good standing up there in that regard.

I remember one or two incidents having to do with his shooting. One time there was a hawk circling around above our chickens. It was away high in the sky. He went in and got the 30-30, aimed, and bingo, the feathers flew and he walked away as though it was an everyday occurrence. Pure accident, I think, that he hit the hawk. But he was that much of a con man, he didn't want anybody to think it was at all accidental.

Another time there was a neighbor who had a dog, a hound, a Great Dane type, a vicious thing that ranged all over the hills. One day my father came home and this

dog was on the back porch and wasn't going to let him in. So he went around the house and got his rifle and by that time the dog got the message and was heading down over the hill, probably 200 yards away, making his last leap before he'd be out of sight, and my dad picked him off.

The owners of the dog were a weird lot. They had a preacher come out from town and hold a funeral over this dog. Well, that was just one of the crazy things that happened.

Another time our milk cow strayed away and my father trailed it over toward Newman Lake. Our place was about four miles through the woods from Newman Lake, but we never went that way because it was out of the way. This rustler lived over there; he lived on rustling cattle, among other things, and sold those to a packing house in Spokane. That's probably another phase we'll go into, but in my father's following the trail of this cow he met this man and two or three of his thugs on the trail.

This man, Hungerford, said, "Where are you going, Canwell?"

And my dad said, "I understand you have one of my cows."

And he didn't question it at all, he said, "How much is it worth?"

And my dad said, "Well, I'd say a hundred dollars." Probably \$20 would have been a fairer price at that time. And so this man shelled out the gold coins and paid him. They were confronted by this bunch of his thugs and my father and the men with Hungerford said, "You don't have to pay him for that cow," or words to that effect.

Anyway, Hungerford said, "Well, you can commit suicide if you want, but my life's worth a hundred dollars." That was a confrontation that taught Hungerford a lesson.

Hungerford used to deal with the packing house in Spokane and he supplied a great deal of the stolen beef to it. The man who ran the packing house eventually became a very respected banker in Spokane, but somewhere along the line he also was caught up in his rustling deal and went to the penitentiary. His family still runs their bank; I debate whether to name them or not. They never were very friendly to me.

But that's the type of man my father was. He was completely competent, completely fearless, not a braggart or that sort of thing at all. He was just a good citizen, but very sure of himself and when he was hired in this Merchant Police organization, it was partly because they were having a problem of department stores being looted. It developed later that one of the employees of the railroad was in on the thefts.

The head of the organization assigned my father to work with this man. The man would try to wear down anybody who worked with him; of course it didn't work with my father, he was equal to the situation. Finally they had a showdown on it; no shooting occurred, but my fa-

ther solved the burglary arrangement. It was a machine sort of thing. That railroad detective was in on it and two or three of the local police, as well. They were looting the major department stores.

You were asking me to describe my father. He was, I would say, about 5'8" or thereabouts and probably weighed around 160 or 170 pounds, and quite an attractive man as such things go. He was not bearded, but for a time he did wear a mustache.

I was going to describe his relationship with the family and so on. He was a very stern, rigid disciplinarian. My mother would always say, "Well, I'll tell your father on you." He had a razor strop, as everybody did in those days, and he'd make gestures with it, but I never remember him ever laying it on anybody. But everybody thought he would and that was all that was necessary.

I remember one incident where he was building something up at our place in the hills. Nails were very, very precious—they were hard to come by. And I asked him where nails came from. He told me they grew on bushes. Then he went in to have lunch and I took his nails and planted them. That was really infuriating to him and he took after me and I retreated to my mother's protection. She said, "Well, you shouldn't lie to him, that's all your fault." She was very much against misleading or that sort of thing, although he was just being humorous.

Another time I infuriated him. I called him a "son-bitch" because he had hit me. So again he took after me and my mother wouldn't let him touch me because she said, "There's only one place he could have learned that."

My mother was extremely sharp. She—like our daughter, Christina—should have been a district attorney. My mother was very, very sharp and my father was no equal to her that way. The only way he could get any relief at all was to start swearing. He had a vocabulary that was learned in the cavalry and it was a dandy. Well, that would shut my mother up. So, anyway, I remember those things about him.

He was not a very scholarly person. He didn't read much, though he always read the newspapers. Beyond that, he was not a bookish individual and we didn't have many books. I remember in the hills we had a dictionary, a Bible and a few assorted books, but not many.

Mr. Frederick: How did he express affection or approval?

Mr. Canwell: Ah, he was not a very expressive person. He was stern. You just knew that he meant what he said. He wanted order and discipline. He wanted obedience, but there was nothing mean about him. As far as affection, other than a pat on the back or shoulder, I can't ever remember his expressing affection by hugging or kissing children. He may have, I don't remember it. I was in such awe of him. I always was afraid I would fail him in

what I was doing.

I remember one time we were over on Green Bluff, which was about three miles from our farm, picking strawberries. He wanted to go back to take care of the cattle. I walked with him back that three miles. Well, I just couldn't keep up with him, but I was unwilling to say that I couldn't and I'd trot along. It about killed me. But he was thinking about other things, I suppose, as I was trotting along. That gives you more of an idea of my attitude toward him.

He was the stern disciplinarian who was entitled to respect and got it. And that's about the way it went. He didn't overdo it. He was quite—I won't say affectionate...but attentive to Carl. My brother, Carl. He was always very fond of him and I don't know why; I think maybe because Carl looked like him. In addition to that he had delivered Carl. Carl and John and Joe were born at the place up in the hills. No doctors were available and my father delivered these children. So Carl, being the first one, I don't know whether that accounted for it, but I always felt that Carl was the apple of his eye.

Mr. Frederick: So there was a special bonding that potentially came out of that delivery then?

Mr. Canwell: I suppose, but anyway we were a very close-knit family. There was a mutual respect, I think, all along the line. My father worked at things that he probably would not have, because he needed the money. He was not a person who could have ever gone into business and made money because he was not a businessman. My mother was more capable in that area, but she was too busy raising children. There was always a caring, mutual respect in the family for each other. I wouldn't fault my father in that direction at all. He was not a demonstrative man.

Mr. Frederick: What form of humor did he use?

Mr. Canwell: Well, if you're familiar with State of Mainers, people from the State of Maine have a dry sense of humor. His was more or less that way. He could appreciate humorous situations; I'll try to think back as to just in what ways it was manifested. He was not a trickster or joke player. That would not be his ken at all. He could appreciate something humorous or funny; but my mother could much more so than my father. Most of the time he was working at something when we lived in the hills. There was very little way to produce income there. He worked as an assistant to the blacksmith at the logging camp. And he had some training in that area in the cavalry. He could take a piece of iron and make a horseshoe, things like that. So he did, during the logging operations up there, for a time work with the blacksmith.

That also kept him away all day. He would leave

early in the morning to go down to camp and be back late at night, so other than the times that he was just working around the farm I didn't have a lot of exposure to him. He was not a humorless man, to answer your question.

I believe he saw the humor of his purchase of that farmland up there, because as was true of all the forest land, the topsoil had accumulated through hundreds of years of decaying leaves and debris and when that was plowed up it was very productive at first. You raised potatoes and strawberries and all the hill folks did that. And then gradually that topsoil would wash off or be depleted and there was nothing left. Well, I remember my father saying that what it needed was three showers a month, two of water and one of manure, and even then you couldn't raise very much.

But we raised what we had to eat—potatoes, rutabagas, tomatoes, corn, turnips, a few things like that, and apples. We had a root cellar where stuff that would keep would be stored and things like potatoes, rutabagas, carrots would last all winter. And cabbage, that's another thing we raised and these provided almost our entire livelihood. We would shoot a deer once in awhile. So what you had to buy was salt and coffee, a few things like that. The demands cash-wise were not so great.

Mr. Frederick: Did he have time for hobbies? Was he a collector of anything?

Mr. Canwell: The only hobby that I can recall was shooting. That was a way of life with him. And that went on even up into our teens. We'd go up to the old place in the hills. There'd be three or four of the boys and my father and we'd shoot at a target. We'd each put in a nickel and the winner got the pot. He always won.

I learned to do some pretty fancy revolver shooting. I'd shoot objects in the air. He was very contemptuous of that. He thought it was a frivolous thing, it served no useful purpose. The fact was that I couldn't hit the target like he could, but I could shoot. I'd save my flashbulbs from my camera and throw those up in the air and shoot at them. I got so I could hit them quite consistently, which is something of an achievement. And he had no time for that. He thought that was a waste of time.

[End of Tape 2, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Albert, last session we left off with discussion regarding your father, which had to do with pastime or hobbies—these issues.

Mr. Canwell: Well, I would say that his hobbies were very few. Trying to recall what he did in that area, I do remember in addition to his spending a great deal of time shooting, that he also played a terrific game of checkers. I never could beat him. I don't know if anybody in the

family ever could and I suspect that he probably had perfected that during the long winter nights in Alaska.

There was not to my recollection any card playing at home. I think that probably was partly due to the fact that my mother disapproved of it anyway. And there just wasn't time for it. In those days, particularly when we lived in the hills, your source of lighting was either the natural sources or a kerosene lamp. They were very inefficient, but they did give you some light. There was no occasion for very much evening playing of games and it was even difficult to read. Doing your schoolwork, it was never easy to have the proper lighting, but we did survive it.

As to other things my father did, he worked; he was a very busy person. I never think of him as ever spending an idle moment. He'd be doing something and, of course, there were always innumerable chores to do. At that time and period in history, you didn't have the conveniences that you have now, so you had to carry water and store it. You had to provide wood and it had to be split and brought inside. Most of those chores were delegated to the children as they got big enough to do it.

I can't think of much time spent in organized recreation. We did play games outdoors. The games that children played. And we always had dogs, some wonderful ones. The time was occupied and there wasn't much mischief to get into nor an inclination to do so. Nor was it very safe to do anything that was forbidden as far as the family discipline program went.

My father's presence in the family, as I look back, was more from the standpoint of what he worked at. He was always working at something. When he was employed for gainful employment the income was always very low. It was never enough for a large family, but that was not unique to our case—that was the case of most people we knew.

His skills were such skills as he had developed in the military. Beyond that he—well, he was not a businessman. He had no inclinations in that direction. Any books that were kept, finances handled, all went through my mother's hands. When he'd come home with a check, it was given to her. And if he needed money for tobacco or carfare or whatever, he got it from my mother. That's the way the thing worked. It was just convenient for him and a practical way of handling our limited finances.

When we were living in the hills, he worked—I mentioned this the other day—in the blacksmith's shop of the logging camp. He had skills that were useful there, skills that he had developed in the cavalry.

Then when we moved into town, he worked at whatever employment he could find. Usually he'd work for the police, the Merchant Police. But there was a period of time that he worked for the City Park Department. He worked for and with the famous Duncan, John Duncan, after whom the Duncan Gardens of Manito Park are

named. I think he learned quite a bit about gardening and that sort of thing there, and decorative gardening. He could produce wonderful roses. That's something he seemed to know all about.

Mr. Frederick: Did he grow roses on his property eventually?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, on our city property, not in the hills. I don't remember that we had roses up there. At various places we lived in Spokane we always had a garden. But that was one of the things that he seemed to know something about—the culture of roses. I think he learned that from Mr. Duncan, who had lots of them, and he would be given plants, of course, that way.

Mr. Frederick: Well, that could be referred to as a hobby then, later on?

Mr. Canwell: Well, yes, I'd say to that degree it was a hobby. I'm trying to remember back to those days. As children we'd watch for him to get off the streetcar. We knew what time he'd get there and the kids would all be lined up to voice their complaints; the small ones who had been abused by the older ones. My father would swear a little and threaten to do something about it, but nothing happened. It was always one of the pleasant occasions, to see him come home.

Earlier than that, of course—I think I may have mentioned that—when he was in police work, much of it was on night shifts. And so we didn't see a lot of him. He was there. He would get his sleep if he could. That wasn't easy with a bunch of kids around and noisy neighbors. As I say, he was present, but we didn't have a lot of give-and-take, family give-and-take, because there wasn't the time for it.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, out there on the homestead, what was your father's costume?

Mr. Canwell: Well, when we first went up there, one of the things he still had were numerous uniforms from his military service. I don't remember him wearing those very much, but I remember my mother making them over for the older boys to wear.

Overalls, I think, were the standard wearing apparel for people at that time and usually they were bib overalls. Then, of course, woolen shirts. He seldom wore hats.

Mr. Frederick: And what type of shoes did he wear?

Mr. Canwell: Well, they were rugged boot type shoes, not the cowboy boots—they seemed to come in later—but these were laced boots. In the wintertime you had a heavy rubber boot and that's about all I remember of it.

He didn't go barefoot anyway.

Everyone had a last with which you could repair your own shoes; cut out and buy the leather, pieces of it, and cut out a sole to fit the shoe. Then on this last they would nail the soles down, nail them on. That was not only for the boots—the children's shoes were repaired that way, too. It had a variety of lasts, small ones and on up to the larger foot sizes. I think I see that sort of thing once in awhile in the antique shops now, but anyhow people did not take shoes into a shoemaker to be repaired, they did it themselves. And they had leather shoelaces—thongs.

Mr. Frederick: Would you and your brothers dress similarly?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, yes, everybody dressed about the same. They had, well, I'd say not always well-fitting things; we were not as put upon in that area as most children in the hills were. My mother sewed well and so our clothes were a little more acceptable than the average up there. But we wore trousers made of fabric and most of them were knee trousers—horrible things. When you dressed up you had long stockings that your long underwear was stuffed into. And they really created a horrible effect, but that's what everybody did and nobody thought anything of it. I can remember that most of the boys and youngsters—the males—wore knee trousers. We did have overalls that were full length and they were pretty standard also.

On this matter of dress, a photographer came through taking family pictures and, I think, probably took my mother by surprise. She put two or three of us down on the porch steps and arranged us for this photograph. And with me, I was tow-headed. I had white hair. It was cut like hair usually was in those days. And she took a cap and put it down over my head. It's a fantastic thing as I look at it. I didn't like it when I was a child, now it just amuses me.

My sister would have a white starched blouse. My mother always dressed her better than any of the rest of us, because she felt that a girl is entitled to that sort of thing. So she did always make her some fancy blouses and sometimes they were made out of bleached flour sacks, but that's what we had.

Mr. Frederick: And did you have an opportunity as a child to wear shoes through the summertime?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, we had shoes and I can remember going barefoot quite a lot. But we usually had shoes of some sort.

Mr. Frederick: So it would have been your option, if you could have gone barefoot you would have?

Mr. Canwell: Well, yes, and you usually wanted to. You couldn't wait for the weather to completely adjust, summer, before you were out hopping around barefooted. And part of that, I think, had to do with the fact that the shoes were darned uncomfortable. They weren't made and fitted the way they are nowadays. People talk about the good old days; they are talking through their hats.

But everything was that way. You lived and worked and played with what was possible. Nobody went to the store and bought toys or things, they were made at home if you had any. And if a girl had a doll it was made and stuffed and decorated at home. And usually they had them.

But for boys you were lucky if in the winter you had a sled that was of good quality. Almost nobody had a bicycle. Sometimes some rich kid or two at the school would have a bike, but never up in the hills—there he might have a horse. But even though they were available, the hill country kids walked to school. If they had horses they were used at home for work or if they took them to school they had to be fed and cared for and it just wasn't done.

I can remember some of the hillbillies up there would walk to school eight or ten miles. We were about four miles from the school, but we walked.

Mr. Frederick: Did you have access to rubber boots in the wintertime?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, they were very cumbersome things and they had a thick felt inner stocking you could wear. If you were fortunate enough to have those, they kind of helped fill up the space in the rubber boot. But it was not too desirable to wear that sort in hiking to school. They were too uncomfortable to. Too hard to wear.

I can remember sometimes when there would be real deep snow that my mother would take gunnysacks and fold them in the right shape and then with a sack needle would sew these things so they'd stay on. And they were wonderful. They did the job and in dry snow they were just perfect. That was not just done by our family, it was quite often done.

Mr. Frederick: Now would they—that burlap—would that be used as an overshoe to your leather shoes?

Mr. Canwell: No, it could be either. If you're leather shoes were comfortable and served the purpose, you might put them over. But you could do it with the bare foot, too, but just thicker amount. They could be fitted very comfortably and stay on, sewn on with these wheat sacks, needle and thread that they used. And that was not unusual. Then you'd get down to school and you'd take them off.

One year I went to this school down there, there were always things drying on this big stove. Some of these

hillbillies never bathed. They didn't have such facilities and weren't too concerned about it. Sometimes they would hang their clothes by the stove in the school to dry and the odor was just terrific.

But I think back to some of those things, they were annoying and amusing. We came from a more civilized background than a lot of those children up there. Many of their parents were strictly moonshining hillbillies who came from Tennessee or that area. I suppose most of them were on the dodge one way or another. But, anyway, they raised their brood of kids and most of them would try to see that they got some education, so they'd get them to school. You were lucky if you didn't have to sit by one of them. They used to have those double seats and a double desk, and so you were very fortunate if you drew somebody to sit by who was compatible in various ways.

Maybe I'm wandering here. But that was a problem. Foot gear was also a terrific problem because you had to negotiate these miles to school through snow and sometimes mud and slush. Usually whatever you were wearing in the way of leather shoes would be thoroughly wet and saturated.

When we first went up there the area had not been logged off up that far and there was beautiful timber and a lot of wildlife. By the time the older children would be getting home from school, it would be dark. You'd hear the coyotes and timber wolves howling and mother would be just terribly distraught and watching for the kids to finally get home. The last distance coming home was all uphill, so they didn't hurry. They'd come slowly and mother would hear these timber wolves particularly—they ran in packs—would hear them howling and she would be so very worried that the kids were in trouble. However, they never seemed to bother them. I think they were more curious than anything else. I never heard of them attacking a human up there. Of course, if they did with those hillbillies, I don't know whether they would have missed a kid or two or not.

On one occasion, my mother heard a screaming sound. And this was when I was home alone. The children were at school. She heard this screaming. She was just determined that somebody was in trouble. So she took me and walked out through the woods toward where the sound was coming from. Eventually we came into a little clearing and here was a cougar, switching its tail. I still remember that. That's what had been doing the screaming. Well, my mother, holding my hand, headed back the way that we'd come and we were really fast. That was the sort of thing that happened up there.

I can remember my older brother going back through the woods to go to one of the logging camps to deliver some mail or something. He took our dog with him. It was two or three miles through the woods. On the way back one of these bands of timber wolves was ranging in

there, so the dog led them away. This was a real smart animal. My brother came on home with no dog. The dog didn't show up in a day or so, so finally my brother went back to the logging camp. The dog had gone back there and the sack or thing that my brother had carried was there by their stove. The dog was lying on that and he wouldn't move and nobody could touch him. It was an interesting thing.

There's, of course, talk about games and entertainment, this dog was part of our life up there. The sheep band had gone through, and a sheepherder—they were nearly all Basques and Spaniards. They had these trained dogs. They were very proud of them and very careful of their bloodlines. One of these dogs had crossed with a coyote and had then whelped this bunch of pups. They were going to kill them and dispose of them, but they gave this one dog to us. It was a legend in itself. It was just a wonderful dog and smart. I could see why the sheepherders developed a strain or line like that. We had him for years. He was just, well, he was just a part of the family. You talk about playing. We would go outside and we'd make a sound like a coyote and point down the hill. He'd join in the fun. He'd go rushing down the hill and then we'd all laugh and try to get away. He'd rush back to apprehend us before we could hide. I can remember I'd try to get up on a woodshed that had a low, sloping roof and if I didn't make it, then he'd hold me down and if I would try to move he'd nip me. He was just as much a part of that game as we were.

[End of Tape 3, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: Let's spend some time this morning talking with you about your mother. Once we get through that we'll have an opportunity to go back to the childhood memories and play routines, games and whatnot. Physically describe your mother. How tall was she?

Mr. Canwell: Well, in describing my mother, I always am somewhat amused when I think about it, because in most of my childhood in my mind, she was 10 feet tall. But she really wasn't. She was actually a diminutive person. I suppose she was 5'6" or thereabouts and a very attractive person. Of her group of sisters I would say she was the most attractive one. I remember she had very long, golden blonde hair—not really very golden, kind of a corn silk thing.

I remember it so well because the little time that she would rest up in the place in the hills would usually be after the children had gone off to school and the two of us were left there alone or there might be a baby in a crib. She had a rocking chair and she would sit and quite often read her Bible or some of her church literature and I would brush her hair. She just loved that; and I would enjoy doing it. Well, I'll never forget that she did have

this beautiful hair. She enjoyed that and it provided her a few moments of relaxation.

At the same time the kitchen stove would be going and a boiler full of water would be heating. She might be boiling some clothes up in it, but, anyhow, her "idleness" was never completely idle. There was always something else going on.

It took me a long time to realize that she wasn't a lot taller than she was, I suppose, because of the many things she did and the way she did them. She could break a horse or she could shoot a gun or she could sew to perfection. She had this sewing machine that hardly ever cooled off. And if you remember that type of sewing machine, it was operated with a foot treadle, went up and down, up and down. One of the precious things, of course, was sewing needles. She was forever running out of those and they had to be replaced. So that was one of the things that she seemed to be doing all the time.

Of course she did hand sewing. Like all such children at that time, particularly children of the Europeans, I think, she had learned to sew. She was forever making these crazy quilt blankets and later I can remember her weaving circular rugs. She'd make the fabric into sort of a rope and then she'd sew the ropes together into this little rug. That's one of the things I remember her doing.

Mr. Frederick: And potentially that would be the only floor covering because the rugs would be washable?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, and we had—getting to floor coverings—we didn't have such things. We weren't concerned about them. These were little rugs that might be by a bed or something. But my mother would do the laundry, and incidentally, she often made our own laundry soap. And it was pretty powerful stuff. In boiling up this laundry the water wasn't just dumped outside, it was used to scrub the floor.

That's another thing she seemed to have a fetish about—cleanliness. The floors were just rough pine floors, but they were scrubbed white. And I can remember she'd use the soap suds and a broom and go over this. So she had a thing about cleanliness that was, oh, it was a part of her philosophy.

I can remember her at times saying, when we complained that we didn't have the fancy clothes that we might want or we'd see some other kid having, that was not important. It was nice if you could have them; you couldn't all have those things, but you could always be clean. And she impressed that. It was partially a defense on her part. She couldn't provide the things that we were asking for, but she tried to give the logical substitute. And it was a good one, as I look back.

Then she was forever baking bread. That was one of the delights that I think is missed today. She was forever making bread and then she had some Norwegian recipes;

I suppose that's where she got them. She would make a very thin bread. She'd roll this bread dough to a paper thinness and then cook it on top of the stove, turn it once and it was done. Well, you could take that and roll it up and put some jelly in it, or butter if you had it, and it was delightful.

Another thing she always did was to make some dough cakes that were cooked in deep fat. I haven't seen that sort of thing for years, but that was one of the things that she'd be doing. She made cinnamon rolls and a lot of delightful things that I think we could well use now, but there's no way to get them. When you get them, they're horrible things, made in the bakeries. Well, she sewed; she was forever doing laundry. And to do that laundry we all had to carry water about a block from a well. We used to always have a rain barrel, where you collected the rain that came down off the roof into a trough, and into the rain barrel. The prime reason for the rain barrel was to have some water ready in case you had a fire. If a house caught on fire you had an immediate source of water, but it was soft water and was also used for some things like laundry, and dishwashing or even cooking if it were fresh enough. But that was a standard facility.

Mr. Frederick: I'd like to focus a bit on your mother as an individual. And you have physically described her. What was her emotional make-up?

Mr. Canwell: It was very stable. And stable because she was able to control what ordinarily would not have been that way. She was a restless person. She had to be busy and people like that are often perfectionists. She desired perfection, but realized that it wasn't possible under the circumstances. So she came as close to it as possible.

I would say she was a scholarly person. Had she been exposed to a more extensive library, she would have ranged further afield. She concentrated essentially on her religious faith. And she was an adequate and competent student of the Bible. She knew it, it seemed, from cover to cover. She drew a lot of her entertainment, and her comfort and her ability to meet the hardships that she was undergoing, I think, through that source. She did have some religious publications that her church put out and so she would read those. But in reading the Bible she was prone to quote texts that were apropos of the situation. Like most religious people, she was pretty well able to support her position whatever the position was. You can find it in the scriptures—a justification.

I remember in later years, that she lectured me about the evils of drink. And I would quote some passage where Paul said to take a little wine for your stomach's sake. She would be a little exasperated and she'd say, "The devil can quote scripture."

Well, anyway, my memory of my mother up there in

the hills is very clear and distinct. It fortifies the thinking that I always had that she was a remarkable person; a splendid human being. She was always concerned about the poor neighbors. She wouldn't for a minute tolerate any derogatory thing being said about some foreigner or black or whatever. It was just part of her nature.

Then because she was a trained nurse and was sympathetic to these people, wherever they had a neighbor who needed help they got it, although none of them as I recall ever returned the favor. But that was her nature. She was a good person who worked at it and didn't expect any praise or blessing for it. It was just part of her life.

I think of one thing maybe that might describe her very well. It was a matter of the sort of discipline that she imposed. She had sent me to the store. And I was just a little boy. I suppose I was five or not over six. I went down this long distance to the store and with a little money to buy something that she needed. The lady who ran the store gave me too much change; it was just a small amount, it might have been fifteen cents. I was aware that I had gotten more than I had coming and when I got home I bragged about it. And she sent me back with this change and an apology to the lady who ran the store. Well, that had such a lasting effect on me that I couldn't keep a nickel that some clerk or cashier gave me that didn't belong to me, and can't even today.

That was the type of person she was. Honesty wasn't just a formula. It had to be real and a part of your life. My father pretty much shared that same kind of thinking. But with her it was just a stern part of her essential discipline that was just as real as her opposition to drinking or gambling or any of the general hell-raising that went on in those days. It was a genuine thing. It was just part of her.

And you didn't question it. I can't think of a time that I ever challenged her thinking. I might have departed from it stealthily or quietly, but I never challenged her thinking because it was always right. It was, of course, based or founded not only in her religion, but in her family life and background. They were that kind of people. So that to some degree describes my picture of my mother. She was always that way to the day she died.

Mr. Frederick: How did she express approval and affection?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, she was usually quite generous in praising your good works or good things that you did. She was a very loving person and affectionate. While she was, as I said, a stern disciplinarian, there was nothing mean about it. I can remember she used to send me out when I'd do something that displeased her; send me to cut a switch and she'd switch me with this thing. In later years I told her she logged the farm off up there that way.

But one time I thought I'd outfox her. I took the knife

and I cut the switch almost in two and when she whacked me with it, it broke. Well, even she had to laugh at that and, anyway, that was one of her ways.

Another habit she had was if you said a dirty word she washed your mouth out with soap. The soap, some of it was homemade, was pretty potent, as I can personally attest. I can remember my rascal of a younger brother, Carl, who was always plotting mischief, one time asked if I could say some four-letter word and I did. He ran and told mother what I'd said. So she washes my mouth with soap. I got him later.

But trying to keep focused on my mother, she tried to enforce discipline as well as impart it logically. She didn't put up with much nonsense, but you never felt that there was anything mean or vindictive involved in any way. It was just that you got what you had coming. So, like every kid, you did what you could get away with, and with her it was a game. She didn't like to be outsmarted and wasn't very often. Having been a child herself, she knew about what to expect.

Mr. Frederick: With regard to your mother—yourself and/or your siblings—what could you do to intentionally please your mother?

Mr. Canwell: The things that we did to please her were to do the chores that had to be done without being told or forced to do them. Now, one of the things I can never remember my mother having to do was the dishes. Some of us always did those and they were assigned chores and you just did them. My mother didn't have to do that.

Another thing my mother liked was any opportunity to sleep in a little in the morning. My father was up at probably five o'clock or before and he'd be rattling the stove and cussing out children who spent too much time in bed. He would start breakfast; ordinarily we had cereal or something. And my mother usually did not have to do that chore.

We children did the dishes and kept the woodbox full of wood. In the logging operation up there, there were quite a number of fir trees and these fir trees have large limbs that are quite brittle. We would drag those limbs in from wherever the tree had been felled, up to our woodshed. It had a chopping block and you put a double-bitted axe deep into the chopping block; then you hit that with the fir limb and it would break off into pieces that would fit the stove. It was very satisfactory and those fir limbs burned almost like coal.

Well, we had this stove, usually had it hopping, and she had, as I said, laundry going. There was a big water tank on the back of the stove that heated water and a big oven where she could cook a whole batch of eight or ten loaves of bread at a time.

Carrying water was one heck of a chore. It was a long ways to the well. You had to scoop the water up with the

bucket—it had a pole with a fastener on it and you dipped the water out with that. Then to get up to the house with that without sloshing and spilling it was quite a chore. Usually when you were big enough you carried two buckets. And that was a problem.

Mr. Frederick: Did you ever have a yoke for that task?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, yes, we did. My father, and our only neighbor also, had developed that sort of a device. We did have these yokes that you could fasten on to the bails of these buckets to help carry them. We also made a water conveyance out of a five-gallon oil can. Kerosene was available in five-gallon square tins. You'd cut the top out of those and put a handle across and that, well, the older boys were more likely to use those than we smaller ones.

Having water and my mother being the type who wanted a lot of it, it just seemed we were forever carrying water and forever getting wood for the giant cookstove.

[End of Tape 3, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Considering the environment out there and the economic base that your mother was working from, what could she, outside of the family, claim as her own? Did she collect anything? Could she collect anything? Or what were her prized possessions out there?

Mr. Canwell: Well, at first we had some of the fine things that were part of her wedding gifts and that sort of thing. She had some very fine dishes and silverware and quality things. They were not usual to the hill people, who were primitive and everything about them was primitive. But she did have these civilized things that were close and valuable to her.

That's another tragic thing, in one of the interludes while we moved back into town for a winter or for a short period of time, mother, being the good person she was, let a destitute couple up there in the hills stay in our house while we were in the city. And this character held an auction and sold all of those things. So everybody in the hills had a dish or a kettle or a tray or some silverware that belonged to us. A little of it was recovered, but not much. That's another tragic thing.

I can remember her also mentioning how children break things; you know, you have a few valuable or important possessions. She said that one by one they'd be broken or disappear; pretty soon they just were no more.

They had good friends and good family who had provided some nice things in the way of wedding gifts. Those were things that vanished and disappeared. And that is a severe blow to that type of person who is separated from the better things and from access to them. So you prize very highly the little mementos, things of value.

But that's the tragedy, I think, of everybody in that situation and it certainly was true in her case.

When we acquired the property it was part of a homestead. We did not homestead the property. We had only one close neighbor and he had homesteaded the area. He sold off a couple of pieces of it.

Mr. Frederick: His name?

Mr. Canwell: His name was George Henriksen. He was a Dane, an interesting character in some ways. He had been a member of the Danish Royal Army. I think he had some problem over a girl and he took off for the States. He would come into Spokane and work to earn money to pay his homestead fee, to get coffee and staples that he had to have. So he would work in Spokane in the winter. He was here, I believe, when the Spokane Fire occurred, which was in 1889. So he must have acquired the homestead along about that time. He was a bachelor and remained one all of his life. Anyway, he was one of the more desirable hill folks up there. He had sufficient education, he was not an illiterate or that sort of thing. He had come here—as so many of them did—for some free land. There was homestead land available up in that area at that time.

Spokane, of course, was the jumping-off place in the West. It was quite a notorious town at that time. He came here like so many others, who then filtered out into these areas that could be homesteaded. The government had, in their railroad grants, given alternate sections to the railroads and the rest were up for homestead. That's how most of these homesteads came about; that's how this one came about.

And when we acquired it, it was a one-room house. It was built with pine boards. It was not clapboard, but rough pine boards that were approximately a foot wide and an inch thick. They were pitchy and lasted forever. Antique dealers have ripped most of them off from the old dwellings to sell. But that's the type the house was. It had a pitched roof and chimney, no fireplace.

So when we came there my father built another room of similar size on it to the west, overlooking the edge of the hill and looking west toward Greenbluff. There's about a three-mile valley in between. Well, he built that first, but as need arose we did what they did in the logging camps and other places; we built a base, a frame form, and put a tent over it. So we had two of those. Each one would accommodate a double bed and a stove.

The two of those were utilized most of the time we were there by the children—that is, the boys. My sister slept inside as my mother and father did and any infant children. Particularly the three boys, myself, and my two older brothers inhabited this space. My uncle who was killed occupied one of them.

It was quite comfortable, but very primitive. These

tents were not difficult to keep warm, had a little tin stove, little sheet metal stove, in them, and a very small amount of fuel would warm them. That's about what I remember about those. They served the purpose of keeping the mosquitoes or bugs out and kept you warm and dry and were satisfactory. But that was part of the setup there.

Then there was a fairly large woodshed, which would have been maybe 30 feet to the north of the main house. Back of that was a Chick Sales Outdoor Plumbing facility. It was quite a walk from the house to that facility. Looking out that general direction there was a gate to the fencing that protected our garden and orchard area. Looking out that direction you look right at what is now called Mount Spokane. It was officially Mount Carlton at that time, and was generally called by the hill people "Old Baldy." But that was our view to the north and I always enjoyed it.

We had a chicken house that was to the east and we had a root cellar. It was customary there, you dug a root cellar; you built the walls up with rocks and then put a roof over it that was covered with dirt, which would last a number of years before the ceiling logs would rot out and have to be replaced. It was a very efficient thing. It would keep potatoes, squash, cabbage, rutabagas and things like that, and some apples, all winter. So we were not too deprived ever. We had the things that made for good stews and we were able to raise and preserve them.

That's another thing my mother was forever doing, canning fruit. We always had whatever fruit was available canned, and in considerable quantity. I remember another task that was part of this living there; that the room that my father built on the house had not a flat roof, but it was not a very steep pitch. My mother would dry fruit on that: prunes, yellow transparent apples, and something we always had was dried fruit. These dried apples, we'd take a pocket full of them with us to munch on the way to school and back.

Ah, I think I mentioned, maybe not in recorded session, that one year we went up in the hills and got huckleberries. They were canned in great quantity. Strawberries we raised, we had strawberry jam. And, oh, of course, always had onions and some garlic. We didn't use much of that, but we had it. And all in all, we were able to come up with a pretty tasty and satisfactory meal.

Another interesting thing I might say about my mother, she was a lifelong vegetarian. I don't ever remember her eating a bite of meat of any kind, but somehow or another she knew how to cook it in the most tasty and delightful ways. She could even make venison edible, and that takes a bit of doing.

Everybody in the hills raised some pigs except the Canwells. My mother, being an Adventist, wouldn't touch the stuff. She didn't think it was fit to eat and wouldn't even use the bacon, or get the benefit of bacon greases. She put together very delightful food, but that

wasn't one of the staples.

For meat, we had more pheasants and game birds and fish. We had fish from the little stream down there. It was called Dead Man Creek. I don't know what it is now. I think they changed the name. It runs up to the foot of Mount Spokane, originates there.

It's another thing my mother did to perfection. She loved to fish and she was a very patient person. She would find that there was a good-sized trout in some pool and it was a game with her. She'd stay at it until she got him. With me, I was more like the Indians and others up there, I'd fish up and down a stream. But she would zero in on them and, as a manifestation of her inherent patience, she got the fish.

But we had fish. We had wild game. We had garden produce. An important factor there was cabbage. The cabbage kept well and it will season most everything in the way of a stew or roast, or a boiled dinner. That and rutabagas were very essential. We had them and she knew how to use them. When we had venison, in the cold weather it would be hanging outside. You didn't have refrigeration, so usually it was consumed quite rapidly. The bones and inedible part went to the dogs.

Another thing I remember about the venison, my mother would make mince pie. The old pioneer way of making it required venison. She would cook up this leg of venison, pick it off in little pieces and that went into the mince pie. She would put currants in it and various other things. And hard cider if we had it. Then in cold weather she'd put those out and let them freeze. It was a delightful product and I don't know whether anybody does it that way now, but that became a mince pie.

Oh, yes, we never had pumpkin pie as such. She always made her pumpkin pie out of squash, which makes a superior pie and the squashes would keep. These Hubbard squashes are almost indestructible and they'd last all winter, but they're delightful food. She would can up some of that sort of thing and use it for pies.

We had one German neighbor who was probably half a mile or so away, but whose house and dwelling was not within our line of vision. He had been a butcher, I believe, in Germany. He used to sell beef products and whatever in town. He'd drive into Hillyard, which is a suburb of Spokane. He would go in about once a week with something to sell.

Whatever money he got he'd take to the local pub and the bartenders and people there knew him. When it was time for him to go home, they'd unhitch his team from where it was tied at the rack, tie the lines up, put him in the front seat and point him toward Mount Spokane. He didn't need a designated driver; these horses would come home with this drunk.

Well, that was a routine for this character—he was not a very affable person—cultivated nobody's company. My dad couldn't stand him and so they had no contact with

each other at all. But he did sell beef and, I think, would buy some of this from other hill people and would butcher it and take it in. He'd make sausage or different things and it was a source of income for him.

Mr. Frederick: Did your mother ever can venison or beef?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, she would can the venison tongues and hearts. And I think, pickle them, some sort of pickling process. We did dry some venison, made jerky out of it. It's an inedible thing, but it's something that would sustain life if you had to eat it. We didn't go in much for that. As I told you before, my father was a crack shot. There were not many deer up there in those days because the deer thrive on underbrush and that type of browsing. When the timber was there, there wasn't much brush and not much forage for them, so there were many fewer deer than there are now.

He would go out and get a deer every now and then, so that was a source of meat. Believe me, venison is not a very desirable source of meat. It's a little better nowadays where they pasture in better forage. But that was one of the things we had.

Mr. Frederick: Did you ever see any elk up there?

Mr. Canwell: In those days, no. I understand they do now; that there are elk and even a moose wandered into Spokane the other day. When we were up there, I'm certain there were no elk and no moose. There were bear and the hill people ate bear. That's another thing that neither my father nor mother would eat, so we never took advantage of that. We did, as I say, get game birds or blue grouse and fool hens or pheasants.

Mr. Frederick: Any ruffed grouse up there?

Mr. Canwell: Ruffed grouse? Yes, there were those and, oh, that's another thing I remember. You hear of these grouse pounding on a hollow log.

Mr. Frederick: That's a ruffed grouse?

Mr. Canwell: Yes. So you know they're there, but the places you'd see them is when you're going through the woods on some of these trails, game trails. They were there even in later years. I used to pick one off now and then with my revolver. But in those days there were those birds. There were bobwhite quail, too. They seem to have disappeared and the California quail have taken over. But we did not have those topknot quail, the California quail, in those days.

Mr. Frederick: The Chinese pheasant?

Mr. Canwell: No, they came in later.

Mr. Frederick: When do you first remember them coming in?

Mr. Canwell: I would say long after we moved out of the hills. I used to see them when I would go back up and sometimes I would stay at our place. I'd have an interlude where I had time off or felt I could take it from whatever I was doing and I'd take a box of books and a bunch of ammunition and some food and I would go up there. Sometimes that was in the winter.

One winter particularly there were quite a lot of these Chinese pheasants there and they would feed on the seeds of the weeds that grew there. They'd beat the snow down around these weeds and pick these seeds off. So I remember them from that time on, but I don't think there were any of them there when we lived there. There were no wild turkeys either. They've bred or imported those recently here.

Mr. Frederick: Do they have any prairie chickens out this far?

Mr. Canwell: Prairie chickens? Not that I know of. I think most of that sort of thing, if we had them at all, was south of Spokane down through the wheat and grass country. They still hunt them, those and other similar bird-chukars—in rocky areas down along the Snake. But we didn't have them to my knowledge. The pheasants they called fool hens because they didn't have sense enough to get away and were always easy prey because they'd fly up and land on a limb right near you and were easy to pick off.

Some of the hill people there, one or two families, were part Indian and they hunted like Indians. They would build a stand up in a tree near a water hole and wait until the deer came down for water and they'd pick them off. One of these families particularly, the Parkers, always had five or six deer hanging up out in their shed. They'd eat the edible parts and give the rest to their dogs. Their dogs were of such a variety you would not have wanted to come within a half-mile of the place anyway. Talk about a junkyard dog, they really had them. The family were not very sociable people, they didn't mix very well. Two families of them were early pioneer homesteaders up in that area.

[End of Tape 4, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: What was in the orchard?

Mr. Canwell: We had a great variety of fruit. The trees included quite a number and variety of apples. One of the principal ones was Wagner. That was because they were a

very good keeper; a dry land Wagner will keep all year. Then there were quite a number of yellow transparents. They produced a good applesauce and dried apples.

There were cherries, apricots. I don't remember that there were any peach trees or if there were they didn't survive. There was a Grimes Golden, I think they are an apple that they crossed to make the Golden Delicious, but they were like a Golden Delicious only smaller. Then there were some of the native, or almost native, apples. The earliest apples up there were King apples, a very attractive shapely, quite large apple, but not much for eating. When we got better trees developed, we abandoned those or didn't use them.

We had enough apples to make some cider and that was a handmade thing. You cut these up, crushed them and had a turning apparatus with a handle on it that you used to squeeze the apple juice, which ran down a little chute into your bucket. That was one of the byproducts of the orchard. We did have cherry trees. There were pie cherry trees, I remember two or three trees were Bing cherries.

We had a quince tree. Now when commercial pectins are available, that no longer is significant, but that was what you used for pectin to thicken your jellies and things; so everybody who knew what he was doing had a quince tree. Crab apples, we had two or three crab apple trees. They also were more or less used for the same purpose, to get the substance to jell because of the acid in them.

Oh, there were pear trees, too. In general it was a very well-balanced orchard that became a delight to the few deer that were there. So then it became necessary for my father to fence this orchard in with an 8 foot chicken wire fence. It was only the most desperate deer who could clear the 8 foot fence, but anything less than that they'd come in and prune your trees whenever the browsing was short anywhere else. In fact, they do it out at my farm now.

Mr. Frederick: Did your father use pine for his fence posts?

Mr. Canwell: We used fir and tamarack. The pine is—if you have the choice—the pine is too soft; the fir is a little better; tamarack is excellent and splits quite well. So it seems to me that most of our fence posts, at least for the chicken wire fencing and things, were tamarack. That was available because the logging operation had no interest in it. The tamaracks would die and dry. They were standing there curing and maturing and they were always available, very hard on your saw and axe, but almost indestructible. They did split quite well. So that, as I recall, was the choice or favorite fence post.

Originally there wasn't much fencing up there. There wasn't any occasion to fence it. Later years there were

more cattle running loose, so you had to fence them out. But originally it was just more a matter of marking your boundary lines, having a fence.

Oh, another thing we had was grapes. We didn't have the grapevines, but old Henricksen, the Dane, had planted a bunch of them very early. I don't know what they were called. I imagine they'd make wonderful wine. They were little red grapes that were quite sweet.

I remember the Dane had a wonderful apricot tree down near the well. It was a very prolific thing and it was very difficult to keep out of that, because the fruit was so attractive and desirable but, if you touched it, it infuriated the owner, so we didn't bother it much.

Mr. Frederick: And you had no plum trees?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, there were some plums and Italian prunes and I think there was what was called a "petite plum," a sweet plum or a prune. I don't remember any large plums and still I think we did have. I know the neighbor had a tree with larger plums on it.

Most of the stuff he had they didn't do anything with. He always had a nice garden, but raised much more than he could use. There was no place to sell it. He'd give it away if anybody wanted it, but most of the hill folks were too lazy to go get anything that was free, unless it was something they wanted to steal; that was a different matter.

Mr. Frederick: How did you contain the milk cow?

Mr. Canwell: We had a certain amount of fencing. More often we just let her run out. They come back; normally they'll come back for feeding and milking time. Occasionally they would not, so you had to go find her, but we didn't particularly try to confine the cow because there was no forage in the cleared area but considerable out in the forest area.

Mr. Frederick: Did she wear a bell?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, everybody belled their cows. You could tell your own bell. You could hear it a long distance away, so you'd know where old Bossy was. That was another chore that as children we had, to go bring the critter in. I never milked the cow, but I know at least one of my brothers used to do that. Mother did, she kind of liked to.

Anyway that was an important source of food. We had our butter and cottage cheese. My mother was forever making cottage cheese. She'd let the milk sour and clabber. She'd warm it on the back of the stove until the curd came together, and then she would put it in one of these flour sacks; you twist it and work the whey out of it. And then you had cottage cheese. She would make it up

sometimes in large curds, sometimes small curds. If you ate the stuff, it was very good with some good thick cream on it and I can remember doing that. My mother was forever trying to make people drink milk. One of my brothers, John, would not touch it.

It required a lot of endeavor to keep this cow corralled and fed. We fed them grain additives, shorts and bran, and that was one of the expensive commodities you had to have. It had to be bought from the store.

When we had horses or a team, of course, it was no big problem, you go down there and get your groceries and shorts and bran. And it seemed to me we'd occasionally buy some baled alfalfa, but more often we had enough of that up there. The neighbor always had a cow or two and he raised enough alfalfa that he had extra.

He also raised some wheat, which he'd thresh by hand. That was harvested, I suppose, the way they did for centuries. He had a scythe. He'd go out and cut this stuff, had a cradle on it. Then he'd wrap up pieces of the straw and tie it around the bundle. He'd put these bundles in a shock and let them dry. Then he would haul them in and pitch them into the barn. We did the same thing, except we didn't have much land for hay, but we did help him put his up.

He would get his wheat or grain for his chickens from what filtered down from these shocks of wheat that were pitched in the barn and then some of it that he might flail, letting the wind blow the chaff away. So he'd have sacks of wheat for feeding his chickens. Very primitive, but it worked.

My father built a chicken house down there and surrounded the chicken yard with chicken wire to keep the coyotes out. But we didn't have a large flock of 12 or 15 chickens. We just had enough to produce some eggs. Of course, we'd raise the roosters to eat. And we hatched our own chicks. We had an incubator, which was a very advanced thing up there in those days. That was kept warm with a kerosene lamp. We'd hatch these chickens and there were often more from the hens; when they got to setting they want to set on and hatch eggs themselves. And so there would be some of them that would produce that way, but to make sure of a brood, we also used the incubator. You usually kept one or two virile roosters for breeding purposes.

I remember one particular incident having to do with our Danish neighbor and his chickens. When he would plow, he'd go out there plowing around this area and, of course, turning up worms and things. He'd let his chickens out there to go along and they'd feed on the worms. I was sitting on a stump watching this operation one day. A coyote came up from the other direction and sat there awhile watching the operation. This Dane was a very nervous character. He was so nervous that he made his horses nervous. There was always a danger of their bolting and running away. And they did that quite often.

They'd bust up all of his equipment.

Well, anyway, he'd go along, "Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa—" and a coyote was sitting up there watching the operation. I was watching it from another position. His chickens were out there in the plowed ground. And this coyote just carefully wended his way up there, keeping his eye on the plowman. Finally he grabbed one of the roosters, just grabbed him and away he went looking back at the farmer, but the farmer not daring to say anything, in fear that he'd spook his horses. Well, that was a way of life there.

Mr. Frederick: What was his first name?

Mr. Canwell: George. Once a year he'd go in and serve on the jury. That was a way of getting a little money for staples, and his tax money. I don't know whether you want that here or not. But it was one of the things that influenced my thinking.

One time there was a train robbery out here at Hillyard or north of Hillyard. A young fellow, a foolish guy, held up the train. So George Henricksen was called for jury duty when this young man was being tried. I remember his saying when he came back, "I didn't listen to the testimony. I knew he was guilty when I first saw him."

Well, that's kind of what you get in a jury, and you still get it. Henricksen was a study in himself, nervous, I won't say a nervous wreck, because he was very healthy, but he had this excitable side. My dad kept away from him because he didn't want to have to clobber him. He couldn't tolerate his nervous disposition.

My mother sort of liked the guy, largely because when coming into town to work in the winter he had become acquainted with her church people and had joined the church. So they had that much compatibility. Being a Dane he didn't read the English language and he got his Adventist papers in the Danish language, so she couldn't read them. That was part of explaining him. But he was in many ways a delightful person, too.

I can remember I was just at the right age to find it interesting to go over to his place. Sometimes he was making hotcakes and I'd get one of them. He had a phonograph that nobody around there had in those days. He had some records and would play that. It seemed to me it was a disk thing, but it was very ancient.

Mr. Frederick: That must have been absolutely magical for you as a young child.

Mr. Canwell: It was pretty far back. Then, I don't know just what time, I remember his having this music machine. He had two or three catalog pictures on the wall that just fascinated me. I know why now, because they were Charlie Russell paintings that the hardware store put out in their calendar. So there's one of my first recollec-

tions of this artwork of Charlie Russell. I was just fascinated with it. I'd have given anything to take those things home.

Mr. Frederick: Do you remember which scenes he had hanging up there?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I remember one of them very well. It was a man on a horse and it seemed to be a packhorse. A bear was confronting them and the horse was bolting. It's still one of the famous Russell paintings. There were three Charlie Russell prints from the Hillyard Hardware.

[End of Tape 4, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Let's take the opportunity to describe your house and furnishings at the home on Mount Spokane.

Mr. Canwell: The house that we acquired when we went there in 1909 was a one room house, I would guess it might have been 16' by 25' or 30'. It had a stove and a chimney up through the roof in the center of the room. There was an attic in which things could be stored, it was not large enough to stand up in but there were things stored there.

The arrangement of the house at that time was very inadequate. There were at least two beds in the south end of the room. There was a kitchen table and chairs, I'd say five or six chairs. There was one rocking chair. This is the chair where, the few opportunities she had to rest, my mother would sit and read whatever she had to read, usually her Bible.

The furniture was very inadequate. Besides the chairs, there were homemade benches that served for seating at the table along with the chairs. There also was a bench outside that had a water bucket and hand-washing pan and a dish for soap and that was on the outside. There was a china cabinet.

[End of Tape 5, Side 1]

Mr. Canwell: I remember how the wind would howl around the corners of the house in the wintertime. I don't know if you've ever been in Switzerland, they have about a month when the wind blows and it howls; they call it the "bees." Well, that's about what was happening there. Our house was up on top of a hill and right at the edge of it, and it seemed to get that breeze.

In the kitchen area there was a door to the outside and there was a gun rack above the door. My father's rifle and a .22 caliber rifle were there.

Then we had a kitchen table where we ate and there were several of these benches around for seating. There was always a tea kettle on the stove steaming and some-

times a coffee pot. While my mother didn't believe in drinking coffee, she was still a Norwegian. So that was one of her occasional vices, she'd have a sip of coffee now and then.

Some hooks were fastened in the wall and curtains curtained off the sleeping area. Then things moved so fast, my brother Carl was born up there; in fact three of the boys were, Carl and John and Joe.

Then it became immediately necessary to expand the space and then this room was actually put up and tents acquired. I don't remember exactly when Aaron came up there, but it was very early.

I don't ever remember many candles, but we always had kerosene lamps and lanterns. More often than not they used the lanterns because if you had to go out to the outhouse or you had to go feed cattle or something you carried the lanterns along. They were a very convenient thing.

Mr. Frederick: Were there any trunks in there? Did you ever have trunks, storage trunks?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I remember round-topped trunks and there were several of those. There was at least one dresser with a mirror and drawers.

Mr. Frederick: And that would have been your mother's?

Mr. Canwell: That was my mother's. There was a chest or two. I don't remember entirely what was there at first. You see, a family had occupied this house. They had bought the property from Henricksen and then I think they sold to my father. At that time there was at least one giant fir tree out here. I'll always remember it because like most of the pioneers they weren't interested in scenery, they saw the utility of things.

My father cut this tree down and, of course, we burned it for fuel and then the stump was in the way. So at various times he'd dig around this stump to get it out of there and finally he decided to blast it. I will never forget that, because a piece of the stump came through the window. He wasn't as expert with dynamite as he was with his gun, but anyhow we got rid of the stump. That was a disaster, because you had to go a long ways to get glass.

Mr. Frederick: I cannot imagine that she would pleased with that whole operation.

Mr. Canwell: No, my mother wasn't exactly a nag, but sometimes she would chastise my father for doing something when she thought he obviously should have known better. I remember that she would criticize the flatness of the roof on the addition, but it had a very logical explanation. He just couldn't get the long 2-by-4s and he didn't

have enough of them to splice and do it. He had to get the roof on and he did it, so his only defense against my district attorney mother was that he would start to swear. He had some really choice language that he had learned in the military and that would shut my mother up. She would get away; she didn't like that. And so, anyway, she was a little inclined to remind him of things like blasting the stump or building a roof that was too flat.

Mr. Frederick: So every once in awhile she would strategically remind him about that roof and apparently he had heard about that roof several times previously?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, yeah, quite a number of times. Anyhow, it wasn't a disaster. It served as a wonderful area for drying fruit and was utilized for that, but it did require recovering more often than a shingle roof would or a shake. The main room had a pitched roof with native cedar shakes on it. This was covered with tar paper, which was commonly used and was not indestructible when we walked up there as much as we did and took fruit and things up there. It had to be replaced or patched and repaired more often than the shake roof would.

Mr. Frederick: Were there any wall hangings or any calendars in those two rooms?

Mr. Canwell: Wherever we could, we would acquire a calendar, and usually they came from town or we brought them out there. There were a few pictures, one of them was a large photograph of my grandmother and father and his twin sister. That, I think, was out there for awhile and then taken back into town so it survived. There were other pictures, but not a great many, mostly in the form of calendars. They were highly prized because you needed them and then they were ornamental.

I remember a gun rack and the rifles on the rack. Usually there would be a double-bitted axe or two because they had to be sharpened all the time. On rainy days or something, my father particularly might be sharpening the axe or grinding it down. And he had good facilities for cleaning, keeping his guns clean and oiled.

Another thing he had was a small mirror, a stand, and a basin where he shaved. I can remember this razor strop. It was two or three pieces of leather, one side was coarser than the other for keeping his razor sharp.

[End of Tape 5, Side 2]

Mr. Canwell: The razor strop hung on a nail on the wall. It was used as a constant threat as a behavioral instrument. I never remember his laying it on anybody, but we always understood that he would. A time or two I can remember my mother getting it and taking after one of us, but anyway that was an important instrument.

Another thing he had was a fine set of barber tools.

We were probably the only kids in the hills who had a decent haircut. He had these barber scissors and was very touchy about that. He wouldn't even let my mother use them in her sewing operation.

Mr. Frederick: Do you think he picked that up from the military or did he acquire that later?

Mr. Canwell: I believe it was part of the Alaska military adventure. He probably acquired the tools there and I suppose members of the team up there cut each other's hair. My mother had sewing scissors and buttonhole scissors but she kept her hands off his barber tools.

Mr. Frederick: Were you proud of the haircuts you received from your father?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, yes, it was so different than these kids at school and that was a sight in itself. Some of them looked like they'd just put a bowl or a kettle down over their head and cut around the edges. Their haircuts were horrible, mutilation jobs, and as I remember most of the children, they weren't very clean or well washed.

The girls seemed to take a little more pride in their braided hair and I suppose it was a little easier problem to solve.

Mr. Frederick: You can remember some of your siblings' births?

Mr. Canwell: I remember Carl's birth that occurred right after we went up there. I was very small and I don't remember as much about that but I remember his infancy. I remember because he had a painful problem and was doing a lot of crying.

My father and mother decided he needed to be circumcised. And I can remember my mother holding him while my father did this circumcision on him. He was hollering like hell.

Mr. Frederick: Was this your mother's idea?

Mr. Canwell: Probably so. She was a trained nurse and my father had medical training. So it was something that they felt obviously needed to be done. The medications they had at that time were very limited, very primitive. They didn't have the anesthetics and things that would have been desirable, so they just had to do it the way it could be done.

Mr. Frederick: Was Carl the only one that had to undergo that procedure?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, he's the only one that I recall.

Mr. Frederick: It's a wonder he didn't die of infection out there.

Mr. Canwell: Well, they did have some disinfectants. I think they had alcohol.

Mr. Frederick: Well, you were quite young at that age. Did you think that maybe they were doing away with your little brother?

Mr. Canwell: No, I was very aware that he didn't like what was happening, that's about all I remember. Anyway, he survived it. He had some irritation there that had to be attended to and that seemed to be the obvious thing to do. Both my mother and father were competent to have performed the procedure. They had enough medical training and a knowledge of proper procedures and cleanliness and sterilizing things. But I recall her cradling him and holding him. I was very small. It was right after we first went up there.

I remember better the birth of my brother, John. My father had built a big fire in a stump down over the hill and we sat around there and kept warm by the fire while the birth was taking place. But no doctor. It was Carl, John, and Joe my father delivered, and helped my mother make the deliveries. That was typical of that kind of life. I don't suppose that anybody up there in the hills ever had a doctor for a birthing.

Mr. Frederick: Were there storage boxes under those beds?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I believe that there were. There was always stuff stuffed under the bed. You didn't have adequate storage facilities, but didn't have a lot to store. We did have tools and things. I rather think that's where my mother stored any of my things that weren't in trunks.

There were facilities that were native to time, pots that were kept under beds so that people who couldn't or didn't wish to go out in the night to the outhouse could use the facility indoors. But it wasn't a recommended practice, usually you were expected to make it back to the little outhouse. I remember vividly some such instances and I didn't like it. It was a long ways in the cold weather. People talk about the good old days—they don't appreciate indoor plumbing.

Mr. Frederick: And when you and your brothers were little fellows, that could be somewhat frightening, too, in the night and whatnot to be going out there.

Mr. Canwell: Well, I can remember one incident that just about scared me to death. I was going out there and there were clotheslines out along the area where we walked to get past the woodshed and out to this outhouse.

My mother had some blankets or something on this clothesline and a vagrant breeze hit it and snapped right by my face. I just about died. I thought a bear had me or something. But it was not the sort of thing that was very desirable. It was what you had and you didn't know anything else.

Mr. Frederick: What was that little village called by the store?

Mr. Canwell: It was just called the Peone Store. The school was the Beaver Creek School. It was across the road from the store. Down to the east about a quarter of a mile was a sawmill. The people who had the sawmill were sort of aristocrats because they had a little more money than other people. They were still hillbillies; they just had more shoes or something. But they did provide lumber. It was available and anybody who could buy it or trade logs for it could get lumber to frame up a house.

Mr. Frederick: What was the source of power for that sawmill?

Mr. Canwell: I believe originally it was a water wheel that wasn't very effective. And then they had steam, I believe. They had a donkey engine or something that operated this steam device that ran a pulley, and cut the logs.

Mr. Frederick: And that would have been wood-fired?

Mr. Canwell: Yes.

Mr. Frederick: Describe that country store.

Mr. Canwell: The store was typical of grocery stores at that time and particularly in a remote area like that. They had flour and salt and cornmeal and such things. Then they had barrels of crackers and other commodities sitting out in the open. You'd go fish out what you wanted to buy and take it up and they'd weigh it. Then there was a counter in back of that shelving. There was tobacco back there and canned milk—that was a staple in those days. When we didn't have a cow, we bought condensed milk. There was quite a market for that there. It was not expensive.

In front of the store across the road was a rack of mailboxes. Everybody in the hills had a mailbox there; no mail delivery beyond that point. The mail came out from Hillyard or Mead by horse-and-buggy or wagon.

I remember the first automobile that came up there came to the store to deliver mail. I was in my first year of school there. They let the school out for the kids to go out and see the car. It was one of those early-day Fords with a brass radiator and straps down to the fenders from the

top. That impressed me greatly because that was the first one as far as anybody knows to penetrate that far into the backwoods area.

But at the store itself, you could buy kerosene in cans and you could either bring your gallon can and have it filled or you could buy case lots of it. They did sell two five-gallon square cans that fitted into a wooden case and you could buy them in that quantity. But most people would come with their gallon can and have it filled because that's what they used for their lamps; they had no other real use for it.

I'm trying to think what else was at the store. The woman would sell you stamps. And there was a telephone. The telephone connected with Mead, Hillyard, and Spokane and it was a party-line affair. I remember the woman who ran the store; if there was an emergency call she'd crank this phone up for you and place the call. She would then call the people all along the line and say, "Get off the line, Mrs. So-and-so. It's an emergency call." All of these listeners would automatically tune in whenever there was a call, but she'd have to get them all off so you could be heard. The telephone line ended at the Peone Store. In those days there were no telephones beyond that point.

Mr. Frederick: And her name?

Mr. Canwell: The name was Roberts, I believe, a Mrs. Roberts, it was a man and wife operation, but she was usually the attendant.

Other things they had there, they had tobacco and snuff. Quite a lot of the lumberjacks used this Copenhagen snuff—deadly stuff. And there was canned tobacco. I always suspected at first that that's where my father got my name because he smoked Prince Albert. I found out later that it was a family name.

Mr. Frederick: Then did he roll cigarettes or smoke a pipe?

Mr. Canwell: He smoked a pipe. I don't ever remember his rolling cigarettes. And one of his luxuries was a can of tobacco once in awhile. I don't remember what else might have been available at the store.

Mr. Frederick: Cloth?

Mr. Canwell: Cloth? There was oilcloth. Maybe you're familiar with that.

[End of Tape 6, Side 1]

Mr. Canwell: They had rows or a rack of tablecloths. It seemed to me there was a choice of two different colors, you could get a red one or a blue one—blue check or red

check. That was one of the things we had that covered the kitchen table. I'd forgotten about it.

Mr. Frederick: Could you get a newspaper in there?

Mr. Canwell: For years we took the Spokane Chronicle. That's one of the things we did when we came from school. I'd bring the mail or my brothers or sister would bring the mail home and the paper would be in that. A little later on, the First World War was shaping up and I can remember those great big headlines on the front page of the Chronicle. We were almost unique in taking a newspaper up there. I suppose most of the local people could read, but they weren't interested.

Mr. Frederick: Was there a catalog in that house?

Mr. Canwell: A catalog? That was a staple in everybody's house and outhouse. We had the Sears, Roebuck and Co. catalog and there was another one from Montgomery Ward and Co. Everybody got these catalogs, they called them "wish books." It was always a source of interest to thumb through these catalogs to see what was out there in the real world.

Mr. Frederick: That must have been the most magic book in the house for you.

Mr. Canwell: Oh, it really was to everybody, I think. They were large and very elaborate and illustrated. They were just a source of wonder.

Occasionally my parents would order something that they needed. Quite often it would be something like a curry comb for the horses or some other article that you needed and didn't have. You could get blankets, saddles, just about everything, most of which you couldn't afford anyway, but it was wonderful to know it was there.

We figured out some ways of making a few dollars once in awhile, picking fruit. We once got an assignment to gather sweet clover seed. It grew all along the logging railroad. I suppose the seeds had fallen off the train and took root along the railroad tracks. The seed to sweet clover was quite valuable, so somebody made a deal with us to gather a bag of it, a large bag. Nobody had realized how long and how much effort it takes to fill one of those big bags with sweet clover seed. But we gathered it and I remember we got twelve dollars, which was a fortune for this great big bag of sweet clover seed.

I'm deviating from what you wanted at the country store. You could get nails down there and that was an important commodity. They had eight-and ten penny nails and shingle nails. They had roofing tacks that you tack the tar paper roofs down with. You could buy metal files there and rasps. But there was a very limited supply of that sort of thing.

Mr. Frederick: You mentioned that the logging company accessed the area out there via railroad. Was that private?

Mr. Canwell: The railroad land was a railroad grant. There were railroad grants given to the railroads to induce them to build the railroads through the country and through the West and that was part of the deal. I don't know whether it was a good thing or a bad thing, but it got the railroads built and the railroads—at least up in our area—owned alternate sections. I think that was true clear across the country, that they were given these land grants to aid and abet them in developing the railroads.

Up there the railroad sold off trees to the early-day lumbermen, who were in general an unscrupulous lot. And they surveyed. They knew where their lines were, but they forgot them when they got to cutting the timber. So anybody who had a section adjoining one of those railroad sections usually had his best trees looted and hauled away. If he made a fuss about it, he might get shot or beaten up or whatever was necessary. They made a lot of money; some of them became Spokane millionaires and that was the story up there.

The hill folks didn't understand laws or much of anything else and were afraid of the law in most cases. If they weren't so afraid of the law and called for help, which wouldn't have been forthcoming anyway, then they were afraid of the goons that the timber barons had. It was a rough and ruthless thing; the sort of thing that made radicals of loggers and other people, but it was part of the history of our time.

Mr. Frederick: What railroad company put the line through up there?

Mr. Canwell: It might have been the Great Northern, I just at this point don't know. I don't think they were original builders, I think the Union Pacific and Northern Pacific were two of the original railroad builders.

They built these railroads across the country in many cases with Chinese labor. Those railroad men were a hard-driving group, some of them were recognized as great men afterwards. Hillyard, a suburb of Spokane, is named for Jim Hill, who put the railroads through this area. There were a lot of things he contributed to the area, but most of it was the railroad.

Mr. Frederick: The reason I ask is, if there needed to be an order placed through that store and you said, "Take a team into Hillyard or Mead to pick up that shipment," would that shipment come out of Spokane via a railroad or via team and horses?

Mr. Canwell: If it were ordered from Sears Roebuck or Montgomery Ward, it would come by railroad to Spo-

kane. Then it would be optional whether you shipped it by rail up to Mead. The railroad went through Mead and another little town north of there; either place you could pick things up, but Mead was the better road and a more direct way to town. For shipments like that it was quite likely that they would be picked up at Mead and that was, say, 12 miles from our place. You could get things sent up through some approach to the logging operations, but it was not too satisfactory. You would have to arrange that yourself.

Mr. Frederick: You would have to know someone in the operation?

Mr. Canwell: In general, and somebody who would do it and someone you could trust. Usually it was handled the other way because there were quite a lot of things that had to be picked up that way. Various ones of the hill people would go together in hauling things.

Mr. Frederick: That was my next question. Was there an individual who made a living doing that? Or was each family responsible for trucking to Mead to make those pickups.

Mr. Canwell: Well, in early times there was someone who ran almost a bus service up to the logging camps. So if you utilized that, as we did when my mother and I first made the trip up to the farm after we had acquired it, you rode out on this facility to where we got off the main road and then walked up a mile or so to our house.

Mr. Frederick: Was that a team and horses?

Mr. Canwell: It was horses and it was, as I recall the thing, sort of a bus. They hauled the lumberjacks up there and it was transportation for the bosses and others who would go into town. Some of the people who lived up there in the hills would utilize this and there probably was some pay system, but I don't remember what it was.

Mr. Frederick: Well, considering your age, when you first accessed that, it must have been a very mysterious, romantic adventure.

Mr. Canwell: Oh, it was a dramatic thing. I must have been—I think it was along in October in the fall and I was born in January, so I would have been three on my next birthday. I've always been surprised at how much I remembered of it. But I do recall riding up on that rig and getting off there. My mother had a suitcase and some other things. I was just a toddler and remember walking up that road and around on up to our place. It was quite a long walk, carrying things.

I described earlier how I still remember the beauty of

these tamarack trees that had turned yellow. They were like candles in a green forest. I remember seeing those all along the way; none of that had been cut. There was a certain amount of brush and weed along the road, but not much. Buckbrush and other stuff grew after the timber was logged off the first time.

Mr. Frederick: When they came through and logged that the first time and you had the opportunity to watch that, how many years did it take for something to grow back?

Mr. Canwell: Well, of course, they didn't cut small trees, the second growth timber was left standing. They went after the big trees and valuable stuff. There was no market for these pencil trees that they market now. They left quite a lot, but also left a lot of slashings.

These trees were lopped down and cut up into log lengths and then skidded by horses down to the landing level. They had a logging railroad in those days they'd constructed in there. All they had to do was to get logs down off the hills, down to this creek basin, and then they had great stacks of them. Those stacks were loaded onto rail cars and taken over to Elk, which was another little town along the railroad, a little farther north. They did have a good store and commissary facilities at Elk. Once in awhile we'd go over there or my brothers would ride the logging train over there.

They had a game they used to play. This famous dog of ours, Nig, they'd take along on this trip to Elk and someone on the train would want to buy him, so they'd sell him to them. And, of course, when the train got to Elk and the kids headed home, the dog was right behind them. So it became a kind of joke among the railroad people or the logging people, the Canwell kids selling this dog, because they wouldn't have sold him for a million dollars. And they knew he'd come back and he did every time. But that was another means, while the logging railroad was in there, by which we could get to Mead or to Elk, so that was done occasionally.

Mr. Frederick: What type of locomotives did they use on that road?

Mr. Canwell: They had steam locomotives. They were not large, but they seemed large to me at the time. It wasn't a narrow gauge railroad either, it was a wider standard gauge, probably because these flatcars loaded with logs were so heavy that it required a good bed. They did a pretty good job of building that railroad there and as soon as they were through logging they ripped it up and took the rails away.

But it was a source of interest. From up at our place on the hill, I could see this train go chugging along. They had a whistle on it that when they had a notion, or a cow

or deer got on the track, they'd blow this whistle and you could hear that way up where we were. But it was a source of interest. We kids watched the train go by; there was action in a place where there was very little except the normal sounds of life.

At a later point I think probably we should go into something about this railroad and Elk and a notorious woman who lived along the railroad.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, why don't you do that now?

Mr. Canwell: Well, this was an interesting thing because this Molly Gilchrist had been a Spokane prostitute. As I got the story, she married a man who owned some property up there. He staked her out up there to get her out of town, but he was not there. He had a feed store or something in Spokane and left her up there in the hills. She became a very notorious character. When the logging train would go by, she'd purposefully be out working in her little garden right nearby. She would wave at the loggers and pretty soon they developed a habit of stopping off to see Molly. She usually had a bottle there and they could play cards or other things as long as they had money. She would accumulate these silver dollars and she had a lot of them. She buried them out along by her barn and woodshed.

Molly had a hired man who was a kind of simple soul, but not as simple as she thought. She'd send him to Elk to get a bottle of booze for the guests. He had watched her burying her money, so he helped himself to it, got himself a bottle in town and came back thoroughly soused. So Molly was about to do him in. She took after him with a pitchfork. He ran around a haystack with Molly after him, with her long Mother Hubbard skirt flying, and every time she'd make a jab at him, he'd muster another spurt of energy. He was going around and around and would let out a war hoop as he ran.

My mother was out looking for our cattle; she had followed them on horseback and she rode into this incident as it was happening. Molly, of course, stopped this procedure and was just so thankful to my mother. She said, "If you hadn't come along, I'd have killed the little SOB."

And anyhow that was Molly. She was a notorious character and as smart as could be. She knew how to make money with the one facility she had. And she benefited, of course, by the logging activity up there. She is a legend in the hills.

She had a son up there, Walter Gilchrist and, like so many hillbillies, he was a dead-eye shot. About all he did was hunt and shoot, except that he had an instinct for mechanical things. He could build a sawmill or anything else. But they drafted him in the war [World War I] and he became a sort of a Sergeant York in the war because of his shooting ability. He then came back to the hills and

married a woman just like his mother.

The hill country up there is full of that kind of story. They shouldn't all be forgotten because those people were colorful and sometimes dramatic and Molly was one of the most colorful. She lived right by the logging railroad that hauled the logs into Elk where most were then transported to mills in Spokane or elsewhere by rail.

Mr. Frederick: What were those logging camps called and how many were there?

Mr. Canwell: There were two or three of them in along Dead Man Creek, which is our area. One or two of the outfits were operated by the Edwards and Bradford Lumber Company. That one I remember and there were others. I think the Dimeling family were interested in logging up there and they became prominent Spokane people. Also the Edwards and Bradford, I think, was the big company that first went in there with large equipment and did a big job.

Mr. Frederick: At that age in 1913, 1914, did you ever have an opportunity to walk through one of those camps?

Mr. Canwell: I used to go down to one of them that was just down the hill to the north from our place. There was a trail down the side of the mountain that you could use to get to this logging camp. Since for a time my father worked there as an assistant to the blacksmith, I would go down there to see him. I remember the chef down there at their eating place would always give me something special to eat, so I used every excuse I could to get down there.

There were tents and cabins, largely tents. That's where we got the tent idea and basis for the ones we installed up at our farm. But that's where the lumberjacks lived; they lived largely in the tents. The cook's shack, dining hall, and commissary were built out of rough lumber and very crude, but served the purpose. They had their big cookstoves and water tanks in there, and eating tables.

The food was generally good. That's one thing they did; they didn't pay too well, but they fed well. I did quite often go down there.

[End of Tape 6, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: What was the capacity of those tents in that camp?

Mr. Canwell: The dining capacity, I suppose, would accommodate approximately 30 people who would have seating at one time. There were long tables and benches. The dining room was very close to the cooking facilities. Food was cooked in great big pots and kettles and ladled

out in bowls and dishes. As I say I think they were pretty well fed. I don't remember the cook too well there, I remember the blacksmith, whose name was Bill Bailey; I don't know why I remember that. The eating facility was adequate to take care of all of the loggers and the men in the camp.

Mr. Frederick: What was the sleeping capacity of a bunkhouse in that camp?

Mr. Canwell: It seemed to me there might be from two to four men in each. They were quite crowded and that was a constant complaint. Some of the lumberjacks wouldn't bathe and they became very fragrant and occasionally the others would take one out and throw him into the creek or run him out of the camp because he was too much of a problem.

The tents were probably 8-by-10. They might have even been 10-by-12, but they were not large.

Mr. Frederick: Did they have any of those camp units on or in boxcars?

Mr. Canwell: No, not to my knowledge at that time. They did have a caboose that sometimes went with the train. It was not unusual for some city dude to come up there fishing. I would imagine they were usually friends of the logging officials. But very early I learned to sell trout that I'd catch to these people who couldn't catch them. The caboose, I think, accommodated them when they'd come up on these hunting or fishing forays.

Mr. Frederick: Within that hill and within that valley, what were the predominant ethnic groups out there?

Mr. Canwell: Ethnic? Some of the people living there at the time were temporary or transient and they were Spokane people. That was a different thing than the hill residents. The homesteaders and moonshiners of those people were from Tennessee. And they were storybook hillbillies, long stringy characters, most of whom could shoot straight, wouldn't work other than make moonshine, and their wives did most of the gardening and other work.

Some of them were of a little higher type. I remember one, Charlie Crowfoot. He was an educated man, but the story was that he came out here just a couple of jumps ahead of the US Marshal. He may have had something to do with opening banks, but whatever it was, he was not illiterate. He was not like the other hillbillies and didn't get along well with them. But, he, too, was a man who could take care of himself, so they didn't give him any trouble.

One of my favorite stories that my father told was that one time he was out hunting in the woods as he often would. He would take his 30-30 along and hope to get a

deer. There was a hillbilly family that raised a few sheep—the Spencers—and as my father was going along one of these game trails, he heard two rifle shots, one right after the other. So he proceeded on down the trail, but very cautiously and quietly.

He came into a little clearing and here was Charlie Crowfoot who had shot two of Spencer's sheep. He had his rifle leaning across one of them while he was cutting the throat of the other. He looked up as my father walked into the clearing. It was a very tense moment because Crowfoot was prepared to shoot his way out of any confrontation with the owner of the sheep. My father didn't know what he was walking into until he saw who it was.

So they stood there, my father standing and Crowfoot kneeling in the act of cutting this sheep's throat. He's looking at my father wondering what he'd do, my dad not knowing exactly what would develop. Finally Crowfoot said, "The son of a bitch bit me."

Well, that was one of the highlight stories that I remember. Charlie Crowfoot was, like my father, a dead shot and a man of cold steel. I don't know whatever became of him. Eventually one of his daughters married someone down near the Peone Store. That's the last I knew of Charlie Crowfoot.

Mr. Frederick: If that was back of the Spencer's property, that seems to be a pretty gutsy thing to do.

Mr. Canwell: It was pretty close to Spencer's property, but Crowfoot had a continuing feud with Spencer, so he was very happy to take a couple of his sheep. Had Spencer been the one who came along the trail, it would have been a shootout between those people, so he was taking a substantial risk.

There were always things like that happening up there. I remember another incident with the Forker family. In one of our conversations, I mentioned that his son ran booze. George Forker, homesteader, used to feud with another man up there—Buck Peters. They were always just about at the shooting stage, but never got to that.

One day George Forker brought a package of meat, neatly wrapped in butcher paper, and left it on Buck Peters' porch. Upon Peters finding it and seeing the tracks—and they could read tracks like we'd read a book—he thought, "Well, good old George, he wants to make up." So he enjoyed the meat and when he saw Forker he thanked him for that roast he had left.

He said, "Oh, you didn't eat that, did you? I delivered that for your dog." He says, "My old mare died and I butchered her up for dog meat." He knew in advance exactly what Peters would do with it. Well, the feud was on again and they never did get along after that. That's the sort of thing that these hillbillies would do. They had a sense of humor and a contempt for everybody and everything. In general, they had working wives, wives who

would keep the farm up, but they didn't do much but hunt and make booze.

Another interesting story connected with that hill situation. A man, a lawyer, who had killed his partner in a feud in Kentucky, came out here to forget about it and to start a new life. He went way up on Mount Spokane and cut cordwood one year. He stayed up there, cutting cordwood, and then his instincts overcame him and he came into Spokane, opened a law office, put his shingle out. Well, this man eventually became a federal judge, J. Stanley Webster, and he was a very literate man. I used to go to federal court just to hear him give his instructions to the jury and that sort of thing, because of the beauty in his command of the language.

He was one of those who found his way up into this back country. Spokane at that time, as I said before, was a jumping-off place. It was the end of world. That's where all the action was, out in this area. People were coming this way, the logging and mining was beginning to open up and they were all coming this way. And Judge J. Stanley Webster was one of them.

An interesting local sidecar to that, after he opened up his law office, and he was a Democrat, of course, from Kentucky, he began to move around in politics. Mr. Cowles, who ran the local newspaper, didn't like that; Cowles was a Republican. So when he learned about Webster's background, he began to refer to him in stories as "the killer" and make such references.

So one day Webster came into Cowles' office at the newspaper building, introduced himself, put his six-shooter or "hog's leg" down on the desk and said, "I'm J. Stanley Webster and you've been writing some bad things about me." He said, "I did kill a man and he had it coming," and, "If you write any more about it, I'll kill you."

Cowles and Webster became very good friends in later years. That was a story that I asked Webster about, if it were true. Well, he said it was something like that. But he was one of the characters who touched down in the backwoods up there.

Mr. Frederick: Were there any ethnic minorities within that valley?

Mr. Canwell: There were a few Germans. Ah, the Germans. One family that I remember was right west of Henricksen's place. He was a German, had been a meat cutter or butcher in Germany. Nobody knows why people like that leave and come to a place like this. But, anyway, he and his wife were German and he was born in the Old Country, as I believe his wife was. His name was Seck.

Then down lower toward Peone Prairie there were several German families. I cannot think of their names. They were quite clannish. The Germans, all speaking the same language, would do so when other people were around and it was always resented.

There were quite a number of Scandinavians, too, like Henricksen, who was a Dane. My mother was Norwegian. I think there was a family or two of Scandinavians back up in the hills. They were among the more responsible people. I tend to remember the characters like the Spencers and others who were hillbillies and moonshiners, but there were a few very stable families that found their way out there for free land.

The Smedleys lived up in that area and developed a nice home, raised a family and did not get along with the hill folks because they weren't the same kind. In general these hillbillies didn't like people who were educated and refined. They were suspicious of them. They couldn't get along with them. They were always criticized by the responsible people and so there never were good relations.

As to ethnic clusters, it would be the few Germans that I would think of and a few Scandinavians. Then here and there an Irisher, but nothing that created a problem ethnic-wise. No blacks that I recall. I don't even remember any within the work orbit. They didn't hire them for logging and that sort of thing. There weren't very many of them out here and most of the blacks worked in town in various occupations: in restaurants, as waiters in clubs, and so on.

Mr. Frederick: Were there any Chinese or Japanese out there?

Mr. Canwell: No, there were none of those there. There were some in Spokane, but not many. In the early days there was a small group of Chinese who came and established restaurants or laundries. There was a Chinese gardener or two. I remember that in town they'd have a wagon loaded with vegetables. They would drive through the neighborhoods and sell, but there were none up in the hills. No Chinese, no Negroes, there were Indians and that's about it. The stock I would say was generally English, German, French and those mixes.

Mr. Frederick: Let's begin to take the opportunity now to explore routine and schedule, particularly your mother. Would there be an identifiable routine associated with the days of the week with regard to what your mother would be doing?

Mr. Canwell: Well, she usually would establish a baking day. It would probably be toward the first part of the week. She'd do that and she was doing laundry all the time, it seemed, because it needed to be done and she was a clean person. She wanted things immaculate and she'd scrub floors and things.

On Saturday, her day of worship, she didn't move a muscle. That's a day that she didn't do any work. It was well understood that was her time, so other than the essentials that she just had to do, she took that day off. But

the rest of the week it seemed to me that she was working, if not always early, always late. She was busy all day with a never-ending series of chores.

There was nobody much to visit with. In connection with that I remember there was one woman who lived off through the woods near the Parkers. Her husband was away most of the time and she was very lonely. She would find her way over to our place, which was two or three miles through the woods. And she would come over there to talk and visit. My mother was always happy to see her. She'd bring some small thing, some cookies, bread, jam, or something, and then my mother would fill her basket and send her home.

One of the interesting stories about her was that one day she was going home along this game trail and surprised a bear. The bear didn't take to this, he attacked her and was mauling her quite thoroughly. She was screaming and yelling and no help was coming and the bear was scoring all the points.

Finally she just decided that if anything was to be done, she had to do it. So she booted this bear off and got up and kicked the stuffing out of it. And the bear ran off through the woods. Well, that's the kind of woman she was. She was no sissy.

There were people like that there, but Mrs. Parker would be overcome with loneliness and make this long trek through to come up and chin with my mother. My mother would try to convert her to her religion, but I don't think the woman responded particularly. All she wanted was company, somebody to talk to and relieve the loneliness.

Mr. Frederick: What was the wash routine?

Mr. Canwell: There was forever boiling of clothes being done. We sometimes had store-bought soap, but quite often she made our own soap. She made it with grease and lye in some combination that the pioneers used. They'd make a soap that was very strong. If you boiled clothes up with this lye-laden soap, it would pretty much boil the worst dirt away.

Then somewhere along there we acquired a primitive washing machine that operated with a crank. It turned a series of pegs back and forth to agitate the water. So you filled that up with soapy water and clothes and would crank that crank. I came in for some of that. That was quite a chore, but it was a step in the way of mechanizing clothes-washing.

Mr. Frederick: She would have that big copper washing kettle on the stove?

Mr. Canwell: It was a wash boiler. I would say it was probably 2 1/2' long, 15" wide and 18" deep with hand-holds on each side. It had a cover that fit down into the

top edge.

Mr. Frederick: She'd boil them and then what would she do with them?

Mr. Canwell: Then they'd be rinsed out and scrubbed, usually by hand on a washboard. That would be in a tub of water. We had a round tub; this tub would sit on a bench that was made for that. And she had a hand washboard. I don't know whether you ever saw one, but they were a deadly instrument, but useful. She would take these clothes and scrub them up and down on this board, rinse them, and turn them over and scrub them some more. Then when that process was done they were rinsed in clean water a time or two and hung outside on a clothesline. She would save the water, which contained the soapsuds, to scrub the floor.

Another thing she had was bottles of bluing. She used to put this in the wash. It substituted for bleach. It did something to make them whiter, but I don't know just what. It was the usual preparation used. That was hard work and she did a lot of it. There was no one else to do it. But she insisted on clean clothes.

Mr. Frederick: Some place along the line, would Pearl be old enough to help her or would Claude or James be old enough to help her on something like that?

Mr. Canwell: No, not very much. Usually they were either in school or during the vacation period they were out getting some sort of a paying job. They might be picking berries or anything like that. They didn't participate much in that sort of thing. Maybe Jim did some of the dishes, but my sister, Pearl, and I seemed to end up on the dishwashing routine. That was a chore that has made me love the electric dishwasher.

We tried to do the things that could be done, like the carrying of water or rustling the wood. My father would haul wood up. It was cut with a crosscut saw in those days and usually, if you could, you got two people on a two-man saw, but more often than not it was a one-man operation. Then that wood was cut and stacked, enough of it kept dry so you could always start a fire. We gathered the pitch roots and that would be split into little pieces that could be used to ignite the fire and get it started well. That's a product of the pine trees. Their roots would be very pitchy.

But all of us tried to do what we could to relieve my mother's work. She was a compulsive worker. It couldn't be blamed on anybody, she was just busy all the time.

Mr. Frederick: Okay, now with regard to some of Pearl's blouses and potentially some of your mother's blouses and whatnot, did she starch that and then have a

hot iron?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, she would starch and iron those. The irons were heated on the stove. You had a handle that you could fasten into them. You would lift the flatiron from the stove after installing the detachable handle. Then you would rub it over a cloth and some salt to be sure it was clean. Next it was waxed. They had bars or cakes of paraffin or beeswax. And they'd stroke the iron over the wax and then do the ironing.

She would starch the collars and the cuffs of my sister's blouses. They would be ironed and done to perfection—just perfect—and she'd do her own finer things that way. Because she didn't go much of any place except when she had moved into town, she didn't do a whole lot for herself. But she did keep my sister, Pearl, in pretty good shape and she did her clothes, too.

The rest of us had long johns underwear and that sort of thing. I was thinking the other day when you were asking about my father's apparel, I can remember that he did wear trousers that required suspenders. I can remember he had some wide suspenders. I think he brought them with him from the cavalry, but they were the type that would last forever.

[End of Tape 7, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: Up there, did your father have detachable starch collars that your mother would work on?

Mr. Canwell: No, he didn't have anything like that nor would he have worn it if he did.

Mr. Frederick: So she didn't have to iron any shirts for him then?

Mr. Canwell: No, she didn't. The clothing that male members of the family wore were such that all they required was washing. They didn't in general require ironing. Once in awhile there would be something that she'd want to smooth out.

To digress a little, another chore my mother engaged in was, when it was cold, she would get big boulders and heat them in the oven, then wrap them in newspaper and put them in the foot of our beds. That was delightful. You would crawl into a cold bed; there was blizzardy cold outside, and you put your feet on those warm rocks—it was just wonderful. She did everything in the world to make us comfortable, clean, and well-fed.

Mr. Frederick: Where would she hang the laundry in stormy weather?

Mr. Canwell: In the stormy weather it was usually dried indoors. I can remember some improvised racks or things, where clothes would be hanging and sometimes

drying near the heating stove and sometimes near the cookstove. I think that she probably avoided doing blankets and sheets and things when the weather was not favorable. She always did an incredible amount of work and she was that way all her life. She remained that way when she was in town or in the country.

Mr. Frederick: You mentioned that your father would be the first one up. He would start breakfast, generally a cereal of some kind for the kids?

Mr. Canwell: That was quite a usual procedure. If mother had any luxury by way of rest, it would be in bed in the morning. My father went to bed early, he got up early, and he'd build a fire. Usually we ate a lot of oatmeal. He'd put on a pot of oatmeal. I always remember it because the darned stuff so stuck to the kettles that you had a heck of a time washing them. They must put something in it nowadays so they don't do that. Sometimes my mother would make some hotcakes later in the day or on weekends.

Mr. Frederick: About what time would you have dinner?

Mr. Canwell: Usually at six o'clock and in those days it was called supper. If there was ever a dinner, it was a special occasion or something. But you had breakfast and supper, sometimes there was a lunch, but usually it was breakfast and supper. That was at six o'clock and you'd better be there. That went that way all of my life at home.

Over the years my father did the same things. He'd get up early and put on cereal or something and a pot of coffee if he happened to want it. He didn't drink much coffee. He would try to roust us out of bed before mother got up.

Up in the hills, the children who went to school had to leave about seven o'clock in the morning. It was pretty early, sometimes it was still dark and it would be dark when they got home.

Other than school events, there was no place to go for social life or entertainment. They had a dance hall that had been built by the logging operators. It was down in the woods toward the store, but that wasn't a place that our family frequented.

Then if someone, like this lady who would find her way over there to visit, would come over, that was about the extent of visiting. George Henriksen, the Dane, was not a particularly interesting person to visit with. He was there, and that's about all. Over the hill there was the German family, the Secks.

Mr. Frederick: How would the routine vary during canning season?

Mr. Canwell: Well, during the canning season there was less laundry done and more boiling up of fruit or vegetables. It seemed to me that my mother would fill jars with some of the things she was canning, then put them in hot water, and they were cooked in the jars. I don't remember all the particulars, but that was a technique that she used on some things. I think to prevent botulism and spoilage on any beans or peas or things like that, she would cook them in the jars.

In our root cellar we had shelves that were filled with canned food. There also were bins of potatoes, rutabagas, carrots, onions, and usually a bin of apples that kept well, like Wagners. So for a good share of the year we'd have fresh fruit and when we didn't, we had canned fruit.

Mr. Frederick: When you were out there on that ranch, your father would never commute into town to the Merchant Police? He'd be working out there some place, out in that valley or out on the side of those hills?

Mr. Canwell: No, the only time he worked for the Merchant Police was at times that we resided in the city. He never went into town to do that. He did occasionally go out to earn some money in the harvest, which came along in July or August, I believe.

Mr. Frederick: How far south would he go?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I think that he had a place that he went where he knew the people. I believe it was down near Lind, which is, I suppose, nearly a hundred miles south of Spokane. He would leave and would work there for maybe a month. Then he'd come back with his earnings and articles that he bought on the way back. It was always a delightful occasion to see him return, both for my mother and the rest of us. It was not an easy way to make money either. He worked about 12 hours a day and for not very much pay.

Mr. Frederick: Did you know what tasks your father had on those harvests? What he was doing?

Mr. Canwell: As I recall he did whatever was necessary there, whether it was pitching bundles or driving a bundle wagon. Those were two things that they required quite a lot of help to do. They also had a large number of work horses in these operations. They did their mowing with about twenty or thirty horses hooked up to the mowing machines.

I don't remember just how they salvaged this hay and wheat, but I know a lot of it was done by bundling and hauling to a stationary threshing machine, pitching it into there, and sacking the threshed grain. Somebody had to sew the sacks and they had to be stacked and hauled to either the railroad or a granary.

So what he did there I don't know, but he probably would have something to do with the horses because he knew a lot about that.

Mr. Frederick: There was probably not very much fat on that man?

Mr. Canwell: No, he was lean, muscle, and hard as rocks. And he always was. In the Army he was, among other things, a champion mile runner. He did that sort thing all of his life. He worked hard. He was not a loafer, never seemed to have a desire to be. He didn't do many of the things that a lot of people would do, like fishing, but he did a lot of hunting because it had a utility purpose and I'm sure he enjoyed it, too. As I mentioned earlier, he worked as a blacksmith, too.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, how long were the camps out there? How much opportunity did he have to work part time with the blacksmith?

Mr. Canwell: A good share of the time that we were up there. He did other things, as well; the lumber company wanted a large barn built, a big storage and hay barn, and he built that. I don't remember what year it was. I believe my uncle, Aaron, also worked building that barn. My father had skills like that; he could do that sort of thing.

Anyway, that barn stood there for many years on a farm down below the hill, below our place. In fact, one or two years we lived on that farm, down on the flatland after the time he built the barn there. Then for a time we rented a house that was built on that property. That was a little closer to school. As to the date that occurred, I just remember that we were talking about newspapers and stories about the war shaping up. It seemed to me it was about 1914. There would be headlines in the papers and that's about what I remember there.

As to stock on the farm, we had a band of sheep. We used the little sheepdog in managing and handling them. We had a stallion that serviced mares that were brought there. That brought in some money. Anyway, there was income during part of that time, one way or another, from the logging camp or building the barn or breeding mares.

Mr. Frederick: Did he ever own a team and a wagon?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, the first one that we had was a team of draft horses, a beautiful and very valuable team, my grandfather sent up, thinking that was just what my father needed. But it wasn't that kind of a farm really. They were...it was like giving somebody a Cadillac where what you needed was a Model T Ford. He did use those horses and hired them out in some of the logging. Then, a tragedy occurred. These horses broke loose one time, got into

the granary, foundered on the grain, and died. That was very sad and unfortunate.

Mr. Frederick: And your father would eventually have to tell his father-in-law what happened to that team?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, he did and that was—

Mr. Frederick: It must have been a terribly—

Mr. Canwell: It was a sad thing.

Mr. Frederick: —embarrassing thing to have to tell him.

Mr. Canwell: His father-in-law was very fond of my father and I think he understood that it was a tragedy and couldn't be helped. My grandfather had never been up there. He didn't know what kind of a farm it was really. And a team of that size was not required. What we used and we acquired from time to time would be what they called "cayuses." They were smaller range horses and some of them were good, some bad. But they could be used for plowing and cultivating or hauling a log up to the woodpile or they could be ridden for saddle horses. So that's what you usually strived for up there, you wanted a workhorse that was a saddle horse and not so big that he ate too much. The big draft horses were too expensive to maintain; other than a few of them in the logging operation you didn't see that sort of horse in the hills.

Mr. Frederick: Your father didn't have much choice. He would have to gather logs with that team, he wouldn't know what else to do with them.

Mr. Canwell: That's all that could be done and I don't remember how much of that he did but he did some. They would cut logs, which would be skidded down to the lower area. They had a sort of sled-like device similar to a travois that you could get the log on and then drag it. The tail end of the log would be on the dirt, but the front end would be on this sled-like device. Horses like that could have no trouble hauling one of these big logs that were tremendously heavy. That's how the logs were brought down to the landing area in those days. Later they began to use cables and pulleys, but they did not use those to my knowledge at that time.

Mr. Frederick: That probably would have been late coming in, too. Because of lack of underbrush and what-not, they could log with those horses for a long time over here.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, they did the job very well. The area sloped toward the basin and the stream. Their problem was to keep from going too fast, to avoid overrunning the

team and driver. It seemed to me they had some sort of a drag brake or snubbing device on the trays of the dragging sled that they could activate.

Mr. Frederick: Some of those teams were so trained and so experienced that they could be controlled almost by voice command. Those horses really did know what they were doing.

Mr. Canwell: Yes. Horses are pretty stupid animals, but they can learn to follow orders and do what they're trained to do. If you keep them in that routine, they're very, very efficient. And that sort of thing he understood. He knew horses from the work standpoint and the saddle or riding standpoint. My mother knew them from the other angle. She babied and broke them by affection and the kind treatment and a carrot approach, but that was not my father's way. He did handle horses and got the job done.

Mr. Frederick: You were talking about your father with regard to his civic duty. Would you spend a little time talking about that at this point in time.

Mr. Canwell: He had a very high regard for and a deep sense of responsibility toward both the law and our historic background, our origins. He took pride in being an American and benefiting by our system. He thought everybody else should respect the system.

One of the things I remember, all of his life while I was at home, when election time came, he would shave, clean up, put on his best clothes and go vote. He was there early when the polls opened. And he had a great contempt for anybody who didn't do that. He felt that they shouldn't really enjoy the benefits of this system if they didn't have respect enough to participate in it. So he did that, he always voted and he did it in a respectful manner.

I've always been amused by one incident, since both sides of my family ever since were Republicans and have always been Republican. A man who became famous in the House of Representatives and a senator later, and who was instrumental in helping get Coulee Dam financed was Clarence Dill. He was a schoolteacher and a Democrat and went through that hill country on foot. He stayed with people wherever, when it got dark. He ate when they served food. And he went from house to house and dwelling to dwelling up there. Ours was one of the places he stayed overnight.

Dill was a master storyteller, a great orator in the House and Senate, and a most entertaining and attractive person. He was the one Democrat they always voted for. He secured a base there.

Well, I wouldn't say the only Democrat they voted for. I think my family also voted for Governor Martin. They

liked him and what he did. I think the choice of Republican candidates must have been horrible because they always voted for Martin and they voted for Dill, otherwise you had better be a Republican.

In his routine he was a law-abiding person who did his work, minded his business, and expected other people to do the same. He never looked for trouble, but I always had the feeling he hoped it would come his way. An incident or two in later life fortified that thinking for me.

But, anyway, he was law-abiding, respectful, did his civic duties, expected the family to do them, and there wasn't any nonsense about it. He was just that kind of man. Although he was entitled to a Spanish-American War pension, he refused to request it. It was only in his very later life that my mother insisted that he do it. Everybody else, every other Spanish-American War veteran, was getting a pension of a hundred dollars or so. They badly needed it. She convinced him that he should apply for it. So a few of the last years of his life he did receive a Spanish-American War pension. But it was applied for reluctantly; he just felt that his military service was what he wanted to do; he'd been paid for it all after a fashion and he didn't think he had anything coming as a pension. That might give you some insight into my father and his thinking.

Given tough assignments with the Merchant Police, he did them well, as, for example, the case in which a railroad detective was suspected of being one who was engineering some of the organized thefts downtown. My father was assigned through the Merchant Police to take care of that problem. And he did.

Mr. Frederick: And that could have been a life-threatening assignment, a very treacherous assignment.

Mr. Canwell: It was. The railroad detective particularly was a real mean, tough character.

I wish I could think of the name of the chief of the Merchant Police. He hired my father largely because of his general reputation after my father completed the application form. But this Merchant Police officer told the railroad policeman, and another one or two with whom they were having trouble, that he was hiring this man because he was an expert gunman and "meaner than hell." So he was trying to psyche these people out by hiring my father. He also told my father what kind of job he was up against. And he could easily have been killed because it would have been a simple solution for these people to get rid of this problem and save their reputations.

One of things this railroad detective used to do when they assigned the merchant policeman with him was to walk so fast and run so fast that he'd wear the guy out and induce him to quit. Well, it didn't work with my father, that was right up his alley.

He was capable of doing any kind of a job and would

do it. And he did some very menial jobs at very low pay just because he had a large family and needed the money.

[End of Tape 7, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Today I would take the opportunity to begin to explore the seasons within this region as you remember them up there on the homestead. Let's begin with summertime and the month that we could say, "Yes, summer is here."

Mr. Canwell: The seasons there were very marked as they are as you get into higher mountain areas. The winters were quite cold with lots of snow. We always looked forward to the breaking of spring, which would begin in March. It would warm up a little, the snow would begin to melt, and the streams enlarged. But spring really didn't come until along in April and May.

In that period of time the gardening started. The potatoes were planted earlier than other things. They took advantage of the seasons to first plant things that were frost-resistant and then, later on, the things that had to be protected from the colder weather. My recollection is that it probably was well into April before we did any serious gardening and the soil began to dry out enough so there was no mud up there.

Then we'd go into the spring season when strawberries would begin to come on and some of the garden things would be developing. I remember my mother was quite a believer in salads and green things. She would go out and gather a potherb that she called lamb's-quarters. She seemed to be able to find it and I never have since then known just how to identify it, but it was a type of green similar to spinach, a delightful thing. If you can make any spinach delightful, that was.

Then, of course, we'd have the garden things like radishes and other things that came along. Green onions and those things were planted in enough abundance so we had plenty of them. Onions then were not used in the early stages as green onions. They were left to develop and became the dry onions that were stored in the root cellar.

The potatoes, as I mentioned, were planted fairly early. I can remember my mother robbing the potato plants. She would go out when they got to a certain stage and would reach in the dirt and come up with little potatoes. We'd have new potatoes and fresh green peas with a white sauce over them. But they were potatoes that were robbed from the growing plant.

We had tomatoes that came on very late in the season. The other things like lettuce and all of those things came along in their turn and were utilized. We had an asparagus bed, too. It came from starts that Grandfather Espelund had sent up from Walla Walla or College Place that he had obtained at the Milton Nursery. Those plants thrived and went on, it seemed to me forever. Until re-

cently there were still asparagus plants up there.

The garden area was a very important thing. My mother was very active in that area. All of her life she felt it was sort of immoral not to have a garden. So every place we lived we usually had a garden plot. Up there the garden was abundant. As the years went on, it was difficult to replace that eroding soil that washed off of the hilltop and down to the gravel base. But we did have a wonderful garden.

I described the fruit trees earlier and my mother's method of drying their fruits.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, was that garden fertilized from the manure out of the barn and was it hand-watered?

Mr. Canwell: It was fertilized from the barn manures and when we first went up there we got some of that fertilizer from our neighbor, George Henricksen. But as we had our own horses and cows, we were able to produce more of it. Every bit of it was utilized. It was very essential, and there were no commercial fertilizers.

That was another area in which my mother was very well-informed. She grew up on a farm down near Walla Walla, where they gardened and did it skillfully and productively. She utilized that knowledge to help in the development of our garden. I think she knew a lot more about it than my father did.

However, he did the hard work of tilling. He cultivated the thing with a hand cultivator you pushed—no motors, of course. And a hoe and a rake and those things were utilized to keep the weeds down.

You asked about the watering. Some water was carried to the newly planted trees. We seemed to be forever carrying water up there and pouring a bucket or two on each developing tree. But they soon adapted and could have used the water, but it wasn't available nor did they require it. The trees seemed to grow and thrive without it. There was sufficient rain usually to help in that area. The snow did not leave as early up there in the highlands as it did down in the lower areas. So I suppose that the general moisture required for these trees was a little less up there than it would have been down on Peone Prairie.

This orchard was sort of a phenomenon up there in the hills. The hill people might have one apple tree or one cherry tree or something like that, but they never developed larger orchards. I suppose they didn't have the availability of trees like we did that my grandfather sent up from Walla Walla.

Mr. Frederick: And she used also the chicken manure?

Mr. Canwell: Oh yes, and again, that was used more on the plants, raspberry plants and things. It's a very hot manure and you have to use it advisedly. I can remember she mixed that with dirt and mulch and used that to pre-

vent burning the plants. She understood those things.

The manure was, as is customary, gathered and stacked in a pile back of the chicken house and the barn. We always tried to have some of it decay there because it became more desirable for certain uses. That, I think, would apply to things like flowers, which I might mention, too.

We did have some flowers up there. I remember hollyhocks. I don't know that I've seen much of them in recent years, but that was one of the things we seemed to have quite a number of.

She grew something they called strawflowers. Those were dried and made into little ornamental bouquets. They remained intact so that all year you had this little show of color for ornamentation.

My mother always had flowers, but I do not remember too well what all of them were, except she came up with color all the time, and attractiveness.

Mr. Frederick: Did it get hot up there in the summertime?

Mr. Canwell: It got pretty hot, yes. My recollection is that when you went barefoot, as we often did, you were very aware of the hot gravel and things in the path. I remember another annoying thing that came with the hot weather. There was an abundance of flies. The store would sell fly ribbon about the size of a camera film that you pulled off a spool. The ribbon was coated with a sticky substance. You hung the spool up with the ribbon dangling and the flies would get stuck to the ribbon. That was one way you controlled them. We didn't have these sprays and things that we have now. Of course, we did have screens over the windows and screen doors and things like that to prevent their access to the house.

Another thing I remember there were these yellowjackets and hornets. I associate that with going barefoot, because you had to be careful you didn't step on one or into their nest.

The garden itself had pest problems. Besides insects, there were ground squirrels. And as you know they dig holes and mound up the dirt and are a general nuisance. Later on I remember my father providing me ammunition for the .22 and encouraging me to pick off these ground squirrels. And I got pretty good at it.

Mr. Frederick: What was the average temperature in the summertime up there?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, golly, I would not know. I don't think we got much 80° and 90° temperature. We're up high enough so it was a little cooler, there was always a breeze. But I was aware that you could—very early in the spring—begin to run around without a shirt on and get a tan.

Mr. Frederick: What was the elevation?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I think it was around 2,500 feet. Now that's a guess; but 2,000 or 2,500 because it was about half what it would have been on Mount Spokane, which is almost a mile high.

Mr. Frederick: And when did it start to turn fall up there?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, usually in October. There was what we called an Indian summer. I guess they had that all over in this area. The leaves would begin to change color and mornings would be pretty snappy. In October would be the real feeling of fall and the threat of winter. But we'd be well into Thanksgiving or later before there was serious snow.

Mr. Frederick: Within the house during winter nights, did your father bank that heating stove, and maybe the cookstove that would have coals in there, all night?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, as I recall it would be the dampers that would be throttled down. There would be wood in there smoldering. You could open the stove in the morning, open the drafts, and the smoldering wood would burst into flame. That was a regular procedure. It also kept the rooms a little warmer than outside. We always had wood stacked by both stoves, particularly in the very cold weather. In fact, sometimes in the colder weather when it reached 20° or 10°, the stoves might just be kept going full-blast.

Mr. Frederick: Within those tents in the wintertime, did you keep those little stoves going?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, they're a very efficient facility. They're still available. I see them once in awhile. They are little sheet metal stoves controlled by a chimney damper and front damper. You could bank those up with quite a bit of wood and control it to just the amount of burning that you wish. It would, of course, be easy to get too much warmth in those small tent areas, so we learned to do that in an efficient way.

Some things are sharp in my memory. Your shoes would get wet sometimes. We oiled them or greased them to prevent that, but in spite of that your stockings at times would be wet. In this coldest weather if you hung your stockings near the stove, if there wasn't heat, they'd freeze. They wouldn't dry, but usually that was not a problem.

But I don't remember winters as unpleasant; maybe time has erased some things. I still think of the hills up there as home. I never quite got over that. I have very few unpleasant memories of that time. We were comfort-

able. We were a happy family. We were a little more civilized than some of the hill families. And so I think that part was all right.

We had things that we missed and some shortages. We were a long ways from the dentist or a doctor and a long ways from stores. We didn't have a lot of money. But, anyway, the recollections are pleasant. They're enhanced by comparing the hustle, bustle, and strife of our time with the tranquillity of that time. There's a great contrast. There was no TV, no radio; you went to bed early and normally got up early. The beds were warm and adequate and in general it was a pleasant existence, along with the hardships that we didn't call hardships.

Mr. Frederick: What was the schedule for bathing?

Mr. Canwell: The bathing was usually in a large wash tub filled with warmed water. I think it was almost universal at that time—you didn't have bathtubs and running water. I can remember a tub and chair by it so you could put your feet in there; they needed more washing usually than the rest of the body. My mother washed us when we were smaller children. You seemed to have quite a lot of that going on, more than I liked at the time. But that was it. You heated water on the stove and took the chill off the bath water you were using,

Mr. Frederick: When was bath day?

Mr. Canwell: I think it was usually handled on a weekend when you had more time to heat bath water without interfering with other activities. My mother was always very meticulous about that. She might make the kids do a partial bath or something, wash their feet and so on. She wouldn't let them go to school in any way that she felt was improper. That was a way of life up there with our family. You kept clean and it wasn't easy.

[End of Tape 8, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: So we're talking maybe Saturday?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, probably more likely Sunday, because my mother observed Saturday to the best of her ability and didn't engage in things that could be done at any other time. I don't know what you know about the Adventists. They are like the Jews. When the sun goes down Friday, that's their day of worship until it goes down the next day. She pretty well observed that. She tried to schedule her week and her chores and activities so that she had this one day of rest and religious contemplation. She didn't have a church to go to. There wasn't any such thing up there. So as I recall that is the reason bathing had to be on Sunday.

Mr. Frederick: And she would run everyone through that process if they needed it or not?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, that was a standard operating procedure. Of course, the older boys particularly tried to avoid as much of it as possible, but they were never successful. They were clean...period.

Mr. Frederick: Would your father bathe also on Sunday?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, and he would be more likely to bathe during the week. Particularly if he was going to the store or something, that would be part of the procedure; a bath and washing, and more likely during the week than during the Weekend Scrub-Out.

Mr. Frederick: Could you get all of those children with one tub or would you have to change it some place along the line?

Mr. Canwell: No, it would be changed because we kids were pretty finicky, too. As I recall it wasn't a great amount of water, it was just enough to make it adequate. I can remember my mother washing all of us with a large washcloth and soap. Sometimes in working over your face you might get a bite of that strong soap or a taste of it. But she did a pretty enthusiastic job of washing our hair and ears. I thought sometimes she'd remove them in the process. But we went through the procedure and there was no way of avoiding it.

Mr. Frederick: With regard to the outhouse, how did your mother or your father treat that outhouse?

Mr. Canwell: It was treated with lime, I believe. And then many outhouses were built so that there was access at the back for cleaning them out. I do remember that lime particularly was used as a sort of disinfectant and deodorant and pest controller. That again was standard operating procedure for people who were concerned about the unpleasant effects or parts of that process.

I remember they got that in sacks something like a gunnysack and that was another thing that was hauled up from either the store, Mead or Hillyard. It was obtained and regularly available. I don't remember all of the particulars about it, but I just know it was there. There may have been other things used to treat the outhouses, but I don't know what they would be.

Mr. Frederick: Let's take the opportunity now to list your brothers and sisters, and their birth dates and death dates.

Mr. Canwell: Well, I think I have all that, fortunately;

the blessing of my son Jon's endeavors. You want to start with the children in chronological order?

The first child was Maybelle. On records and the death certificate they've spelled it Mabel, but it was Maybelle. Maybelle or Mabel was born July 29, 1898, and her death occurred when she was 13 months old, which would have been in August of 1899. My father was in Alaska at the time. The death of this first child was a tragic thing for my mother. I can remember her saying later that she was never completely happy again in her life because of that tragic incident.

Well, that was the first child and the next one was Claude Adelbert Canwell. His middle name was from my father's name. He was born January 10, 1900, and died in 1954 in Spokane.

James Lee Canwell or Jim was born August 27, 1901, and died in 1978 in Spokane.

Pearl Adele Canwell, the fourth child, was born August 27, 1904, and she is still living. I believe she's now 86.

I was the next one and I was born January 11, 1907, and I'm still partially alive.

Carlton Demeritt Canwell was born July 27, 1909, and

he is still living. He has always used the name of Carl.

John Mellen Canwell was born November 16, 1914, and he is still living.

Walter Joseph Canwell, commonly called Joe, was born July 26, 1916, and is still active. Carl, John, and Joe were born at the place up in the mountains.

EDUCATION

Mr. Frederick: Well, let's begin the process today of exploring and walking with you through the school process. You've mentioned that the first school that you attended was Beaver Creek School?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, it was. Beaver Creek School is up at the north end, northeast end of Peone Prairie, about four miles from our mountain residence. My older brothers and sisters started to school several years before I did because of the great distance and the problems of getting there. As a small child I was kept at home until I was almost eight. My schooling was not really neglected because during that time all of their homework and books and things were brought out and my mother had some books that I used to learn to read and write.

Some of the hillbillies decided somewhere along the line that their children needed some education, so they would enroll them in this school. You might in the first grade be sitting next to somebody 15 or 17 years old who was in the first grade. Anyway, because of the hazards, the distance, and the difficulties, I did not enroll when I would have been eligible, but I did learn to read and write and maybe developed a habit of self-education that was both good and bad in my life. When I did enroll in the country school, I spent one year there and then at that time we moved into town.

Mr. Frederick: How did you feel about that at the time? Your brothers and sisters were going to school, you knew that other children within the area were going to school, and then you were not allowed to go to school. Were you for that or against that?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I felt a little deprived. I'd see them going off to school and it sounded like fun and, of course, I wanted to do that, too. But I adjusted to that thing. They left for school very early in the morning and we waited for them to appear in the evening. Sometimes it was dark before they'd get home and, as I mentioned earlier, my mother was very worried until she would see them finally trek up the hill to our place. You could hear coyotes or wolves howling off in the distance and it was an unsettling thing. But answering your question, I did want to go, but it just wasn't possible.

Mr. Frederick: What did your mother tell you? What did she say to you about that?

Mr. Canwell: Well, she explained that it just wasn't possible for me to walk and keep up with them over that great distance and therefore she would take care of my schooling at home until I was big enough to go. She worked pretty hard at that. She helped me learn to read and write and recognize the letters and formulate them myself. I probably did much better than if I had been taught where one teacher had all of these kids of varying sizes and mentality and a real tough problem.

That in itself is a story, about how they get teachers there and lose them. Because it was way out in the sticks, the teachers would be somebody who couldn't find work or hold a contract elsewhere, so they'd settle up there. But in spite of that we had some very fine teachers.

These teachers had a hard job of discipline because, when they had a man teacher, eventually he probably would get in a knockdown fist fight with one of the students who was bigger than he was. That student might be in the first or second grade. Usually the male instructor would decide that was not for him and he'd leave.

And then they'd get a woman teacher. Then the process was a little different. The teacher lived with the inhabitants near the school. They took turns living at one house for a month and then at another house and usually it was a rugged situation because these hillbilly women were always jealous and worried about an educated female living in the house. So that might have an almost tragic ending. It was not usual for the teacher to finish a year in teaching there.

I remember one teacher, a young woman who came from quite a well-known family in Spokane, a business family. As soon as she settled in at one of these residences, the wife, of course, went through her belongings and snooped to see what was there. The things she found led her to say that no decent woman would need that sort of paraphernalia and she made a great big issue of it. This poor gal finally left in midterm up there. But that was always an unstable situation, the teaching was. They did have some good instructors.

Mr. Frederick: Considering what you speak of and considering that there were families up there that were concerned with regard to education, was there ever a movement before World War I to pool resources and build a teacherage cottage, potentially right up against the schoolhouse?

Mr. Canwell: No, that never occurred down at the Beaver Creek School. Years later a school was built at the site of the old abandoned logging camp, along with a cabin to accommodate a teacher. But this was not done at the Beaver Creek School. The housing problem for the

teachers was solved by rotating them around with neighbors who were near enough to the school to make it possible to walk to school.

Mr. Frederick: When was the new schoolhouse built?

Mr. Canwell: Well, that was built after we left the hills. The precise date I don't know, I just know that it eventually appeared and they used it for a meeting hall, as well. I think they called it the Mount Carlton Town Hall. Then that was made into a school and they developed a little cabin or dwelling for a schoolteacher. But that happened after we moved out of there. I was aware of it because I would go up there periodically over the years and spend time at the place.

Mr. Frederick: You have mentioned that you were approximately eight years old when you had the opportunity to walk with your two older brothers and sister to school, which would place that about in 1915. Do you remember lobbying your mother to attend that year?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, I think that I always bugged her about going to school, because that was activity. They had lunches packed up and they were doing something unusual and I was not a party to it. So I think I complained about it and was anxious to start school there.

I so well remember my first day in that country school. I recall this teacher, a woman teacher, a very able person, going to the blackboard. There was a big blackboard all across the end of the room and she had a large stick, a pointer, which she used for various things, sometimes to rap a kid over the head. But, anyway, my first recollection is that everybody was required to be seated. She walked up to the blackboard with her pointer and had the alphabet across the top of the board. She stated her name and said, "I am your teacher. You are here to learn." And then went from there. She was a very stern disciplinarian and it was a contest all the way with these varying-sized and temperamentally maladjusted children or at least with some of them. She had quite a job. But she handled it very well.

I can think of the first thing that I did when I was permitted. I zeroed in on the little library they had. I still remember the book that fascinated me and I grabbed it. It was the *Bears of Blue River*. I've never seen it since, but it was the first book that I'd had access to outside of the few we had at home. That fascinated me and whatever was readable there I read. If you wheedled enough you could take a book home over the weekend, but it was not the usual thing. I just have some vivid memories of that first year at school. We used to play ball, a sort of hide-and-seek thing, where you'd throw the ball over the school and the one who caught it would run around and try to hit somebody with it. We also played a crude base-

ball there. I once was up to bat and was hit smack on the nose with a baseball and it flattened my nose and it bled profusely. It was a horrible situation and nothing much could be done about it. This is an occasion I described previously, when my father's medical training came into use; that night, my father took a pencil-like probe, and probed up my nose and readjusted the bone structure with his fingers. He got me to breathing and my nose straightened up.

Mr. Frederick: And what was the schoolteacher's name?

Mr. Canwell: Miss Jennaway.

I'm trying to think of some of the highlights of that first year at school. Some of the children I've remembered all my life.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, let's describe that schoolhouse, beginning with the exterior and then describing the interior?

Mr. Canwell: It was a one-room building. I suppose the floor area might have been 30 or 40 feet by maybe 50 or a little more. It was not large. It had a heating stove in the corner just a little beyond the entrance. When we first started there it had no porch. They built one on later, a covered porch and entrance, but when I first went there it had only a doorway and a rock or a log step that you stepped on to accomplish the difference in elevation.

Inside there was this large stove with a metal screen partially around it. And there were pegs on the wall to hang clothes. There was a reason for the clothes pegs being close to the stove because a lot of the children would come there through rain or snow and their garments would be wet. They dried the clothes by the stove that was used to warm the entire school.

[End of Tape 8, Side 2]

Mr. Canwell: I remember so well so many things about my interest in the school there, because I had entered school late. So I had not been deprived by this process. I was so anxious to attend and so overwhelmed with the fact that there were a lot of children there, and a teacher authority, and everything else, that it has remained in my memory and mind. Some of the children who went there and their names I don't recall, except that they were part of that scene.

The seating was made up of double seats with a desk. It was all one unit and you shared this desk with somebody else. There were at least two rows of these double desks the whole length of the room. At the north end there was an elevated area, I suppose a foot higher than the general floor and the teacher's desk was up there.

A large blackboard covered almost the whole end of the room. That blackboard was used to outline the day's work and various things to give the emphasis that the teacher wanted to various things. You'd go up there to do your arithmetic to prove that you could add and subtract. It was done on this blackboard with the whole school observing you. This has a tendency, I think, to make you want to do it right; it was not a bad thing. The school was one room with eight grades.

I remember particularly the children who were constant disturbances or troublemakers or funny, but it was an unusual experience that's remained with me all my life.

Mr. Frederick: What was the reader that you used out there?

Mr. Canwell: At the school? I would have to be guessing but think it was probably a McGuffey; somewhere along the line, they were McGuffey Readers. I know they became common, that they were generally used and I would say that's what it was, but I couldn't be positive.

Mr. Frederick: Who were some of the fellow students that you remember?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I remember the Fuher family who had the sawmill right near there. They were considered among the elite. There was a little daughter and she was a doll. Her name was Irma. I'll never forget her. I would have taken her home to keep.

There was the Neff family and they were important to us because they lived about halfway between our home and the school. We used to cut down through the woods and follow the old railroad track to get to school. Where we were intersected by the main Greenbluff road, the Neffs lived back in the brush. They had a mailbox and a gate there. If we arrived first we'd put a stick up there on the gate and if they had been there first and went on to school they'd leave a sign. So usually we tried to rendezvous with the Neff family. There were two or three of them; we had a very pleasant association as children.

There was another family right near there, the Deckers. I remember them, and the Bachelors. The Bachelors had several girls and were nice, pleasant people. Over the years I've kept track of some of them, or the family has. They had a no-good father who eventually was arrested for child molesting or something, but the children were good children and they were part of the children there.

There were others I remember quite well, but not necessarily by name. There was a young man, and he was definitely a man. I believe he was one of the Forkers. He walked about twice as far as we did to get to school. He was back up in the far hills toward Mount Spokane. He or his family had decided he should get some education.

One of his older brothers had been to school and been out and around the world, but this boy had not had the benefits of that.

He came to school and I can remember he carried a lunch in a lard bucket. They had five-and ten-pound lard buckets in those days which were commonly used for lunch buckets. He would have his bucket stuffed full of fried potatoes, pancakes, and that sort of thing. It was enough to feed an army. He'd sit down and eat the whole works. Anyway, he was one of the man-sized students in the lower grades there. He was no problem, no trouble; he was obedient, not too bright an individual.

Then there was the Jack family. They lived down toward Spokane on Peone Prairie, but near the school. They had four or five kids. One of the children later worked with me in the Spokane sheriff's office.

I remember at a Christmas affair, which was one of social events that would occur, they'd have a Christmas party and show, in which the kids would participate and the families would come in to observe and be a part of it. The Jack family sat down in the front row; they were in stair steps and one of these hillbillies was quite an artist, Benny McLaughlan. Sitting back of them, he took a piece of paper and scissors that he seemed to carry with him and he cut a silhouette of this stair step group of children. It was a priceless thing. I wish I had it because anybody seeing that would recognize the Jack family.

They were quite civilized people, too. They were not strictly hillbillies. We called them flatlanders. They lived down on the prairie and had farms that were more prosperous. It was fertile soil and they raised lots of hay and other farm crops.

There was a German family, the Mildus family. They had, I think, three children. Their father was a tyrant. If the weather permitted, they were kept home from school to work and about the only times they ever showed up in school were when it was snowing or raining or the weather was such that they couldn't do any work at home.

Mr. Frederick: How many students were in that room that first year?

Mr. Canwell: I would say there must have been around 30. I would guess that would be about what the room would accommodate and the seats were all filled. There was pretty faithful attendance there. Of course, the kids wanted to get away from home and get to school. There was a lot of activity, there were children to play with and things to do.

Mr. Frederick: I was going to say that must have been very exciting for you to be around that many children.

Mr. Canwell: Oh, it was, because other than my brothers and my sister I saw almost no children up there. The hill

folks who had children lived back up in the hills and we had no real contact with them. We just knew they were around or would see them going back and forth to the store once in awhile. But we had no one to play with except our family.

Mr. Frederick: What did you pack for lunches?

Mr. Canwell: Well, my mother was forever making bread. We always had good bread and quite often rolls or cookies. The sandwiches were more often than not made from peanut butter or peanut butter and jelly. We bought peanut butter in these five-pound pails, which eventually became lunch buckets. Usually those were used by most everybody for lunch buckets. If we had fruit, there would usually be an apple in the bucket. Another thing we always had were dried apples which we often munched on the way to school. But the lunches were quite adequate.

Mother was a genius at frying chicken. I suppose the health nuts now would think that was not good for you, but that was one of the desirable things that I remember all my life, my mother's frying these pans of chicken. It seemed like she'd take all day doing it. They'd be patiently browned and tasty. The leftover chicken became part of the lunch.

The hill people were pretty strong on pork and bacon. They all had pigs, so for butter in their lunch, they might use lard. Such things would be abhorrent to my mother and so we didn't do that sort of thing. These hill people had meats and wild game.

Mr. Frederick: With regard to Claude, James, and Pearl, walking with them to school, walking with them back home after school, and being with them during the daytime that year at school, how would you rate them as chaperons or supervisors or helpmates of you?

Mr. Canwell: They were always very protective, and particularly protective of my sister. It would have been very perilous for anybody to give my sister any trouble. In addition to that, this little dog that I mentioned always accompanied the children to school. You needed no more protection than this dog. But the boys were protective. I think they were excessively fond of my sister.

I don't remember where I fit in the pecking order, but I was there and had no problems. The older boys were quite athletic and self-sufficient and could well take care of themselves in the altercations that would all automatically develop in the schoolyard. I don't recall that at any time as being a problem.

Mr. Frederick: Claude and James would run together and then maybe it would be you and Pearl?

Mr. Canwell: No, we pretty much stayed in a group, particularly on the way to school. The older boys would sometimes have to slow down a little to keep us in sight or in orbit, but it was not a matter of them stringing out and leaving us. We stayed in a group pretty well. There was the constant feeling that there were some natural hazards such as coyotes, cougars, and so on; they were always around.

Mr. Frederick: You have mentioned that you had the opportunity to spend that year there and then your family moved into town. What were the circumstances for that move?

Mr. Canwell: The circumstances largely had to do with my mother's health. She developed some problems and it just seemed advisable to move into town. The living up there was too rugged and there were no medical facilities. I remember she had some infection in her ear that required attention. It was a combination of those things that prompted us to move into town.

[End of Tape 9, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: Was that looked forward to with anticipation, with excitement?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I think that we, the children, all looked forward to it as a move in the right direction. Now, keep in mind, or you might have in mind, that over the past years we had occasionally moved into town and spent the winter. I don't remember just how much of that there was, but there was some. The older boys were more aware of the excitement of living in the city than Pearl and I were because we were so small when we went up there. But I think that we looked forward to it with some pleasure and anticipation.

Mr. Frederick: Did you take the household furnishings with you?

Mr. Canwell: No, we took only some of the furnishings.

On this trip, the final trip to town, we did take some furnishings. It seemed to me that it was all loaded on a wagon, sort of a hayrack and we had furniture and kids sticking out all over. We went into town and to a house that had been pre-rented for the purpose. Of course, I remember that well and the address of the house.

Mr. Frederick: And the address?

Mr. Canwell: The address was 1014 East Courtland on the north side of Spokane near the Longfellow School where we all enrolled in public school. That was a treat and an innovation in that we were about six blocks from

the big school, but terrifying to me—I'd never seen so many children. I got into a room where I knew nobody and felt very ill-at-ease. They gave me a test, suspecting that maybe I didn't belong in the first grade, and they put me in the third grade.

Mr. Frederick: And this would have been your first experience out of—

Mr. Canwell: Out of the hill country that I'm knowledgeable about.

Mr. Frederick: Out of eyesight, earshot of your brothers and sister?

Mr. Canwell: Yes.

Mr. Frederick: It was a room devoted to a single grade?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, there were individual rooms for the grades or half grades. As I recall they had 3B and 3A, 4B and 4A and so on. Usually the room was occupied by the half grade. There were that many students. I sought out a seat in the back row, way back in the back corner and the teacher looked around and said, "The little boy in the back corner, you move up here." She put me right in the front row. I guess that she felt I needed observation.

Mr. Frederick: Well, that was probably good for you, to do that. She probably saw that, sensed that, and brought you up front there to begin that.

Mr. Canwell: Well, I was quickly moved out of that room into a third grade room.

Mr. Frederick: Did you see in your mother a recovery after that move?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, she recovered from that ear infection, which was a pretty serious thing. She recovered from that and I remember she had some very necessary dental work done. That's another thing that was missing in the hills; there were no dentists. Other than getting a tooth pulled you couldn't get much help. And the tooth pulling in our case was done by my father, who had the tools for it that he brought back from Alaska. He could pull a tooth, but he had no facilities for filling one or doing that sort of work.

Mr. Frederick: Did you have indoor water?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, we did have in this new dwelling. We also had indoor plumbing, which was a very desirable change. There was a large woodshed that was filled with wood. By that time, my brother, Jim, who was usually

charged with the responsibility of getting the wood cut and in, would round me up and see to it that I did a good share of that cutting, splitting, and carrying the wood. I was very small at that time. The house was comfortable. It seemed to me it was about four rooms with a small but adequate kitchen. And a bathroom. That was a great luxury.

Mr. Frederick: Did it mean something to you that those around you didn't have to carry water, that actually there was water inside that house?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, all of the major chores like that were gone. The one of cutting and carrying in wood remained. But we still had the cow and my mother always insisted on milking it. I think she and the cow were the best of friends.

A woman living next door had Shetland ponies and a fancy rig she used to show around town and at the fairs and things, and that was just fascinating. The streetcar ran right by our residence. So we were within touch of downtown for, I think, a nickel fare.

Somewhere along the line, my father went to work for the city or the Washington Water Power Company or had something to do with transportation, but I don't remember the particulars on it.

It was a new world. There were just all kinds of things to do that you never did before. I remember at school they used to have a drummer who'd beat the drum and you'd form in lines outside and march into school to the beat of this drum. The children would be in line at the first drumbeat. That drum fascinated me, I wanted to beat that damned drum. Anyhow, I'd go home and I'd get a washtub out and beat a rhythm on that and the neighbors were all wild. But that was part of the big move.

Another feature of school in Spokane at that time was one of those horrible things they called a truant officer. If you didn't show up for school, he was likely to go track you down to see if you were ill. In our case, at home it was pretty hard to get away with sick call because my mother was a nurse. The minute you indicated you didn't feel well enough to go to school, she had her thermometer out and the bag to give you an enema. So you went to school. I remember this truant officer, who was a bugaboo of the school. If you got out of line, he was after you.

Anyway, I was terrified of that first day in school: new people, a great number of kids I didn't know. Each class or each room had more students than we had in the hills and that was quite a terrifying thing to me. I was always kind of a timid youngster.

I remember the principal at that school was Miss McWethy. She was a scarecrow type tyrant, I thought, and if you misbehaved you got sent to Miss McWethy's office. That was a terrifying experience, too.

Mr. Frederick: And your schoolteacher's name in the third grade?

Mr. Canwell: The one when they moved me into the third grade was a Miss Russell. She was a doll. Her major thing was penmanship and the language, but particularly penmanship. You spent hours making ovals and up-and-down lines that were supposed to turn out good penmen and I think it did. That sort of thing never stays with you or seldom does, but she gave us an inordinate amount of penmanship and a great deal of math.

She was a stickler on two or three things. I remember you'd have a spell-down, and one of her things was spelling. She'd give a prize which was a box of candy for the one who could spell down the room. A time or two I got that. There was a girl in the room who came up second and there were two prizes. I was pretty infatuated with this little scarecrow and I gave her one of my prizes, with the blessing of the teacher.

But I did very well in the spelling and penmanship and things that this teacher required. Unfortunately it didn't stay with me, but I think it was a help in my life in whatever schooling I had afterwards. Then about that time we moved to another school.

Mr. Frederick: And you passed through the 3rd grade at Longfellow School, 1916, and you said that summer that you moved?

Mr. Canwell: Well, shortly after that. I'm sure I went through the 3B and 3A and the 4B and I believe 4A, so I may have been there two years. About that time, we moved to a larger house, which was not far from there. It was on Perry Street and the next street over was Hogan. The house that I was born in was right back of this house that we rented. In fact, the house I was born in was built by my father. He was a pretty good carpenter.

Mr. Frederick: How much larger was this house on Perry Street?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, it was a great deal larger. There must have been four or five bedrooms.

Mr. Frederick: And by that time your mother had been fully recovered and everything was back on course?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, as far as I recall, she was fully recovered and as usual unbelievably busy. She still had her sewing machine and still did the family laundry and things like that. But it was easier with hot and cold running water and things that we'd never had before up on the mountain.

Mr. Frederick: It must have been absolutely heavenly

for your mother to be in there.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, it was in two or three respects. It also enabled her to go to her church, which was a very important thing to her and which she missed in the hills.

It was a great thing for my mother when she got to town and she could get us cleaned up and starched and take us to church. I can remember that quite well. The streetcar that went by our place delivered fairly close to the church, which was within walking distance of the streetcar line, so we could just get on the streetcar and a few blocks later we were down to where she could go to church. It was on Spofford and Nora. I think that was the principal thing that entranced my mother, plus the fact that she could do a little shopping.

I can remember she still went to salvage stores to buy things that she could make over. She made me one of these short coats that was made from an overcoat that she got for that purpose. When you turned the fabric inside out, it had blocks or checks in it, a very attractive thing. I was the envy of everybody in my class when I wore that thing. Well, that's one of the things she could do. She could go find fabrics and materials to enable her to utilize them in sewing for the children. She did a great deal of that and did it very well.

Then she also had acquaintances in Spokane with whom she could visit. The Gwyder family were early day pioneers. Major Gwyder was a Spokane institution almost. He dressed like Buffalo Bill in white buckskins and had a mustache and goatee like William Cody. He had been the Indian agent at the Colville Reservation. When he retired, they lived in Spokane and Mrs. Gwyder, a very fine person, was a lifelong friend of my mother's. It was the grandson who shot me through the arm. But she had acquaintances like that who were, oh, boon companions. She had good friends, quality people whom she loved and respected and it was reciprocated.

Mr. Frederick: How long were you at Perry Street?

Mr. Canwell: I doubt that it was much more than a year. It must have been a very short period because part of the time I continued to go to the Longfellow School, which was quite a long walk. Then I think in this framework of time I enrolled at the Logan School, which was where I was required to go. I went there a very short time until we moved over on to the south side of the city.

I went from the Logan School to the Edison School, which is in southeast Spokane.

We rented a large house there. Again my mother was trying to buy this place, but we did not have sufficient funding to make the required down payment to shore up such a deal, so sometimes we worked at that, but it didn't materialize. And on leaving the house on 3rd Avenue where I went to the Edison School, we finally bought a

house and double lots east of there in the east end of Spokane and lived there for quite a long time.

Mr. Frederick: Okay, now, the address of this?

Mr. Canwell: The one on 3rd Avenue was 2606 East 3rd. And the one that we moved to from there was on Greene Street, which was 743 S. Greene, I believe. It was on Greene and Hartson, which interchanged and became 7th Avenue somewhere along the line; it was one and the same street. We bought that place and it was not as large as our previous house.

[End of Tape 9, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: We're talking approximately 1919, 1920, when you were out there at the purchased home on Greene Street. Were Claude and James still at home?

Mr. Canwell: Claude was part of the time. He went away to work during this period of time as I recall. He worked in a mine up at Chewelah. I remember that because he fell and was injured there quite seriously. Then a good share of the time he was home. He became a painter and worked at that trade.

I can remember the house on Greene Street. There again we had a closed yard and there were pine trees. We set up a tent to give more bedroom space. My brother was there and I don't remember what Jim was doing at that time. It seemed to me he was away somewhere along in that period of time, but he was there, too, part of the time. I remember more firmly that Pearl and I were there and Carl, Joe, and John. It seemed to me that Jim at one time was doing something that took him away, but I just don't remember.

Mr. Frederick: Now, what would they be mining up there?

Mr. Canwell: I think it was a magnesite mine. And I think it's been in operation over the years until recently. I believe it exhausted what they were producing at that time. It was a matter largely that at that time employment was hard to find. The opportunities were not abundant, so you took a job at whatever you could do at that particular time and age. He should have been in school, but high school for those two boys was more or less neglected, because it just couldn't be afforded.

Mr. Frederick: And when you were on Greene Street you were going to Logan School?

Mr. Canwell: No, the Logan School was on the north side of the city. When we were living on Perry, I entered the Logan School, and on the move to the south side, I

attended the Edison School.

Mr. Frederick: And how far from home was Edison?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, four or five blocks, it was a short walk.

Mr. Frederick: And what grades did you attend there?

Mr. Canwell: I was in the fifth grade there. I remember that distinctly, partly because I had this wonderful teacher. Again, a delightful person, she was pretty, gracious and just a lovely person. I can remember after we moved on Greene Street I also continued there even though that was out of our area.

Again we had a cow. I used to have to carry water out to this fool cow in the morning before I could go to school. She must have had a bad tooth or something. We had to warm the water. She'd drink and drink and drink and I'd hear the first bell down at the Edison School, so finally I'd bring a bucket of cold water, which she couldn't handle and I'd take off for school, lickety-split, running.

I remember one thing distinctly because on the way there was a woman who had a large garden. It must have covered several blocks. She raised a lot of beautiful flowers; peonies and things. And I remember hopping over the fence and gathering some of these flowers and running on to school and giving them to my teacher.

After this happened a time or two, this woman with the principal came from room to room to see if they could find the guilty little boy. She said that this little boy jumps over the fence and picks flowers and runs away. So the principal and this woman went from room to room to try to identify this boy. When she showed up at my room I just about fainted. Here was the bouquet right on the teacher's desk, looking beautiful. And the teacher says, "No, nothing like that happened here." So you can see why I always loved Miss Lynnblom, a beautiful blonde. I wonder where she went.

One of the blessings or the pleasures that occurred in the public schools, along about the fourth or fifth grades, you got to take manual arts, carpentry. So suddenly you were able to do some work in that area. I enjoyed that very much and partook of it.

There were customs in the school in those days. Kids settled their difficulties in a fight out in back of school. If you had difficulties with somebody, sometime after school a whole bunch of the children would gather around while you settled this. It was just the custom of the time. And a big kid didn't pick on a little one. They didn't permit that. They do now. Half a dozen will gang up on one child. But that wasn't permitted. It wasn't part of the ethic. And you learned to defend yourself quite well.

There was one thing which I learned at the Longfellow

School. One family that we knew, the Ackles family, lived right across from Longfellow. This one boy was quite an expert in boxing. And he took me under his wing and taught me not to swing haymakers, but to draw a bead on your opponent and smack him in the nose and that would end the fight. And it usually worked that way. I was in several of those altercations at the Longfellow School. You established your pecking order that way somehow.

But I found that this rascal who was training me wasn't being honest. He'd go to some other kid and tell him I said I could lick him. So soon we were hard at it, but this friend and sponsor of mine was, I think, on my side. He taught me what little I ever knew in that area and he taught me well.

The same thing more or less occurred at the Edison School. There was a lot of this squabbling and fighting among the boys and it would eventually end up in a confrontation out in back of the school. One time I got thoroughly trounced by a fellow who became quite a well-known doctor. He, too, had been trained. Anyway, I got my comeuppance there.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, let's spend some time thinking about the effects of World War I on the community as you perceived it?

Mr. Canwell: In thinking of World War I, one of my strongest recollections is that there were great shortages of food and staples and that started even before we left the hills in 1916. You couldn't buy white flour. You couldn't get sugar. My mother would make biscuits or bread using shorts and bran and maybe just a little flour in it. We didn't have sugar and we depended on honey, which was often gathered from the wilds up there. We quite often had a sufficient amount of honey for sweetening.

There was no coffee or tea available for awhile. I can remember my mother browning grains in the oven to make a substance to create a sort of coffee—something like Postum. It wasn't the best in the world, but it was something. That was a result of the shortages. I'm not sure that some of these weren't created as a conditioning, a mental conditioning, for people to adjust to the coming war and its demands. I think that was a factor, but there were shortages and we were very aware of them. As we moved on into town and a major war developed, there were increased shortages.

At school we learned to knit little squares that were made into blankets and sent off to the military camps, or allegedly that's where they were going. I suppose I could still do that knitting if I tried to. We'd make these little squares. And the people were supposed to supply the yarn and the needles. That was a project at school; you'd make these things to be a part of the war effort.

Then you were aware that people were being drafted and going to war. By the end of the war, we had moved to the house on Third Avenue. And I can remember that there was a false armistice that occurred. It must have been right around the 1st of November. Everybody flocked downtown to celebrate the thing and then the word came through that it was no armistice, no dice. So in about ten days, the 11th of November, the real thing happened and we went through this process again.

I can remember walking downtown from Third Avenue, which was nearly three miles out of downtown, to watch the celebration. The town went wild. People were yelling and hollering and singing and dancing in the streets and everything else. I well remember that, and I don't know where they got their booze. I think it was during Prohibition, but there was quite a lot of booze flowing. It was probably Mount Spokane moonshine. Anyway there was a lot of noisy celebration and I remember that well.

Mr. Frederick: Where was that centered in town, that celebration?

Mr. Canwell: It was pretty much down on Howard and Riverside, the center of the city at that time. Most of the celebration and revelry were along in that area on Riverside and on Main. There were a lot of people down there. I don't know how many, but they were just going wild. It was such a wonderful thing that this war was over and their sons and fathers would be coming back to help. So it was a delightful and memorable occasion.

Mr. Frederick: Did you accompany your parents, or did you have an opportunity to go down there by yourself.

Mr. Canwell: I went down there myself with a neighbor boy, Harry Underwood, who lived across the street. I'm not sure that we walked. We may have taken the streetcar because it went right by our house. We got downtown for both celebrations, the aborted armistice and then the real one. We just observed what was going on, we were not old enough to participate the way the grown-ups seemed to be doing. But we did watch the thing and it was interesting and important enough that I've never forgotten it.

Mr. Frederick: It must have been a magical, mysterious thing to see that many adults behaving that way.

Mr. Canwell: Well, yes, it was. I had never seen anything like it. They were all down there going wild. They were singing and yelling and hollering and dancing and doing all kinds of things. They were just letting go. And people had been pretty much uptight here for the years of the war and the shortages. Many people were working at war-related industries, and women were starting to work

who never had, and many such things. It was a release of a tremendous amount of tensions and a hope that everything was going to be wonderful.

My mother and father were not down there. They did not go down. I don't remember where my brothers were. I don't remember them being home then, but they must have been.

Mr. Frederick: What type of war industries were in town?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, there wasn't a lot here. Many people went over to the coast to work in the shipyards. That seemed to be one of the major endeavors and war-employment areas. I think there was a certain amount of fabrication of things here, but I don't know what, other than the production of lumber; a lot of that was in demand and shipped to the coast and overseas.

Mr. Frederick: Did your father benefit employment-wise from the war?

Mr. Canwell: No, I would say not. I don't know just when he went to work for the Park Department, I think it was later. I don't remember precisely what his employment was at this time. Wages for common labor did not increase during that period, in this area anyway.

Mr. Frederick: Did you detect within the environment and amongst your friends a hardening toward local Germans or German children, that type of thing?

Mr. Canwell: I was aware that there was a great deal of hysteria and resentment of the Germans. There was an enormous amount of propaganda. My mother was more inclined to counter that because she knew a lot of Germans and they were among the most stable immigrants to America. She had known many of them and did not quite buy all the atrocity stories. So within our family those things were not as evident or as much of a problem as they might have been with a lot of others.

My mother was all of her life very aware of the painful things involved in discrimination. In their early life down at Walla Walla they were Scandinavians and Protestants moving into a French Canadian Catholic community. The feelings were very strong and bitter between these people, because they did discriminate. Well, my mother always resented that sort of thing. And that probably goes back to that time.

We never could use slang names for ethnic groups: blacks, Bohemians, various people we knew. My mother always seemed to have an affinity for those families and knew them and liked them. She was not one to buy all the war hysteria and propaganda. She was not pro-German, she was pro-American, but she wasn't carried

away with the thing either.

My father was not inclined to get emotional or hysterical about the war, or to condemn somebody because they were German. But he was a patriotic individual. He believed we were in a justified war and therefore took the reasonable attitude on it, and was not inclined to be condemnatory nor abusive toward Germans because we had known too many of them personally.

Mr. Frederick: Did you detect that feeling in your peer group? And did it come through school, organized school activities?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, there was very much feeling and very much conversation about the horrible atrocities the Germans were committing. Much of that war propaganda is a technique of war, something that is used to inflame people and engage them in 100-percent activity in support of the war endeavor. That was very evident. German—it was a dirty word. I can remember they ridiculed the Kaiser's spiked helmet and all of those things. There was a great deal of that, not in an organized sense. It was just that people absorbed the propaganda and believed it and naturally felt that their country wouldn't be in an unjustified war.

Mr. Frederick: What was the source of electric power during this period?

Mr. Canwell: One of the early industrialists here, Mr. Post, built a dam down near what would be Lincoln Street, just north of what was Main then, which they now call Spokane Falls Boulevard. He put a turbine in there and started marketing electricity. Then that electricity provided the motive power for the streetcars. At first, and I think at all times in the streetcar operations, they were propelled by electricity, which was clean and reasonably quiet.

Such paving of the streets as occurred was of brick. We had the Washington Brick & Lime Company, which was one of the early industries here. They produced a vast amount of brick.

[End of Tape 10, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: Where was the brick factory located?

Mr. Canwell: The major one was out east of the city, in what became known as the town of Fairfield, I believe. It's probably 20 miles out. They also had a major downtown office, which was right here in this building where we are sitting.

It was one of the original businesses located or situated at this corner in this building. This had been an early-day hotel and then when that went out of business, Washing-

ton Brick & Lime had offices where they sold bricks, tile, and sacks of lime.

Mr. Frederick: Were they the only outlet for bricks?

Mr. Canwell: As far as I know. They had pretty much a monopoly on it. It would not have been an easy business for someone to enter without adequate funding. One of the people who developed that was named Fosseen. One of the Fosseens (Neal Fosseen) is still around. He was for a time mayor of the city. But anyway, that was one of the early industries.

There were, of course, sawmills where lumber is produced and planed for marketing. And there was a large market for it here as the city rapidly developed. And so, lumbering and milling were important and, of course, there were granaries and flour mills. There were early-day flour mills here, substantial ones where a lot of flour was milled from the available wheat produced in the Palouse country south of here, which is still a major wheat-producing area. There were dairies.

Mr. Frederick: Was there any, in let's say 1920, was there any manufacturer in town?

Mr. Canwell: Oh yes, and I'd be hard-put to quickly say what, but there was the fabrication of lumber products, box making.

Another company that developed here was the Riblett Tramway Company where they sold tramway equipment all over the world. The same company still supplies ski lodges and ski areas with that type of equipment. That was an industry that developed quite early.

Mining was becoming an important industry in the Coeur d'Alene area at this time and things that were essential to mining were sold and distributed from Spokane. Since it was the railroad center, that sort of thing was distributed from here. It was then moved or transported by various means up the Coeur d'Alene.

And the Coeur d'Alenes, of course, provided money and customers for a great number of bars that Spokane had at one time. I heard it said that at one time Spokane had more bars and saloons than any city in the world. Anyway, this was the dropping-off place for people going West and they were surging out to the mining and lumbering, and Spokane was the nerve center for all of that in the eastern part of the state.

Mr. Frederick: Where were the rowdy streets at in 1920?

Mr. Canwell: Trent Avenue was the roughest, toughest part of it, but it also extended up onto Main Avenue. There were bars and saloons and houses of ill repute all over that area. It was a rough, tough town in its early

days.

There were characters like Wyatt Earp and his brother who settled in here. Many people of that type were surging West for the mining and the money opportunities. Many people like the Earps have been falsely glamorized in the movies and storybooks, but they were a couple of cardsharp killers, pimps, the riffraff of the earth, and they were tough, unscrupulous people. Both Wyatt and his brother were here for a time. One of the Earp brothers, who was also a famous gunman, had a quarrel with his woman companion. When he got mad at her, she was frightened and ran up the street. He shot her in the back. Now, that's the kind of characters they were and there are myths prevailing about such characters. They were unwholesome, no good, worthless characters who deserved killing, but there was nobody or seldom anybody around who wished to tackle the assignment.

That was part of downtown early Spokane. The early industries were hotels, bars, restaurants and such. The famous Davenport Hotel wasn't built until about 1913 or 1914. One of the early and rather famous hotels was the Spokane Hotel. Then there was one down in the skid row area called the Chicago Hotel. It interests me in one way in that George Henricksen used to come in and work in the restaurant there in the winter to earn money for his homestead payments, taxes and other things. The Chicago Hotel was a famous hotel. The Coeur d'Alene Hotel was developed by men whose families made fortunes in the Coeur d'Alene mines. That hotel is still standing. It's sort of an old people's hotel now.

But there were numerous buildings like that and after the fire a lot of the Spokane businesses rebuilt very quickly. The John W. Graham store, for instance. He had a more general store. It wasn't all bookstore but eventually became quite well-known throughout the Northwest for its dealership in books. They retailed textbooks and office supplies, as well as maintained a wholesale source for bookstores and dealers.

There were early hotel people like the Deserts who had the Desert Hotel. And, of course, Louie Davenport who had a restaurant and some sort of a hostelry before he built the Davenport. Nobody knows where he got all his money. My suspicion is that Jim Hill staked him—the railroad tycoon—that he staked him to build the Davenport, but I don't know that to be true. I know that a tremendous amount of money went into the building and furnishing of the Davenport Hotel.

We had a famous architect here, Kirtland Cutter. He designed the courthouse, city hall, the Davenport Hotel, and many of the other quite famous structures here.

Mr. Frederick: Where was the business district?

Mr. Canwell: The heart of it was at Howard and Riverside. That was the center of the city and it fanned out

from there. If you go down Riverside, you come to what was the western perimeter where the Cowles family built the Spokesman Review building, which still stands. There were stores, retail, and mercantile stores all along the area; clothing stores, drugstores like the Murgatroyd and others there. And there were famous bars down a block or two like the Jimmy Durkin Saloon that survived the disappearance of many of the others.

There were theaters, a number of theaters. Spokane was noted for its early cultural interests and achievements. I think I was calling your attention to the fact that at one time the New York Philharmonic Orchestra, the whole orchestra, spent a summer out here. They entertained down at what became Natatorium Park. At that time it had a different name, Twickenham Park, I think. But this whole orchestra stayed here and I think part of it came back another year.

My wife's mother was very prominent in music circles in Spokane at that time and took lessons from one of these famous pianists. Marsinah, my wife, was remarking not too long ago a reminiscence where this famous teacher was teaching Marsinah's mother some difficult piano passages and she wasn't getting one of them quite right. I think she was about 15 at the time, and this instructor said, "Edna, if you could only fall in love." Well, anyway, he felt she was not getting the musical message. But that's just a sidelight.

There was a great interest in culture; there was a great deal of new money here. People built elaborate homes. They imported the finest art and silverware and furniture. And so Spokane was not all primitive. It quickly became a cultural center.

Some of the elements remain—the families' descendants and some of their homes, but in most cases the old-timers, the original founders, have died off and gone into the sunset. But it was a famous town and people who had pioneer spirits or were rugged types were heading this way. They came when the railroads were put through here; they came in droves. So Spokane rapidly grew and became somewhat a commercial center; the shopping center for people all the way up to the Canadian border and down south toward Walla Walla and Colfax.

That was partly based on the fact that the early railroads came through here. Power was developed from the river producing the electrical energy they needed to have electricity when most people didn't, and lights, streetcars, and other things.

Mr. Frederick: Which theaters did you attend as a child?

Mr. Canwell: The theaters were largely on Main and Riverside and on what is now Post Street. There were some on Washington Street. There were small theaters all along here that had movie projectors and when I began to

remember it, they showed the new movies. There were more elaborate theaters like the Auditorium and Hippodrome and the Orpheum that had Vaudeville. So there was quite a bit of that. These show troupes were constantly coming through Spokane, vaudeville type entertainers.

Mr. Frederick: Did you have the opportunity to see legitimate Vaudeville?

Mr. Canwell: Not very much. I had no particular interest in it and the access that I had to theaters was to the movie houses. I think the Vaudeville presentations were largely in the evening when I wouldn't have been downtown anyway. But the movie theaters ran all day. Those that had the large stages and all and put on the vaudeville shows also had movie screens. But the famous artists of that time all came through here.

I know one of them originated here and this, I think, is a kind of an interesting story. Laborers who would fan out to the orchard areas in the Spokane Valley, over in the Okanogan, Wenatchee and such areas would come to Spokane. They were recruited here and then were taken by whatever carriage means they had to these areas to work the harvest. They'd meet down on what is about Browne, or Bernard and Spokane Falls Boulevard, which was Trent Avenue at that time. But they came in there from all directions and they would wait to get employment and be taken to these places.

There was one radical who came there and he immediately was trying to organize these people into acts of espionage and strikes and sabotage against their employers. His harangue was against the bosses and how they were exploiting the workers. He told them what to do when they picked apples. He said, "Take their money, but puncture the apples with your thumbnail, so it will destroy their crop." This man who did that was a character by the name of Monty Blue. He became famous in the movies.

But the way that happened, the police in Spokane came down and, when he was giving one of these harangues, grabbed him, took him over across the railroad tracks and put him in a boxcar. They nailed the door shut and he never got out of the boxcar until he was down on the perimeter of Hollywood. When he got out, there were signs there "Help Wanted"; they wanted common laborers to build props for the early movies.

And Monty Blue went over there and offered to hire on as a carpenter. He had no tools, so the question was raised, "You're supposed to have a saw and a hammer," and so on. And the director said, "Well, if you're a carpenter, we'll get you some tools and we'll put you to work." And they did. Monty Blue was there but a few hours until he was standing up on the lumber pile gathering the people together and haranguing them against the

bosses.

I don't know which one it was, but D.W. Griffith, or one of the other great producers, came over and watched this procedure and he went to Monty Blue and said, "You're no carpenter, but you are an actor." He said, "Report to work in the morning." So Monty Blue became very successful and quite a famous actor. He even had a limousine and chauffeur of his own. And this great friend of the wage slave became notorious as one of the worst employers in the film colony. Well, that was Monty Blue; he originated in Spokane but he was nailed into a boxcar here and they shipped him out.

There are other characters from those early days who made news and history. I think of some of them that I can't date too well, but I remember their names. There was Dashiell Hammett who became a famous mystery writer. I think his books about *The Thin Man* are still sold. Well, he was a Communist, one of the early Communists. We didn't know much about that in those days. He lived at the Davenport Hotel and wrote some of his copy there and made a great deal of money. But he was one of the dedicated radicals who was caught in the net down in the Hollywood hearings by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

There was one famous baseball player, Lefty Grove, who originated in Spokane. That goes back a long way. There were some boxers and fighters, and other athletes.

You asked me about the industries in Spokane and in this area. As I mentioned before, the saloons, the gambling emporiums and houses of ill repute were a major part of the city. One of the early-day madams, Cora Crawford, had a fancy team of horses and a rig that was very expensive. When the city would have some celebration like the Fourth of July parade or something, she'd wheel her rig with all of her fancy girls in it and it would join the parade. All the women of the community who knew who she was were infuriated and the men would stand there grinning. But that was part of the early-day history.

Mr. Frederick: What movie house did you attend?

Mr. Canwell: There were three or four of them that were operated by a Mr. Stillwell. There was the Casino and the Lyric, the Rex, the Unique; and there were others. Of course, there were the larger ones, the Auditorium, the Hippodrome, the Pantages, and the Orpheum.

I remember that they had player pianos that had roller music on them. They'd start this thing and it'd play this music. They had those in the smaller theaters, too. There was music with the screen performances that had word lines on it. They did not have at that time, at first, audible tracks on the movies.

But I don't remember just when sound first began to come in. The first movie I saw here was down at what

they used to call the Annual Apple Show. They had a performance area that was built under the railroad overpass and that was all filled up with entertainment booths and displays of apples and fruit. There were big columns covered with these things. There were dairy displays. I remember they used to have a refrigerator display where they had a carved cow, a whole butter cow there. The first movie I ever remember was shown there. Charlie Chaplin was the performer. All I remember is that it bounced and danced, but we thought it was wonderful.

From that point on, these theaters began to develop around town and they would, I suppose, accommodate 50 to 100 people, maybe a few more in some of them. They had sloped floors where one seating could look over the other and without too much interference. They gradually disappeared when more advanced entertainment came in, TV and so on.

Mr. Frederick: Would that be a Saturday routine for you, to go to a show?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, it might be, because I couldn't do it during school times and I used to try to find my way downtown when I could on a Saturday. If it got dark before we came home, the streetcar, one type of them, had a bar over the back and if you sneaked on there you could sit there and hold onto the trolley and get home. I wouldn't have dared tell my father I was doing that, but I'd sometimes do that. Usually to get downtown I either had a nickel to ride the streetcar or walked down. But quite often I'm sure I rode the streetcar down.

Then there was a time, and it seemed to me it was during the war, when they developed some automotive transportation. They had buses, kind of crude buses with probably a dozen seats in them. And they called them jitneys, because it was a nickel fare. I may have been inaccurate on the streetcar, it may have been a dime and you bought tokens; I don't remember just what the fare was. But the automotive transportation was called jitneys because "jitney" was originally a slang term for a nickel.

Mr. Frederick: Would you explain that again to me, where the term jitney comes from?

Mr. Canwell: Well, that was a common name; a slang name for a nickel coin, was "jitney." And so, when these cars, these automotive buses started operating and they were competing with the electric facilities, they charged a nickel. They therefore were called jitneys. I don't know how long they lasted. They lasted for a time, but it was not a commercially profitable venture. It seemed to me that came up during the war and why I don't know, but they were here for a time.

Mr. Frederick: Today we're going to continue the insight into Spokane and we would be talking circa World War I and Albert's childhood memories of these various locations. We will begin with the first home that they occupied in Spokane.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, the first home we occupied in Spokane after returning from the hills was at 1004 East Courtland Avenue.

Mr. Frederick: And this would be the first dwelling that had indoor plumbing and water?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, at that house we had indoor plumbing and water.

Mr. Frederick: Out there were you on a sewer line?

Mr. Canwell: No, I don't think that any of the north side, unless it was the immediate north side, had any sewer facilities. We had cesspools and the cesspools were routinely emptied. Workmen with a team and a tank would pump these cesspools.

Mr. Frederick: We're talking circa 1915 north side of town. What landmarks would be noted within that region?

Mr. Canwell: Well, the only thing that I remember north of the city of any significance were schools. The north side had its share of them and also had libraries. Carnegie endowed the library system very early. We had an abundance of very adequate libraries. The buildings were well-constructed, they're among the city's most durable structures. They're attractive and were well-built and provide an unusually good library service.

Mr. Frederick: And there would have been one of those libraries in walking distance from your home?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, usually that was the case. I can't remember a time when we couldn't walk to one of them.

Most of the books I was interested in were reference books or were too heavy to carry out. I was always interested in the encyclopedias and all that sort of thing, some of which, by this time, we had at home. I remember my mother buying a set of *World Books*. It was hard to afford anything like that, but she had a feeling that was a good investment. So we did have what we could afford, but it was very limited.

[End of Tape 11, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: Were there more automobiles in the other areas of town as opposed to the north side?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I would say there was a significant difference. The automobiles were not as much out here in the east end and the southeast end as they were in other parts of the city. Where the more wealthy or affluent people lived there were more automobiles.

Our neighbor did have a nice automobile and she used to invite me to go for their Sunday ride with them. In those days the pavement on East Sprague ended at what is now Dishman. It was about five or six miles out, which was a Sunday drive in those days. These people lived right across the street and their name was Underwood. The boy Harry Underwood was a close companion of mine at school and at play, and Mrs. Underwood was a very wonderful woman. Anything that Harry had, she tried to see that he shared with me and that included our Sunday rides. I remember that automobile. It had side curtains. It was sort of a luxury in those days if you had curtains on your car. They did. I believe it was a Case automobile, but anyhow it was a wonderful contraption and we would go for Sunday rides, but Harry and I attended the school here together.

Down the street a little ways, probably right across from the school, the mayor, -Funk, lived there and his son was again one of my school companions, John Funk. That relationship, friendly relationship, extended on into the future.

Beyond that was apple country. They called the main street there the Apple Way and some of the local businessmen still incorporate that name into the name of their business.

Mr. Frederick: So that would have been all orchard?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, out in the east end of Spokane it was largely orchard and berries. Later they produced quite a lot of cucumbers for salads or pickles but apples were one of the main industries at that time. The Apple Show that was held in the fall was held under the railroad overpass downtown on Trent Avenue. That's now been converted into a park, but the depots were down there and there was a railroad overpass, a steel structure, and under this overpass they would install these side shows and apple displays. It was at one of these that they had the sculpted cow made out of butter. And the apples enclosed the columns, a very colorful thing. The first moving picture I ever saw was down there at the Apple Show.

Mr. Frederick: What was the apparatus for showing that? This apple celebration was out-of-doors?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, but under the overpass. It was a steel railroad overpass with four or five railroad tracks there between the Union Depot and the Great Northern. It was all covered trackage and was elevated about, I suppose, thirteen feet and the show was developed under there. It

was quite a big thing when you came to Spokane to the Apple Show. That was the big seasonal event.

Mr. Frederick: During that time, circa World War I, was there a regional fair to compete with that?

Mr. Canwell: Yes. There was the Spokane County Fair which was an annual thing with a race track, horse races, and harness races. There were the usual side shows and amusements that go with such things: the merry-go-round and chute-the-chutes and all that sort of thing, the regular circus side show/fair installations. That was an annual event but, before that became quite so prominent, the Apple Show dominated. The county fair sort of phased out the Apple Show as apple production in the valley became more limited.

Mr. Frederick: I was going to say I think that whole valley and the orchards kind of got phased out pretty seriously.

Mr. Canwell: Not many apples out there now. A sidelight on my mother. She grew up with horses, raising horses, and she loved the fair. She'd go to the fair and I always knew where to find her. She'd be leaning over the rail watching the horses run. She never bet any money, just loved the horses. And she particularly liked the harness races. That was one of the things she got out of the Spokane County Fair.

The Apple Show came and went and it was a great thing in its time. All of the merchants, of course, participated and advertised their thing at the Apple Show.

Mr. Frederick: Down there by the railroad tracks, with that apple celebration, is that where the IWW Free Speech Movement was mounted?

Mr. Canwell: A good deal of it occurred right in that area. Now among the first organizers of the Industrial Workers of the World, or Wobblies, in this area were Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and William Z. Foster. They were organizing in this area way back in about 1913, I believe the date is, and were thrown in jail at that time. The Wobblies were organizing in the lumber industry and became very strong in this particular area. They centered their organizing activity down where loggers stayed in the cheap rooming houses. The restaurants down there would cater to them, although in some cities, such as St. Louis, the Wobblies would unload from a boxcar en masse, descend on a restaurant, eat, and leave without paying.

Mr. Frederick: Now that IWW activity was in the east side on the cusp of that orchard area out there?

Mr. Canwell: No. Most of this activity occurred right downtown. Right down here in the heart of the city. When I mentioned the Apple Show, that was downtown here, too. That was right down in the heart of the city, what we called Skid Row at that time, where the lumberjacks and the miners hung out, but more lumberjacks than miners.

Mr. Frederick: Okay, so the train trestles and whatnot and the Apple Festival, apple celebration was held annually underneath those trestles. What your saying is that was—

Mr. Canwell: That was right downtown. Right down the street here from where we are on Pacific & Washington. And maybe a block to the west. The center of it was about Bernard and Washington and that area. That's where the workingmen's hotel and restaurants were. The apple production was out in the east but the show and the labor activity was all downtown. It was under the trestles and the major depot, the Union Depot was there, and part of it. Right north of that was the Great Northern Depot. That tower still remains as part of the Riverfront Park down there. But the Union Pacific Depot and the major part of the Great Northern installations have been removed for the park.

[End of Tape 12, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: About the time that I was enrolled in the Sheridan School, two friends of mine from the church who were sons of Mr. Martin, a photographer in Spokane, had a little five-wheeled cart. It was the envy of every kid in the city. Their father bought it for them not because he particularly loved his children but he had a sense of advertising, a very keen sense.

These two friends of mine were going to a private school out on Orchard Avenue in the valley, and they said, "Well, why don't you come along." So I did. Not only did that cart fascinate me, but among other things, I was not enamored of Sheridan School which I had been attending, because I was a stranger there.

So I went to school at their private school out in the valley for about two weeks before my mother knew that I was doing it. And somehow or another she sort of approved of it and that continued. That's an interesting phase of my life and development that occurred under those circumstances.

It clicked with me because I didn't particularly feel friendly to continuing at the Sheridan School. I didn't know anybody there although a couple of my brothers were going there. But it just didn't appeal to me and at the psychological moment these boys came along with this cart which was the wonder of the city and said, "Well,

we go to school out there, why don't you join us?" And so I did.

My mother was sort of softened to the thing when she realized what I was involved in. It was the Adventist school out on Orchard Avenue. So that had some merit in her eyes, but how we could afford it was something else. I enrolled out there and was geared to go into the sixth grade, which I did. After a short time, they moved me into the seventh grade which was in another room. And that again was part of the progression or digression of one Canwell. But anyhow they gave me tests and felt that I was geared to the seventh grade. One of the boys owning this cart was in the same sixth grade and I suspect the teacher moved him to get rid of him. But anyway they moved the two of us into the other room in the seventh grade.

Mr. Frederick: Do you recall their names?

Mr. Canwell: Oh yes, very well. They was Robert and Berwick Martin, and both of them later became very successful businessmen, millionaires, I believe. One of them, Robert, became mayor of Grants Pass, Oregon, and developed an automobile company there that made him rich. The other one, Berwick or Brick, went into the flooring and hardwood business and developed a southern hardwood and became very wealthy, very comfortably so.

I was, I think, a competent student, a potentially competent one if you kept me guided along the lines that interested me. There were those in my family and among my teachers who wanted me to become a doctor or a preacher, clergyman, and neither profession particularly appealed to me, not enough so that it became a compelling or driving force in my life. History intrigued me and I read a great deal. Fortunately, I had teachers who recognized that there were certain areas that I was interested in and they tried to direct me or help me in that way. We had good teachers there. They were dedicated people and well-trained. They had the religious incentive that helped drive them. But, anyway, they were good teachers and they did their best to make something out of me and were not very successful though they worked at it. The school was something that my mother approved of and my sister, the next year, started out there, went there and continued after I left the school.

Mr. Frederick: What was the name of the Seventh-day Adventist school then?

Mr. Canwell: It was commonly known as the Orchard Avenue School, but it had a technical identification. What that was I don't remember. It was some sort of a secondary school.

Mr. Frederick: You, as a young student, could see a difference between Edison and the Orchard Avenue School in terms of curriculum?

Mr. Canwell: Well, yes. The curriculum particularly, because suddenly you get into an enlarged area of learning. You leave the area of mathematics and grammar and things that you get in the lower grades and you get into an enlarged learning field. I remember the first thing that I had there was Old Testament history. Well, it interested me...intrigued me. I probably should explain that I always have been a skeptic. If I'd been around in doubting thomas' time, I'd have been right with him because I always wanted proof. I wanted evidence. I wanted to know that what I believed or was being taught had substance and was factual. And that was particularly true in my religion.

When I got into the field of study like studying Old Testament history and New Testament history and later the journeys of Paul, I was critically examining the faith that had been laid on me. And I became more than convinced that my mother knew what she was talking about. That opened a field of thinking and study and research that I never would have acquired otherwise and never would have encountered.

Along at this time, I had teachers who recognized that I was interested in history and they would recommend historical novels and history books. When I'd be given a new textbook, I'd read the whole thing the first day or two and be bored with going over the same material. So I did have teachers who recognized that something should be done about that and they recommended a lot of reading and study for me that I wouldn't have had otherwise. Their efforts were directed pretty much in the field of religion, of theology. I can remember books by William Stearns Davis. Books on early Persian and Greek history. And *The Life of Martin Luther*, *The Friar of Wittenberg*, but they were books that this teacher recommended that I read. When I wasn't perusing at that school I spent a lot of time in the libraries of Spokane. I did what interested me and not particularly what somebody else thought that I ought to be doing. I probably was not always wise in it but it was my nature. I pursued my own thing.

The climate and atmosphere at the school was to go along with the commitment and persuasion of the Adventist belief and religion. I think that I accepted that pretty thoroughly. I find myself today still a little bit superstitious about working on Saturday. It's inherent. It becomes deeply ingrained in your thinking and I suppose that's true of any religious persuasion. I see my wife doing things in her Catholic faith and persuasion that are almost ritual but they are part of what she has learned and I think that was true of my religious exposure. Coupled with that was a very inquisitive mind. I pursued it from that standpoint and, of course, the compelling things in a

person's life, particularly a young person's, are very important.

In my case I was more inclined to evaluate them from a logical standpoint than the average person was, to review the religion and its effect upon my brothers and sisters; some of them didn't take to it at all and some of them became quite convinced and persuaded and worked at it. In my case, it is hard to define. The Mormons have what they call jack Mormons. They believe it but they don't practice it. Well, that's somewhat the effect that my religious exposure had; that is, the technical exposure at the school. You learned what you presumed to be the compelling facts behind the religious persuasion. You learned them and argued them and it became a part of your life; what part depends somewhat, I suppose, on what sort of a person you are fundamentally.

Mr. Frederick: And you were there two years?

Mr. Canwell: I was there two or three years, somewhere along in there. It was, of course, my mother's hope in my family and others that I would continue my formal education, which, of course, I should have done, but I was a restless sort. I've never quite been able to analyze it entirely, but I took to finding things to do that took me to other places. I retained largely my faith and convictions, but I was never thoroughly convinced that I wanted to pursue the formal phase of my education, not enough that I did anything about it—so I neglected it. But I think I probably acquired an education of a sort over and above the formal approach to it.

Mr. Frederick: There are several questions I'd like to ask you at this point in time and what sparks that is the Orchard Avenue School experience that you had.

At that point in time, as through a child's eye, what was your perceived obligation to God?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I suppose that my perception of God and then my responsibility in that direction could be narrowed down to what my actual faith was. I'd been convinced that there was one God and that the philosophers seemed to be confused about the primal causes. I was convinced that they were not as wise as some of the Hebrew philosophers and lawgivers who recognized that no man could, with his own mind, fathom God. The Jewish and Hebrew thinkers just solved that by saying, "In the beginning, God." Well, that pretty much sums up my thinking in that area.

Then I recognized that there was a system of ethics outlined that encompassed pretty much man's relationship to God and his responsibilities there, and his responsibilities to his fellow man. I think that I accepted the Ten Commandments as encompassing that thinking and those responsibilities. And how I was influenced to

relate to that...I don't know whether to credit my religion with that or just my family background. Both my mother and father felt that a person had a deep responsibility to be a decent person and citizen and that encompassed a certain amount of responsibility. I suppose that just became a part of my life and thinking.

Then as relating it to my religion and my God, my feelings ebbed and flowed there as to what my responsibilities were. For a time, I went to work for my denomination and then decided that the religious life wasn't for me. Not because I had any great collision with it, but that wasn't what I wished to do. And that's about where I have stood all the time. I've felt that I have a greater responsibility at all times than I have discharged and I think that's the nature of man. Beyond that I don't know.

I didn't wish to enter the clergy and I didn't particularly care for the field of medicine. At all times I had the feeling that I wanted to write. So in relating that to religious belief or convictions, well, it's all part of the process. You are what you think, pretty much, and what you believe. If you believe strongly enough, you put it into action.

[End of Tape 13, Side 1]

I always thought of God as a person, as a being. And my mental relationship was not one of great fear or anticipation but rather accepting the things as they were, as they came about. I have no strong feeling that I was entitled to anything that I didn't earn, participate in. And I never felt that God or my religion or faith or however you want to define it owed me anything. I always felt I had a responsibility that was laid on me pretty strongly all of my life; that I have a responsibility for myself and those around me and I had no right nor reason for expecting any supernatural assistance. I don't know whether that answers your question or not.

I suppose my political faith was also my religious faith. I was taught very early and always that in the words of Jefferson: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights. That among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," and that is about all that you have a right to expect. You have a responsibility to see that you and others enjoy those rights and privileges and I think that's essentially a part of my religious faith. It encompasses what I feel to be inherent in life and man's rights and his expectations, his right to expectations. I find no way of separating my political faith from my religious faith and I have a little difficulty with my responsibilities, of course. But I think that was a part of my total upbringing.

I was a little amused and touched by a letter that I found in my searchings here the other day, from my

mother, when I was elected to the Legislature. I don't know whether she understood the full significance of what I was involved in, but she took full advantage of the opportunity to advise me a little bit, too. One of the things she covered was the errors of drinking. She brought that out in a reference to a friend of mine who had died while I was there. And then she advised me that she didn't understand everything that I was doing, but she knew that what I would do would be the right thing. Well, it was a touching letter because it was what she always did.

She never separated anybody's responsibilities from their acts. They had to be associated. And I suppose if I was to try to draw a picture of my faith it has to be a part of my environment and my family and, you know, what you inherit, your genes and everything else. You have no real control over it. You have decisions to make, but in general I suppose there are responsibilities and opportunities placed before you somehow or another, and you respond to those somewhat according to your convictions and your character and abilities. You blend them all together and try to have an alibi for your failures.

Mr. Frederick: At that point in time, what was your perceived duty with regard to nation?

Mr. Canwell: To the nation? Well, both my father and my mother always laid a strong sense of responsibility on us toward abiding by the laws. Earlier I described the routine of my father on election day. He was up early and shaved and dressed and went to vote. He had great contempt for anybody who did not discharge that responsibility and appreciate the fact that the opportunity was there. He was down at the polls when they opened. And he dressed for the occasion.

Well, it was just part of citizenship: We have a respect for our country and its founders and we learned about them. We just had it impressed on us that we had an obligation to be good citizens, that we lived in a wonderful country and had opportunities that other people didn't have and that we should make the most of it.

Mr. Frederick: And again at that time what was your sense of duty with regard to community?

Mr. Canwell: Community? I don't recall anything specific except that I remember that when I started to school out at Orchard Avenue they didn't have much of a library. So I set up a program to get all of the students there to gather up all the books that their families would part with and I took them down to Clark's Old Bookstore and traded them for books, encyclopedias, and other things that we could utilize out at the school and improve their library out there.

Well, that's a roundabout way of saying that I discharged a responsibility. That was the sort of thing that just came naturally to me because of my interests and my family background; you do something about the situation that isn't the way you want it. And you do it within the framework of what's legal and available to you. So beyond that all I know is we were always instructed to obey the law and have respect for it and along with that, too, the public officials as far as you were able to do so.

Mr. Frederick: At the Orchard Avenue School, were there instructors that stand out in your mind's eye?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, there were two or three of them. If I were to enumerate the great women in my life, there were several of them, one of them particularly was a teacher out there, Mildred Ford. She took a great interest in me and my sister and another girl who was a friend of ours. She went to great lengths to help us and to instruct us properly and aid us in every way. And she retained an interest in us all through our lives. I see her once in awhile now; she's in her 90s and I tell her I have to keep her alive because she's the only proof I have that I ever went to school. But, anyhow, I think of that teacher particularly.

There were several others there who were outstanding. One was an elderly woman who had been a teacher and was called back to help out there, because they were short of staff and short of money. And this was one of the teachers who I felt was very influential with me. She was the one who guided me to a lot of the reading I did and saw to it that I understood what was available, the source materials, and so on. I'll always remember her—Mrs. Roberts. I don't know anything beyond that; her name and the fact that she was helpful to me and interested in me as an individual.

But Mildred Ford stands out in my mind as one of the great people whom I knew in my life, one of the people who had great influence on me.

Mr. Frederick: With regard to referred readings, was this associated with your study of the Old Testament and the New Testament?

Mr. Canwell: Well, somewhat, but history in general. Back in those days we had a standard text, *Meyers General History*, which I just devoured when I got to that phase of it. Along with that I had the readings recommended by this teacher, Mrs. Roberts, and to some extent Mildred Ford. But Mrs. Roberts was the one who directed me toward the historical reading, things that she knew that I was interested in and would like.

Mr. Frederick: And those two teachers stand out in your mind?

Mr. Canwell: They're two of those who were out there. There were others there: Lyla Godfrey, who lived out in the Valley somewhere, Veradale. She was a very competent teacher and one for whom I had a great respect. I always remember a story that she told when I first went to school out there. There was some kid who was inclined to be kind of a bully. He was bigger than the rest of us and inclined to be a little domineering. He overdid it one day with me. We were playing "shinny," which was a game they played in those days with a stick and a can. I told this fellow that if he persisted in what he was doing I'd work him over with a shinny stick. This teacher said she and another teacher were standing on the steps of the school and observed this and one said to the other, "We'll have trouble with that one," meaning me. "But we didn't." I became a good friend of both of them.

It was an illustration that there were things I wouldn't put up with and one of them was being domineered over by some other kid or person. But those teachers, I think they were all good. I had a number of them out there, but they remain in my memory as very competent people, very sincere and dedicated. There was another one, she became a missionary in Ethiopia. I kept track of them one way or another over the years, regarded them very highly and felt that they contributed what they could to me.

Mr. Frederick: What was the student population?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, I don't imagine there were over 30 or 40 in the whole school. The classes were from the grades up through high school, the twelfth grade. That was another benefit that I liked. When I was bored with my classes, I could listen in on the upper classes and get a certain amount of instruction that wasn't intended that I have or it wasn't beamed to me, but it was there. So, I've listened to Latin and other things that were outside of my curriculum, but available and enjoyed. There is a lot to be said for the old one-room schoolhouse, in spite of the fact that they've gotten entirely away from it. It gives room for development of the inquisitive or brighter child who is a little bored with what's going on in his own class.

There were things that occurred there that in later life had some effect on me that were not planned. There was a woman who drove the school bus to and from downtown to Orchard Avenue. She had a youngster or two in the school and later she became an official in the Communist Party. When I came back to Spokane in about 1938, she was the first person I encountered. It was quite an interesting coincidence, because she became one of my leading informants in the community and she had been the bus driver at the school out there. Not very deeply religious, but a good person.

Mr. Frederick: She never attended, she just drove the bus?

Mr. Canwell: She drove the bus and her daughter attended school. I think she sent her daughter there to try to reform her. It's quite often the case in religious schools. The people who become exasperated with their children's conduct and activity think they may reform them by sending them to a denominational school. It doesn't work usually.

Mr. Frederick: Why doesn't it work?

Mr. Canwell: Because they have ventured into areas that create problems. They enter into practices and activities that cannot be undone and occasionally the religious environment might help them, but usually not. It just doesn't work.

Mr. Frederick: In what type of facility was this school housed?

Mr. Canwell: Well, mostly what they had was like...what was it the philosopher said: "The University is a log with a student on one end and a teacher on the other." Well, the "facilities" they had there were largely good teachers. They were competent and dedicated teachers, but their facilities I don't remember other than a beaten-up piano and playground facilities which were about what anyone could create. There was nothing particularly along that line. There was just a school with competent, dedicated teachers and children who ranged from dedicated to indifferent as you might expect in such a school. But in general they were good students who were going somewhere. They were going to continue their education. Many of them became doctors, teachers, and clergymen.

Mr. Frederick: So, the facility was actually designed for a school. It wasn't a conversion?

Mr. Canwell: No. It was a building which I think was built by the Adventists. It was a two-room school with a little development for classrooms in the basement. But it was designed to be a school and what they could afford and what they wanted. They wanted a religious school. The Adventists have always been strong on that. They go in a great deal for education and medicine and hospitals and sanitariums. They usually start out with colleges and work down. Instead, you'd think they'd start with the grade schools and work up, but they developed schools like Walla Walla College in this area. They developed high schools and they still do that and in Spokane they have a grade school. But they have quite a large high-school facility

down at Spangle. They bought the county poor farm and converted it to a school. They like to have a farming atmosphere in their schools wherever they can. Down there they have a dairy and a woodworking shop and that sort of thing, but they try to get their kids as far out of the environment of the city as possible.

[End of Tape 13, Side 2]

EARLY CAREER

Mr. Frederick: Today we're going to take the opportunity to continue the discussion with regard to the Orchard Avenue School experience and the first question would be: Approximately what year did you transfer from Sheridan to the Orchard Avenue School?

Mr. Canwell: I've been trying to place that accurately, trying to remember what my age was at that precise time, which would give me the year. I would say that I was probably eleven years of age when I transferred to the Orchard Avenue School and that would have made it 1918.

Mr. Frederick: That was in the fall of 1918 you had the opportunity to attend the seventh grade there?

Mr. Canwell: I began in the sixth grade there. There were two rooms, the first six grades in one room and the upper grades in the other. I started out in the sixth grade, but the teacher decided that I was qualified to go into the seventh, so they moved me across to the other room. That was done on the basis of examinations and other things and I think my general interests. I had a tendency to become bored if the class procedure was too routine and dull. The teachers were aware of that and moved me into the other area, which partly may have been good. Some of it was not so good because there is a period in your grammar development that occurs in the fifth and sixth grades and does not carry over into the seventh. So, maybe I missed a little in that area, I don't know.

Mr. Frederick: And you were there two years and in 1919 did you then move into the eighth grade?

Mr. Canwell: Yes. I hope those dates are accurate. I did proceed to the eighth grade and in that same room in which, as I think I mentioned before, there were the upper grades. It enabled me to listen in on classwork in other grades which I think was very helpful to me, and it kept me from being bored, too.

Mr. Frederick: Now between those two years, you didn't make one of your trips?

Mr. Canwell: No. Some time after the end of that year—

I would suppose it must have been about 1919—the brother of one of the boys that I knew at the Orchard Avenue School came by our residence on Greene Street and suggested that we go somewhere looking for work in the general direction of the harvest area. So we took off after I advised my father that we were going somewhere. I wasn't too definite about where we were going, but anyway he said, "Well, write," and that was it.

Mr. Frederick: And that would have been potentially the summer of 1919?

Mr. Canwell: It was probably 1921.

Mr. Frederick: And his name?

Mr. Canwell: His name was Osborne Shaw. Ozzie, they called him. It was just a happenstance that he came along. I agreed that we ought to go somewhere looking for work. So we went down into the Lewiston area. Someone down there was hiring harvest hands and they needed bundle-pitchers and teamsters and so I agreed to drive a team of the bundle wagon. I had enough knowledge or experience in that field to handle the horses, but I was pretty small, too.

[End of Tape 14, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: With regard to downtown, was there ever a time in your memory when horses predominated downtown?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I remember back in time when you just didn't see an automobile or if you did it scared the daylights out of the horses, which predominated in my earliest memories. There were hitching racks along the street. Some places, the rings had been imbedded in the granite curbing. Other places there was just the traditional western hitching rail or rack. But as the automobiles began to come in, it created havoc because the horses had a tendency to run away when some car would snort by or a horn honk, and away they'd go.

Mr. Frederick: Are we talking the years of World War I?

Mr. Canwell: Before that. By the time of World War I, the automobile had pretty much taken over. There were streetcars and automobiles and occasionally you'd see a horse-drawn vehicle. It might be a Chinese vegetable gardener, which was a part of the scene for quite a long time even after the automobiles pretty much took over. The 'John Chinaman' didn't adapt to the automobile very fast, didn't have a need for it. He could accommodate a horse and wagon and it took care of his transportation or

hauling needs.

Mr. Frederick: When and where did you see your first airplane?

Mr. Canwell: That is a hard one for me to pin down. I remember some of my early experiences with airplanes. Martin, the photographer, whom I mentioned before, whose boys went to school at Orchard Avenue, had one of the early airplanes in Spokane, a result of his super knowledge of publicity. I remember his orange plane. Finally the Martin boys arranged for me to get a ride in the thing and I was scared to death—but did so.

Then there were other planes along about that time, that vintage. They were very early. Lt. Nick Mamer, who became a famous stunt flyer, and pilot for Northwest Airlines, flew here. In 1920, he flew under a bridge at Lewiston, Idaho, while working for United States Aircraft Corp. I remember Nick Mamer very early.

The two or three stunt flyers locally were colorful characters who had these planes that were glued together with spit, I think. They'd do all kinds of daredevil tricks and loop-the-loops and people would go out there to watch, particularly during the fair; any time like that when they had the demonstrations. But those fliers were around and they did some commercial flying.

There was also balloon activity. I remember one of the eastend boys was quite a daredevil. He went in for that sort of thing. His name was Morrison. At the fair, he would jump out of a balloon and into a tub of water, this impossible thing. I remember the balloon activity mostly because of Morrison. They were highlights of the time. Airplanes were becoming a reality and balloons, of course, had been around for quite awhile.

Mr. Frederick: Where was the airport located?

Mr. Canwell: The airport was out east of the city at Felts Field. It's still there. It still serves as a commercial airport and I think is used by the National Guard. It's in east Spokane about five miles out Trent Avenue along the riverbank.

Mr. Frederick: With regard to that first trip, extended trip away from home potentially to work the harvest, did you have any idea how long that would take?

Mr. Canwell: No. No, I had no idea. That was never a part of a concept. We were just going to go somewhere and earn some money. This partner of mine was probably the most no-good person I ever knew. He would only work about a day or two and then would goof off until he was fired, wherever we went. We worked down there east of Lewiston. Many times I have said that in driving the bundle wagon the hills were steeper than a cow's face

and it was almost impossible. But I was very happy to be making some money. They had my partner out pitching bundles. He would disappear out in the weeds and never come back. Finally they couldn't put up with that and so along with his being fired, I left.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, how did you get from Spokane down there?

Mr. Canwell: I believe we took a bus. We started out trying to catch a ride and that wasn't very productive. I believe that we took a bus to Lewiston and that was about a hundred miles or more down the line.

Mr. Frederick: Did you stay within that area for several weeks or are we talking months?

Mr. Canwell: No, we went from there back to Kennewick. I did not mention that I had gone, prior to this, down to Kennewick and picked strawberries. I took time off from school in, I think, May. I went down there, the strawberry harvest was on and I picked strawberries and earned a little money, so at least I knew my way around there. Eventually my partner and I arrived in Kennewick. I knew people there that I had worked for before and immediately obtained work in the apple harvest. And, Ozzie, I don't remember what he did. He soon got fired whatever he was doing, but I stayed there for quite awhile. Then he came back and when the apple harvest was over we decided to go south, just see the country.

We then hitchhiked from Kennewick. We crossed the Columbia at Maryhill. There was a Maryhill ferry and there was a museum at Maryhill that Jim Hill had built for Queen Mary of Romania. I remember passing that. We did get rides, several different rides, and finally arrived down at Maryhill, crossed the river, and ended up at Hood River. Somebody was building a dam there—the Hood River Dam. It was an earth-filled piece of construction and they were hiring, so we hired on there. I was delighted with that job. It paid well and they had the bunkhouse and a warehouse stored with all kinds of blankets and cooking utensils, so we just had it made there.

I was assigned to work with the powder monkey, the man who handles the explosives. That at times was a little terrifying, but it fascinated me and I learned a great deal about the handling of dynamite. They moved the big rocks and stones into the landfill, or dirtfill with a rope ladder sort of thing. They'd get those around a great big boulder two or three times as big as this desk and then they'd have twenty or more men on each end of that and would roll that boulder into position. Then they had teams and fresnos for moving dirt. I enjoyed that and we were well-paid.

But again this bum got fired. He just wouldn't work. I didn't want to leave him—I should have. Then we went on down through to Portland and down through central Oregon and wandered, found our way from job to job, and eventually into California.

Mr. Frederick: How far south?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, eventually we went to the Mexican border and the highlights of the thing that stick in my memory were in San Francisco more than other places. I may have mentioned before that I was always interested in writing and writers. I was interested in Jack London and other writers who had become identified with the San Francisco, California, area. We stayed around San Francisco until we were well out of money.

I remember the old Chinatown there. It was really Chinatown in those days. Little cribs all along the way that people could go in and smoke opium. I believe it was not illegal or banned then. And the restaurants were not what they are today but were Chinese food restaurants. It was inexpensive. So we spent quite a bit of time along Chinatown and Fishermen's Wharf. I was back and forth to San Francisco, in later years, so many times that I find it hard to separate the occasions. But it became a point of interest, of fascination and fondness. I like the place.

Mr. Frederick: Did you see any of the effects of the earthquake?

Mr. Canwell: The earthquake occurred in 1906 and, no, I don't recall that there was any visible evidence of it. I knew about it because I had read and studied something about it in school at Orchard Avenue. The Adventists were vitally interested in the San Francisco area. They had started their first installations in that area and their prophet had advised them to get out of there and they did. About that time, the earthquake occurred. So they felt it was providential or a phenomenon that they couldn't otherwise account for. But I did know something about the San Francisco earthquake. I don't remember why I knew something about Amadeo Giannini, who set up the bank there, but somewhere along the line I learned quite a bit about him. San Francisco just became a part of my memory and my life.

Mr. Frederick: Why didn't you stay?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, I was restless, I suppose. I just wondered what was over the hill. We worked on a cattle ranch or two down south of San Francisco. One of them was owned by William Randolph Hearst—the Peachtree Ranch at Los Banos. We worked on another one or two there; on one of the famous Spanish grants there. They needed a cook more than they needed ranch hands. They

could use somebody to mend fence, so I said I could cook. And I did. Their past experience must have been horrible because they certainly liked my cooking.

I also did some of the fence work. We'd ride out along the fence with a bag or pocketful of staples and a hammer to mend fences wherever they were damaged. There were scrub oak trees all over the hillsides there and you'd sit down under an oak tree and watch the scenery. The only smoking I ever did in my life was there. I tried rolling cigarettes and smoking them. I suppose I smoked two or three and that was the extent of my smoking in my lifetime. My partner was always smoking.

Mr. Frederick: As you traveled down past San Francisco, what was the average wage for a fellow your age in those days?

Mr. Canwell: It was very low. It seemed to me twenty-five or thirty cents an hour was the maximum. There was a problem getting any sort of work. I think about that time the influx of people from the dust bowl or somewhere were coming in there. Whatever caused it, the natives were very anti-outlanders, so they got together and formed an organization called the Native Sons in which they agreed not to hire anyone other than a Native Son. I remember the bums had a song which had many stanzas, I just remember one of them:

The miners came in '49
And the whores in '51
And when they got together
They produced a Native Son.

Well, that was the outlanders' opinion of the Native Son organization. But the society was effective. You just didn't get a job if you were not a Native Son.

Mr. Frederick: Were you ever in danger?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, I suppose. Yes. This partner of mine was forever picking quarrels with people that would often generate into a brawl or a fight, but I don't think that any time there was any extreme danger. In such a squabble there might be a danger of getting knifed or hit over the head with a timber, but I don't recall that it ever came to that. I do remember one incident at Redding, California.

[End of Tape 14, Side 2]

Mr. Canwell: The incident at Redding is a little out of context because it happened before I arrived in San Francisco. It was typical of my experience with Ozzie, who was forever getting us in trouble. In this case, we went to a Chinese restaurant and for once he happened to be right. They were double-charging us or something and this created an incident that developed into a real knock-

down-drag-out fight. Where there was only one Chinaman when we went in there, they then came out of the walls from every direction. It was quite a hassle and I don't think we would have fared too well there.

I was trying to keep the owner or manager from using a revolver he had. I was holding onto him and going round and round. About that time the police broke in and I thought, "Now we're in for it." But it didn't work that way. These were the first Chinese who had come back to Redding after they had all been run out of town. The police and the people didn't want them there, so instead of arresting us, they arrested the Chinamen! They put us up in a hotel there for a week waiting for the trial. That was the only experience in California where I felt I was in actual danger. This man with the gun would have used it. It was a pretty hectic affair. That sort of thing is not native to me. It's not the kind of incident that I would ordinarily become involved in, but Ozzie had a genius for it.

Mr. Frederick: Whatever became of him?

Mr. Canwell: The last I heard of him he was living up in Colville, Washington, with about ten or twelve kids and that news involved his funeral. That's the last I heard of him, but there's probably thirty years or more that I never heard of him and didn't know anything about him. We finally parted company somewhere down in Southern California. He went one way and I went the other.

Mr. Frederick: And from Kennewick then you kept moving south?

Mr. Canwell: South, yes. We went up through the Yakima Valley and down through Goldendale into Oregon and California.

Mr. Frederick: Did Ozzie lose his amusement quality for you, finally, in Southern California?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I just finally became fed up on the never-ending series of problems and the fact that he didn't really want to work. He just wanted enough money to be able to assure that he had a can of tobacco and a few cents in his pocket. I wanted to accumulate a little reserve and it just wouldn't work out that way with him.

I remember things that were amusing, or are amusing now. In San Francisco, we'd go down to the ferry and take the ferry across to Oakland. We could do it for ten or fifteen cents. If you stayed on the ferry you could come back. The ferry was hauling grapes, so you could go down in the hold of the ferry and just stuff yourself on the most wonderful grapes in the world, so we'd do that.

I remember going over to Oakland. He'd agreed he was going to quit smoking, he didn't have money to keep

him in tobacco, anyway. On the way over he bummed a cigarette. That's the history of smokers. They're that way.

But we used to do that for amusement. You'd ride that ferry probably an hour each way. That was quite an adventure. San Francisco is still a wonderful sight as you view it coming and going across the bridges.

Mr. Frederick: You were in communication with your family?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, usually I would send my mother a card about the time we were moving to a new place. I often thought that my poor mother was probably worried to death. I don't know what I'd do if my kids were doing the same thing. But I was always busy and was doing things exciting and the opportunity to write was not a convenient thing. I usually had some postcards and things that I could mail, but I never was much of a correspondent anyway.

Mr. Frederick: So we're talking that you'd be on the road by at least 1919 up into 1920, possibly 1921?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, along through that time I made a number of trips down there. I couldn't at this time really put them all together in the proper context. I do know what I was doing. I would ship my nail stripper and hatchets to some place where I knew there was likely to be work and I'd go there. Then when that terminated it might be in the Imperial Valley or wherever, then I'd go somewhere else.

I worked at San Jose in a prune-packing place where I nailed the lids on the crates of prunes. They were loaded into boxcars there. I still see that company's product, the SunSweet Company. They produced Santa Clara prunes. That was a big industry down there before the electronic age, when they began to plow up everything or build eggcrate houses over what were prune orchards. But I can't for the life of me separate each individual trip. I can remember what my interests were. I did quite a bit of writing. I'd have notepads with me and would sketch what I hoped would be some immortal tome, that never was. That was my overriding interest—my justification for not going back to school, I think.

Mr. Frederick: It sounds like when you went down the Coast from San Francisco, you went through Los Angeles?

Mr. Canwell: We went down through the valley there, through Gilroy and that area. It was in that area down by King City, Gilroy, and Los Banos that we worked on these cattle ranches—and that's inland. At the time they were beginning to develop San Simeon and that intrigued

me. I don't know why I didn't end up over there, but we didn't—we went on down the other way. I remember going by the prison at Soledad. It's along in there somewhere that I split with Ozzie. I went on down to Glendale and the Los Angeles area. My friends, the Martins, were living down there by that time. So I had friends to see and visit and went on down to the Imperial Valley area along the border.

I worked at Yuma, Arizona, for awhile and then I'd be back at El Centro and in various areas, wherever they produced lettuce.

Mr. Frederick: If you were crating, you were following those harvests?

Mr. Canwell: Pretty much, yes. I knew that there was box-nailing available wherever lettuce was being produced. Down Imperial Valley would be long trains, a hundred cars at a time loaded with lettuce. Production there was just fabulous. It's unbelievable how much produce they developed. So there was always the availability to sign on as a nailer and it paid well. You could make two or three times as much nailing as anything else. So from that standpoint when I was working, my income was pretty good. I never accumulated much, I'd spend it before I'd go back to work.

Mr. Frederick: Of what was the work force made up in those days?

Mr. Canwell: The lettuce workers in general were Mexicans. But the nailers were Americans, occidentals. I don't remember any Mexican nailers at all. It was pretty much an exclusive thing; I don't know why there weren't any Mexican nailers, except probably the fact that you have somewhat of an investment there, too. The nail stripper and the hatchet you probably had nearly a hundred dollars invested in, and so it was not easy for that type of person to come up with that kind of investment.

Mr. Frederick: What's a nail stripper?

Mr. Canwell: Well, it was a contraption that you put the nails up in a tray and you shake it a little and they come down the end of these slots. There were four or five of these slots and the nails filtered down through there. We would buy pound cans of talcum powder, you sprinkle the talcum powder on the nails to keep the cement nails from gumming up your hands; the stripper was the essential part of the thing. Then if you didn't have the assembly bench, you built one, but usually in those places they had them. So where the Mexican laborers might be making two or three dollars a day, a nailer might make eight to ten, in that neighborhood.

Mr. Frederick: Which was fabulous money.

Mr. Canwell: Yeah, it was a lot of money. Of course, it was strictly seasonal, too. The lettuce harvest would last about so long and then you had to move on to something else, like I did at San Jose and the prune harvest.

Mr. Frederick: And did you stay in the camps?

Mr. Canwell: No. We stayed in inexpensive hotels in places like Imperial, El Centro, Yuma. They were not deluxe hotels, but the camps were strictly Mexican. I don't recall anybody among the nailers staying in those camps. And I don't know much about them. I don't think they were too desirable. They had portable toilet facilities and the flies were unbelievable. It isn't the sort of place that one would want to stay. The hotel accommodations were not terribly expensive. I don't remember what they were, but I could well afford them. The restaurants were typical of workingmen's restaurants. The Mexicans liked their own food and it's too hot for me. I think the reason they use so much red pepper is to counteract the flies. That may not be the reason they developed a taste for that stuff, but there must be some reason. I never could tolerate it.

Mr. Frederick: It sounds like, too, at that time in your life, you would have an opportunity to discover what girls were all about.

Mr. Canwell: Well, they were around. I was always sort of a timid character in that area. The girls were around and women around in the packing sheds, the apple-packing sheds. They were prominent on the prune-packing thing and the lettuce packing I don't recall. They were there and working, but things come down the assembly line and you didn't see much of the workers. I didn't stay long enough in one place, usually, to become well-acquainted. My taste was such that I suppose I passed up a lot of good entertainment.

I just don't remember that there were many important female-related incidents. I would take somebody to dinner or something like that or to a show occasionally, but not usually. You worked very hard; this nailing thing was very hard work, very demanding and there were not a lot of desirable, available women, certainly around in the Mexican area. You didn't mix with them. The Mexican men didn't look kindly on any approaches to their women. In the apple harvest a good many of the women were married. They were people who earned a little extra money in the apple harvest packing or picking.

There was a romance or two that still remain in my mind. Many years after being at Kennewick I was up at Tonasket. I was a speaker at a big meeting there and, walking out of the place, I saw somebody beaming and

smiling at me. It was a girl I used to date in Kennewick maybe twenty years or so before. And I would remember her. Anybody would. She was a charming person and played a wonderful game of tennis. Here and there, there were girls who made some impression on me, but usually I was on the move and nothing came of it.

Mr. Frederick: On that first trip, why did you return home?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, you become homesick. I did become homesick for the familiar things and your own people and people who know you and care about you, so you want to go back. It's an ever-present feeling. There's a compulsion to go on and see what's over the next hill and there's always a compulsion to go home. Usually somewhere along the line, I'd also go home. But soon I'd take off again.

Mr. Frederick: So what you're saying then is the fall of 1919 potentially up to 1928 you would work seasonally on the road. Was it always nailing boxes?

Mr. Canwell: That was what I did most of the time. It was a skill that was very profitable and in demand seasonally. I was just out for adventure at the time. I heard about a gold strike down on the Rogue River in Oregon, so I went down there and decided to go prospecting. I hiked down the wild Rogue River a hundred miles, fished and did a little gold panning. There were things like that which didn't involve box nailing. They were just adventure.

Mr. Frederick: Did you go back on the road after you worked in the bookstore?

Mr. Canwell: No. I never did. After I worked in the bookstore, I then worked for the publishing department of the Adventist Church. From there I went into newspaper assignment.

Mr. Frederick: What did you learn about the country, about the western portion of the country and what did you learn about yourself during those sojourns?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I learned a great deal about the country and people. You get so you understand people and the varieties and variations of people. I can remember times that I rode freight trains and stopped off in the hobo jungle. They have a society all their own there. They're cleaner than most people imagine. They'll have cans and pots and things that they cook in and they also will come there and boil up their clothes that may be vermin-infested. They're a society all to themselves and they are very exclusive. They don't put up with any

nonsense.

You get into one of these camps and everybody fans out and gets what they can. They get some vegetables and a hunk of meat or some bones or something to cook up. They make the famous mulligan stew, and it's delicious. I've done that sort of thing and have observed the people that were there. As I said, I was interested in writing and I tried to analyze people and figure out what made them tick and what their responses would be. Maybe it wasn't a scientific thing, but it was what I was doing. I would think about how I would write certain things.

[End of Tape 15, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: You said that you were keeping a notebook at that point in time—off and on I would assume.

Mr. Canwell: Yes. Sometimes I'd lose it but for a time I had quite a lot of that stuff around one place or another. When I was on junkets at home, I quite often would go up to the place in the hills. I would be up there and would again try to write something that I was satisfied with. More often I was exploring how somebody else wrote. I admired London's ability to develop suspense. I would feel that such books were the best textbooks, and next to that were the people that you observed.

Mr. Frederick: I can see that. But during that process if you were going to pursue that, you would need someone outside of the family to serve as an, in essence, a mentor to pass some of this material through, a short story or an article. Did you make any of those contacts?

Mr. Canwell: I don't recall that I made any significant contacts. I would meet people or work with people who were closely observed by me. They were specimens, they didn't know that I was observing and analyzing them and trying to figure how you would write something interesting about them.

Mr. Frederick: Why didn't you make that connection? Why didn't you explore that transition? You were in the field, you were observing quite courageously as a young person, as a child basically, but were you writing short stories—did you have as an objective to write short stories or to write a description? Were you doing that?

Mr. Canwell: I had not arrived at a place where I had a market, if that's your question. While I made contacts at times with weekly newspapers and other editors, usually they're pretty indifferent. They have no great interest. I remember a story where one of the great all-time writers applied for a job at the *Portland Oregonian* and was turned down because he didn't have any talent. That was

Rudyard Kipling. That's what you would encounter in the average newspaper setup. They didn't need help. They were very busy and very opinionated.

I remember one particularly down at Port Orchard when I made the trip down the Rogue River. The man there had a little newspaper. This was something I always hoped that I'd be able to acquire, a small newspaper. This man had a small newspaper at Port Orchard and when I came to his plant there was a sign on the door that said, "The editor is here every day, if he isn't fishing." And he usually was fishing. The ability to pursue that approach is more or less a matter of luck and maybe persistence, but it didn't work out for me. I did make contacts with papers and at times would think that some day I'll own one of my own and then I'll do it differently.

Mr. Frederick: I hear you. What I was asking about, if you wanted to become a writer, the profession or trade of writing, and you weren't in school how did you get feedback from your work? How did you learn to do that?

Mr. Canwell: My texts were other people's writings and—

Mr. Frederick: But that's their writing, that's not your writing and you would need someone outside of yourself to view what you were doing if you wanted to pursue that.

Mr. Canwell: Well, it's like any other art. You probably need a sponsor. There wouldn't be any Rembrandts or Michelangelos or anyone else if somebody didn't put up the money to feed them. That's a never-ending search, but I wasn't at the point where I felt that I was mature enough to demand attention. I was seeking the means of developing a talent that would be productive. But I think that one needs the element of luck to encounter somebody who is interested in you or sees in you a talent and wishes to forward that.

Mr. Frederick: So, what you're saying then is that you weren't necessarily looking for a mentor to review your work, you were looking for an apprenticeship where you could have worked in a shop, maybe some place in a paper.

Mr. Canwell: Looking for an opening and I was always looking for gainful employment. But in general it was not to be found in a small newspaper plant unless you were a printer or an operator or somebody who could set type, run a linotype machine. In general they weren't looking for brains. They thought they had them. My experience was that I never arrived at a point where I felt that I had a marketable product.

I was just looking partly for adventure and the answers to the riddles that were always there and some

justification for not getting down and working effectively to go back to school and pursue a formal education, which I should have been doing, of course. I knew that all the time, but I was a restless sort of person.

Mr. Frederick: Going back to your observations as an apprentice writer. Apprentice to yourself. Apprentice to your ambitions to be a writer. What could you say about the American character from that period of time, after World War I up to 1928?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I was, of course, aware that there had been a war and rumors of wars and I was not a peacenik as such. I felt that some wars were probably justified and I didn't do a lot of thinking about it. I was not susceptible to a draft or military service and I wasn't particularly interested in it.

Mr. Frederick: I hear you, Albert. What I was saying is, with World War I as a parameter up to 1928 when you were traveling the West Coast, what did you learn, what did you see of the American character? Could you characterize Americans from that experience?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I felt that we were undergoing a drastic backwash from the First World War. We had expended beyond our abilities and we had deteriorated morally. I think that there were many changes that were occurring constantly of which I was aware, but I don't recall that I had any program for doing anything about it. I was not a protester or marcher or that sort of thing. I always felt, and I feel now, that we shouldn't have been in the First World War, and I don't think we should have been in the Second. I don't think we should be out in the Persian Gulf, but at the same time I feel that one has a responsibility to support his country and make his protests or objections through the acceptable approach or means.

Mr. Frederick: I hear what you're saying. Did you experience inflation?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I felt that there was a drastic inflation all along the line. It was a product of the war and war production, and so I was aware of that. However, we didn't arrive at a period of wild inflation like Germany did. Employment increased and wages increased so that the inflationary cycle was not all one way. We had arrived at the eight-hour day and decent pay and living accommodations, so the wild-eyed anarchists brought about some improvement. They obtained better living and working conditions, shorter hours, but at the same time they brought on the abuses of organized labor. I was aware of all of those things and never felt that I had any pat answers to any of it. You just rolled with the punches.

Mr. Frederick: You saw a quickening of the society and a loosening?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I think that squared with what I expected. That was part of the fundamental teaching of my religion that “many would run to and fro and knowledge would be increased” and it certainly has. Travel and getting about the world has become an everyday phenomenon; my daughter is in the air more than she is on the ground. And knowledge has certainly been increased and organized. So, I observed that and expected it. And probably was not prepared for it.

I remember my physics teacher trying to explain nuclear energy to me and I didn’t get it. He was German, and he said, “Canwell, you’re a dummkopf.”

Well, that’s okay with me. I’m an observer. Nothing has happened that I haven’t expected and I don’t know what to do about it.

Mr. Frederick: I hear you. I hear you. What I was attempting to approach is that in those travels, 1919 up to 1928, you saw a decline. Could we list that decline? Is there a moral issue?

Mr. Canwell: I think so. I think the decline has been a moral thing and I would lay a great deal of it at the foot of the entertainment industry. They have something to market there, and the more sensational and the worse it is, the better it sells. I would say that a good share of the moral decline, if such there be, is due to the quality of our entertainment and it hasn’t all been bad.

We’ve had some good music and we’ve degenerated into an area now where there’s almost none. But the older music as is the literature is still with us and still available, but I would, if I were to try to analyze it, say that the moral decline is closely associated with the entertainment industry, the development of the moving picture and television. I’m not a bluenose. I’m not somebody who wants to ban it all, but I am aware of how it’s happening. I just don’t watch it.

Mr. Frederick: In your opinion did Prohibition accelerate what you view as a decline?

Mr. Canwell: It was a vehicle for the acceleration of organized crime, largely because it was not permitted to work. I think that the great criminal empires that developed around that probably would not have done so had there not been Prohibition, which created a market. But they’re applying the same thing to narcotics now. It isn’t only Prohibition or the laws against these things. It’s the addictive factor related to it, so the profit flows from that. On the Prohibition, I watched the thing, of course; was in a family that was very much against drinking anyway, so it didn’t make any difference to them. But I

think that Prohibition was seized upon by the criminal element as a vehicle for expanding power and wealth. It did work that way, but it need not have been so much so. It’s one of the anomalies of civilization, you cannot by law ban the willingness or desire to commit crime or correct the weakness of people, but you can make it a little more difficult for those things to function.

In answering your question. I saw a great deal of the Prohibition problem. I saw the stills and moonshiners develop and come into their own up in the Mt. Spokane and Mica Peak areas, and the rumrunning associated with bringing in the bonded liquor from the border and so on. But I certainly am not one who has any doctrinaire position on the thing. I know it worked out that way and maybe it was inevitable.

Mr. Frederick: I’d like to ask once more with regard to those travels that you undertook which was a unique opportunity in, let’s say, characterizing your peer group or the group that you would work with—could you characterize what you saw as a group?

Mr. Canwell: I can remember that there were people who, such as I, had the skills and were working at it. It was a fast-moving thing. You didn’t have time to visit. I don’t recall making any fast friends in that period of time and I only remember that the people who followed that profession were very much alike in their skills. They had to be in their temperament, too.

But beyond that I don’t recall anything significant, any persons of lasting interest or friendship. You just did your job and collected your pay and went on about your work. Some of these fellows had camper rigs and some of them had wives, but I never became acquainted with any of them on a social level. I suppose I’d be classified by someone as a loner because I just minded my own business and did my thing.

Mr. Frederick: The reason I asked this type of question is that potentially it could be a unique opportunity to gain some first-person insight because you had desires, or pretensions, of being a writer. I was trying to elicit from you in a writer’s mind’s eye, if you could categorize those whom you worked with and discuss some of the changes they were going through or society was going through at the time. Did you see union-organizing going on in those fields and factories?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, there was quite a lot of union-or labor-organizing. In trying to categorize or identify my thought processes and experiences all during this time, there was a great awareness of a radical movement on the labor level. The Wobbly organization or IWW was very, very prominent and very active. Wherever you turned you would encounter these people. In general they were

not a very desirable lot.

I remember one incident. I was coming home from the Kennewick area. I had worked down there and ended up with a little money—not very much—and decided to ride a freight train back to Spokane. I boarded a flatcar and somewhere along the line a couple of fellows were working the train. You either had to have a Wobbly card or get off the train. That's cold turkey—supposed to pay a dollar for a red card, and that wasn't the sort of thing I was likely to do. In Kennewick, I had bought a regular horse pistol. It was a .45 Colt; badly worn and almost dangerous to shoot, but I bought it for five dollars and I had this. When I was confronted with "Either pay for this red ticket or get off the train!" I decided that wasn't the way it would be and I displayed this firearm that should have had wheels on it. Anyway, these two guys just took off, jumped off the train into the sagebrush head-over-heels. That's all I saw of them. That was one of my experiences with labor-organizing.

That was the first time I was really confronted with it. Prior to that I had gained a firsthand knowledge of what the Marxist program was by association with one of the boys who lived out in the east end. A group of us used to meet at Underhill Park. There wasn't much of anything to do and we'd sit around there and yak.

One of the fellows was a dedicated Marxist and was a real brain. Most of the fellows didn't have any interest in what he was talking about and they labeled him Bull Birge. He was Harvey Birge, but they called him Bull because they felt that was what he was pedaling. Well, anyway, I was more interested in that and I would go down to the library and look up things that he was quoting and talking about and argue with him. So that was my first experience with a professional red.

Mr. Frederick: And were you attending Edison School at that time or Sheridan or were you at Orchard Avenue?

Mr. Canwell: I think that I was attending Orchard Avenue at that time.

Mr. Frederick: And how old was Harvey?

Mr. Canwell: Harvey might have been a year older than I, or maybe even two. He became quite an important figure here in the left-wing, Communist, Marxist group—his sister, also.

Mr. Frederick: So, Albert, we have Harvey out there who was what, 13, 14 years old, who was going to explain to you chapter and verse that Marxist theory?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, yes. He knew all about Nietzsche and had a lot of names there that I first couldn't identify. I'm wondering if this wasn't a little later along the line. There

were boys in the group, one of them, John Funk, the mayor's son, and three or four others, which may have put this a year or so on down the line. John Funk and I bought a house across from Underhill Park in which we established a little store with pop and snacks. It was during this period of time, and whether I was still at Orchard Avenue or had come back from a trip, I'm not certain. Anyway, I remember Harvey well and his dedication to his left-wing thinking.

[End of Tape 15, Side 2]

Mr. Canwell: One of my problems here is that scrapbooks and things that I had kept over a period of years that would cover some of these incidents or peg them datewise were burned in our big fire here. But Harvey must have been a little older than that because he worked for the Northern Pacific Railroad as a telegrapher. So my experience with him must have been after I had been out at Orchard Avenue, it could not have been quite that early.

Mr. Frederick: Was Harvey a local boy?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, he lived up on Fifth and Greene, which was about a block and a half or two blocks from where we lived. All of these places were somewhat adjacent to Underhill Park.

Mr. Frederick: And he was there living with his family at the time?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, his sister, I believe, lived there and I know nothing about his mother and father. I suspect that at least his mother was there. I don't know on that.

Mr. Frederick: Do you believe that Harvey stumbled on to these concepts by himself or was that his father's political inclination?

Mr. Canwell: I don't know where he got it. He was a studious type. The radicals had worked Spokane very early and their principal invasion was in the railroad industry. Their first successes in organizing were in the Great Northern shops, then the Northern Pacific. Many of the leading Communists over the years were identified with those two enterprises. And so, who got to him or what interested him, I just do not know.

I can remember challenging some of the things that he was laying down as doctrine. For instance, that old chestnut that in the workers' paradise each would contribute according to his ability and receive according to his need. Well, that just sounded like fertilizer to me because somebody would have to tell them how much they should contribute and how much they needed. I just

knew enough about human nature to know that wouldn't work.

Mr. Frederick: What did Harvey have to say about that?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, he said, "Yes, it would, when we....," he said, "We will change men and our system." And that's one of the points I didn't agree with. We had a neighbor who never worked. He wouldn't work. His poor wife would have one child after another and my brother called it the "Gillette" family, because every day they'd come across the alley and say, "Would-ya-let me have a cup of sugar? Would-ya-let me have a cup of flour? Would-ya-let me have a potato or a bag of potatoes?" On the way out they'd steal an axe or something that they wouldn't use.

That's human nature and nobody is going to change it by—you just don't change human nature. Somebody has to make determinations for some people. He (Harvey) was just full of that sort of thing. I had never heard some of these names before. I would get the spelling from him and that's part of what I was doing down at the public library. I'd go look some of these things up and try to familiarize myself with them. But, to me, Karl Marx, then and now, looked like a bum who wouldn't work. And he lived off of his capitalist friend, Engels, and spouted all of this nonsense that has enslaved half or two-thirds of the world.

Anyhow, everywhere I turned I'd encounter some of this activity. They were very busy people and worked hard at organizing. The Communists have always been the best labor organizers in the world. I've seen them in all of my activity over the years. They know how to find out what people want and promise it to them and work like the devil to get it for them, until they get in power. But, everywhere I turned I would encounter a certain degree of this.

Mr. Frederick: What were the other folks in labor doing then; if the Communists were the best, what does that say about the rest of them?

Mr. Canwell: There were a great many people in the unions who joined for good reasons. Leadership is what I am talking about. For instance, my father was a member of the Teamsters Union. But people on that level had nothing to do with the Hoffas and Dave Becks and that type of person. But labor was easy to organize because capital was abusing it to the extent that they could get away with, they always did.

I remember one time I was running for Congress and I was invited down to the City Club to talk to a group of businessmen. One of them wanted to know my position on labor and I happened to know his. He and his family had run a sweatshop mill, a lumbermill out here where

they underpaid everyone and worked them to death, and so I told him about that. I didn't get votes there, but I got it off my chest.

There are abuses in labor that organizing corrected. But what it didn't correct was the ability of sharpies to move into positions of leadership and exploit the laboring man who didn't himself wish to make a career of labor-organizing or union activity.

Mr. Frederick: Was Harvey your first encounter with that type of rhetoric?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, as far as I know that was the first visible evidence of somebody trying to proselytize or organize or recruit into the radical movement. I would hear expressions. My father would contemptuously refer to the Bolsheviks as "Bullsheviks." So I would hear that terminology. There was a certain amount of the radical activity going on in the lumber camps that operated up in our area. But I was not old enough to have much knowledge of that.

Mr. Frederick: Your father would have been on the Merchant Police during the IWW Free Speech Movement, several blocks from the office right here in the middle of Spokane? And you just mentioned that he would make a disparaging remark within the home periodically. Did he ever share with you children later his philosophy with regard to potentially what he had insight into because he was in town during those times?

Mr. Canwell: I don't think so. In the first place my father wasn't much of a talker. He just didn't talk. And as to sharing his opinions, it would be in a chance remark or something like that from the fact that he held certain people or things in contempt. I can't remember his doing any lecturing or talking on the subject.

Mr. Frederick: So quite literally then it would be Harvey with—as you perceive—that outlandish rhetoric with regard to human nature?

Mr. Canwell: Well, yes, I would say that Harvey triggered my interest in the thing and my awareness that there was an organized body of information out there somewhere covering this subject.

Mr. Frederick: With regard to a level of rhetoric that Harvey was involved in, who was the next person you encountered with that type of rhetoric?

Mr. Canwell: Well, we haven't gone to the level or plateau where I was working on a newspaper at Yakima, but at that time I did get into Harry Bridges and that sort of thing.

Mr. Frederick: I hear you. And we're talking circa '33?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, '32 on. To '38.

Mr. Frederick: I hear you. We'll have an opportunity then to explore that at that appropriate time.

Mr. Canwell: I would say that Harvey Birge was a likable person. I admired his intellect and his use of the language—he was the person who triggered me because it was a challenge. That sort of thing, whether it's in religion or anywhere else, where I find myself challenged, I want the answers. To the best of my ability I'll proceed to get them. And that's what I did there. I did a great deal of reading. A lot of it I didn't understand too well, but I was doing it.

Mr. Frederick: You worked at the bookstore in 1928? And that lasted several months?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, it lasted longer than that. I was there at least a year, maybe going on two years. When I say I was there in '28, I remember '28 because I was there at that time, but before that.

Mr. Frederick: And what did you do at the bookstore and where was its location?

Mr. Canwell: The bookstore was on Sprague Avenue between Post and Wall on the south side of the street. It extended through to First Avenue. There were two levels. They were at that time the largest dealers in textbooks in the Northwest. They had a very large general bookstore.

My duties to begin with were carrying books up and down stairs to the mailing room. John W. Graham, being a very frugal person, didn't want to wear the elevator out, so I took the stairs. That was part of what I was doing. Then I placed books in stock and helped with their continuing inventory.

You had to learn three things in handling books. You learned the author and the publisher, so you thought in those terms. Jack London wrote such and such a book and such and such publisher put it out. I was forever shelving books and moving them around, dusting them and admiring them.

They had a great many fine editions at the Graham company and the little salary I got mostly went to books; some of them I still have. In fact, I bought a Morocco-bound Bible. I bought a leather-bound, India paper edition of Shakespeare, and Milton, Tennyson, others, and I still have them. But that's where my interest was and it's where my meager salary went.

Mr. Frederick: How did you hear of that job?

Mr. Canwell: One of my brothers was working for them at the time in the shipping department and said that he thought that I could get hired on there. So I applied and was accepted.

Mr. Frederick: Where were you living at the time?

Mr. Canwell: We were living on the north side, I think on Post Street.

Mr. Frederick: And this would be yourself?

Mr. Canwell: My mother and father, brothers and sister, at that time we were living in this house on North Post. That was after we moved back to the north side of the city.

Mr. Frederick: And this would be circa 1928? Did you have an opportunity to acquire an automobile by that point in time?

Mr. Canwell: I had my first automobile when I was 14. I don't think I had an automobile at the time that I was working at Graham's. We were within walking distance of downtown and it wasn't a serious problem. Along about that time in 1929 I did buy a Nash coupe. It was slightly used. From that time on I had a car, but I think at first when I was working at Graham's I did not.

Mr. Frederick: When you acquired your first car at age 14, was that in California?

Mr. Canwell: No, that was in Spokane. I probably should have enlarged on my brother, Jim, a little bit. He was a very ingenious, industrious person who was always finding ways to make money. For a time he worked for the Eureka Vacuum Cleaner Company selling vacuums. Then he noticed that they had literally carloads of these old vacuum cleaners, so he made a deal with them to acquire them. He would remodel and take some of them apart for the copper and aluminum.

He traded a vacuum cleaner for one of the Ford pickups. It had a little box thing on the back and one seat, one windshield, and no top. He traded a vacuum cleaner for that and he sold it to me for five dollars. So that was my first car. Nobody had to have a license in those days. I was never much of a mechanic, no more than I had to be. But I learned to take the clutch, brake, and reverse apart and put new parts in them. And cranked the thing until my head ached. That was my first automobile. We were living on Greene Street at that time.

Mr. Frederick: How long did the employment last at the bookstore?

Mr. Canwell: As I mentioned previously, it must have been a year or two, I cannot be precise on it; I suppose it was most of two years.

It was very pleasant, very desirable work in an atmosphere that I liked. But I talked to a woman who was in a superior position at the store, Miss Collins, and I had noticed that various people who had worked there, who became experienced, went on to other stores or other businesses. I asked her frankly, "What are the chances of getting anywhere here?"

And she said, "Well, frankly, I think that you'll have the same experience as the other men did." So I decided to get out of there. I think I was only getting about seven dollars a week or some ridiculous sum.

Mr. Frederick: Which would be somewhat appropriate; you'd be getting about maybe twelve cents an hour there.

Mr. Canwell: Well, Mr. Graham was a very attractive, very popular man, but he was a real cheapy. He was the kind of person who made Communists. I remember that he'd put on a great drive every year to join the Community Fund. Every employee was supposed to contribute to this fund, so there would be 100 percent of Graham employees contributing.

I knew a girl up in the bookkeeping department quite well and she told me that Mr. Graham himself never contributed a dollar, never contributed anything. So when our department head began to lean on me about contributing to this thing I said, "Well, I will contribute precisely the same amount that Mr. Graham does and when you find out what that is, you let me know." But that was the last I heard of the contributing factor.

I wasn't too popular with that department head. He was a knee-pants tyrant who abused the girls who would put up with it and anybody who would tolerate it and I wouldn't, so he didn't bother me too much.

Mr. Frederick: About this time we had the stock-market crash. Were you aware or did you have an opportunity to be aware of what that meant and what it would mean within the next several years?

Mr. Canwell: I believe so. There was a great deal of discussion at home and everywhere else about the crash and people jumping out of windows and so on. Of course, it was seized upon as an opportunity to lambaste Herbert Hoover, or blame him for the crash. Our family didn't quite buy that. We were supporters and voters for Hoover. But, anyway, he was the victim of that crash and we were aware of that as it progressed.

Times were very tough. It was along about this time, getting into the 30s, that I accepted that assignment in Montana. Nobody in Montana had any money, they were all suffering from the Depression.

Mr. Frederick: And you were over there in 1930?

Mr. Canwell: 1930 and 1931.

Mr. Frederick: And the depths of the Depression weren't felt until at least '33, so it sounds like it hit quite rapidly out here then.

Mr. Canwell: The Depression closed in very, very rapidly. There was widespread unemployment and those who were employed weren't making very much. I think industry probably took such advantage of the situations as they could. Inflation is the product of that sort of thinking and condition and activity.

I was very aware, as our family were, of the crash. We had no money to lose, or no big money, but were aware of the unemployment, the difficulty of finding a job that would pay anything. We went through it like everybody else did, but fortunately we had a mother who was a frugal, ingenious person and we always had plenty to eat. That's the part I remember, but we didn't have any money to throw around.

Mr. Frederick: What was your father doing at the time?

Mr. Canwell: Most or a good share of the time he had worked for the Park Department. I don't remember at what point he discontinued that. There was a period of time, when we lived on the north side and after he began to get his Spanish-American War pension, that he worked for the Post Office Department. There was a Post Office unit out right near where we lived. He served as custodian and caretaker for that facility. But before that, he worked for the Park Department for quite a number of years after his employment with the Merchant Police.

Mr. Frederick: Now, did he get a pension from the Park Department?

Mr. Canwell: No, the only pension he had was the Spanish-American War pension. And the labor he was doing for the Park Department was common labor. It didn't pay a lot, but it was pleasant.

He worked for a great man in that activity, Mr. Duncan, for whom the Duncan Gardens here are named and he learned a great deal about floral culture. The pay was not very great. At one time he also was in charge of the Underhill Park out where we lived.

Mr. Frederick: Now, was he let go by the Park Department?

Mr. Canwell: No, I think that he reached the age period when that just automatically terminated.

Mr. Frederick: So, it was fortunate then that he got that job with the Post Office Annex out there.

Mr. Canwell: Well, yes, the veterans were given preference in those jobs. There were still a few Civil War veterans around then; quite a number of Spanish-American War veterans.

Mr. Frederick: You had been in the book business. You saw the prospects there. How did you hear of the position in Montana for the church?

Mr. Canwell: My sister by this time worked for the Upper Columbia Conference, which is the organizational division of the Adventist Church. Their office was right near where we lived. She worked there for many years and finally retired from that employment. It was through that I heard about this opening. There was a man, an Irishman, who was a genius at selling. He took me under his wing for a little field training. I did very well and they needed somebody in Montana in a supervisory position and so I accepted it.

Mr. Frederick: And his name?

Mr. Canwell: His name was Wilfred Ryan.

Mr. Frederick: And your field-work training was here in town?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, and in northern Idaho, Bonner's Ferry and that area.

Mr. Frederick: What were you selling?

Mr. Canwell: I was selling two of the major Adventist publications. One of them is a doctor book, one of the best all-time books in the field, they call it *The Home Physician*. It was not difficult to sell, it was just difficult finding anybody who could afford it. Then we had another volume that was widely sold, the *Bible Readings for the Home Circle*.

[End of Tape 16, Side 1]

Mr. Canwell: These were standard publications and the Adventists have a vast publishing enterprise, always have had. This doctor book was one of their prime sellers. They had others but, of course, they aimed their work at evangelisation. That's what their intent was, but they had good products. I worked with this man up in the Bonner's Ferry area and our sales were better than most, but they still were not anything to get rich on.

Mr. Frederick: That second publication, this was, you

said it was selected readings?

Mr. Canwell: They called it *Bible Readings for the Home Circle*. When we were talking to a Catholic, we'd tell them it's in catechism form, because it was question and answer form. And it was well-illustrated and a wonderful book. I still use it for reference when I want to find something. I know if the subject is worth covering it's in there. But that was easy to sell.

Mr. Frederick: If I hear you correctly you weren't actually running down a name list of Seventh-day Adventists, you would—

Mr. Canwell: No, no, this was sold to the general public. Adventists already had all of them. That's the only thing you could get from the Adventists—and they were very glad to put you up if you were there at nightfall or mealtime. But these books were sold all over the United States and particularly very widely in the West.

I can remember some farm family, they would just want the thing so badly that they could taste it. They'd trade chickens or anything else for a copy. So, sometimes, we'd go in with a crate of chickens to the market but, anyway, we sold them. It's a work that anybody would be proud to own or to sell; it's a competent work and not overly biased in the direction of their doctrine. It just presents it as they see the truth. And it's a good piece of work.

They had others, too. They had one that was sold quite widely to the Mormons. It was by somebody by the name of Uriah Smith, who had a big beard. When you'd open this book up, the Mormons would see this elder Smith, they'd say, "Oh, we'll have to have Elder Smith's book," so they bought it. But, he wasn't a Mormon. Anyway, I didn't sell that particular book in that area, but I heard about it.

I engaged in that and then I had an offer to go to Alaska or to Montana. At first we'd thought of going to Alaska and floating down the Yukon and the Kuskokwim River but didn't do it. I settled for Montana.

Mr. Frederick: So this was your trial period then in Idaho?

Mr. Canwell: That was what it amounted to. They weren't giving me boot-camp training. It was just putting me to work. They liked the results of my endeavors and there was this opening in Montana. They didn't have any other sucker, so they gave it to me.

Mr. Frederick: What did you use for transportation in Idaho?

Mr. Canwell: In Idaho the man I was working with had

a car and we set up camp at Deep Creek, below Bonner's Ferry, a beautiful little stream. We had a couple of tents and I had one of them and the Ryans had the other. Although he had an automobile, mostly you walked, at least I did, and those logging roads were pretty dusty. You earned your money.

Mr. Frederick: Would he take you out there and drop you off and you would walk those roads?

Mr. Canwell: Usually we'd go to some given point where there's a dividing of the roads, maybe up in Paradise Valley—that's a place near Bonner's Ferry. He'd drop me off and I'd work up in a given area and he'd work in another and then along toward nightfall we'd rendezvous back where we started.

Mr. Frederick: That seems like an awful lot of work. Maybe not a hard sell, but there was no money up there. Why weren't you knocking on doors in some suburbia down here in Spokane?

Mr. Canwell: Well, first, their publishing enterprise is a missionary endeavor. They go where the people are and so, you know, why does a missionary go to South Africa or somewhere? Something spurs them on. Anyway, selling house-to-house in a big city is not easy.

Mr. Frederick: Now, I didn't hear you say that you were a missionary, Albert. I heard you saying you were a book salesman.

Mr. Canwell: Yeah, well—

Mr. Frederick: How come you didn't double back to the suburbia out here?

Mr. Canwell: Well, that's what it amounts to if you're selling books for a religious organization that is dedicated to their doctrines and persuasion—your endeavor is somewhat of a missionary one. You're trying to sell people a book that will convince them of a way of thinking, a way of life. Their first approach, of course, always is the health one. They sold the doctor book and if people liked the doctor book then they'll buy the others.

Mr. Frederick: What were those two books going for?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, there were two bindings. That's one of the things you learned. You don't learn to say, "Do you want to buy a book?" You say, "Which binding do you prefer?" One of them was \$6 and the other one was \$7.50, I think it was a leather or karatol binding, the other was a cloth-bound book. They were not terribly expensive, but there wasn't much money around then

either. We took a down payment on it and then delivered the books at a given time in the fall. That was the supposed procedure; sometimes you just sold them outright, but not usually, you just took the orders and delivered them later.

Mr. Frederick: Was there someone who would ride that circuit in terms of collections and work with them?

Mr. Canwell: No, the organizational setup of their church I suppose was like any other. They have divisions and regions and so on and the Adventists have the North Pacific Union Conference consisting of the Oregon Conference, the Montana Conference, the Western Washington Conference, the Upper Columbia and it seems to me there's an Alaska unit in there. All of that endeavor will be under that particular union. There are so many unions in the nation, so many in the world, and they're divided up that way. They have their hospitals and colleges and universities scattered pretty well over the world.

Mr. Frederick: What type of living could you make from that? What did you see from that Idaho experience?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, I don't know, it wasn't enormous. I would say it was a living income, but that's about all. It was never a real profitable enterprise and they don't plan it to be. I think later they've developed more expensive sets of books and things that they market. That came on after my time.

Mr. Frederick: So, approximately 1930 you took the position in Montana?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, in '30 and '31 I was in Montana. In 1932, I came back to Spokane briefly and a couple of friends of mine were interested in a newspaper enterprise in Yakima. I joined them and that was in '32.

Mr. Frederick: And where were you first stationed in Montana in 1930?

Mr. Canwell: The major office was in Billings. I had an apartment in Bozeman and I had one in Billings. So I was back and forth across the state a great deal. Then later they moved their conference office to Bozeman, which is pretty much in the center of the state. But I was all over the state of Montana. I was in every post-office stop that you could imagine.

And I did a little fishing, quite a lot of fishing, not so much hunting. The Adventists are vegetarians so they frown on you going out and bagging an elk, but some do it. I did quite a lot of trout fishing. The best trout-fishing streams in the world are over there.

Mr. Frederick: That must have been an extraordinary experience, because a lot of that would not have been fished out at that point in time.

Mr. Canwell: Oh, it was prime fishing every direction you would go. They've taken care of that by heavy stocking of streams in recent years. There were plenty of fish wherever you wanted to go after them.

Mr. Frederick: What would be a typical day in that regime?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, probably you would start out around nine o'clock, usually giving people time to get their kids off to school. In rural areas in most cases the people were glad to see you. They may have some built-in biases or antagonisms, but in general, certainly in Montana, the people are friendly and just lovable people. They may not agree with you and may not want to buy your book, but they're courteous and friendly and just nice people.

You'd start about that time in the morning and as you get toward the end of the day, kids coming back from school and people having to get a meal for their family sort of terminated their interest.

The custom was for these salesmen to stay with the people wherever they were. When nightfall came, if they were invited to, they spent the night there. That was the usual custom. I did not do much of that. They had been following this procedure for many, many years throughout the West and I suppose the whole country.

Mr. Frederick: And you were selling the two volumes also there?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, primarily those, but we found that in the general area, there was nobody who had any money. They all wanted to buy, but they didn't have anything to buy with. Our publishing house put out a little series of booklets called *Uncle Arthur's Bedtime Stories*. They were very well-illustrated and a beautiful piece of small work. You'd get on toward the Christmas season and one way or another people would buy a bunch of these. We sold them like hot cakes. That's one reason my sales were very high over there. In other areas of the union they were not doing that and my sales were much better. But it was a good product and I felt that it was an entree. The people would buy those children's books and like them; when you came back with something they were likely to buy that. That was at least my selling philosophy, and it was a good one.

Mr. Frederick: And what did you use for transportation?

Mr. Canwell: Over there I had an automobile that I had

purchased in Spokane, a Nash coupe. Most of the time I traveled by rail because the distances are so vast in Montana. Instead of calling it the Big Sky Country, they used to call it the Land of Magnificent Distances, and it certainly is. You can go 700 miles from the western border to the eastern outlet. So most of the time I traveled by rail. Well, I don't know that I'd say most of the time—I drove a lot. And those Montana roads in those days were something less than desirable. We had a reduced rate card on the railroad, through the religious organization. I utilized that often. And again that gave me a great deal of time to read. If you realize how many hours it takes to get from Great Falls to Glendive or wherever, I'd have many, many hours.

Mr. Frederick: How were the people doing at that stage of the game over there?

Mr. Canwell: Well, as I say, nobody had any money. They did have food because they raised cattle and crops. Up in northeastern Montana there was quite an uprising. A bunch of more radical people started a move there to secede from Montana and the United States, too, I guess. There was a great deal of socialist influence. It spread from Minnesota and out into the high-lying country of Montana. In Butte and Great Falls in the mining industry they had quite a lot of radical activity there.

Other than that the farmers were not too politically concerned. I would say most of them were Democrats. They were taken in by this worker philosophy of the New Deal and went along quite well with it. The farmers in general I don't think had any politics. They voted for some guy they liked. He came through and shook their hands and was running for Congress, so they voted for him.

In fact, that's the way they got Jerry O'Connell, a Communist, over there. He was a member of Congress from Montana. When they finally dumped him he came over to Washington and became Executive Secretary for the Washington State Democrat Party. You probably don't remember him...before your time I would imagine.

Mr. Frederick: They were getting by economically?

Mr. Canwell: I think so. They were not happy about their lot, but they were getting by and their kids, some of them, were going away to school. One way or another the Montanans are rugged people and they don't ask for much. They work hard and had done what they always did over there, good times and bad they do about the same thing. They shoot what they call a slow elk every now and then. I have a couple of them out on my lawn that are looking more like slow elk every day.

But, anyhow, the Montana people survive. Their kids left, of course. They came over here and went to business

school, the girls went to business colleges and so on. That's the continuing story of Montana and the Dakotas. There's no place for the young people there and when they get through high school they leave.

Mr. Frederick: Well, how would you operate when you would travel by train? You wouldn't have a vehicle when you got into town. How did you operate when you got into town?

Mr. Canwell: Usually you'd made contact with some of the believers before your trip, so they'd meet you at the train. Usually they'd set up some little meeting. Here was somebody from out of town to talk to them. So that was pretty much the procedure. The ranches might be at the edge of town or they might be miles away. During the wet season there, they have what they call gumbo mud to deal with, it is unbelievable.

But the thing that sticks in my mind most is the wonderful people. They were just delightful, hospitable, friendly, and most of them had a sense a humor, they could laugh at their lot. The Adventists, of course, had outside connections; their children had gone away to college, Walla Walla College, medical school in Loma Linda, California, and so forth.

Mr. Frederick: Well, it sounds like you had to keep your nose to the grindstone, but it sounds like it would be a relatively pleasant sell.

Mr. Canwell: Oh, it was. I think back on it with fondness. I think if I had been able to figure out a way to stay there and go on eating I'd have done so. I had a split with the head of the conference there, so I decided that it was not for me and I left that line of work. But as to Montana I would have been very happy to stay there.

Mr. Frederick: There was just no way for you to do that?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I couldn't see any way at the time. I came back to Spokane and had some correspondence or contact with these friends of mine about starting a newspaper in Yakima, so I came back to Spokane for awhile and started over. I worked with my brother's paint-contracting outfit and we did that whenever there was any blank space in our time. I remember two of my brothers were attempting to earn money to go to medical school. We worked with the paint-contracting firm and then I went on down to Yakima.

Mr. Frederick: Now, Albert, on your paint contracting, what did you do?

Mr. Canwell: We painted many of the tall buildings here

in Spokane, the old National Bank, the telephone company that's down the street here aways, the Spokane Hotel.

Mr. Frederick: Interior? Exterior?

Mr. Canwell: Exterior mostly, but we did interior work, too. Much of our work and our best income was exterior where you used a swing stage. It was hazardous work, but a source of income.

Mr. Frederick: Now would you be painting window trim?

Mr. Canwell: Window frames or the flat surface on the building, whatever required painting.

Mr. Frederick: What did that factor out into an hourly wage?

Mr. Canwell: When we'd take a contract on the thing, we all worked on it and then we split the take. It was usually pretty good, however. We were always bidding against people who were unscrupulous and who would bid on quality paint and work and then use an inferior product, so you were competing with that sort of chiseling. But we did very well on our painting. My brother, the master painter, like most painters, had a little alcohol problem, but other than that he was a genius at painting, mixing colors, and was very competent.

Mr. Frederick: What was the dispute about with regard to the mission book work in Montana?

Mr. Canwell: Well, it's probably a subject that I should let lie, but the head of the conference and Canwell were both interested in the same woman. And he shouldn't have been. He was married. That's what the dispute figured around. He appealed to the union, said that they didn't have the funds to continue the department. The union didn't give me any support, they offered to send me somewhere else and I didn't like it. I decided that religious life was not for me, so that's where I severed my connection with them.

Mr. Frederick: Now you've mentioned in the past that your two friends were potentially your cousins?

Mr. Canwell: No, they were cousins, but they were not cousins of mine, but of each other.

Mr. Frederick: I see. And their names?

Mr. Canwell: One was Leal Grunke and the other one was Verlin Coleman. They had both attended the

Orchard Avenue School, so I knew them from way back.

Mr. Frederick: And they knew of your interest in writing or your newspaper interest, your trying to break into that field?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, they were well aware of that. We'd discussed it many times. They had gone on to college and both of them at one time had moved to California and then they came back. They went to Walla Walla College and that's where my contact with them was, over the question of joining the enterprise in Yakima. They had worked on the college paper, I think, and things along that line. They were interested in the advertising angle of the newspaper production. I was interested in the editorial end and that seemed like a good combination, so we got together.

[End of Tape 16, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Albert, in approximately spring of 1920 when you were preparing to graduate from the eighth grade, how did you engineer with your mother your slipping out of class and going to Kennewick?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I explained what I was doing, that I could do so, that I could get released early and there was a way to make some money down there and I wanted to do it. As I recall, I took a bus or a train down there. It was all right with my mother because it had been adjusted at school. The teacher had said it was, or one of the teachers at least had said it was all right; that most of our schoolwork was completed at that time.

I think it was in May. I had a blanket bedroll and I had my toothbrush and things in that. When I arrived at Kennewick I just didn't know what to do. I didn't have any funds, or very limited money, and had this bedroll. I wanted to find a job picking berries, so I went down near the railroad tracks and there was a great pile of telephone poles. There was a crawl space under them. I remember crawling under there a long ways back and stashing my bedroll there, hoping nobody would take it. Someone told me afterwards I was lucky I didn't run into a rattlesnake under there.

It was all right with my mother. I was pretty young, but we had a pretty packed household, too, and so it was not too bad a thing to find some employment and some income and it also provided extra space for someone else. That wasn't particularly a factor, it's just the way it worked out.

I did go down there and got a job picking strawberries and I worked in the asparagus. I always remember that because, while my mother was one of the greatest cooks in the world, we had an asparagus bed up in the hills, and it grew wild out in East Spokane Valley, that's one thing

that she couldn't cook to make it desirable. Like most things she cooked it well-done and you don't do that to asparagus.

So, when I got down there and a man I worked for asked me if I liked asparagus, I said, "No." And he said, "Well, you probably have never had any." And so he gathered the fresh asparagus and just lightly cooked it and melted butter over it. It was delightful, because it was a new thing. I remembered that and planting, setting out asparagus plants, and picking strawberries.

Mr. Frederick: And how long did you stay down there?

Mr. Canwell: I just don't recall the precise time. I stayed there I suppose a month or two anyway.

Mr. Frederick: And what did you do that fall and then that winter?

Mr. Canwell: That is where I kind of lose track of things. Somewhere along the line, I went out in the Valley to work for the man who had the hay baler, Bill Borman. It was church-related to some extent. He belonged to the church or his father did and he'd married a girl whose sisters went to the Orchard Avenue School, so there was some reason for my going out there to work for him. Actually, it was too hard work. It never should have been done by a boy my age.

I did make a few dollars and I remember associating that with the purchase of my first long-trousers suit; I couldn't wait for that to come about. I was fourteen and the suit was fourteen dollars. I don't know why I remember that except that it was a lot of money to spend on anything at that time, but it was something that I greatly desired.

I couldn't wait to grow up. It makes it impossible for me to understand these young people now. Boys seem to want to look like girls and never quite get to the place that I very early found myself, where I just wasn't maturing fast enough to suit me. I always kept my hair cut and my clothes clean and pressed. It never seemed to me there was any other way to go about it. That pinpoints my activities at the age of fourteen..

When this trip with Ozzie came about, whether it was that fall or the next one, I don't know.

Mr. Frederick: Now, did you purchase that car before you went to California?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, that was during the summer when I spent quite a bit of time at Underhill with John Funk and other friends of mine. I acquired the car and finally we held a raffle to dispose of this car. It seemed to me that we sold raffle tickets for fifty cents each and whatever it brought in I suppose was fifteen or eighteen dollars or

something like that. A boy in our group won the car. His father was a mechanic and repaired it. That was the end of my ownership of that car.

During that time I had spent some time with the car up at the place in the hills, too. I remember having it up there some. So, I suppose it's in that range of time.

Mr. Frederick: Approximately two years?

Mr. Canwell: I would suppose it's about that—that would bracket it.

Mr. Frederick: Describe the procedure when you worked out there in that hayfield in the valley.

Mr. Canwell: In those days the baling rigs were stationary. They set them up and the hay was hauled in and pitched into a hopper. A person sat on each side of the baler and you'd poke wires through the hay. There were blocks or boxes that you dropped periodically into position in the hay baler. Then you'd push those wires through there and as the baler would tighten up it would be possible to hook these wires together. There was one person on each side of that and then usually there was one person stacking bales.

When we got out into the area around Liberty Lake, there was another old lake basin where they grow a lot of timothy hay. The bales of hay there were about twice as heavy as the ones we'd normally worked on. And I remember that Mr. Borman put two of us to stacking those hay bales. I quickly learned that I had to do something other than lift these bales because I couldn't lift them. I learned to roll them and bounce them around.

Well, I learned something there. That's probably the way they built the pyramids because these bales weighed about twice as much as I did. I found that I had to roll them and tumble them and keep them moving to get them into position. The other fellow who was working was twice as big as I was and strong as an ox. He'd lift these bales and he couldn't understand how it was killing him off while I survived it. But, anyway, I learned something about locomotion and the application of limited strength to a job you shouldn't be doing in the first place.

Mr. Frederick: Were those stacked on a wagon?

Mr. Canwell: No, they were stacked in the field. It seemed to me we stacked them about, oh, maybe six or eight high. You'd build a stairway sort of thing and you'd roll and bounce these up there.

Mr. Frederick: And they were being staged in preparation to be sold or transported to shelter?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, they would be. This timothy hay was

largely horse hay and was premium hay. It was then sold to brokers or whoever handled that sort of thing. But it was stacked up in the field and you hauled the hay in a hayrack to the baler and it was pitched off into the baler in that manner.

I remember something that might be interesting. I found that the only way that we could get a rest period or get a five-minute breather was to put a block into the hay baler the wrong way and it would jam it up. Well, we'd get a few minutes rest, but Bill Borman, frugal soul that he was, would dock us for the time. I remember that is one of the devices we used to get a breather once in awhile.

Mr. Frederick: What was the wage for that?

Mr. Canwell: About twenty cents an hour, I believe. It wasn't any more than that. He tried to work us ten hours or more. He'd work just as long as the crew would hold still for it. Sometimes you ran out of hay in some area and you had to move, so it wasn't ten or twelve hours every day. We had blanket rolls and we slept out, usually in a barn or near the haystack. The farmer on whose farm we were operating provided at least the noon meal. Some places it was good and some places it was terrible. Anyway, I came away from that operation with enough profit to buy my first long-pants suit.

Mr. Frederick: You have mentioned that you and John Funk, in that period in time, purchased a house. How did that come about?

Mr. Canwell: Well, John Funk's father was mayor of the city of Spokane and I think that had something to do with it. He arranged with somebody in the department that knew about these tax-delinquent places that were for sale. Ordinarily they sold at auction and I think that there was a short-circuiting of the system in making this available to us. I don't remember the amount, it was only sixty or eighty dollars. One way or another we came up with the money to buy this tax-delinquent house for the amount of the back taxes and interest.

It was a small place, probably about two rooms, one story, and not very elaborate, pretty rundown, but it served the purpose for us. We installed a counter and a place to dispense and sell our pop; had a refrigerator unit. And it seemed to me that somewhere along the line I sold my interest in it and I don't remember for how much. I should have held on to it. It was a good piece of property.

Mr. Frederick: Did you sell this before you went south?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I suspect that maybe that was some of the funds that I had when I left. Whatever they were, they weren't very great.

Mr. Frederick: And the reasoning behind the purchase of that house.

Mr. Canwell: Well, it was just available and we felt that a store there would be profitable. There were no facilities nearby for pop or ice cream or snacks. It was at least a block or more to the nearest store and this just seemed to us to be a practical investment and serve a purpose that would add up to our making a little money and, besides, it was a fun thing.

Mr. Frederick: And you've mentioned that this was across the street from a park?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, it was right on Fiske Street. Underhill Park was bounded by Fiske. I don't remember what the western street was, but there was quite a large flat area there that at one time had been a race track. It's been taken over by the Park Department and made into a neighborhood park.

Mr. Frederick: We left off yesterday's session with your correspondence with a Mr. Grunke and a Mr. Coleman, school chums from the Orchard Avenue School. About what time was that contact made?

Mr. Frederick: Well, I had been in contact with them before I went to Montana. I was down to Walla Walla College for conferences and things through the publishing department. And Grunke worked for me for a short time one summer. It was along in that period of time before I went to Montana, but I was in charge of an area or district here. We were in communication from time to time. I would see them if I'd come home to Spokane or, if I would be down at the college, I would routinely see them. They were long-time friends, acquaintances.

During that time, they had concocted the idea of going to Yakima and starting a shopping news. The shopping news idea was a prevalent one at that time. They were developed in competition with newspaper monopolies and that's what was taking place there. They suggested that I join in that enterprise.

Mr. Frederick: And why Yakima?

Mr. Canwell: Well, it was nearby and it presented what seemed like a golden opportunity.

[End of Tape 17, Side 1]

Mr. Canwell: In Yakima, it was a one-newspaper town. The famous Colonel Robertson had the two papers, the *Morning Herald* and the *Yakima Republic*. He had a monopoly there. There were other newspapers down the valley at Sunnyside and along the line, but no big papers

like the *Herald* and *Republic*. So it presented a golden opportunity for this idea.

Coleman and Grunke had made trips up into Yakima and talked to people like Safeway and Penneys and others, feeling out the possibility whether there would be support for such a program. They found that there was very ready support. These big operators wanted to give the Colonel some competition. So they had no trouble when we finally set up there in getting full-page ads and double-truck ads. We set out, of course, to cover the whole Yakima Valley from way up at Easton and that area right down through Ellensburg and down through the Valley almost to the Tri-Cities, which were not very big at that time.

Mr. Frederick: And where were your offices located?

Mr. Canwell: In Yakima.

Mr. Frederick: And where at in Yakima?

Mr. Canwell: I've forgotten the street. We acquired an old weekly newspaper there. I believe it was called the *Yakima Valley News*; it might have been *Yakima Valley Review*. Anyway, we acquired this by mostly jawbone and an agreement to hire the publisher, which we did, a man by the name of Foresman who was an old-time newspaperman who had conducted this weekly paper. It was just a shoestring affair, but survived and provided him a bare existence and an opportunity to promote his particular ideas on irrigation.

He had a fixed goal of developing what they called the Rosa Project. It involved tunneling through a mountain north of Yakima and diverting the Yakima River, part of it, to this irrigation project. It seemed very visionary, but he was determined that it was sound and it was his one thing. So, by taking over his paper and letting him remain active on it, he was able to pursue this Rosa Project. Eventually it became a reality, not during the time that I was in Yakima, but later that part of the Yakima Valley irrigation system became a reality.

Mr. Frederick: And between the three of you, you came up with the necessary capital? How was that handled?

Mr. Canwell: Well, we had very little capital. We each had some, but mostly it was a matter of jawbone. We just agreed to do certain things. We signed up certain contract agreements with advertisers and seemed to have a going operation. It did not produce a lot of money because we always needed more than we had. We were underfunded. We had no substantial funds when we started there, so it had to come out of our endeavor. We had to have an apartment, a place to live and an existence of some kind. We needed an automobile, which we bought as a business

investment.

Mr. Frederick: And what type of automobile was that?

Mr. Canwell: It seemed to me it was a Ford coupe.

Mr. Frederick: And we're talking 1932?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, it started in 1932 and then continued on. I would leave there intermittently and then come back. But, I think my time of association with the paper ended around 1936. Shortly after that it was sold to a Yakima industrialist or wealthy man, who had a lot of Sunshine Mine stock. Had this been done earlier it would have been exactly what I wanted. I always wanted to make a newspaper out of it. My partners were more interested in a shopping news. I felt that there was no real future for a shopping news.

Colonel Robertson was one of the great newspapermen of our time. He was a determined person who took pleasure in this conflict. I can remember he'd write editorials about us. One of them greatly disturbed my partners, but amused me. He said, "The boys came to town on the back of a truck and they'll leave the same way." Well, that's the type of competition the Colonel liked and he exploited it. If somebody advertised with us, a jeweler or some small hardware store or something, he would raise their rent and raise their advertising rates. So pretty soon they had to come back because the readers, as much as they wanted competition with the Colonel, still had to read the paper with the sports department and the various things that the Colonel was able to provide and always did, that people realized they couldn't get along without.

I always wanted to make a newspaper out of it and I felt that involved covering the news, having a strong editorial policy and things that my partners really had no interest in. They were interested in writing and selling ads, and were good at it.

Mr. Frederick: Who was the better, or the best, salesman in the group?

Mr. Canwell: I would say the best salesman was Coleman. He worked day and night and was just a tireless worker, a very attractive person, a good salesman and I would say he was the major sales force.

Grunke was marking time. He had a lovely girl still in college at Walla Walla and he'd spend weekends back there, while Coleman and I would be working in Yakima. Grunke did a routine job. He was capable enough, but I don't think he had the interest in it that Coleman had and that I had.

Mr. Frederick: And who was the ad-writer? Who did

the layout?

Mr. Canwell: Coleman wrote most of the ads. I would occasionally lay out an ad and call on a client. I remember I handled the beauty ads. It was an easy thing to do and so, when I had some spare time I'd write layout for an ad for some beauty parlor and take it to them. There were several accounts like that I used to handle. But in general Coleman was the advertising man.

Mr. Frederick: How many accounts did you people have on the books?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, I don't remember the amount. We were usually putting out about an eight-page paper and we would have full-pages from Penneys, Montgomery Ward and, I believe, Safeway. Usually the paper was crowded with ads, limiting the space that I wanted to develop for news and editorials. But, I don't remember the number of accounts. The big accounts predominated and we worked trying to get the smaller ones, the hardware stores, jewelry stores, and the smaller merchants. Usually they did not have a lot of money to spend on advertising and the Colonel saw to it that they had problems if they advertised with us.

Mr. Frederick: How far was the Colonel's reach? Did he reach up into Ellensburg or down south?

Mr. Canwell: There was some distribution of the Colonel's paper in Ellensburg, but he didn't try to compete too much with the Kaynors. His reach was more down the Valley and he had some circulation in Ellensburg and the other little towns on the line, but it was not significant. It didn't make any difference to him whether he had that or not.

The Colonel had a friendly relationship with the Kaynors, who had the paper at Ellensburg. He kidded them a lot about their windy city and so on. Through Wenatchee, the Colonel up there had a going concern and I don't think there was any circulation of the Yakima papers in Wenatchee. But down the Valley the Colonel's paper covered the Valley quite effectively and skillfully.

He did what publishers like the Spokane newspapermen did. They have two papers and they arrange it so if you want full coverage you have to buy both papers. As it works out, it's a very profitable approach. But, one paper will usually be the dominant one. In Spokane the *Spokesman Review* dominated the *Chronicle*. They're both Cowles papers. In Yakima the *Republic* dominated the *Herald*, both Robertson papers. But, he had circulation all the way down through Sunnyside and that area toward the Tri-Cities.

Mr. Frederick: Where did he get the title of "Colonel"?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, that was very common for a newspaper publisher to be called “Colonel.” It came from the South I think, but they were always “Colonels.” He was a character and a great one. I felt that I was learning a great deal from him in a detached sense. He had a brilliant and mean editorial style. He drank pretty heavily and he slept in a room up above his office. He’d consume a bottle of scotch—I think that was his favorite—and he’d come down in the morning in his bedroom slippers, bleary-eyed and angry and cussing out the politicians and everybody else.

Sis Anthon, who was a subordinate there, would be taking it down in shorthand and out of those comments came his pithy editorials. They were dandies.

He had a particular hatred for our senators at that time, who were Bone and Schwellenbach. He’d never dignify them by calling them “senator.” He’d say, “the firm of Bones and Schwelly.” But, anyway, he always had something to say that they wouldn’t like. That was pretty well true about the administration. He was very anti-FDR and New Deal. He could afford to be because he had a monopoly there and was making a lot of money.

During the time that I was there he sent one of his subordinates and tried to hire me away; that’s the way he would work. He felt that I was important to the paper and so he offered me a job. If I’d had good sense I’d have taken it. The Colonel trained some of Washington State’s ablest newsmen, like Ashley Holden, who did a stint there, and Fred Neindorff of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer. Any number of others had training under the Colonel in Yakima.

Mr. Frederick: Did Ashley and Fred start their careers there in Yakima?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, Fred did, and I rather think Ashley. One of Ashley’s first jobs here was with a Japanese trade paper and then I think he went from there to the Yakima papers. But I did not know him at that time. I do know that he did time at the Yakima paper and Fred started his career there.

Mr. Frederick: Why didn’t you take that position with the Colonel?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, it was a feeling of loyalty to my partners, which wasn’t shared. I don’t think in the same situation they would have hesitated a minute to better their own lot. But I still felt that we would come up with a newspaper there. I was working in that general direction. For a time we had our paper printed in Ellensburg at the Kaynor’s. Then we had it printed in Seattle. I would go to Seattle every week and put this paper together, put it to bed, and bring it back to Yakima.

Mr. Frederick: The paper was a weekly?

Mr. Canwell: It was a weekly. It seems to me it came out on Thursdays or Fridays. We were able to provide advertising for the weekend grocery and mercantile advertising.

Mr. Frederick: Did you keep the original title?

Mr. Canwell: It seemed to me that we changed it somewhere along the line to the *Yakima Valley News*. That may have been with our incorporating. We needed to come up with a second-class mailing permit. And so, in dividing it up some way, at least on paper, we were able to get a second-class mailing permit. Along about this time the Colonel got the city council to put through an ordinance that you couldn’t throw papers on porches. So, that was to put the free distribution of the shopping news out of business.

Then we came up with a little metal clip we had made. We’d go to a person and ask them if they wanted to continue to receive the paper, and almost all of them except the Colonel’s employees wanted it. So, that was no problem, it’s just the mechanics of it, putting this clip on a doorpost and fastening it with a screw.

Mr. Frederick: Did you have your logo on that clip?

Mr. Canwell: No, we didn’t. It was just a cheap metal clip that we had stamped out or bent to provide a little tension or spring when the thing was screwed to the wall. It was along about that time that we also tried to take the leap into the second class mailing and get a second-class mailing permit, which I think we did.

Mr. Frederick: And what is the procedure? What does that mean?

Mr. Canwell: Well, you go through the Postal Department. It’s a mailing concession that newspapers have had, I suppose almost from the beginning of free delivery. Wanting a free press in America, Congress always worked toward providing an easy approach to it and giving certain concessions and privileges in mailing.

Mr. Frederick: Before you could access a second-class mailing permit through the Post Office, what you are saying then is that these newspapers were hand-delivered?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, they were delivered from door to door.

Mr. Frederick: Who was in charge of the recruitment? Who was in charge of that organization? That sounds like an extensive operation to manage.

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember who handled all of that—that was quite an operation. It may have been the son of the man whom we bought the paper from, Kennedy Foresman. I know he worked for us for a time both in the editorial department and I think he may have had something to do with the circulation.

It was a continuing and tremendous problem because these papers had to be distributed rapidly and over a wide area. Of course the Colonel was trying to figure out ways to inhibit us or prohibit that.

As I mentioned, for a time, we had our paper printed in Seattle.

Mr. Frederick: Before we get there, you started your, well, it's somewhat obvious that you probably couldn't get it printed in Yakima.

Mr. Canwell: No, there was no way. We acquired an old flatbed press with the purchase of the weekly paper. It would work, but it was a very slow process. To turn out the volume that we had to have, we needed a web press. We eventually did get one, a used one. But, in the interim period, we jobbed our printing out, first at Ellensburg and then in Seattle.

Mr. Frederick: And about how many units were you publishing then when you first started? Or how many units were you printing?

Mr. Canwell: I would probably be inaccurate on that, but I suppose it was somewhere between 20,000 and 30,000. It was a lot of them.

Mr. Frederick: And were you the individual who would go up to Ellensburg or to Seattle?

Mr. Canwell: Usually I would. I'd go up there and make sure that everything was shipshape and ready to go. The Ellensburg people had Linotype capability, and such editorials and things as I had I might be finishing up there and having them set them. They set the type for the ads, too.

I'd quite often go up there and stay overnight. Sometimes I'd be up there during the week and come back because we'd get some of the ad material ready early. We had to. It was a pretty heavy schedule for a few people to handle.

Mr. Frederick: Would they call some of those ads in to you while you're up there or would you always take hard copy up there.

Mr. Canwell: It seems to me that most of it was just hard copy that we delivered up there for assembly or for setting. There was some telephone communication.

There were repeat ads that would be the same ad all the time, so those were standing. Then we'd have to communicate as to what copy was going to be available. They couldn't set the pages until they knew what most of the total copy would be. But it was a program that worked. It was a little awkward, but it worked. And it worked because we worked day and night, for one thing.

Mr. Frederick: Would you drive that truck then back with the whole printing?

Mr. Canwell: Yes. We had a trailer. We hauled the papers in the trailer. And it was not an easy thing. The Yakima-Ellensburg Canyon was a very crooked, devious route and you get behind a truck going five miles an hour—that's how fast you went. So that was an unhappy situation, but you had to live with it.

Mr. Frederick: And what did you do in the wintertime?

Mr. Canwell: In the wintertime? Oh, we rolled our trailer and—

Mr. Frederick: Did you have chains on that truck then?

Mr. Canwell: No, no, we had chains if you had to use them or put them on. Most of the time the canyon road was pretty well-plowed and so that part was negotiable. Your biggest problem would be when it was icy and slick and you couldn't get in motion. But the depth of the snow was never a problem, they plowed that out.

Mr. Frederick: And that would most assuredly carry your weight with regard to the endeavor because that would have been a very grinding and very heavy responsibility.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, it was, although I sort of enjoyed the break to get to Seattle because I did a little general-news work while I was there. I had some time on my hands and I'd make certain contacts there. We also had a very happy arrangement. We traded hotel and restaurant costs for space in our paper, which was not hard to do. I remember we had an account with the Roosevelt Hotel in Seattle. I had very good accommodations. There were places along the line that we had accounts with restaurants, so we never had to spend any cash money in that area.

[End of Tape 17, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: So, you would have like "pony express" way stations along the way? You had one there at the Roosevelt Hotel. Did you have any between Yakima and Seattle?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, we had some very pleasant accounts, one of them being at Falls City. There was a really nice restaurant at Falls City and then up at Snoqualmie Falls was the Snoqualmie Lodge, I think it was called. We had an account there and we never were able to eat up as much money as they owed us. But, anyway, that's the relationship.

Mr. Frederick: That reminds me. Who did the collections or did all of your work on collections?

Mr. Canwell: Well, Coleman did most of it. He took a responsibility there in paying the big accounts and collecting the money to do it. That money usually was forthcoming from the large accounts like Penneys and Montgomery Ward, Safeway and that type of business, so that our general overhead was pretty much assured. But Coleman handled that and he was a little tricky.

We had a jewelry store, one of the major stores, and finally had got an account with them. I remember handling the ad and seeing that it was set up in place and so on. And I thought, "Well, that's pretty good, we have a new account." Well, when I went to collect on that account I found that he had traded the ad for a silver set for his mother. So, he was a little tricky in areas like that, but he also was a good businessman.

Mr. Frederick: So considering the amount of work that he did, he would take a little cut here and there that you would discover once in awhile?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I'd say that he was not above doing that. But in general our gross income had to go to meeting our printing and living facilities. Most of the time we had an apartment. The three of us occupied an apartment across from the St. Elizabeth's Hospital. I always remember that pleasantly because there were a lot of pretty nurses living there, too. Had I had more time for them I think I'd have enjoyed it more. But we did have an apartment there. And another fellow from Walla Walla College who was a baker lived with us for a time. So we had a three- or four-way split on the living accommodations.

The cash flow went into paying our printers. That was a substantial amount. I don't remember how much, but it took almost everything we were able to garner.

Mr. Frederick: My guess is, if you wanted to stay in the business, that the printer would never be shorted.

Mr. Canwell: Well, yeah, we went through sort of an evolution there. We eventually bought a web press. When you have a web press, you have to have a printer who will operate it. So our expenses increased along with the utility or convenience of the thing, being able to turn

the paper out in Yakima and usually on time and eliminating some of the travel. It was an important factor, but it still didn't add up to any take-home-pay usually.

Mr. Frederick: How long did you job the printing out?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, I might be inaccurate on that. I think we jobbed it out in Seattle for probably a couple of years. I remember that phase of it very well because of where we had it printed. We had it printed out in Ballard. The printer was a man who eventually went to the Legislature, a senator. He and his wife had this quite elaborate printing operation in Ballard. His wife was the Linotype operator and I think the real brains and motive power of the whole thing. I would go out there to Ballard and help get the paper all ready for printing.

At the same time there was an interesting operation going on there—the Communist Party was also printing their paper at the same establishment. I'd be watching these characters and listening to them, one of them being Terry Pettus, whom you may have known or remember. I think he's dead. But, the whole high command of the Communist apparatus would be out there putting their paper together.

Mr. Frederick: Now we'll have an opportunity to go into that a little bit later. With regard to jobbing out your printing, approximately how long did you do that before you had your web press and your own printer, in-shop printing?

Mr. Canwell: It seemed to me that it involved most of the time that I was active on the paper and that was several years.

Mr. Frederick: '32 through '36?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, along in that time, but at times during that period I interrupted my activity on the Yakima paper. I think most of that time was after we had the web press in Yakima. During that time I remember going east and seeking employment, hoping to break into the upper levels of the newspaper-writing area. As to just the time, I can place some of the time because I went back and attended the World's Fair in 1934.

In 1935 and 1936 I spent quite a lot of time around Detroit and Chicago. I was active in covering the sit-down strikes in the automotive industry. So these were interims when I'd come and go back to Yakima. I was not too pleased with the progress that was being made as a newspaper. I wasn't interested in running a shopping news. I wanted a newspaper; wanted to edit one. I wanted it to have some impact. I couldn't see that was coming about.

Mr. Frederick: Now when you were out of state in '34, potentially '35, '36, did Coleman and Grunke have that press in-shop, the web press, in Yakima during that time?

Mr. Canwell: It was during part of that time, I don't remember just the year that the press was installed. I remember being there part of the time and the problems we'd have with the web breaking and all that sort of thing.

Mr. Frederick: Which would place it before '34?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I rather think it was in that period of time. I don't know just how I happened to decide to go back and observe the World's Fair. I just know that I did and I can remember that well because I became acquainted with Sally Rand there.

Mr. Frederick: So as near as we can tell at this point in time, you jobbed out the printing for at least two years? And you and your partners started that in Ellensburg? Why, if I'm correct, was that the first?

Mr. Canwell: That was the first venture out-of-town for printing.

Mr. Frederick: Why didn't you remain with the Kaynors up there at Ellensburg?

Mr. Canwell: They were not too happy to do the job in the first place. They had a busy newspaper operation and I think brothers operated it. They entered into this with the idea of maybe it'd be a worthwhile, moneymaking deal. I don't think they were too happy with it. And so they probably terminated that and we went to Seattle.

Mr. Frederick: You couldn't have gone east or you couldn't have gone south? That was your only opportunity then, was to go to Seattle to have that printed?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, there was just nobody in the area capable of handling a job that size. There were newspapers down in Sunnyside. Al Hillyer, I think, had the newspaper there and it was a pretty good operation. But, not capable of expanding to accommodate like this and not particularly wanting to. They weren't anxious to have somebody flooding their market with free advertising.

It seemed to me that the only place that we could find to handle a job that size was in Seattle. I don't know who arranged that. I think maybe Grunke did; he spent some time over in Seattle. They lined up this *Ballard News*, I think it was, that had this large shop.

Mr. Frederick: Let's spend some time now in Yakima. That would have been approaching the depths of the

Great Depression, and as we have discussed earlier from your perspective the Depression hit relatively soon on the east side of the mountains. Did you see a decline within the economy, within society, from the initial stages of 1929 down into when you were in Yakima? And if you did, what did you see?

Mr. Canwell: I don't think that I saw it from that perspective. I was aware of changes and I was never one of those who harped on the good old days. I accepted changes as they came and I didn't see any great change. There was a financial bind, a squeeze, the businesses had a very hard time making a profit. The reason they had a hard time making a profit was that people weren't working, they didn't have income to spend.

As to the criminal or moral level, I'm not aware that I had any extra concerns in that area. I try to think of just what I did for spare time and recreation there, and I had very little. There wasn't much to do. I remember when light wines and beer came back; they opened two or three places in downtown Yakima and had live music and suddenly things began to take on some life. But I didn't have much time for that, either.

Mr. Frederick: Considering the time you did have, where would you hang out?

Mr. Canwell: Well, most of the time I hung out in our upstairs office. We had a second-story office downtown and our print shop was across the railroad tracks two or three blocks away. But, we had this downtown office and I spent most of my time there trying to write something or taking some part in the advertising business problems of the paper.

Mr. Frederick: And what building was that located in?

Mr. Canwell: The Star Clothing Company was downstairs. Around the corner and down the street was the Donnelly Hotel. This was on the main street, I think it was called Yakima Avenue. It was above this Star Clothing Company and that's the best I can recall. It was rather comfortable quarters, a couple of rooms.

Mr. Frederick: And what was the apartment building called across from the hospital?

Mr. Canwell: That I don't remember. It was just an apartment complex that had, I suppose, ten or twelve units or more in it. It was quite a modern, attractive unit, in which we had cooking facilities if we wished to use them.

I recall most of the time I worked late and maybe slept late. We'd have coffee or something at the apartment, but usually most of the eating was done downtown. I had a good friend I developed there. He had the Avenue

Theater. He was a Jewish fellow. His father had made a fortune in Yakima in the metals-iron area and he had sent one of his sons to Harvard to law school and another one to medical school. This one, he decided, he should be in business, so he bought him a theater.

Well, he didn't care much for business. He liked to play golf and he would invite me out to play golf. I didn't have time for it, nor any great interest. But I did go out a time or two with him and I'd slice a ball out into the rough and he'd say, "Oh, let it roll, it'll come back to me." He'd give kids entrance to his theater for golf balls. So, it would hardly stop rolling until some kid would have it. So, he had lots of golf balls.

He was a friend with whom I quite often would visit and stop in at his theater office.

Mr. Frederick: And his name?

Mr. Canwell: Brown. His last name was Brown; I'd have to reach for it now to remember his first name. I suppose that the Brown name had been acquired or assumed, because they were definitely Orthodox Jewish people. His father was very determined that he not only stay in the faith, but make a success of his business.

He thought that his son should get married and he didn't seem to be working at it, so the father went to Seattle and brought him back a bride. It didn't add to the happiness of young Brown because she took over the operation of the theater and pretty soon had all the help mad, fighting and quitting, and everything else.

Anyway, he liked to play golf, and he was an easygoing fellow and didn't seem to be concerned about making a lot of money. His brothers were successful, which made him the bad example of the family. I became well-acquainted with him and would visit him quite a lot. And I also had a weekly ad from his theater.

Mr. Frederick: So what you're saying then, as the region slipped into the depths of the Great Depression, '32, '33, when you were over there in Yakima, is that you didn't see that much of a change?

Mr. Canwell: No, I didn't. I was very aware that we were having a real hard time making it. And we were not the only ones; everybody was having a hard time. There wasn't a lot of employment. It was seasonal there at that time; the industry was largely apples in the Yakima area. The retail marketing fluctuated with the harvest season. But, Yakima was a shopping center for the whole Valley and benefited from that.

But nobody was very prosperous. However, there was a lot of basic money there, so that when the Sunshine Mine was being promoted and the stock was worth nothing, the salesmen found the greatest number of suckers down in Yakima. Suddenly the Sunshine Mine

came in and they were all millionaires. So there was a lot of that money in Yakima.

Mr. Frederick: Where is that mine located?

Mr. Canwell: Up in the Coeur d'Alenes.

Mr. Frederick: Who was behind that endeavor up there?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, I don't remember who all were in the Sunshine, some of Spokane's early mining millionaires. Most of the mining money out of the Coeur d'Alenes was local. It would be Spokane fortunes, and many mines were developed up there. The Sunshine Mine was one of those. I remember my wife telling about how her mother bought every stock that was available; anybody that came along selling some stock she bought, except Sunshine Mine, which she thought was too cheap. It was ten or twelve cents a share. And suddenly it was sky-high. But the Sunshine Mine supplied a lot of the basic money in Yakima, the Larson Building, and the men who had the Star Clothing Company, the Dills—those families made big money out of the Sunshine Mine. And they were able to support businesses that otherwise might not have fared so well, but they had the financial cushion. And the Colonel made his off the paper.

Mr. Frederick: Was he involved in real estate also?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, he owned a good share of the downtown area in Yakima. You wouldn't know it until you heard the complaints of some his tenants, who had their rates raised or their rent raised because they advertised with us. But he owned a good share of the downtown real estate.

He had ways of evening the score with merchants. His wife was a kleptomaniac, Robertson's wife was. She would go around downtown and boost things; she didn't need to, she had all the money in the world, but she had this kleptomania. The merchants found that they could bill the Colonel. And when they'd complain to him he'd say, "Well, just send me a bill." Well, of course, they'd send him bills when she didn't boost anything and then he'd raise the rent, so it was a round robin. Everybody knew about her problem and she was a charming person otherwise. It is just a mental derangement of some kind that does that.

Mr. Frederick: Well, it sounds like it wouldn't have been an easy life for her, because it sounds like the Colonel was a practicing alcoholic.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I don't think that he spent much time at home. As far as I know, the times that I was there, I never saw him anywhere except in the *Republic* or going

down the street a block or two away. He would wend his way down there in his bedroom slippers to the Shamrock Bar. It was a beerparlor that had operated for years. It was one of his ports of call and he'd go down there and back. That's about all I would see of him, or anyone else would see for that matter.

He had some friends, the Coffin brothers, who were big sheep operators. And they had a bank in Yakima that I think was probably partially owned by Robertson, and the Coffin brothers ran it. They were also poker buddies and drinking buddies of Colonel Robertson. So they would play poker with the Colonel up in his upper room, balcony room. They played poker and drank and got meaner as the hours went on, but that was part of his way of life.

In the spring when they were cutting the lambs, castrating them, the sheepmen would bring in these cuttings and the Colonel would write rhapsody editorials about these "mountain oysters." Well, you had to know what they were to know what he was talking about. The Coffin brothers were the contributors of that delicacy that the Colonel prized so highly.

Mr. Frederick: How long was the arrangement with the Kaynors in Ellensburg on the job work?

Mr. Canwell: I don't think it lasted more than a year or part of a year. It wasn't a long period of time.

Mr. Frederick: Then approximately sometime in '33 you said that potentially Grunke made arrangements in Seattle?

Mr. Canwell: I rather think that he made the Seattle arrangement, but I don't know that for certain. I think he must have, because Coleman wouldn't have had time. And I didn't do it.

Mr. Frederick: And Grunke could find himself over in Seattle, potentially?

Mr. Canwell: Well, his girlfriend, whom he finally married, came from over there somewhere. So, when she would be home during vacation, he would find it necessary to make trips to Seattle, business trips, and whatnot. Grunke was a very able man, but a goof-off as far as he could get away with it. He devoted his spare time to Ruth, the lovely girl he married.

Mr. Frederick: Where did he eventually settle?

Mr. Canwell: He went to California and for a time was making movies down there, religious movies. He would write the script for this thing and then he would go out to the movie colonies, the studios, and rent the camera

facilities and the people necessary to put these things together. They were brief films. I think they probably were marketed within his church or in that orbit. But, he did that for one thing. I don't remember what all he did after that. He's now dead.

[End of Tape 18, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: What happened to Mr. Coleman?

Mr. Canwell: Well, Coleman, again, was a person of expansive ideas and had a genius for seeing opportunities to make money. He got to buying cars that people would advertise in the paper. He would buy them and I think he got in some trouble by kiting the contract costs. He would give somebody a credit for a down payment that they never made. That was done also in the housing area. But, finally he got in some trouble with the local bank over that and it was pretty serious trouble. Anyway, he got out of that, but I remember he was venturing in such areas in real estate and cars.

When he left Yakima he went to Portland and started an advertising agency down there and did very well. I haven't heard anything about him in recent years. I think his health broke and whether he's still alive or not I don't know. But he did go to Portland and established a successful advertising operation.

Mr. Frederick: The printer in Ballard, what was that establishment called and who were the people associated with that?

Mr. Canwell: The people who had it were the Kimballs, Harold Kimball and his wife. I believe it was called the *Ballard News*. I think they had a local paper there as well as this rather extensive print shop. Harold Kimball was the owner and the one with whom we, well, I won't say he's the one we did business with, we did business with both Harold and his wife. Harold would be away from the place a lot, but you could always find his wife there. She was the Linotype operator, as I mentioned previously.

Mr. Frederick: And what was your impression of Harold when you first met him?

Mr. Canwell: I thought he was a nice guy, but nuts. That's the way I would have put it. I thought he was a little flaky, but a nice guy. He worked hard on Fred Neindorff to become a member of my investigative committee, then never attended a meeting. However, I later met him unexpectedly and he announced to me that he, a member in absentia, would take care of the westside of the state for the committee, and I, the chairman, could handle the eastside. He then proceeded to make unauthorized arrangements to travel to Washington, D.C.

on the committee's behalf!

I remember at one time he lost his billfold that had hundreds of dollars in it and somebody found it and brought it back to him. He peeled off \$100 and gave it to the person. He was that sort of person. And he was a little flamboyant. I thought at the time, and later observed, that he was a little psychotic.

He was elected to the state Senate from that district and had served there before I went to the Legislature. I don't think he was in the Senate or in politics when we were having the printing done there. But I, of course, was aware of him and aware of some of the other people who had printing done there.

Mr. Frederick: During those early years did you have an opportunity to do any printing with the Frayn publishing?

Mr. Canwell: No, I didn't know Mort Frayn until I served in the Legislature and was involved in Republican politics. He was very active in the Seattle area.

Mr. Frederick: So, when you were jobbing that printing in the Seattle area, it was with Harold or his wife you dealt?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, in the printing operation that's where we had all of the printing done that we did there. While I was over there I used to make contact with the *Seattle Star*. I became acquainted with the publisher of it and was in and out of the *Star* office.

Mr. Frederick: And how did that come about?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, I suppose I just went in there to make a contact.

Mr. Frederick: Who was that?

Mr. Canwell: I had quite a bit to do with him later on and I've forgotten what his name was. Later I was involved in a deal where I was going to the Far East to help set up a news-collecting agency over in the Malay Peninsula area. I discussed this with him and he gave me letters of introduction and things. But, I still would have to think to remember his name.

There was another character who worked on the *Star* who set himself up as a detective, an expert in that area. He knew nothing at all about it, but he eventually conned his way into becoming in charge of the Naval Intelligence office in Seattle during the war. Anyway, he didn't know anything about the field he specialized and experted in. He couldn't have tracked an elephant through the snow. But he became known as a great detective and was called in by many places to give assistance in cases. Anyhow, I made contact at the *Seattle Star* and also at the Hearst

paper there, the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*.

Mr. Frederick: Who was your contact at the *P-I*?

Mr. Canwell: Well, my contact later on was Cap Hammer of *International News*, but I don't remember who I first met at the *P-I*. Later I became acquainted with the publisher and various editors, Neindorff and others, but not at that time.

Mr. Frederick: This would be in about '33 then?

Mr. Canwell: Along in that period.

Mr. Frederick: You were mentioning that you had an opportunity to meet Ashley Holden at that time.

Mr. Canwell: Yes. I was paying a great deal of attention to the radical activity over there; Harry Bridges, there was a general movement. The Communist Party officials were having their paper printed at the same plant we were. One day the word got to me that the city police and mayor were going up to Communist Party headquarters to raid it. They didn't go through the formalities in those days that they do now.

I went down the general direction that I knew they were coming from and I met them down there in front of the Communist Party headquarters. There probably were twenty people in the group and one of them was Ashley Holden. They went into this place. It was on the second floor in an old storefront sort of building. And they went upstairs and were going to carry the party desks and furniture out of the place. The desk wouldn't go through the door, so they threw it through the window. I'll always remember that because I picked up a little button with Marx or Lenin's head on it and I still have it.

I met Ashley there and had some conversations about the general Communist activity in Seattle, which was very intense at that time. They were organizing heavily and were of considerable strength, both in the Legislature and in politics.

Mr. Frederick: And some of that insight would have been provided through the Kimball press out at Ballard?

Mr. Canwell: I would say that the insight that I acquired there was just observing this bunch of radicals putting together their paper. They were very vocal and loud, busily engaged and completely oblivious of me. And I was aware. Knowing something about Communist activity already, I was aware of what was going on. I think I picked up copies of their paper, *The People's World*, I think it was called then.

Mr. Frederick: And you mentioned that Terry Pettus

was out there?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, he was one of those that I remember.

Mr. Frederick: Is there anyone else that you recall who would be out there?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, it seemed to me that Bill Dobbins might have been one, and Tom Rabbitt. I don't remember that Pennock was there, he probably was a little young for that at the time, but it seemed that Tom Rabbitt was one of those who was there and I'm not sure that Howard Costigan wasn't occasionally there. Somewhere along the line I know I became conscious of Howard Costigan. He was very active in a front or two that weren't necessarily identified as Communist. I would not have known of his Communist connections other than through the paper, the Ballard Printing Press.

But Pettus, I think, was the editor, it seemed to me. I just don't want to be inaccurate. I think Forbus was there, but I don't know.

Mr. Frederick: And these recollections would have been established through hindsight. Would you have known who these people were at the time?

Mr. Canwell: To some extent. I knew that they were putting out a Communist newspaper there. My association or awareness of Harold Kimball was, of course, increased when I went to the Legislature because he eventually ended up on my committee.

Mr. Frederick: I hear you. You would be out there in Ballard at Harold Kimball's press plant, there would be various individuals associated with the publishing of a Communist newspaper. That meant something to you, that sparked something in you and you state today that you are somewhat aware of that movement or radical movements predating that.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I'm trying to think what would cause me to go down to Harry Bridges' meeting, for instance. There was a big rally and Harry Bridges was in town to address it. So I went down there to see what was going on and blithely walked into the meeting. I think I was wearing some seersucker suit or something. I didn't look like these longshoremen. They let me get all the way into the place and then a couple of them picked me up and danced me to the front door and threw me out.

That gave me a great interest in Harry Bridges. At the time, I believe I thought, "Well, I'll get you, you so-and-so-someday." And that was the beginning of my interest in Harry Bridges. I eventually provided the information that proved him to be a member of the Communist Party and ordered him deported from this country. But it

started there.

After meeting Ashley Holden there I had quite a number of contacts with him and conversations. He was very interested in the radical, Communist situation. It was partly through that early contact in Seattle that I became closely acquainted with him and associated with him in Spokane after he became political editor of *The Spokesman Review*, and I came back to Spokane.

Mr. Frederick: Did Ashley focus your interest within the Communist movement?

Mr. Canwell: My recollection is that we discussed the situation in Seattle and the radical situation in general. He was very well-aware of who Harry Bridges was.

Mr. Frederick: In what capacity did he discuss that with you? In what capacity were you discussing that with him?

Mr. Canwell: Just as a fellow reporter. We might have coffee together and I don't remember when I used to go to the Seattle Press Club with him, I think that was in later years, but we discussed that over coffee or having lunch. He had an office over there, and it seems to me that he was editing the trade journal for the Japanese people. And just what that was I don't know now.

But to get into the proper context or atmosphere, you have to realize that the one thing moving that everyone was aware of in Seattle was the radical activity. They were promoting and parading and protesting everywhere, and everywhere you'd turn that's what you'd see and hear.

Mr. Frederick: So, that was, other than the Great Depression, that was the story?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, that was the moving force. They were organizing labor and there was a lot of sympathy for the radical approach to it. As it increased, then the alarm about it increased. But for the time being I would say that people were not too antagonistic to it, until they saw it in operation and saw the brutal recruiting methods and things that the radicals participated in or organized and led.

Mr. Frederick: In your visitations with Ashley, let's say circa 1933, it would be a news-story source, as reporters, a potential. Well, they would, in a certain sense they would, represent a commodity within the news field?

Mr. Canwell: Well, my intention, of course, was to utilize some of this information translated to our paper. Yet we didn't have much room for news. I was thinking along those lines and it was the limitations in that area that

I felt were inhibiting, that were not taking me where I wanted to go.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, what I don't understand is that a long-time-held desire was to enter into the publishing, writing, newspaper field. You have the genesis platform for that in 1932. You find yourself in 1933 in Seattle, make various contacts, one of them being Ashley Holden. And through him potentially other contacts within the field. It's the depth of the Great Depression. There is a radical, Communist movement taking place all around you that from a newspaper standpoint represents a commodity, a very salable commodity. What I don't understand is at that point in time why would you persist with the Yakima advertising paper? And if it was before, or later, who knows, to team up with Colonel Robertson to get more active press background and use this in Seattle as a commodity to do that? Why did you fool around with that Yakima paper at that point in time?

Mr. Canwell: Well, in Monday morning quarterbacking, of course, it's a different thing. But at that time I still envisioned the possibility of developing a viable, genuine newspaper. I read and studied and acquired every paper that I could find that was going in the direction that I was interested in. Of course, I was more interested in the Hearst approach and the *Denver Post* and papers like that. I felt that to have a newspaper as such in Yakima, you somehow or another had to sensationalize the front page so that you could compel attention. Well, I just couldn't find a way or a means of doing that. Now, in Seattle, if somebody had offered me a job on the *P-I* or *Times* I probably would have taken it. But I don't know that I would. To my way of thinking and looking back on it, and I'm sure it was my thinking then, the news was the burgeoning radical movement. That was the thing.

Well, as Bill Dwyer in the Goldmark trial asked, "What were you doing back in the sit-down strikes?"

And I said, "Well, that's where the action was." Well, that's pretty much what drove and compelled me; that I had this anchor all the time in Yakima. But I was gradually realizing that it wasn't going anywhere that I wanted to go.

Mr. Frederick: Are you saying a little bit that Colonel Robertson's papers weren't punchy enough?

Mr. Canwell: No, he was going in the direction that I wished to go. But to compete with him I'd have to be a little more flamboyant in my thinking. I had no way of doing that at the time. I was maturing all the time, too. I was not a seasoned newspaperman, I was just an ambitious one.

Mr. Frederick: Within 1933, what was the extent of

your contacts; and were your contacts primarily within the publishing field at that point in time?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I would say most of them were. However, I had a girlfriend or two in Seattle I used to visit with and date once in awhile when I felt I could afford it. But in general my contacts were in the publishing area. Of course, Seattle also had great library facilities which I would occasionally take advantage of. But, I didn't have unlimited time. I'd be in Seattle two or three days and then I had to get the paper back and on the street.

Mr. Frederick: So, this was groundwork or this was a genesis of your career, your life's work?

Mr. Canwell: I would say so. It was developing in a direction. I think I sensed the importance and the significance of the radical movement. I was able to relate it to the economic situation and evaluate it somewhat from the standpoint that it flowed out of the war and the stringent economic situation, and all that made the way easier for the organized radicals.

Mr. Frederick: And we could date this, then, circa 1933? You have a commodity. You are attempting to access, build a platform. How did that scenario develop? How did you work that? You found a field and how did you begin to work that?

Mr. Canwell: Well, it tied to my basic interest at all times, which essentially involved writing. To write anything significant you needed information, you needed a cause, an issue. It seemed that everywhere I turned I was exposed to some phase or some step or area in the radical movement. I was inquisitive enough and in those days I had an extremely accurate memory. I found myself putting these things together, not in a structural or established way, it's just the way the things broke and the way they happened. I was conditioned by my background and interests to go in that direction.

Mr. Frederick: I hear you. But what could you do with that in 1933? You've got an advertising newspaper back in Yakima and you were fighting for space and whatnot. What did you do with it?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I was sort of feeling my way...I don't remember what the occasion was...to go back to the Chicago area and the World's Fair, whatever took me back there. I think that I went back there originally to pick up a car, a new car. I had a contact and later it developed that any time I wanted an automobile I could go get a new one delivered at the factory by paying this person a slight commission for handling the paper on it. So several times I picked up cars, came home, and came

back to Yakima to see what was going on or if any changes were occurring or anything that would interest me. I can remember picking up a car or two or three and selling them out here and then deciding to go back East again.

I always had the feeling that if I was going to get anywhere in the news field it would be in New York and the East. Every newspaperman, every reporter, I think, shared that feeling.

[End of Tape 18, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Albert, who was your contact for the car arrangements?

Mr. Canwell: I was trying to think the other night of what his name was. He was a dealer back in the Kentucky area and he handled almost all makes of cars. You could get just about anything you wanted. I think he made a great deal of money by just brokering them that way, taking a small cut.

Mr. Frederick: Did you read about him in an advertisement?

Mr. Canwell: I think that Grunke or Coleman knew him originally or had some contact with him. I just don't know at this point what that was. At the same time I went back there, I would find my way to Detroit and areas where there was unusual labor unrest. In so doing I came to do a pretty thorough job of covering the sit-down strikes in the automotive industry.

I remember I was always searching for a market for my material. I usually would find that. I could get paid by the line or word by finding the right outlets. It generally developed over a period of time that my better contact was International News Service. At some time I acquired credentials, press credentials, from them as a roving reporter. I don't know how loosely they distributed those, but it was something I prized very highly because it gave me access to news sources.

Mr. Frederick: Where are they? Where did they operate out of?

Mr. Canwell: The base office was New York, but there were major offices, of course, in San Francisco and Seattle. At that time my contact was in Chicago. I don't recall where their office was, but later my contact in New York was at Hearst International News.

Mr. Frederick: And that International News Service, was that a Hearst operation?

Mr. Canwell: Yes.

Mr. Frederick: Well, how did that come about?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, I just sought it out. I was trying to sell copy and trying to find a way of financing my endeavors.

Mr. Frederick: When did you make your first trip back to Chicago or Detroit on this car business? Was that the genesis for that?

Mr. Canwell: That probably was the genesis of my trip back there. I had to have some way of financing it and some reason for going there. I remember that the Chicago World's Fair was an incentive. It was a drawing card. I remember using my press credentials to get in. Somewhere in my things I have my press card from the Chicago World's Fair of 1934. So that was the process that I used. I don't remember entirely what all of the motive for going back there was, except that I wanted to proceed in that direction. I felt that if there was a future for me in the news field, it was in that area.

Mr. Frederick: In Chicago?

Mr. Canwell: In the East in general. Chicago was just a stopping-off place. I'm trying to think of when I proceeded from there up to the Detroit area. I used to go from Chicago to Detroit quite routinely. I'd leave my car, park it in the police parking lot. I learned to do that because one day I left my car parked on the street and took a train up to Detroit and in the interim a big snowstorm buried my car. So I then found a better place to park. I'd park in the police parking lot.

I did go back-and-forth quite a lot. It may have been on the suggestion of other newsmen, explaining to them what I was trying to do, essentially looking for a job, looking for an outlet for what I thought was talent. My talent, I felt, was in the direction of covering of radical news that I'd seen coming up and developing, and followed closely.

Mr. Frederick: Did you move back there in 1934? Or were these just trips, extended trips?

Mr. Canwell: Well, these were trips. I would establish living quarters. I remember the Morrison Hotel in Chicago, which is on State and Madison. I always had a weakness for decent hotels. If I could afford it at all I'd stay in a good one. I established a sort of headquarters at the Morrison Hotel and when I'd come to town at any time I had people there that I knew. I had a Morrison Hotel credit card, so I was able to cash checks when I needed to and that sort of thing.

There was quite a lot of labor activity up in the Detroit area. I was trying to see what I could find out about—how I could increase my knowledge. It was very obvious that

that's where the action was taking place. The radicals did step up the sit-down strikes there and the Communists practically took over organized labor in that particular area.

Mr. Frederick: Now are you talking 1934?

Mr. Canwell: A major part of it as I recall of my activity there was probably '35 and '36. I had made feeler trips into this area and I had some contacts with newspaper people and editors. I remember that I used to go into the *Detroit Free Press*. I don't remember whom I contacted there, but I had a loose arrangement later somewhere along the line with International News. I was filing copy from several different points, anything that I could find that was newsworthy. I'd go back-and-forth to Minneapolis, occasionally up to Milwaukee, up to Detroit and back to Chicago. As I recall it was very slim pickings. I found no easy source of income.

Mr. Frederick: And it was basically the radical beat that you were on?

Mr. Canwell: That was my concern, my interest; it was where I felt that I had a future. If I was to write or cover the news, I felt that I had an advantage from that standpoint.

Mr. Frederick: What were the challenges that you faced when you were back there with regard to that objective; that you'd established for yourself? What were the challenges?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, the challenges were a matter of eating regularly; the field was full of reporters. And any editor could put his finger on reporters who could cover an assignment. They had rewrite men. You didn't need to be grammarians. Every newspaper had a rewrite desk and they took your copy and in my case they'd prune it down, cut out any of the excess verbiage so that they paid less.

But, anyway, every newspaper editor had a fleet of reporters who were competent, who could cover an assignment. That didn't particularly appeal to me to one day be covering a wedding, the next day a shooting, an automobile accident, or whatever made news at city hall.

That didn't interest me. I felt that the action and the future involved radical activity, radical labor—and more than that, radicalism on an intellectual level. That was my interest and I felt that if I had a future it was in that direction.

I communicated that thinking to editors and writers. I recall in New York that there were two or three Hearst writers who were Europeans. They knew the Communist radical thing from the ground up. They were just beginning to write on it a little bit. And in general the

advice to me was to go back West, that this was where the action would be. I wasn't finding a place in the news field back there and I was losing interest in so doing. New York is an awful place. And so, along with that advice and suddenly realizing I really didn't want to live back there anyway, I decided to return back to Spokane and Washington State. By this time, somewhere along the time, I had severed my connection with the Yakima paper.

Mr. Frederick: And you still maintained your International News Service connection through Cap Hammer?

Mr. Canwell: Yes—whether this is the place to insert or not—when I came back from New York, I was advised to contact Cap Hammer who was the INS desk chief in the Northwest bureau. And I did so. I told him what I was going to do. I was going back to Spokane and I had some other connections on this radical thing and was coming back to extend my endeavors or put them into that area. And I needed identification in Spokane. So they said there was no problem, you can be the INS correspondent in Spokane.

And I did so and started covering a few stories here while I was doing undercover work on the Communist apparatus.

In that area, I became more and more active in the use of my press credentials and identifying myself as the INS correspondent here and I found that they already had one. Cap Hammer had neglected to tell me that they had an INS correspondent here and he was Ted Crosby, Bing Crosby's brother. So as we were setting up the Spokane Press Club and Ted was drawn into the thing, he was really looking askance at me because I was identifying myself as the INS correspondent and he knew that he was.

So he got in touch with Cap Hammer and Hammer put him straight on what I was doing. Ted, having had an intelligence background in World War I, had a sympathetic approach to what I was doing and we became very fast friends. But it was a touchy situation there for a moment. He felt that I was an impostor.

Mr. Frederick: What did you see at the World's Fair in '34? And whom were you representing when you were there?

Mr. Canwell: The credentials I used were my Yakima paper credentials when I applied for a press pass at the World's Fair—which was issued to me. As I walked into the entrance of the fair, they had an overhead display that was worked with mirrors. There was a fan dancer up there who would do her thing, her ritual of moving her fans and fanny and anyway, it was quite a spectacular thing.

So that was the first thing; I approached her to find out what was going on. And I met Sally Rand there. She was the one in charge of the show and display. Over the years I'd see her from time to time. She'd appear in Spokane or Seattle or somewhere else and we became quite well-acquainted.

I remember she gave me autographed photographs, where she was pretty skimpily clad. On coming home, my mother went into my suitcase to do my laundry and so on and that's the last I saw of Sally's pictures. My mother thought that was a little too advanced for me or something. Anyway, she did leave one of them that was a very formal picture. I had that up on the wall until our big fire here.

Regarding what else I may have seen in the World's Fair, it was just another fair. It didn't impress me, as such things never did. And there was little news there. I think I sent a story or two back to my paper.

Mr. Frederick: And then from there you'd make periodic trips into Detroit?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I made quite a number of trips up there. I don't remember exactly what disposal I made of my copy, it seemed to me it was International News that utilized it. I met such people as Walter Trohan of *The Chicago Tribune*. Trohan was just beginning to become interested in the radical movement. Various other news people at that time were beginning to feel it, feel the pressure. There was too much going on there to ignore it. But Walter Trohan was one of those I remember meeting.

Mr. Frederick: In Detroit?

Mr. Canwell: No, he was in Chicago.

Mr. Frederick: In Chicago.

Mr. Canwell: *The Chicago Tribune*. In Detroit, I was in and out of the *Detroit Free Press*. It seemed to me there was another publication there that I had something to do with, but it's just too far back. I remember the highlights more of what I did in the sit-down strikes in that area than I do the general activity.

Mr. Frederick: How would you report a sit-down strike?

Mr. Canwell: I supplied part of that to INS and to other reporters. I used to supply some technical information but don't remember what all the details of the modus operandi of it were. I was a pretty competent reporter, in that I had an instinct for news and how to get to it. Never in my life did I ever deal with flunkies. I always went right to the top and worked down. I remember going to

the meeting of industry and labor at Lansing, Michigan, in Governor Murphy's Office. That's where the news of the world was breaking that day. As I approached the Capitol building, John L. Lewis was getting out of his limousine. I just joined him and walked in, talking to him, walked through the press room and through the governor's anteroom and back to the meeting room with John L. Lewis. I think he knew what was going on, but everybody else thought I was with Lewis.

For the day or two of that conference, I was the only reporter in the inside of the thing. I can remember providing some of the reporters whom I had contacted or knew who were out there in the anteroom with significant information, but I just don't remember all the mechanics of it.

I remember observing that Governor Murphy was psychotic. He was not well mentally. We had this big press meeting room, anteroom. You'd go through that and there was another room adjoining the governor's office. Then you go through that to the back to a meeting room where these conferences were taking place. Well, Murphy every once in awhile would jump up and go through these two or three rooms. Nobody could have heard a thing that was being said or any commotion being made out there with the press section, but he'd go out there and scold them for their noise. He was just nuts. He later became, what was it, supreme court justice or secretary of labor or something.

That was my introduction to labor on that level. I became quite well-acquainted with Lewis and kept contact with him over the years. When he came to Spokane, I brought him to a conference at the Press Club and photographed him. I remember just by way of making conversation in our press conference that I said, "Well, Mr. Lewis, when will you arrive at a place where labor has what it feels it's entitled to? And when will you arrive at where you're going?"

And he laughed and slapped his fat belly and said, "Where would I be if I quit asking for things?"

Well, that was the key to labor leadership. They have to move ahead; they have to demand more and more, and it has to come from production.

Mr. Frederick: And what specific industry did you cover in Detroit during those years when you were in there? You mentioned sit-down strikes.

Mr. Canwell: It was largely the automotive industry. That's where the major action was. I remember hearing that there would be a sit-down strike called at the Hudson department store, which was, I believe, the major department store in downtown Detroit. So I went down there to watch the thing in motion. These labor goons came in various doors and they shouted, "Hudson is on strike! Sit-down!" And anybody who didn't sit-down got

knocked down by them. So, that was the way they organized the sit-down at Hudson's. I suppose in other places it was done the same way. They were trying to get a general sit-down strike. But it was aimed primarily at the automotive industry, which was the lifeblood of Detroit and the automobile industry.

Mr. Frederick: Okay, so you had an opportunity to cover a Hudson department store incident?

Mr. Canwell: I remember that one. There were other skirmishes that were taking place, but the Hudson's is the one I remember well. It was a good place to observe their mode of operation, the way they conducted this strike. They just moved with muscle. Nobody asked them to come in, nobody was demanding organization for the Hudson workers. They just were told that they were on strike and—

Mr. Frederick: Now, is this the Hudson department store you mentioned or a Hudson automobile?

Mr. Canwell: No, no, Hudson department store. Hudson Bay Company, I think, is the parent of the store. I don't know whether they're still operative there or not. But it was a large downtown department store. It would be like Frederick & Nelson at Seattle or The Crescent in Spokane. They had the large, impressive department store in Detroit.

Mr. Frederick: What other industry did you cover back there?

Mr. Canwell: The Chrysler Company, Chevrolet, and Ford. It seemed to me that the Oldsmobile Company was up in Lansing. Wherever the strike action was, why that's where the reporters would go. It was pretty well-advertised in advance that at Chevrolet, for instance, a strike will be called there. They'd work this up to a point where it would be in the news and then it would become a reality. To see the thing in action, you went around to where the action was.

The Ford Motor Company had a confrontation with labor prior to this in which they had a bunch of real tough characters who defied the union. One of these—I've forgotten what they called him—was Bull somebody. Anyway, he equipped these people with pick handles and they withstood the union organizers. It became quite a bloody fray, but I was not at that. It had happened prior to this time.

Mr. Frederick: How would you—cover—how would you report one of those strikes?

Mr. Canwell: I would report what in the news would be

called sidebars. You'd know that the general strike activity would be covered and so you try to find interesting sidebars, sidelights. Some of them involved interviews with workers. I remember interviewing some of these foreign-speaking people who were working there and questioning them. They were on strike and they were laborers, the highest-paid laborers in the world. They came from places where their families had no employment or if so it was at very meager figures. But here these people were getting five dollars a day and an eight-hour day, something unheard-of in the world. So, I'd ask them, "Why are you on strike?"

"Well, we've got to stand up for our rights."

"Well, what are your rights?"

"Well, we've got to stand up for our rights."

That's all they knew. They'd been told by their union people that they had their interests at heart and that they were working to better their lot.

[End of Tape 19, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: Now, you are sitting there telling me that through that experience, when you would have an opportunity to visit with some of the participants of the strike, that that's all you would hear?

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember anybody on the labor level voicing much opinion as to opposition to the strike. I think they just felt that they didn't understand the situation. Then, business people were very, very alarmed. I can remember a friend—I stayed with some people, I've even forgotten their name—but I was acquainted with them through some other source. They lived out at Bloomfield Hills, which is a suburb of Detroit. This man, the head of the house there, was just shaking apart. He thought the world was coming to an end. Everything was crashing in on him. There were labor troubles and a race problem. The Negroes were quite restless there. They were moving across Woodward Avenue or whatever that main street was. And this man was very concerned. He was going to lose all of his money and there was just no hope.

There were people in business who were thinking along those lines. The industry—the captains of the industry in the automotive field—I had no particular access to, other than Walter Chrysler. I met him and talked to him. But the business people and others in the community were very concerned about the violence and potential for extending the hard times by unemployment and the things that were associated with these strikes.

Mr. Frederick: Now, Albert, as I understand the situation during this time frame, there was a union-organizing movement within the auto industry. They were attempting to establish unions, recognized unions within that industry, one holdout being the Ford Motor

Company, which was involved in the Walter Reuther beatings and whatnot. And that was '36 or so, I believe.

Mr. Canwell: Along in that period of time.

Mr. Frederick: I get the impression from you that those whom you spoke to in the labor side were just dupes. They didn't understand what was going on. And it's very difficult for me to understand that, how that would be.

Mr. Canwell: Well, labor in Detroit was made up of great blocks of ethnic groups. They might be Poles or whatever and many of them first-generation Americans. They were not politically astute. They were not informed. All they knew is that they had jobs, they were well-paid, they were able to buy a power washing machine or a radio and various things and send their children to school. But they were not politically informed in any sense. They were willing to go along with whatever their shop leadership recommended.

Now the shop leadership was not all in favor of the union organizing. The United Auto Workers were heavily infiltrated by the Communists. And with their technical skills in recruiting and organizing, they were effective far beyond their membership. There were a lot of people just doing their job and they were worried that a strike would interrupt their home payments; and most of them had cars and things that were being purchased on time. So there was a lot of unrest and unhappiness in the labor community. But there was no organized resistance.

These experts came in. They were ruthless and they were organized and actually the Communist Party took over the United Auto Workers and almost American labor in total, as far as the control of it went. That's what was happening. And the people, well, they're always divided. There's some of them, sure, they're all for a strike; it gives them a chance to goof off. But in general most of them wanted to just go on working and do their stint. Some of it was very dull work and routine, but it was so many hours a day and good pay.

Mr. Frederick: As you remember, what was the driving force, motivation, behind the United Auto Workers Union movement to unionize the auto industry? What was behind all that?

Mr. Canwell: The bait held out was increased pay; to get more money and better working conditions. Their working conditions were very good, but there was a lot of unit work, a lot of piecework. And the unions were very much against that because if a person was paid somewhat in accordance to his production, what he did, if he worked hard and more expertly he made a little more money than when he was involved in that unit program. The unions didn't like that at all.

So they would, of course, inveigh against the bosses in the typical radical line. And try to create class division, the haves against the have-nots. It took a bit of organizing to convince some first-generation American who is getting five dollars a day and working eight hours that he was being abused.

So, more often than not, it was just that he was afraid to resist the thing. The pressures put on him were social and other things. You know: a great deal of talk about somebody being a "scab" who wanted to work when the union said you should strike. And so there were influences afoot there, but the United Auto Workers didn't have things all their way. If you withdrew the element of violence from their practices, I don't think it would have gone anywhere. They did have a lot of these people terrified.

Mr. Frederick: You say violence. You are talking violence directed at the laborers themselves. Is this what you are saying?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, it was not unusual for them to carry on programs of damaging property and cars, and beating up people who offered resistance in the union meeting. That was standard operating procedure in most of the unions. The leadership made gains by using their muscle. The laboring people just want to do their job and go home and collect their checks and live a normal life. They don't want to engage in or make a career of union activity. They soon learn that they can't get anything in the union meeting, so they leave early.

The hard core sit there and pass the resolutions and motions and moves to get labor in motion and strikes and such.

Mr. Frederick: Is a portion of the labor movement from, let's say, '34, '36? And/or what portion, if it is the case, was it just a bogus movement?

Mr. Canwell: I would say that the radical element, or the radical factor in there was a fraud. They seek out the complaints, the things that some laborer feels he's being put-upon, and often they're valid, and then he exploits that. He promises him a better way if you go along with the union.

Mr. Frederick: Well, what would be some of the instances that you heard of? What would be some of the complaints?

Mr. Canwell: You mean of the laborer? Oh, in the automotive industry, I don't remember that there were any valid complaints. I think that indicates the genius of these organizers. They've capitalized more on the fears of the people than they did on their actual abuses. It is not

always the case in union organizing but, in radical union organizing, they combine force and fear and such elements. They always promise more than they can produce. Whatever you want, they promise to get for you, and so they represent you in meetings and have a lobby at the legislature and so on.

But of actual abuses in the automotive industry, I don't think there were many there. They were not valid. If they had an abuse it was in the piecework area. They could claim that the management was getting all the benefits of your hard endeavor. But it wasn't an easy bill of goods to sell.

In other areas, I've seen them be much more effective because they could pick valid reasons for complaint. There is seldom a genuine, valid reason for calling an industry out on strike. The workers suffer more than they gain. The only people who make real gains there are the labor leadership. They collect a few more dues and get a few more votes.

But the industry from the time of Henry Ford—particularly in the automotive industry—began to realize, that if you are going to sell a lot of automobiles, your workmen have to be able to buy them. You can't just sell automobiles to the rich. So Ford came up with support of the eight-hour day and the five-dollars-a-day pay and enabled his workmen to buy Ford cars. That was the general thinking of industry on that level.

On lower levels I think there were many abuses. I mentioned the other day that, at the John W. Graham store, there were people who just felt that the people who worked, their place was down. They think of them that way, but they're the exception. And, of course, they provide the justification for a lot of radical activity.

Mr. Frederick: Where did you gain your insight into the automobile industry to make these statements? Did you interview them? Did you tour the plants?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I remember particularly talking to Walter Chrysler. He said, "Well, I have no fear of a strike." He said, "I know my workmen by their first names. I can walk through my plant and know every one of them and I know that my workmen will not strike against me." Several days later they were throwing rocks through his glass buildings and a strike was in full force. The very people that he knew by first name were induced to go out and strike against him. So, he is one that I did interview and talk to at some length.

Mr. Frederick: Well, I'm talking about getting insight into the line—what it was like to work in an automobile plant. What did you base your observations on?

Mr. Canwell: Most of my observations I would say were made by interviewing workmen to and from work or in

their homes. I remember going out to an area that somebody suggested was a good place to go, where all the people were labor-connected. They were employed in one of the plants. I talked to people there, seeking the inside feeling of what the people themselves really thought.

I could not find any resistance to management that had substance. There would be a radical or a flake here and there who would be sounding off, but the majority of the people were satisfied with their lot. They were concerned about problems like the Negro group expanding rapidly in the Detroit area and there was friction where the two races met. There was that sort of thing, but the complaints against management I don't think were valid or existed in any particular amount.

Mr. Frederick: Okay, so you based that on interviews of various workers themselves?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I talked more to workers than I did to management. Management was not as accessible as the workers and the workers were the valid factor, anyway. That's where the pressures were being put. They were put on management through the work force. And so I felt that valid stories would have to do with how John Doe workman felt about his job and his way of life and his management and so on. I just didn't find the complaints existing there that organized labor was trying to make capital on.

I didn't enter this with any pro-labor or pro-management attitude. I was just observing the thing as I saw it and trying to determine what the effect of radical leadership was and what it would lead to. Beyond that, I don't recall that I did anything other than look for reasonable human-interest stories.

Mr. Frederick: Where do you think that union within that area, in that time frame, was leading to?

Mr. Canwell: Well, my feeling then and now is that the unrest was created by professional radicals who were, in general, Communists and Communist-trained labor leaders. I don't think there would have been any organized activity back there in the labor field in the way of strikes without the Communist experts working there. I remember discussing the thing with John L. Lewis and he himself was not a Communist, but he felt that he could work with them and use them. I disagreed with him. I felt they'd eventually get to a place where he was not as secure, as independent as he was, and that did come about in the CIO. But, anyway, I discussed that very point with him. He, among others, said that the ablest organizers and the ablest leadership in labor was provided by the Communist element; they specialized in it.

I remember a Jewish friend of mine who said, back at

the time we were exposing a number of them in the Hollywood industry who were Jewish, he says, "Is every Communist a Jew?" And I explained to him, "No, but wherever there is a Jew Communist he's going to the top. And it's just the nature of the animal." So, you would see a lot of them, you'd see them in organized labor, in Communist labor.

I became acquainted with the Communist who had been in charge of organized labor in all of America. That was Joe Kornfedder, Joe Zack as he was known in the Communist Party. He was the only American who had served in the Communist International Organization. He explained to me a lot of the techniques of organizing, how farsighted they were, and how intricately they planned many of these things.

Mr. Frederick: What does that say about the other portions of the labor movement, the American Federation of Labor? What do these people do then? What did they do?

Mr. Canwell: I would say that the bulk of American labor and labor organizations were okay. They had a valid area in which to work. Common labor needs organization and leadership; otherwise management will exploit them and take advantage of them. The majority of labor, AFL and most such unions, are legitimate and valid and you don't find them espousing much radical activity. If they call a strike, at least it will have some validity.

But the Communists on the waterfront or in the automotive industry or anywhere else, they have something else in mind. The majority of labor organization, I think, is a good thing. We'd be in a heck of a mess without it, because mankind is essentially greedy and he'll exploit his fellow man. He'll hire him for nothing if you let him get away with it. I have no feeling that there is not a place for organized labor. I just feel that it has to be controlled, just as management does.

Mr. Frederick: So everything was basically fine and the Depression provided an environment for the radical Communist labor movement and—

Mr. Canwell: Yes, they expect such things. That's their lifeblood. If there were no problems and no complaints, they'd have no valid reason for organizing and they wouldn't be able to. But if there is unemployment or hard times and some people are hungry or threatened with hunger, then the radical can come in and point fingers and offer solutions that might be accepted by a person who lacked the experience or expert knowledge to resist it.

Well, that's an old story in the Communist Party; they find what a man's grievances are and offer to do something about it and get in and work like the devil to do it. It's the heart of that type of organizing. You have to

create and exploit dissent. There isn't any workingman who is working at day labor who doesn't feel that he is put-upon, and he usually is.

Mr. Frederick: Why was not the automobile industry unionized before the Great Depression?

Mr. Canwell: Well, in the first place they were in individual units. The Ford Company and General Motors had three or four or five divisions and there was no crying need for it; I say, because I think Ford wisely moved in to meet those complaints before they happened. And so you give a laboring man more money than any of his fellows around the country are earning and favorable hours of work and you constantly improve his conditions. It's pretty hard to convince him that he has troubles. He's buying a house, he has an automobile, he has a washing machine and a radio and other things like that and a yard to tend and he isn't worried about his labor problems. There aren't any unless somebody points them out or creates them. Labor or management wisely met that situation in the automotive industry. And Fisher Bodies and the various divisions of General Motors, Chrysler and Ford provided not only very good working conditions, but they helped in their communities, they helped at their schools and playgrounds and other things. They were very wise and forward-looking. It was pretty hard to go to some worker like that and tell him that he's getting a bum deal.

Mr. Frederick: Why would it be different in the decade of the '30s within the auto industry?

Mr. Canwell: I would say that Ford made the big difference, in changing the working conditions and hours of the workmen. Then as the industry developed, there were a lot more automobiles sold. Why, of course, you hire more workmen and you have a more fertile field for organizing and agitation. But it was not a very fertile field. I think that was one industry where management showed some smarts; they were willing to divide some of the earnings.

Mr. Frederick: Today I'd like to take the opportunity to explore with you the editorial portion of the Yakima newspaper that you and your two companions were operating in the mid-'30s. You have stated that your companions were primarily interested in advertising and exploring that market, producing copy, selling and maintaining accounts, and your interest lay in writing editorial comment. What form or forms did your editorial comment take and how often would you write for that paper?

Mr. Canwell: There was a continuing problem of space

in the paper. I would write editorial copy that I thought was appropriate and very good and often would not have room for it. It was a little difficult to justify devoting that amount of saleable space to editorial copy. I'd follow the news and as it broke I might comment on it and, of course, I followed the Colonel's editorials. In general the lack of space was frustrating to me.

It was hard to sell the idea of the commercial value of editorial copy when you actually did not have space for all of your advertising at times. So I might write a whole lot of things that never saw the light of day.

We decided to do something in the sports area. It was a very limited opportunity because of the time factor. We were a weekly paper and going to bed at a time that required that the copy be in a day or two ahead. I can remember talking to these wrestling promoters and telling them that I just had to know the outcome of a wrestling match ahead of time or I couldn't write any copy on it. So then they leveled with me; they always knew exactly who was going to win and how many falls he'd take and all that. So we ventured into that area a little, also getting advertising copy to justify it.

I remember some ventures into the more literary phase, a music area. Coleman was going with a young woman who had a superior music background. She was very knowledgeable and so she was able to write some criticisms and things on the music picture in Yakima. It was very good. We did find space for things like that.

But I wanted more space and more liberty to be confrontational in my editorial approach. I felt that if there was any possibility of cutting into the Colonel, you had to do it by creating interest in opposition to his very forthright and dogmatic positions. At the same time I found it rather difficult because I shared a good many of his beliefs. His general political approach was also mine, so it wasn't easy to tangle with him.

In a notebook, I had certain things I had clipped, some editorial copy that I had written, and mastheads of the newspaper showing my position as editor. I haven't been able to find it, but I don't think that all of that stuff burned.

Mr. Frederick: What was the Colonel's political philosophy?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, he was a rock-ribbed Republican of Republicans. It was a religion with him and, of course, he had the perfect foil, being able to take after FDR and his cohorts all the time, and the senators and congressman in Washington State, most of whom were Democrats, and some of them pretty radical. He would have a heyday with that sort of thing. Well, it was very hard for me to do anything other than to say, "Amen." But that was the general climate there. I would at times be critical of his excesses, what I thought were excesses, but was basically

admiring. I was learning from the Colonel, I'd say.

Mr. Frederick: What was your position on the New Deal programs?

Mr. Canwell: Well, it was similar to his. The concept of the thing was that it was a socialist venture and a repudiation of our free-enterprise, capitalist system. It was and still is about that. I also felt that we were turning from the philosophy of Lincoln and others who felt that the state should do nothing for the individual which he might reasonably do for himself.

It makes for good politics to go out and gather support from people who are unhappy or complaining, but it doesn't correct their problem. It merely acquires or appropriates political wallop and strength, but it doesn't necessarily make it right. We began a period of inflation at that time where we were spending money we didn't have and in general I opposed that approach. I'm no economist, but I just felt that an eventual collapse of that economic approach would be inevitable. And I think that I was more or less right.

I would have predicted a collapse far before this, but I underestimated the productive capacity of the American people—it was enormous. They expanded markets locally and worldwide and so, as the giveaway program progressed, our economy also developed. Then, of course, we fortified that with a war or two or three. It seems that politicians, when they overspend and are backed into a corner, find an excuse for another war. I'm not, never have been, an isolationist as such or a peacenik, but I've felt that we engage in wars that we should be no party to.

Mr. Frederick: So what you are saying then is that you disagreed with the New Deal program in response to the Depression?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I would say that my disagreement there was general. I did agree with at least some of the great public-works projects. They were inevitable; if the New Deal hadn't committed to them, others would have in the future. The concept of the Grand Coulee Dam and the irrigation of the Columbia Basin was not born with the New Deal. It was born back in the more conservative times by engineers who saw the feasibility, but did not have the funds to do it. It would have come along in any case, but I feel it had inevitable benefits.

So I wasn't dead set against that then, nor am I now, but I think that it is a little too easy to reach for public-works projects and expenditures to solve political pressures and it

doesn't necessarily relieve hunger. To the degree that it does and becomes necessary, I think that some public expenditures are justified. So while I was opposed to the New Deal and the general socialist concept, I was not totally opposed. I felt that some of these things were inevitable and would come about.

Of course, nobody knew at that time that the Pacific Northwest would become the prime center for defense production in the western world. We first developed the dams, the power, and the potential for aluminum. Then the aluminum helped make the move into the aerospace era possible. Those things all came along here and no one could accurately predict them. They just developed as a natural consequence of the technological discoveries and visions and ability of that type of men.

It wasn't foreseen, the Communists and their world program totally missed the point. They thought at one time they were coming into the Pacific Northwest with a land army, after softening the people up with propaganda; that they'd come in through Alaska and the Northwest with massive land forces. Well, it soon became obvious that would not be possible, nor feasible, nor a part of the future. Then they expanded into other areas of penetration and subversion.

First they started out with a bunch of radicals and anarchists and destroyers who were just going to destroy industry. Then they, in an expanded or larger sense, realized that if they were to win their objective they needed the things that we were building and developing. So they changed their tactics somewhat from adversary to cooperator.

But your original question, "Was I opposed to the New Deal?" Yes, I was. I think that we were flimflammed by a master con man who had a mellifluous voice, a good fireside manner. The people followed him, went along with him. I was not for the majority of it.

Mr. Frederick: I get the impression that when you met Ashley Holden, in your mind's eye in hindsight, that meeting means something to you?

CONCERN WITH COMMUNISM

Mr. Canwell: I would say that Ashley Holden had some impact on me. I think probably I had more on him than he did on me. But he was an established newsman. He had definite convictions along the same lines that I did. I think that his knowledge of communism was sort of pedestrian. I felt that, and I do now, that I knew a great deal more about the inner working of the apparatus than he did. But he was against it. There was no question in his mind that it was an evil and he was to oppose it.

Ashley was of pioneer stock in this locale. His parents were among the first people to come to the Okanogan country. His mother was a schoolteacher. They always were people of firm religious and patriotic convictions. He was sort of a prairie Tom Paine, I felt. His heart and interests were in the Okanogan, and then in his state and country, and it flowed out from there.

You never needed to wonder where Ashley stood on anything. You had to just be certain that he wasn't too enthusiastic in his figures and so on about how many people attended a Republican convention or the ones who attended a Democrat one. You'd have to watch his count. He was very, very enthusiastic and believed that the things he wished for were going to come about.

His writings reflect that all the way. They're wholesome. I have a little book of his, probably one of the few nice things that were written about me in the last forty or fifty years. He has a section there where he is approving of my investigations. But that's the sort of thing he did. You knew he was patriotic. You knew that he was a true believer in whatever he was saying. So I'd say he had some influence on me; I think I had some on him.

Later, he came to Spokane. I think he was installed as political editor of *The Spokesman Review* when I came back to Spokane in 1938. We, of course, spent quite a bit of time together. To get a picture of that time, we were still in the Depression. The Depression was intense. There just was not the capital flow necessary to make a society or a city more brilliant. I mentioned earlier Ashley's involvement in establishing the Press Club. Ashley Holden, Bud French, and I were probably among the most active newsmen in establishing it. Al Feyereabend, an advertising man, a genius in his field, led out in the organization and promotion of the club and eventually became its manager.

Holden, French, and I met with the manager of the Davenport Hotel, for instance, exploring the possibility of establishing the Press Club in the Davenport. It was close to the newspapers and the radio stations and an excellent downtown position with a great deal of prestige. McCluskey, the manager, was all for it, but he wanted to run and operate the thing and control it. That, of course, wasn't what we had in mind, nor did it conform to the developing state laws on club operations.

So then we looked across the street. There was a building that had been used for a club—the top floor. An interesting thing about that is it was a building owned by my present wife and her sister, but that was before I knew them. We went there to try to rent this place and had an agreement with the trust officer at the bank that we'd draw up an agreement and sign it the first of the week. This was probably about Thursday or Friday. During that interval, this rascal contacted McCluskey at the Davenport and asked his opinion and, of course, he didn't want it over there, so when we came back to sign the agreement the trust officer said, "Well, sorry, boys, but in the meantime the Davenport Hotel rented this space."

We went from there to the Spokane Hotel and did acquire space and operated there very successfully. I can remember a time that the club had a quarter of a million dollars in the bank, the benefits of slot machines.

The Spokane Press Club became a very attractive facility. The war was coming on and the soldiers were training out at Geiger Field. They were having their final flight training before taking off for England and the war in Europe. So many of those people were members; in fact, almost all of the officer personnel were. They even established a branch of the Spokane Press Club in London. Maybe I deviated from Ashley Holden, but Ashley Holden was in and a part of this all the way.

Mr. Frederick: How did Ashley find himself over in Seattle in 1933?

Mr. Canwell: As I mentioned before, I think that he was working for a Japanese trade magazine of some kind. I think he made trips to Japan, but I don't know a lot about that. But that was his connection and that was an interim thing with him. He had been on the paper at Yakima. I didn't know at that time, but he had received some of his early training there. I think that he had newspaper connections up in the Okanogan country prior to coming to *The Spokesman Review*.

Frank Dallam who, I think, was chief editorial writer for the *Review*, also came from the Okanogan country. His family had been original owners of *The Spokesman Review*. So there was a connection on that level that Ashley Holden, of course, had the benefit of.

But he was a very able newsman, a very competent writer, skilled person. He made *The Spokesman Review*

more pronounced for what it had been; it even came to a place where Harry Truman came into town and, in a meeting, a rally down in front of the Review building in the square, pointed at the *Review* and said it was one of the two worst newspapers in America, the other one being *The Chicago Tribune*. Well, Holden and the *Review* thought that was high honor coming from the source it did.

Holden was there through that period of time. I was doing undercover work in the Communist field. I also was filing stories with International News.

Somewhere in the past, I had acquired a 4-by-5 Speed Graphic, which was standard equipment for the photo press. I had used that in connection with my reporting. It became a very convenient thing in Spokane because in my undercover work I was able to volunteer my services to things like Russian War Relief and other groups, and totally disarm them. They, of course, first and foremost want publicity and here they had it. I would provide and make my prints and supply them to the FBI, and get them a story in the paper. That's part of the way the thing functioned.

Mr. Frederick: Was Ashley an entree for you in Seattle when you knew that you had a commodity within the Communist movement?

Mr. Canwell: Not particularly. He was just very enthusiastic about what I was doing, but he's that sort of a person. He's in his 90s and he's still bouncing. He's still enthusiastic. I don't think that he assisted me in Seattle any more than all the other newsmen that I knew. I just knew him. I had a more personal relationship with him. But I don't think he went out of his way to do anything for me. I didn't ask him to.

And then I sort of lost track of him for awhile until I came back to Spokane and he was installed on the *Review*. Then I'd find that we might be out at some commie-promoted affair, a sit-down strike out on the county courthouse lawn or whatever. I'd nearly always find Ashley Holden there. That would be true of any announced activity that the comrades were involved in. So I'd see him all the time, every day or so.

Mr. Frederick: When did you pick up the camera?

Mr. Canwell: Well, to get back into that, I had considerable photographic skill very early. I worked some for Martin, the photographer. His two boys and I would work in the Martin lab downtown. I developed a very early interest in cameras and photography and I don't remember at what time I got my first 4-by-5 Speed Graphic.

A time or two I had them to use when they were not mine. Eventually I decided that was the best identification that a newsman could have in any activity that was

developing on the street or elsewhere. A Speed Graphic camera was better identification than your press card and it was sufficient. So somewhere along the line I traded for one and I over a period of time had several of them.

[End of Tape 20, Side 1]

Mr. Canwell: I've taken so many pictures of so many prominent people that it's impossible to separate the people and the times. Some of them stand out importantly, graphically, people like Everett Dirksen, who was a famous senator and many like that. John L. Lewis, the labor man, and such characters as Paul Robeson and many others.

It was an entree to those people. They never questioned that you might be critical of their general activity; you were just a newsman. The camera helped do it and, of course, it completed the cycle. I would have a picture or pictures of Paul Robeson. I would have a record of what he said. That became a part of my permanent files.

There's something I probably haven't mentioned but, over the years, I developed files of a very extensive nature where the radical publications, their writers, their people and everything became a part of my files and was organized; material that I used in all my public life and still do, the parts that were not burned when the arson fire occurred here.

Mr. Frederick: What was the function of the Spokane Press Club?

Mr. Canwell: At that time the State Liquor Control Board had set up regulations for clubs. They sort of had a monopoly on liquor and bars, and slot machines. That was the facility that made the other activities possible. I served on the board of the Press Club until I resigned. I felt I shouldn't be in the state Legislature where the issues were being determined and be on the board, so I resigned. I'd had enough of it, anyway.

The club entered into a lot of community activity. They used great amounts of the money taken in from the slot machines to contribute to worthy local causes: colleges, universities, civic programs, whatever. Somebody came with their hand out and if it was a good cause the Press Club would vote them some money. They got carried away sometimes and gave away too much of it. But that was all you could do with it. A non-profit club should not properly accumulate a vast estate or fund.

Mr. Frederick: It was a membership club?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, it was a membership. We had two classes of membership. The active members were newsmen or people connected with the news field. Then they had associate members who were accepted from the busi-

ness community and everybody in town at one time joined or tried to join. For many years I was head of the membership committee. We tried to be a little discreet in who we let into the club. We didn't want rabble-rousers, raucous people, habitual drunks and that sort of thing. We tried to operate it on a reasonably high level and I think did.

Mr. Frederick: And in the early years it was housed in the Spokane Hotel?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, in its heyday, it was in the Spokane Hotel. Later I guess that building burned or was torn down. We took over the quarters of the University Club that had been there for many years. They had very elaborate quarters, but they had a declining membership and lacked the necessary skills or something to make it pay off. So they moved into smaller quarters and we took over the University Club. It adjoined the Spokane Hotel dining room, which was a famous facility. All in all, it was a very happy arrangement.

Mr. Frederick: And the genesis for that was 1936?

Mr. Canwell: In '38 was when we began talking about it. I don't remember whether it may have been '39 before we finally filed articles of incorporation. It was along in that period of time.

Mr. Frederick: And how did the slot machines come about?

Mr. Canwell: Well, the state Legislature and State Liquor Control Board approved the use of them. There was a great deal of conflict about whether they should or they shouldn't, but the general attitude was that people were going to gamble like, on their drinking, they're going to drink. So you try to control it. The slot machine approach at least controlled it to the extent that it was channeled into organized and supervised facilities. The State Liquor Control Board kept a heavy hand on it. But it was more or less wide-open gambling and very popular. The people who would play those one-armed bandits were just addicted to them. Clubs like the Spokane Press Club made the take so narrow that it was about as harmless as gambling could be, but it was inevitable that if you stand there long enough you're going to be separated from your money. That's the way it worked. I never had such an addiction.

We did for many years at the Press Club have a Friday night poker game. That was made up mostly of key editors of *The Spokesman Review* and *Chronicle* and a few people who had been newsmen. This was a continuing thing which most of us partook of for the association. It was sort of like an inner group in the Press Club. Of

course, in my case and I suppose in some others, it also gave you a very intimate contact with the news-makers and the flow of news. Some of the people there knew what else I was doing, but most did not.

Mr. Frederick: Did the club get a take of those poker games?

Mr. Canwell: No, they didn't. It was strictly a voluntary thing. If the club got anything from it, it was in the drinks they served. In fact, the game was very mild. There was a penny-ante deal with two bits to open and a fifty-cent raise, as long as you could get somebody to raise you. But you couldn't; there was no big betting.

Mr. Frederick: Were there ever any floor shows in there?

Mr. Canwell: Any floor shows? Oh, that was quite a usual thing. About, I suppose, once a month there'd be some sort of a party and a show and any excuse that came along for that. We had live music, an orchestra that was there all the time. Affairs like New Year's Eve and things like that were big parties, big affairs, and brought in live entertainments to some degree.

Mr. Frederick: Now was there any entertainment along the lines of Sally Rand?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I might mention that. Sally Rand came to town and was appearing at the Orpheum. Everybody in the club wanted to know if there was some way of getting her up there for a luncheon meeting. So I said, "Sure, I could do that." We set up a luncheon, and this was early in the Press Club operation. Word went around that we were going to have Sally Rand there, so everybody dropped in and pretty soon we had more requests for tickets than we could accommodate.

Anyway, I brought Sally Rand in; they were all expecting a fan dance and feathers. And she came in wearing a very formal business suit, very attractive, but strictly formal. She gave probably the best talk that any of them had ever heard on advertising. Her father had a newspaper, I think in Iowa somewhere, and she'd worked in that as a child. But, anyway, to the people who were expecting something sensational and drooling, it was a vast disappointment but a fascinating affair.

That sort of thing we would do. We'd bring famous people in. We had members in the radio stations and in all the newspapers, so any celebrity who came to town was brought to the Press Club usually for press conferences; the major press conferences occurred at the Press Club. And so, of course, at those affairs I always took their pictures. I had great stacks of pictures of anybody prominent from movie stars to politicians. Business ex-

ecutives like Henry Kaiser or others all came through the doors of the Spokane Press Club.

Mr. Frederick: In the photography field, either the news field or the fine arts field, what photographers did you admire?

Mr. Canwell: Well, of course, I knew about such persons as Ansel Adams and others. I admired their work, but my interests largely were in the news and news picture field. There were several prominent photographers at that time. I can't quickly come up with their names, but there were people who had become rather famed for their photography, news and otherwise. Of course, we were all aware of somebody photographing the Graf Zeppelin when it exploded and all that sort of thing. It's great to be a newsman in the right place at the right time.

I remember one photographer who was quite an able photographer: Art French. I believe he was at the *Seattle P-I*. He was an eccentric, as photographers and such are apt to be. He was taking a picture one time for the Great Northern. They had an Indian tribe all assembled with their colorful feathers and everything and he was set up to take their picture. He didn't quite like the position of his subjects, so instead of moving his camera he moved the whole darn tribe. Well, that was the sort of photographer that French was. He was canny, too; he developed the idea for Santa Claus pictures in stores. I think he made quite a bundle of money off of it.

Anyway, I was aware of those people and always felt that with a 4-by-5 Speed Graphic there was nothing that you couldn't do. The abler ones learned to operate the thing by rote, you know. You watch facial expressions and things that catch your eye, because you don't need to adjust your camera, you've already done that.

I remember taking a picture of Eleanor Roosevelt, probably one of the best ones ever taken of her. She came to Spokane. She's quite a clever person in her news handling. She would arrange for the photographers to get their pictures first and then the news interview would take place. Well, I had her all positioned out along the wing of a plane that she'd come in on and a sunset in the background. I snapped the picture and the bulb exploded right in her face. Well, ordinarily a person like that would have been angry or they'd have cussed you out or something. She never batted an eye, she just took it in stride. Well, there are people like that you always remember. I was certainly not for her and opposed most everything she did politically, but I admired her abilities and technique.

You asked about what photographers I admired. I know there were several. I mentioned Ansel Adams, but there were others along that line of that caliber. I never fancied myself a great photographer. I just was an able news photographer. That involves getting there at the right time and place and getting your picture.

Mr. Frederick: During the '20s within the region and during the '30s within the region, were you aware of a Ku Klux Klan movement?

Mr. Canwell: Ah, slightly. I remember a time in Spokane that there was quite a recruiting program and people were joining the Klan and donning sheets. But I never had any real exposure to that. I just knew that it was going on. It wasn't the sort of thing my family approved of or felt there was any need for. It's typical of that level of activity. There are always some Jew-baiters. There is always somebody who is hyperpatriotic, but wants to take the government apart and start over or something. They're always there. The Ku Klux Klan was just one of the ones that I was aware of, but I had no contact with.

Mr. Frederick: As a child you did not witness a parade or a cross-burning?

Mr. Canwell: No, I can't remember that there was anything like that. I don't think that the average public would have put up with that kind of crap. I know my father wouldn't have. If anybody wanted to burn a cross on his lawn, they'd do it at their own peril. And the majority of people were that way.

The population was made up very early of ex-soldiers, Civil War soldiers, Spanish-American War soldiers. Then later, of course, the World War I veterans, but they were self-reliant people who just didn't need that sort of thing, and would let people have their way in such philosophy as they didn't impose on them.

Mr. Frederick: Were you aware of, within the '30s, a Silver Shirt movement within the area?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, there was a strong Silver Shirt movement and Spokane was one of the centers for it. As I recall, it centered somewhat out at Gonzaga University. There were people out there who were pretty wrapped up in it. But again, it wasn't anything that was cohesive enough or evident enough that it became any part of my concern. It was there, but no big thing.

Mr. Frederick: Did you ever hear any of those people speak?

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember doing so. If there was some rally or something by them, I'd go there just as I would to a Communist Party rally or anything else, just because there was action there. But, I don't remember anything of any significance. I just don't think they had any impact worth noting in the community.

Mr. Frederick: Were there any names associated with that movement or the Ku Klux Klan?

Mr. Canwell: I don't, in my mind, recall any. I suppose if I were to read a list of names I would recognize them, but I don't. None of them were significant. They were not a potent force in the community, the Silver Shirts coming closer to it than others. But I can't remember that there was any alarm about their activities or concerning them.

Mr. Frederick: You have mentioned that when you came from back East, 1936, you realized after the various contacts you'd made that your future was on the West Coast?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I was convinced that was the case and I was quite persuaded by that time. I think that the fascination of New York particularly, and Chicago, rapidly wears off. They're dull, unattractive places really. New York was just flooded with people who want to go to New York. They become New Yorkers and then get out of there.

Anyway, it's not a desirable place from my standpoint other than it had two or three things that interested me. The New York Public Library did and still does. This is a tremendous facility. Then I'd wander in and out of the newspaper offices and the Hearst headquarters.

Nothing firmed up to justify my staying there and some of the people to whom I was talking did say that the activity and the future in my field would be out here in the Pacific Northwest. They were, of course, precisely right.

Mr. Frederick: How much time did you spend in New York City?

Mr. Canwell: I really don't know. I'd be in and out of there. Whenever I had the opportunity I would spend a week or so there. But never an extended period, it was more a "touch down and go." I didn't spend a lot of time there. But I spent enough time to know what the potential was there and that it wasn't for me.

Mr. Frederick: So from 1933 up to 1936 your home base was Yakima?

Mr. Canwell: It was basically Yakima. I would come back there from time to time, hoping that something would develop.

Mr. Frederick: And why did you choose to return to Spokane?

Mr. Canwell: Well, while I haven't gone into all of the contacts that I had that brought that decision about, it was largely because the Pacific Northwest was the basic launching operation of the world Communist movement, that is, its western movement. It was concentrated here

and would expand here. And Spokane was home. I had a home here and all of my personal contacts and feelings were centered in Spokane. I had matured enough and seen enough that I felt that most everything I wanted was right here.

[End of Tape 20, Side 2]

Mr. Canwell: There is something that probably should be inserted at this time. The war was shaping up. I thoroughly expected to be called up for service. I had a high number and I had been offered a captaincy to write copy for a general, but it didn't appeal to me. It wasn't the sort of military service that I felt that I wanted. So I just awaited the call of my number. I didn't ask for a deferment.

Along during this time, and in marking time until being called up for military duty, I was offered the job of chief of the County Identification Bureau of Spokane in the Spokane Sheriff's Office. I accepted that and I worked at that for several years, but was never called for military service.

Mr. Frederick: Who made the initial contact? Did they contact you?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, the Sheriff's Department? No, I think that a newsman friend of mine suggested to the sheriff that I would be a good man for the spot. I had certain skills that were useful there, my photography and other things. And the sheriff said, "Well, can I do that? In the first place, he's a Republican, I'm a Democrat, and this is a Democrat office." He said, "He's a Mason and a Protestant, I'm a Catholic. I hire mostly Catholics."

And so Al Libby, the reporter, said, "Well, do you have any objection to hiring one man with brains?"

So Ralph Buckley said, "Well, I think you've got something there." And he went along.

Al Libby was the reporter, a famous reporter whom I knew well and for a long time. Anyway, he was very helpful in promoting that idea and I was then approached on whether I would accept it or not and I did.

The sheriff at the time was Ralph Buckley. He was replaced by Sheriff Jim Cannon. Most of my service occurred under Cannon and George Harber, another sheriff. During that period of time, I was also assigned for a year to work with the Federal Narcotics Bureau out of the Identification Office. I maintained both jobs or assignments.

I believe that the former chief of the Identification Section had been called into military service. I think that was the reason for the vacancy.

Mr. Frederick: And why was there a turnover in sheriffs?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I'm trying to think of why Buckley left. The office of sheriff is an elective position in Spokane County. Anyway, he had been sheriff and his chief deputy ran for the office and was elected. He kept Sheriff Buckley on the payroll, but there was some reason for the change; maybe the period that they were permitted to serve. I don't know what the reason was, but I know that Buckley was there; then Jim Cannon was there. He died in office and George Harber, who headed the check detail but had been in the Sheriff's Office for many years and was a favorite of the county commissioners for a replacement, became sheriff. After I left there, I think a man by the name of Smith became sheriff.

I more or less tired of the assignment there. It was difficult to get the county commissioners to invest in scientific and technical equipment and things that I felt the department should have. I didn't care for just a political assignment. I wanted to make something of the office.

Mr. Frederick: And what was the date that you went to work for the Spokane County Sheriff's Department?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, I don't have that right at hand. I'm trying to think of whether it was before or after I was married. It was along in 1941 or '42, in that period. At this same time, we had acquired our farm residence property and it was a considerable operation. It was several hundred acres out along the Little Spokane River where we still live. My brother, who joined the enterprise, was married to my wife's sister and we settled in out there on Montvale Farms. So I was able to conduct my other activity with that base without being connected with the Sheriff's Office. I decided to drop that and I had, somewhere along the line, filed for the Legislature. I think it was '41 or '42 that I joined the Sheriff's Office.

Mr. Frederick: And what year were you married?

Mr. Canwell: I was married in 1941.

Mr. Frederick: And were you married when you joined the Sheriff's Department? Or soon to be married?

Mr. Canwell: I was trying to think of just what the sequence was there. I think I was married before I joined the Sheriff's Office.

Mr. Frederick: And what year did you buy the farms on the Little Spokane River?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I think that was '41 and '42. We bought it in segments. This was an outgrowth of my newspaper contacts. My wife and I wanted to live in the country and wanted to live along the Little Spokane River. We spent literally weeks and months going up and

down the river looking for property to buy. Then, one of my newspaper contacts who knew what we were doing heard that Aubrey White, who owned the Montvale Farms estate, was getting tired of the work and was thinking of selling Montvale Farms. So I didn't lose any time. I went immediately to see him and found that he was interested in selling. Then we began to put together a deal to make it possible.

Mr. Frederick: And that's Montvale Farms?

Mr. Canwell: It's M-O-N-T-V-A-L-E.

Mr. Frederick: And what type of acreage are we talking about?

Mr. Canwell: It was pretty hard to tell exactly because of the meandering of the Little Spokane River. We had about a mile of the river and somewhere close to 400 acres.

Mr. Frederick: And in those days what did that cost you?

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember the exact figures. We bought it in two segments, one of them was \$18,000 and I don't remember the other. It was not a great amount. It was a real bargain looking at it in later years. But it was quite a bit of money, too, at the time.

We had hay land and raised cattle there. And I had enough experience in that area to be of considerable help. My brother adapted to it rapidly—we and our wives raised our total of nine children out there.

Mr. Frederick: And which brother was that?

Mr. Canwell: That was John. His wife is Jane and she is my wife, Marsinah's sister. It was a very happy experience and period in our lives.

Mr. Frederick: When and where did you meet your future wife?

Mr. Canwell: I think the first formal introduction we had was actually in the Press Club. She and a group had come in to dinner and that's, I think, where I was introduced to her. However, I used to see her at the polo games and other things around town that I covered or frequented.

Mr. Frederick: And what year would that be?

Mr. Canwell: That was 1941.

Mr. Frederick: You met her in 1941?

Mr. Canwell: No, I married her in 1941. I suppose I met her somewhere along the line of '38 or '39.

Mr. Frederick: What was your first impression?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, she was gorgeous. She was one of the tallest women in town and a beautiful person with a charming atmosphere. She's just a lovely person and she, then and now, has a host of friends and always did. I never could see what she saw in me, but it worked.

That was quite something. I'm what, 5 feet 8 1/2 inches maybe, if I fudge a little. She was six feet 2 inches or thereabouts. And she didn't hide it. She wore high heels and big hats and was a very attractive and spectacular person.

Mr. Frederick: And her maiden name?

Mr. Canwell: Her maiden name was Marshall. Marsinah Marshall.

Mr. Frederick: Was she raised in the area?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, she was born in Spokane. Her father was a very prominent doctor, medical man, as was her grandfather. Her grandfather was a Dr. Campbell.

Mr. Frederick: And did she go to school within the region?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, she attended, I think, largely the Roosevelt School in the grades and a Catholic school seminary here. She did not go on to college.

Mr. Frederick: And what was she doing when you met her?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, really not much of anything other than taking part in all of the social activities of the community, Red Cross, and all of those things.

Mr. Frederick: Was she living at home?

Mr. Canwell: She was living at home. Her mother died in 1938, leaving the two girls orphaned. Their father had died earlier.

Mr. Frederick: So she was, at a relatively young age, head of the household?

Mr. Canwell: Yes. They had household help that were almost part of the family. And both Marsinah and Jane busied themselves in local activities. They were very prominent socially and well-liked. Marsinah still meets with her Catholic girls club. Once a month they have

lunch. They're a wonderful group of people. That's one of the things that impressed me most about her was the wonderful friends she had. They were fine, fine people. Her sister, Jane, was away at college, I believe, when her mother died.

Mr. Frederick: And when did her father die?

Mr. Canwell: Her father died in 1929, I believe. I'd have to check that, I had it in the material I gave you before. He died of a heart attack. He was probably the most prominent physician in the city. He was a Harvard Medical School graduate, took part of the post-graduate work in Vienna, and was a distinguished surgeon. He was forty-five when he died. I'd have to check the year, but it was quite early. Mrs. Marshall was left with the two girls to raise and I think did an excellent job of it.

When we were first married we lived in the Marshall family home at 123 East 12th Avenue. I believe at that time her sister, Jane, was in college in the East. Frederick Jewett, a lumberman, was dedicating his life practically to building a cathedral up there, which became a reality. To do so he needed the residential property on which we were living, which was in the Edna C. Marshall estate.

I knew Mr. Jewett very well. We were good friends. So I kept in touch with him as we were trying to acquire the property out along the Little Spokane River. He was willing to participate in any way possible to obtain the Marshall property to enlarge the cathedral. So we were able, against the wishes of the Spokane & Eastern Trust Department that held the Marshall trust, to accomplish a transfer of funds from that property to the Little Spokane property and it helped us buy it.

Mr. Jewett had vast sums that he could invest in the cathedral enterprise and told me to let him know just what we needed. But I did not take advantage of that. We just got such funds together as our two families could rake up and we acquired the property on the Little Spokane.

Our children then began to come along one after the other until we had six of them. I remember one time I was invited to speak at Seattle University. The radicals were parading and protesting and carrying signs. In the meeting they would raise questions trying to embarrass me and they said, "Isn't it true, Mr. Canwell, that you're anti-Catholic?"

I said, "Well, my best answer to that is that in the first four years of marriage we had four children. My wife is Catholic and we seem to get along all right."

Well, anyhow, that was the picture. Marsinah said it seemed like she was always pregnant with one on the way or one in arms.

The war was going on then, too. We were trying to remodel a farmhouse while we were waiting to acquire the larger place and all of this. It was a very rugged time. But we enjoyed it and survived it.

I remember one incident—I think this is interesting, it’s a highlight. Marsinah was very pregnant and every time there was the slightest noise or anything she’d awaken. My brother, John, had acquired some roosters and game hens. Whenever a light would be turned on, this darned rooster would crow and awaken everybody. Finally one morning I heard a lot of shooting—BANG, BANG, BANG and Marsinah was out there in her robe shooting at this rooster. Every time she’d shoot at him, the gravel would hit him in the backside and he’d jump. She yelled, “Stand still, you SOB,” and she shot again. Well, anyway, there were things like that which were funny and interesting.

We acquired a herd of cattle and were deeply involved in cattle- and stock-raising, and haying, along with trying to do a lot of other things. But Marsinah took to that life like a veteran. She liked it. She was a good cook. She loved children and it became a way of life.

Mr. Frederick: You’ve mentioned that you began to gravitate back toward Spokane and that was in 1936?

Mr. Canwell: No, 1938 is when I severed all connections elsewhere and came to Spokane.

Mr. Frederick: You’ve mentioned that in 1936 that you were not working with the Yakima paper?

Mr. Canwell: No, at that time I was still using my connections with the paper as part of my identification. I would come back to Yakima periodically, but it was not developing in the way that I wanted to go. I was becoming more involved in my other activities and trying to find a place to utilize that knowledge, and Yakima was not the answer.

Mr. Frederick: Where was your—what did you call your base—say circa 1936?

Mr. Canwell: In 1936 I think I still considered Yakima my home base, but I had residence at the Morrison Hotel in Chicago during part of this time. As I said before, I’d be back-and-forth a good deal to the West Coast. My physical base was more in Chicago than it was in Detroit or other areas. Then I ventured to such places as Pittsburgh and New York. Wherever I went I’d usually contact the newspapers. If there was an International News Service office, of course I called there. Some of them had just a string of correspondents. Usually I tried to make contact with people like that.

In general I was looking for a job, something that would get me a permanent base. It just wasn’t forthcoming. As J. B. Matthews, a famous expert on Communist fronts said, “Well, your problem is you are ten years ahead of your time. You’ll starve to death.” That is true; in this field, you have to know more than you read in the

American Legion magazine. And I did, but to communicate that and to market it was another thing. Men like Trohan were just beginning. Westbrook Pegler was moving from a sports writer to a political writer and they were just beginning to pick up in this area [communism].

But I was not so connected or based that I could command any sort of a salary or expense account or the things necessary to me, so I had to solve that or abandon it. That in general is what I did. I moved my base of operations and made some reappraisals of what my position was and was to be. I had this dedication to this particular area of information.

Mr. Frederick: So quite literally then, when you finally said to yourself that you needed to settle, and Spokane was going to be the area, that occurred approximately in 1938?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, that was in 1938.

Mr. Frederick: Within those travels, say from ’36 to ’38 or ’35 to ’38, how did you keep body and soul together with regard to a wage?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I was able to sell copy sufficiently by the word or line to maintain life. I did not live high on the hog. My expenses were not great. I can remember in Chicago I used to haunt the cafeterias. They had what I wanted and it was inexpensive. I can remember getting a great big baked apple with cream for ten cents. Well, I suppose it would be three dollars now. But, anyway, a good share of my living was solved very inexpensively. My hotel accommodations were a little more costly, but I had worked out a situation where I got a better deal than most. I’m thinking of the Morrison. Then there were other hotels where I stayed, like the Nicolet in Minneapolis and Book Cadillac in Detroit. They had special rates for someone who asked for them. I always liked to stay in a good place and I got the lowest rate I could.

[End of Tape 21, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: It sounds like an immense scramble to me.

Mr. Canwell: Scramble? Well, I’d say it was more or less that. I had not firmed up anything permanent. I was seeking some answers to my life, what the future would be. I was not totally finding them. It was quite apparent to me that I was not going to move into some slot in a newspaper in New York or Chicago or Detroit at a livable rate or condition. It just wasn’t there.

There were many people working the way I was on a line-and-word basis. That’s one of the reasons I would try to become acquainted with the city editors and others

on the major newspapers, to get so they know you; then come in and if you have something that's interesting or saleable, why then you get paid for it. That was a very unsatisfactory arrangement, but it did provide the credentials and whatnot to get entree to wherever you wished to go.

I get to thinking of that, trying to think of what all I was doing all that time. It doesn't just come out one, two, three. There were so many influences and so many activities and so many goals and hopes that didn't materialize. Anyhow, I decided that I could best do what I wanted to do in my home base. I was so advised by others who were knowledgeable in the security field.

Mr. Frederick: Did you do any promotional work, any advertising work?

Mr. Canwell: No, I can't remember that I did much of that sort of thing. I did some of it on the paper at Yakima. I can remember when Coleman would be sitting around at midnight, 1:00 a.m. trying to rack his brains for a good line for an ad or something—I might contribute to it, just to get the job done. But, that was not my forte, although I think I understood advertising and promotion.

Mr. Frederick: Why did you take the job with the Spokane County Sheriff's Department?

Mr. Canwell: Merely to mark time, expecting fully to be called into military service. I had a high draft number. I had turned down an offer of a commission because I didn't like the assignment and felt I'd rather just take my chances and see what happened. I thoroughly expected to be called and I so told the sheriff that if I were called to military service, why that would be the end of it. And that was my motive there.

Mr. Frederick: What did the position entail? What did you do there?

Mr. Canwell: Well, the first thing you do is you photograph all of the arrests and felons. You photograph and fingerprint them. You take a statement from them. At least that's the way we did it in those days. If somebody was brought in on arrest, he was fingerprinted and a statement taken from him. The fingerprint files were made in, I think, triplicate at that time. We kept one in our files, we sent one to the FBI and one to the Washington State Patrol headquarters.

So that was the routine. You have the people who are arrested being "mugged" each day. The federal prisoners were brought over once a week to be photographed and a statement taken from them. That was basically what I was doing.

Then, because of my photographic skills, I was called

on a great deal by the State Patrol, the city fire marshal and others to take photographs. I developed techniques that they found very helpful. I would thoroughly photograph things and blow them up big so that when they were presented to a jury, they impressed them.

At the same time, I tried to train the deputy sheriffs to comport themselves on the stand in an acceptable manner. It was quite usual in those days for a deputy to be on the stand chewing gum, sprawled out, and saying, "Yeah," and that sort of thing. Well, I didn't feel that was proper. I tried to do something about that and the sheriff was very willing to cooperate.

In addition to that, I felt that if you were carrying a gun you should be able to use it. When I was inducted into the force, they swore me in and handed me a great big .38, a billy club, a blackjack, and a star, and I was a deputy sheriff. Well, that to me didn't seem like it was enough. So I rigged up a shooting gallery under the sidewalk at the Sheriff's Office and tried to get the men to take regular practice down there. That worked to a degree, but not as well as I thought it would. Those are things that I did.

On one of the first occasions for action I was involved in, I was sitting in the deputies room and an alarm went off that a drugstore on Monroe Street was being robbed. We all grabbed our shooting irons and ran over there. On that particular occasion I met the federal narcotics agent and we became fairly well-acquainted. He was very frustrated, in that he was never able to make an arrest that wasn't thwarted some way by the police themselves. That was what caused me to go to the sheriff and ask to be assigned to work with the Narcotics Bureau. Those were the things I was doing, but I was trying to improve the quality of operation in the Identification Bureau.

Mr. Frederick: And did you wear a uniform?

Mr. Canwell: No, I never did wear a uniform.

Mr. Frederick: And the reasoning behind that?

Mr. Canwell: Well, it just wasn't necessary in my assignment. In fact, most of the deputies at that time did not wear uniforms. They formalized the thing more in later years. I think they've done a pretty good job of updating the procedure in general police work.

Mr. Frederick: So what you are saying then is there was very little training that you could observe as a new employee?

Mr. Canwell: No, there was very, very little and I felt it was not satisfactory. I felt that if a man was going to be toting a gun, he ought to at least know how to use it. I felt there were deputies there who had been carrying a gun for

years who had never fired it. So those were techniques that I felt should just be standard operating procedure.

Of course in the technical area I had an assistant up there who kind of went with the job and he was very good at fingerprints and loved it. So other than learning how to lift prints on a burglary job and that sort of thing, most of the lab work could be done by my assistant. I handled the photographic end of it. We had a view camera there for mug shots and then I supplied my own camera, my 4-by-5 Speed Graphic, for other things. We had a lab for developing and making prints. So in general that part was fairly efficient, but fell far short of what I felt the department should have.

Mr. Frederick: And what was the salary?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, it seemed to me it was about \$250 a month. The salary for the chiefs was a little higher than the regular deputies. It wasn't very much. The county commissioners were always very stingy about funding that department and I think unwisely so. Anyway, I'd find it very difficult to get a technical book or something that I wanted for the department. If I wanted such a text, I usually ended buying it with my own funds.

Mr. Frederick: And what year did you meet the narcotics agent?

Mr. Canwell: Well, it was shortly after I went there. I suppose within the first year. I'd have to go back and pinpoint the date when George Harber became sheriff. He had been appointed sheriff just before this drugstore event that caused me to desire to do some work in that area. That was a field that suddenly opened up that I could learn something.

The federal agent was a very experienced agent who had worked for the department for many, many years. But he had to spend too much time making out his reports and things so, even before I'd joined him, I used to type out his reports for him and the head of the department in Seattle complimented him on how much he'd improved. Well, anyway, he was very happy to have me join the operation and I introduced him to something that was just coming on: electronic surveillance. We used that very widely.

Mr. Frederick: You're under the Identification Section—it sounds like it's an eight-to-five position—you would be called out potentially in the evenings by the Fire Department, State Patrol, etc., etc. Were those fatalities that you were called to?

Mr. Canwell: Sometimes. The coroner quite often would call on me because he wanted photographic specifics and I could supply them. So there was quite a lot of

that. However, it wasn't oppressive. I was busy at many other things at the same time. That cut into my time at home seriously because I was not only doing this work connected with the Sheriff's Office, I was still doing undercover work on the Communist thing.

Mr. Frederick: Was it a forty-hour-a-week job with the Sheriff's Department?

Mr. Canwell: That was, I think, understood as what it was supposed to be. You come to work at eight or nine in the morning and leave at five, if you're lucky. Then, of course, we had a very small staff and everyone would draw some weekend duty. The chief of Ident might draw a weekend duty with some patrolman. We had the Spokane Valley to patrol and down as far as Medical Lake. We seemed to cover quite effectively, but that was one thing that happened periodically. You would have your vacation or your off time interrupted by required weekend duty.

Mr. Frederick: It sounds like you were not stretched professionally within that position. It may have been a little slow at times. Didn't they have a Red Squad themselves?

Mr. Canwell: The Police Department had two officers who worked with the FBI.

Mr. Frederick: Spokane City?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, in Spokane they had a pair of officers who were assigned an informant and they, in general, were the Police Department contact with the Bureau. But the Sheriff's Office had no Red Squad at all.

Mr. Frederick: And why was that, in your opinion?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, I would say a lack of concern and information, and the Sheriff's Office was very much a political operation. They hired their friends as deputies usually, and I don't think they were concerned about finding any new activities.

Mr. Frederick: How many patrolmen did they have in that department?

Mr. Canwell: It seemed to me there were only about twelve. I wouldn't be certain that was correct. They had one deputy who worked on civil matters, he served papers and that sort of thing; another one worked largely on the check detail; then the chief of the Identification Bureau and the chief criminal deputy. There were two of the chiefs there who might have been civil deputies who also had the larger pay. But it was very small and it seemed to

me it was around a force of twelve people.

We had some very ancient rolling stock, very unsatisfactory. There again, the sheriff bought a paddy wagon that was sold by somebody who sold milk wagons. I complained about this thing. I said, "You get out there driving this thing wide-open with the sirens on and guys on bicycles pass you." Well, I was trying to shame the sheriff and the commissioners into buying some good equipment. Their rolling stock left much to be desired. I drove my own car most of the time, I just didn't feel I could risk my life driving the rambling hacks that they had. I had a car and had other things I had to do, so to avoid any complaints, I just used my own car and bought my own fuel. Incidentally, it was a Cadillac, which kind of bugged them.

Mr. Frederick: Yeah, it sounds like the sheriff was not too disturbed as long as those pictures got taken?

Mr. Canwell: That's right. He just wanted a job done, didn't want any complaints or any heat from the commissioners. That was about it. The deputies were—some were pretty fine people and some were slob. They had practices that I didn't approve of. In the first place, I didn't like the food down in the county kitchen, but these deputies were always down there eating off the county. I didn't think that was necessary and I didn't think the food was that good.

Mr. Frederick: So it sounds like a bit of a loose operation?

Mr. Canwell: It was a pretty loose operation, very political. You can imagine how popular I was with this whole bunch of Democrat Catholics and I was a Protestant Mason. It didn't set well with them and I can remember we were having a lot of phone interference and tip-offs. We finally figured out what was being done. One of the deputies had a sister who was the telephone operator. So I'd have a call to or from the Narcotics Bureau. There would be delays until she'd connect me surreptitiously with somebody down in the Sheriff's Office. We soon figured out that was happening, so we fed more false information out than we did true and just quit using the telephone facility for that reason. Well, that's the sort of thing that you'd encounter; I suppose to a degree now, but very likely then.

You make an arrest, put a narcotics addict in jail hoping that he would go through withdrawal pains and you'd get him to talk. And somebody would—deputies somewhere along the line, the jailer, or somebody—would supply him with narcotics, a very unwholesome situation. So we had to circumvent that and did quite effectively.

Mr. Frederick: Were they intimidated because of your

connections with the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, maybe having a little talk with you in the alley once in awhile?

Mr. Canwell: I don't think they liked that. It was a connection that they didn't understand or have any control over. There had been a rather intimate connection between the city vice squad, the Sheriff's Office, and the jail, and that situation had so frustrated the federal department that they were losing their minds. They just weren't getting anything done. Of course, I came in and short-circuited that and they didn't like that either.

I was not a really nice guy. I suspected that I was having some problems down in the prosecutor's office, which was on the ground floor. My office was on the fifth floor with a light well in between. So finally I dropped a wire down and connected on to the intercom in the prosecuting attorney's office. Well, at that time you could do that legally. Now you wouldn't dare do it or let anyone know you did it, but I didn't feel that I had the time to waste deciding who was crooked and who wasn't. And I sure found out.

Mr. Frederick: Well, it sounds like there was a money operation going on. Albert, what I don't understand is, why did you remain on that force, in terms of not voluntarily on your part? Why didn't they get rid of you? Why weren't you taken care of, I don't understand that?

Mr. Canwell: Well, in the first place, when I did this narcotics thing, we had a sheriff who was straight, there was just not a crooked or dishonest thing about him. He was a man who could not be had and that's why he went for my proposal to work with the Federal Narcotics Bureau.

Mr. Frederick: And his name?

Mr. Canwell: His name was George Harber.

Mr. Frederick: And so Sheriff Harber was the one that, or his presence then, allowed you to continue on that force?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, there was no desire on his part to remove me. He liked what I was doing and the manner in which I did it. In fact, I helped him quite effectively to get re-elected. He was not a political person. He was a thoroughly decent man.

Mr. Frederick: Well, I don't know if it's appropriate to say that he was not a political person, but it's disparaging with regard to politics. What you had an insight into was called a shakedown.

Mr. Canwell: Well, by a political person, I mean a per-

son to whom the political thing is paramount and overrides everything else. There are men of integrity who just can't be had and won't be had. And Harber was one of them. There are those who compromise because they're weak or indifferent, venial.

Mr. Frederick: Were you ever warned, "warned" in quotes, by members of that force or their friends?

Mr. Canwell: No, I don't think any of them wanted to brace me on that level. I think that Harber, before he was sheriff, recognized what some of the problems were. I don't think that any of them wanted to put it on that level. It just never happened. There was a deputy or two who were pretty able officers and they went on to other departments. One of them was Deputy Veccio, like the bridge in Florence, I think it was—Veccio. Anyway, he went to the police department in Riverside, California. There were good men, but they didn't stay long.

[End of Tape 21, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Today's date is October 18, 1990. This interview series is being conducted for the Washington State Oral History Program. The interviewee is Albert Canwell. The interviewer is Timothy Frederick.

Mr. Canwell: The thing probably that got me more than anything else is the pettiness that occurs on that level in public employment and it was very evident there.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, was that your first insight into that?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, no, I think that over the years I've become pretty generally street-wise. I knew how the criminal and police thing operated.

Mr. Frederick: I was referring to bureaucracy.

Mr. Canwell: Oh, the bureaucracy. That was my first intimate connection with it. The pettiness that occurred at that time on that level was repugnant to me. I just didn't feel it was professional or necessary. But it was a fact of life; each person being very jealous of his position and perks and prerogatives. But you find it on up the line in all government service. I'm sure you are aware of that. You find it in the Congress and the staff and the people, each one is really looking out for himself and that's it.

But on a level like we had at the Sheriff's Office it became more petty than I cared for. I couldn't tolerate it. It's a deadly thing and I see some of it in some of the official areas now. But it's more professional now than it was back in my day. I think their unionization has helped them in the police field. I think it's given them a little,

well, it's given the individual officer a voice that he didn't have before. I think their union organization is in general a pretty good thing on the sheriff or police levels.

Mr. Frederick: What was your relationship with the Spokane Police Department's Red Squad? And who were they?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I remember one of them was, I believe his name was Swartout. They were two competent police officers who had the confidence of the FBI. And the FBI has always operated a Red Desk and a Red Detail. They work largely through informant contacts and sources. These two police officers did their job and I think did it as well as could be expected. I had very little contact with them because I knew who their informants were. I had my own and others. I had very good working relationships with the Bureau, so I didn't feel that I should meddle in any way with these people and I didn't.

My working relationship with them, I suppose, was acceptable. I don't think they knew precisely what I was doing. The Bureau in general knew more about it; the senior agent usually knew more about what I was doing than the other agents did. It was not unusual for the Bureau to have an excess of informants. There were more than they could handle or use and sometimes they were subtly directed in my direction. Sometimes some of the agents are strictly against that, or do not participate in that approach. They just do what the book says and that's it. But, in general, my relationship with the Bureau was very good.

Mr. Frederick: And there was a regional office in Spokane?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, the FBI has maintained a regional office which is attached to the Seattle office and the Northwest district. Ever since I can remember they've always had a staff here.

Mr. Frederick: Who were, in your opinion, the more competent individuals associated with the FBI? And whom did you like to work with the most?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, it would be difficult for me to answer that and probably improper. If I didn't get along with them or we didn't seem to mesh, then I didn't pursue that contact. Usually I also had a good relationship with the Bureau chiefs in Seattle, men like Dick Auerbach and others who had come up through the ranks. Well, Dick Auerbach and some others came up through Senator Styles Bridges' office. They were FBI men who were hired by Bridges; later they went back to the Bureau. Some of them became district officers, like Scott McLeod, who became chief of the State Department's

Intelligence Department and people like that.

So if my relationship was good, fine, I used it or they used me or whatever. I never abused it. I never betrayed any confidences. I never asked for anything I wasn't entitled to. So my relationship with the Bureau was always good. It still is. And with the Immigration Department and other intelligence areas. If the people are competent and if they're friendly and if they recognize or feel that I have anything to contribute, why then it's available. Otherwise you don't do anything about it. But, there is no antagonism. There is nothing frustrating in that regard.

Mr. Frederick: It appears that when you first joined the Spokane County Sheriff's Department that it was not the most sophisticated operation. You had understanding or access to electronic surveillance equipment at that point in time. Where did that insight come from? Where did you pick that up from?

Mr. Canwell: Well, when it became evident that it was being used and available, I acquired such equipment, I think at my own expense, in the Sheriff's Office. There was a man who sold police equipment who approached me very early and gave me an idea of what the potential was there. The first phase of it, we used a wire spool and then later went into tapes. Art Burnside was the man. He also had a deputy sheriff's badge and he may have had official police connection. But his business was the sale of police equipment. He sold it all over the country and, in fact, all over the world at one time.

Mr. Frederick: Where did he operate out of?

Mr. Canwell: Out of Spokane. His office was in his home. He sold such things as guns, ammunition, holsters, bulletproof vests—whatever was required in police work. And he led out in that area. He had the best equipment and he'd show it to the police and try to sell it. He was one of my early contacts. We got along very well. He introduced me as I recall to the electronic listening and recording devices. I think I bought my first one or the Sheriff's Office's first one from him.

Mr. Frederick: Well, how did you sell that idea within that bureaucracy?

Mr. Canwell: The sheriff knew, in general, what I was doing. Of course, when we got to Harbor he was very much in favor of what I was doing. We did what maybe is impossible now. We wired up every pimp and whore in town that we knew about. We dropped a bug in their bedroom and so very quickly we knew where narcotics were moving and how and which police were on the take and so on. There isn't any better way of obtaining information. In those days, nobody, or very few people were

suspicious of it or expected to be bugged. So it was just done and that's one reason I didn't get as much sleep as I was entitled to. Most of that bugging is done at night.

Mr. Frederick: This would be in conjunction with the fellow from the Bureau of Narcotics?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I introduced him to the electronics approach to the thing and suddenly it just was pure magic, it opened doors and information. A lot of this was fun, too. That is, it was exciting and interesting and effective. I even brought Marsinah into a pretty thorough knowledge of what I was doing.

I remember one night we were raiding the Chinese opium den. It was on the top floor of a Trent Avenue hotel. Marsinah sat down in the car on the street while all the action took place, while these called-in deputies made the arrests and so on. So she was to that degree a part of what I was doing. She had a knowledge of what I was up to, so it wasn't just a matter of always being away from home—it was doing interesting things.

This Chinese opium place, we had to watch it for weeks from the top of another hotel because, to get a federal warrant, you have to obtain your warrant without trespass, a pretty hard thing to do. So we had to watch this place and observe it until we gathered enough evidence to get a federal warrant.

Being a farmer I took a hay hook and fastened a rope onto it and we lifted a skylight; I hooked that hay hook on the side. And the federal officer and I went down on the rope. I was carrying my camera and it was quite an interesting adventure. Ted Crosby and another friend, when I got into politics, used this incident to draw up a cartoon showing the life of Canwell, designating it as my rope trick.

Well, anyhow, we used the electronic surveillance effectively. I don't have any qualms about it whatever. Nobody was hurt who shouldn't be hurt. The narcotics traffic is a deadly business and I think you have to use every means possible to stop or to interfere with it. I think it's kind of silly now that the police have to get a special warrant from a judge for a body wire if you want to wire or record somebody. You are susceptible to every clerk along the way, who wants to talk or has his hand out, or a judge who may be questionable. The whole thing is wrong. I don't feel that the right of privacy extends that far. I didn't then and I don't now. We went after the jugular vein in the thing.

Mr. Frederick: And who was this contact? Who did you work with?

Mr. Canwell: The person I was working with was the federal narcotics officer stationed in this area, John Young. We worked together for a long time. After he

was retired he worked for my brother, who was police commissioner here.

Mr. Frederick: Which brother was that?

Mr. Canwell: That's Carl.

Mr. Frederick: You introduced John Young to the concept of the electronic wire. This would be in the first part of World War II. Could you and John Young install those wires by yourself or did you have other people to help you?

Mr. Canwell: No, that was strictly a two-man operation. It's not a very difficult thing...usually in cheap hotels. Usually we'd try to rent a room across from, or next to, some addict's room. I would use my fishing pole; I'd fasten a wire on the thing and shove it under a rug and take it wherever we wanted to go. If it was necessary to drill through a wall, we did it, but we'd have to do that when the suspect was out or away.

Sometimes you'd run into complications. I remember getting permission to drill through a wall down at the Coeur d'Alene Hotel. I found that the things were about a foot or more through, a very tough assignment to get a power drill and drill through to where you wanted to go. I did the same thing in the Davenport Hotel, got permission from Jim McCluskey to wire up a room. I didn't tell him that I had to drill through the base of the wall to do it.

But in that case we were wiring up some Chinese that we thought were bringing opium into town. It was a very tricky procedure to get the microphone installed and get it done while the suspects were coming up the elevator and so on. Then the rascals just talked Chinese. Couldn't understand anything they were saying. We recorded it and the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs always had an interpreter on tap who they never can trust because if he's Chinese he probably sells to both sides. "Honest John Chinaman" is a misnomer.

But, anyhow, we had many harrowing experiences planting microphones and usually tried to recover them. But it was a two-man operation. My responsibility was having the equipment and the wires or tapes. This was merely to gain information, not to be used as evidence.

Mr. Frederick: Did John keep a lookout? Did John tail the suspects while you were in there planting those things?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, yes, we'd try to not be booby-trapped. I remember one time down the street here at the Armstrong Hotel we were wiring up a suspect and I was just in the act of running this wire under the carpet when the suspect comes down the corridor. So we patted around on the thing like we'd dropped a coin on the floor or

something and I don't think it fooled him much. Anyway, we had already installed the mike in his room and were just connecting it up.

Things like that would happen. One time we had a wire on a faucet to this room in the Pedicord Hotel. We were trying to determine where they were getting their narcotics. We knew they were getting them and peddling them, but we were trying to determine the source. While we were up there, with this place all wired up and listening, the city Police Department's chief of the Vice Squad came in and asked the attendant at this hotel if this prostitute was upstairs. And the clerk says, "Yes, but you better not go up there, those federal officers are there." Well, she was very unwise. We thought we had her advised better than that.

Anyway, he went right up and while we were listening he just knocked on the door and said, "Get your suitcase." He took her, and away he went. So you find out how the thing works. There are many, many interesting and close encounters, because we were just bugging everybody who was suspect.

Mr. Frederick: He would walk up there instead of calling her from the lobby on the phone?

Mr. Canwell: He just went to the desk, the police officer did, and he asked for this prostitute by name, asked if she was in the room. And what he was doing—we'd recorded him before—the pimp wasn't making his payments; I think they were \$10 a week or something like that.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, what I was referring to is that it was so brazen that he didn't call from the lobby—call to the room and say, "Scram," but he walked up to the room in person.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, well, I don't know that there was a telephone in her room.

Anyhow, it was a day-and-night busy operation. I had to report to my office and do the routine things in my office and then try to do all of these things that the federal agent wanted done.

Mr. Frederick: Were you on a contract with John? Were you reimbursed for that?

Mr. Canwell: I was not paid by the federal bureau for this work. This was an assignment by the sheriff's office. There were some perks. John Young, like all federal officers, was required to do a certain amount of target practice. He'd carried a gun all of his life and never fired it and he gave me all of his bullets. So that was one of the little benefits. I had loads of .38 ammunition that I wouldn't have had otherwise.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, with regard to the insight into the drug trade at that point in time within the region, could you describe that to me?

Mr. Canwell: It was very evident at this time that the narcotics flow had been pretty well cut off, that is, what came in by ship and other international transporters, because of the war activity. To determine how the trade was being supplied became one of the tasks that I undertook. It became quite evident that the flow of morphine was coming through illegal prescriptions.

To determine how that operated, we zeroed in on the chief informant for the police narcotics squad. He was an addict and the narcotics officers excused his addiction to morphine because he was supposedly an informant of value. He was the head distributor for the narcotics in the area. He was working with the police narcotics squad, with their knowledge; they were a part of it.

The first thing I did was to take a photograph of this addict. I photographed his father, who supposedly was an addict. The suspect was supposedly getting prescriptions for his father. I photographed his father in the coffee shop at the Davenport Hotel. And I took that photograph and the mug shot of the son and we started calling on the pharmacies in the area. Place after place, we found out that this man, using a variety of names, was using his father as the decoy. He'd come and tell the pharmacist how unhappy he was that his father was under treatment by a doctor who was letting him have narcotics, that he felt it was bad and so on. Well, he'd end up by saying, "Well, he can't just stop, but can you write a prescription for X number of tablets." So in many of the cases, the pharmacists would go for this. When we contacted them they'd say, "Oh, yes, we know so and so, and his poor old man." So anyway, he had a regular milk route. That was one of the things we uncovered and discovered how the flow of morphine was coming into the community, who was handling it and who the police were who were protecting it.

Mr. Frederick: Now I could be mistaken but what I hear is relatively a small-time operation? Was the drug traffic at that point in time, was it greater than that?

Mr. Canwell: No, that was the major part of it. There were two sources of narcotics. One of them being morphine, which most of the addicts used, and opium that the Chinese and pleasure smokers used. They were not vast operations. I would say it's nothing like is occurring today. I would say that consumption of prescription drugs and narcotics of various kinds is probably 100 times as great now. We were just beginning to encounter marijuana at that time.

[End of Tape 22, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: You were saying that compared to today it's not quite the same scene.

Mr. Canwell: No, I do not think that a two-man operation such as Young and Canwell conducted could begin to handle or control the situation now that narcotics is coming through in tremendous quantities and distributed in a businesslike manner in trucks and automobiles. Where, at our time, we were merely concerned about the illegal issuance of prescriptions, which was the prime source of morphine then. And the Chinese did bring in some opium in what they called decks.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, where was that coming from?

Mr. Canwell: The opium was coming from, as far as we could determine, Vancouver, B.C. Of course, at any shipping point you'd have the potential. But, I think the main flow at that time was Vancouver, at least that's what we concluded. That's the deck opium.

Mr. Frederick: What did you two folks do when you discovered a city official or law enforcement officer who was involved in kickbacks or shakedowns. How did you mechanically handle that.

Mr. Canwell: That was actually out of our jurisdiction. My brother at that time was police commissioner. He was in charge of the police and fire departments. I told him at the time what was happening and Carl was never quite as streetwise as he might have been. He was a little reluctant to believe that some of his detectives were doing what they were doing. He tried to counteract it and stop it in whatever ways he could. But we took no official action on it; that was actually not the task that we were undertaking.

Mr. Frederick: So potentially very little was done then?

Mr. Canwell: Not very much was done other than some prosecutions. We raided the Chinese smoking place and made arrests.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, what I was referring to was not your work and John's work with regard to attempting to shut down the opium and the morphine trade, but to a certain extent the more disturbing aspect, which is a recurring theme, of local officialdom who are involved in that. I get the impression that not much was done about that.

Mr. Canwell: Not much was done. The only way it could be done is through the official police organizations. About this time my brother was up for re-election. He had done a very good job of cleaning up the town that

was in pretty bad shape, with reference to morals and law enforcement, during the military operation at Geiger, Fort Wright and other places. It had increased to a place where Spokane had been put off-limits by the military.

Mr. Frederick: What year did that happen?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I was just trying to think of when my brother was elected. It had been put off-limits before his election. I believe he was elected in 1948. I believe it was in that period of time. He did a pretty effective job of closing down the obvious places, the houses of prostitution, the more or less open gambling, and that sort of thing. It was one of the anomalies of the situation that while he had done exactly what he said he would do when he was elected to office, the *Spokesman-Review* supported the person opposing him, who was probably the most corrupt officer who could have possibly been selected. And the publisher didn't understand this at all.

Mr. Frederick: Do you know that for a fact, that the publisher didn't understand this?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I know that because of the acts that I took. I told Carl that I knew Bill Cowles, the publisher; that he was just not the kind of person who would support this candidate, "Sincere Lussier." He was thoroughly no good, the most worthless cop you could ever imagine. He spent his spare time in the whorehouses, drinking up their liquor, and taking their money away from them. In general, he was just a no-good person.

But there were people on the staff of the *Review* who did a pretty good job selling the idea that my brother, Carl, was not being fair to the two newspapers. They kicked up quite a bit of this sort of thing. So I told Carl that I knew Bill Cowles and I knew that wasn't his way and to go see him. And so my brother did.

He went to see Bill Cowles and had a good visit. And Carl said, "Well, I am the first police officer who ever put Cora Crawford"—she was the city's leading madam—"in jail." And Bill Cowles slapped his knee and laughed. He said, "You know, I just found out last week who Cora Crawford was." Well, he was not a street-wise person. He was a good person who was misled into supporting this criminal type who ran for police commissioner and won. So the way of doing things had to be through channels and the channels were short-circuited when Carl lost the election.

I'm trying to place the dates on this. He served for nine years. So if he was elected in '48, which I think he was, then this was about '57 when he finally lost the election.

Mr. Frederick: Was Spokane fairly wide-open, let's say from World War II? There would be a lot of money to be

made with those bases going the way they were during the war. Was that in place clear out into the '50s, up into the '60s? How long was that?

Mr. Canwell: No. Well, for quite a period of time during the war period, there was a lot of bootlegging and prostitution going on in town. Then at whatever time Carl was elected he was elected on the basis that he'd clean up the situation. He had been connected with the Police Department for quite a long time. He ran the emergency hospital. He had medical training and was the chief steward in the emergency hospital. From that base he ran for police commissioner.

And he probably won partly because, at that precise moment, I had tremendous news publicity and up to that time, it was mostly favorable. So I think there were some people who knew just the name Canwell and they elected him. He did what he said he was going to do.

Mr. Frederick: He actually began to slow that down or shut it down?

Mr. Canwell: He immediately began closing up the joints and serving notice on them that the payoff system was no more. Racketeers, gangsters would come to his office with an envelope. I would have thrown them in jail; he just threw them out. But the word went out that there was no more police corruption and no more payoff system. Of course, there were police who went right on doing their things underhandedly and setting about to build up opposition to their boss.

Mr. Frederick: Where was the geographic location of that activity, those years within town?

Mr. Canwell: The major part of it was on upper Riverside, that is, the houses of prostitution were centered pretty much up on Riverside. Cora Crawford, the town's leading madam, had the Waldorf Hotel. Then there were three or four more right in that area, the California Hotel up on the next corner. And the St. Regis Hotel; it now is a wonderful restaurant. But in those days it was part of the underworld operation. Most of it centered up in that general area, a certain amount of it going on down on Howard; the Coeur d'Alene Hotel and places like that. But, the major prostitution operation was in the upper part of town. The soldiers were all over the area.

Mr. Frederick: Was it relatively discreet?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I don't know how. I suppose that the so-called better houses were a little discreet, but there's not much discretion in that area. People who are after that sort of thing are not discreet people and as it filters on down to lower levels it's going on in streets and

alleys, and particularly near military bases at a time like that.

I remember Jim McCluskey answering the commanding officer who said they were going to have to put the Davenport Hotel off limits. Jim McCluskey said, "Well, you might as well, you've made a whorehouse out of it anyway." And so that was the general climate. The soldiers were at a hopping-off place for European service. They did what soldiers do when they are confronted with that situation. And the town was boiling.

The more discreet or gentle phases of the whole entertainment thing were places like the private clubs. The Athletic Round Table, the Press Club, and City Club and places like that were legitimate operations. They were not vice dens or vehicles. Although that's, you know, what soldiers are looking for. They go some place where there's dance and music and girls.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I hear you, but I just can't believe that within the history of the Spokane Press Club that there weren't striptease artists who came through there once in awhile, outside of discreet business suits.

Mr. Canwell: The Press Club maintained a very orderly and discreet operation. There was none of that professional operation functioning there. Sometimes a humorous thing would happen. I remember Al Libby, who didn't drink, brought a couple of madams one day and seated them in the club, gave them his clipbook and left. Then one of the members of the club and his wife were in there and started to complain. They just complained louder and louder and louder. The more the husband had to drink, the louder he complained about how a man couldn't go into his own club without having to associate with whores.

He finally went out to leave the place, taking his wife along, and was complaining to the manager. And the manager said, "Well, I had no way of knowing who they were." So the man and his wife looked at each other and sparks flew, and that was it. But there naturally would be a certain amount of that sort of thing. It's what drinking and celebrating is. I won't say it is what it's all about, but it's part of what it's about.

Mr. Frederick: How long were you with the Sheriff's Department?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, I suppose about three years. I'd have to go back and check the year, but maybe '45. I know shortly after I left there I ran for the Legislature. But, in the meantime, I also opened a camera shop in the Davenport Hotel. So there's a little interim period there after I left the Sheriff's Office and during that time I handled publicity for two or three politicians, too.

Two or three of the prominent local men who ran for

Congress, and they were Democrats. I wrote publicity for them. Of course, in my own mind I justified that because I thought they were a lot better men than the ones they were running against, which included Homer Bone and others. But the men I wrote publicity for were Charlie Finucane and Joe Drumheller, both men that I knew well and knew in later years. And neither one won.

Mr. Frederick: What you're saying then is the Sheriff's Department situation just got too much or—

Mr. Canwell: It just was not acceptable, not an acceptable way of life as far as I was concerned. I decided to get out of it. I was only doing it, waiting to be called for military service and that hadn't happened. During this time, while I was still in the Sheriff's Office, I did some work with the Bureau investigating the Japanese community. I never had too much heart for that either. I felt that these Japanese-American citizens were being badly wronged. I was checking out the Japanese nationals in the area, I did some of that.

Mr. Frederick: Well, if you joined the force in 1941, and we're talking December 7, 1941 in terms of Pearl Harbor, that must have been—the Japanese aspect must have been early within your Sheriff's Department career? Is that the case?

Mr. Canwell: No, I'm trying to think of when we were checking these people. It had to be after Pearl Harbor, when it became an issue of incarcerating the Japanese. I remember there was one Japanese bartender out at the country club. The rumor went around that he was an officer in the Japanese Navy. So, anyway, he disappeared. But there were other Japanese working downtown. I remember working with one of the FBI agents. We'd go check these people out, question them and get their vital statistics.

Mr. Frederick: Did you have to go out there? Were you involved in that internment process?

Mr. Canwell: Not at all. No, in no way. I can remember at the time I felt the thing was wrong.

A houseguest of ours thought I had to be pro-Nazi or something because of my opposition to Roosevelt's ordering the Navy to do things where we had not declared war. I felt it was not the proper approach. I didn't feel that the internment of Japanese was right. They were citizens and supposedly had the same rights as all the rest of us. A guest of ours ran down to the FBI and reported me, said I was pro-Nazi. She reported to the agent I was working with and we both had a good laugh over it, but, anyhow, there was a lot of feeling and tenseness at that time that permitted abuses like the internment of the Japa-

nese.

Mr. Frederick: Where were they segregated? Where were they held within this region?

Mr. Canwell: Any of them that were arrested here were arrested by the United States Marshal. I don't recall having any Japanese prisoners when I was in the Sheriff's Office. I don't remember fingerprinting any of them. I just remember doing some work with this agent in which we would interrogate these Japanese.

One of them was at the Utter Motor Company where I used to have my car. I was having the tires done on the thing and when I was driving home, the wheel came off the car. So it was very easy for me to think, "Well, that Nip did it." On calmer reflection, I went back and checked the thing out and found that he had turned the job over to somebody else during the lunch period; that this guy had not fastened the nuts on the wheel, but just slapped the hub cap on it. I went out on the road and the wheel came off. But, anyway, incidents like that make it very easy for you to jump to conclusions. But I followed up and found it wasn't a result of my earlier interrogations of Japanese citizens.

Mr. Frederick: And do you know where they were sent to from this area?

Mr. Canwell: All I know is that they had internment camps in both Idaho and California. The only one I had any familiarity with was the lake in northern California. I don't remember how I happened to know about that, other than perhaps we may have sent a prisoner there or picked one up or something.

Mr. Frederick: How did you live through that?

Mr. Canwell: How did I live?

Mr. Frederick: What did you tell yourself to get through that?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, I complained. My complaints were, I felt, valid. By that time I knew a whole lot about—we'll say the ACLU, a front in the Communist apparatus. I knew that the man who wrote the legislation, the U.S. attorney general was an "ACLUer" and it didn't square. There were several other things like that, that I would evaluate and in my mind focus the injustice and how it was coming about. But I don't recall that, other than noting it or being aware of it, that I did anything about it. There wasn't anything I could do.

Mr. Frederick: Did you see the property sales within the area?

Mr. Canwell: No, I don't recall. I later became acquainted with quite a number of the local Japanese and some of them, I think, are being remunerated. But I don't personally remember any confiscation of property or sales here. I suppose some of it occurred, but I don't remember that.

Mr. Frederick: Were you aware of any feeling with regard to after the war, anti-Japanese, in returning to the area?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, I think there was a great deal of that. There were local people who had been interned by the Japanese out in the Philippines and that area and had received some very abusive treatment. So the feelings were pretty high, particularly in people who had lost family members. I don't think that many people who were involved in the military in the South Pacific had any sympathy for the Japanese who were interned. I don't think it extended to that area.

It was a fine point of the rights of citizenship. That was the sort of thing that I had grown up on and felt that your citizenship and the rights that go with it are a very real thing and couldn't be and shouldn't be taken away or disregarded.

[End of Tape 22, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Today's date is February 18, 1991. This interview series is being conducted for the Washington State Oral History Program. The interviewee is Albert Canwell. The interviewer is Timothy Frederick.

Last session we left off with Albert's remembrances associated with the Japanese investigations and the relocation that was initiated from America's response to the Pearl Harbor bombing in 1941.

Today we would like to lead off with an opportunity for Albert to explore in a little bit greater depth the automobile dealership arrangement that he had during his travels into the Midwest, and that would be associated with the mid-1930s.

Mr. Canwell: I'm trying to recall the significance of the automobile arrangement. What it amounted to was a vehicle for covering my travel expense. At that time there were quite a number of automobile dealers in the East and Midwest who would sell automobiles wholesale, or they'd charge maybe five or ten percent for handling the paper. All you had to do was to come up with the money to pay for it. From time to time I would make these junkets to the Midwest and East and usually pick up a car at Detroit or Lansing.

As I mentioned in our pre-conversation, in my records or notes I remember having a canceled check or two for automobiles I purchased, and the price appears so ridicu-

lous now. One of them, I believe, a Chevrolet coupe, I paid \$490 for and another one \$510. I had saved those checks because it's almost unbelievable.

What it did was provide me transportation when I decided to come West. Sometimes I would pick up some passengers, they were always advertising for that sort of thing. And I would come back and check out things at the Yakima paper; then before long I would head East again. Usually in the meantime I'd find a sale for the car. With the transportation costs saved and a reasonable profit on the new car I did quite well. I always had some funds anyway.

My living expenses at that time were not very great. I didn't drink. I did like comfortable hotels, and so that's where such money as I had went, to decent hotel accommodations and travel expenses. I never was under any considerable pressure. Selling cars wasn't my major interest, that was just a convenience to solve a problem, and it worked very nicely. I always had a new car to drive. And so that part of it all worked out very well, and enabled me to get from Chicago to Detroit, Milwaukee, or Minneapolis, back and forth around there.

Then as the labor situation became more tense in the automobile industry, I devoted more interest and attention to that, with the result that I did a pretty thorough job of covering the sit-down strikes in Detroit. I was well-informed in the area. I was on the spot. I knew what was happening probably better than most because I understood the radical end or the radical factor in it.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, when was that? Are we talking 1935? '36?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, along in there, '36. It seemed to me that the sit-down strikes were right in their prime about that time. I would have to go back to the newspapers to get the precise dates, my notes and copies of things I wrote at the time have been destroyed.

It seemed to me it was along in 1936 when I met John L. Lewis, for instance. As I mentioned, we differed a great deal in what we thought was the position and the threat from the Communist penetration of labor. John L. Lewis felt that he could handle them, and I told him I thought that he'd end up with them handling him. We had a difference of opinion on the thing, but he was very self-confident and did a fairly competent job of manipulating the radical forces in labor, but strictly to John L. Lewis' advantage. I mentioned before how I happened to meet him.

Mr. Frederick: When you were back there were you doing any contract work with regard to investigating people above and beyond the newspaper, but using the newspaper as a front and passing that information on to potentially the automobile industry?

Mr. Canwell: I think it's probably not expedient for me to go into any of that phase of my activities. I was not on salary anywhere. I was at all times trying to figure out how to go on eating and accomplish certain goals. I didn't know what my goals would be. I don't think anybody in my position at that time could.

I just had more expert knowledge than most people, and certainly more than most reporters at that time. That went back to my experience in Seattle with the Harry Bridges group and observation of the radical activities on the waterfront and so on.

Mr. Frederick: Were you working from references? You would do a job and then maybe get a lead and a reference and then move down the road within the Midwest and do another assignment?

Mr. Canwell: My best recollection is that I became concerned about key people in these fields. I would try to learn everything I could about them. What all my sources of information were I don't recall at this time. I read a great deal. I gathered up a lot of radical literature that was distributed in labor and other operations, and I squirreled a lot of this away.

Mr. Frederick: Now that would be your background. Did you sell articles back there?

Mr. Canwell: I sold some. More often than not I just left a sample of what I was doing. I might write an article on some particular labor activity.

Mr. Frederick: Did you make any company contacts in that process, and potentially have them contribute to you?

Mr. Canwell: You're thinking of the automobile industry, for instance. No, I did not. I was more interested in making contacts that would be of help in a news sense.

Mr. Frederick: My guess is that the industry, the automobile industry, at that point in time, had massive resources and it would have been difficult to penetrate that network.

Mr. Canwell: I would say it would have been futile to try. They worked from the top down, instead of from the bottom up. They felt very self-sufficient. When Ford had a labor problem, as I remember, he sent a bunch of goons in with pick handles to settle it.

Mr. Frederick: Did you feel any need to carry a firearm?

Mr. Canwell: I always felt the need of it, but I didn't do it because it wasn't expedient. The labor forces at that

time were a very rugged, rough-and-tumble people. A firearm would not have been useful. I always had one, but I don't recall what I did with it, usually stored it at my hotel. I kept almost a permanent room at the Morrison Hotel in Chicago for quite a period of time. I used to leave luggage and boxes of records and things there.

Mr. Frederick: Now we're talking somewhat later 1930s, '35, '36?

Mr. Canwell: Yes.

Mr. Frederick: —which would be some of your earlier travels back there. Did you have an opportunity to meet Harry Jung in Chicago at that time?

Mr. Canwell: It was along in that period that somebody directed me to see him, and my recollection is very fuzzy on that. He was one of the great men in the field at that time. He's supposed to know everything and probably knew more than anyone else. I remember going to see him, or looking him up, or having a recommendation from somebody to see him.

Mr. Frederick: Did you realize at that point in time his stature within the field?

Mr. Canwell: Just vaguely, just knew that he had a great deal of information.

Mr. Frederick: Were you aware at that point in time of anyone with a stature in the field?

Mr. Canwell: No, I would say any built-in respect I had for people in that area was more on the West Coast, at the Boeing Company and places like that.

I don't know when I first became aware of the importance of people like J.B. Matthews and Bob Stripling and Ben Mandel and others. They were names, they were important. But I was a very busy, uncertain person, that is, I didn't have specific goals. I was letting things happen and just moving along with the tide, I guess.

Mr. Frederick: Did your contact who you so fondly remember from Boeing—he would have been potentially aware of your travels—did he ever give you any contacts or any tips or any leads when you were back there or was he still watching?

Mr. Canwell: I don't recall it that way. The Boeing Company, in the person of Stan Leith who eventually became their corporate chief of security, was pretty well on top of the radical picture, or trying to be. In Seattle we had a Red Squad at the police station. That was before the FBI really became active in the thing. And there was

quite a lot of resistance to the radical movement as it organized and moved ahead in every direction they could. They were moving into politics and labor and creating a scandal at the University of Washington and it was a day of a great deal of concern even away back in the early '30s.

There was an awareness that there was absolutely no support on an administrative level, particularly on the top government level of the New Deal. The radicals were in, they had no enemies, really. People didn't understand what they were doing and there was a general feeling—I think it was true—that if someone were elected to Congress and wanted to get next to the throne they got next to Eleanor Roosevelt. And to get next to Eleanor you went along with her radical activities and positions.

Many of the politicians did that, like Mon Wallgren, who became governor here, and Harry Truman and others. It was the expedient, diplomatic, effective thing to do. Nobody could get anything done about the radical situation. And everybody who tried it ran into a stone wall and probably a lawsuit engineered by the ACLU. I'd have to backtrack to show where I'd picked up the trail on the penetration of the government, the attempt to take over from within. Somewhere probably later in our discussions we'll go into that.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I hear you. I was wondering—and we'll have an opportunity to pursue that—I was wondering if your Boeing contact during the mid-'30s, latter '30s, ever offered any contacts or names to you when you were back in the Midwest?

Mr. Canwell: My relationship with them was what it remained, a reciprocal thing. We put together sort of a loose-knit group of experts who were concerned about the issue. It was not a formal thing, but as the years went on it was pretty much headed by Stan Leith. There were many of us who were within that orbit and so the flow of information was a reciprocal thing.

Mr. Frederick: Was Stan concerned primarily with the industrial side of the equation?

Mr. Canwell: I think that he had originally been employed by the FBI, I've forgotten just what that was, but he was employed by Boeing because he was quite a recognized expert in the radical labor level. I don't know just what year he came to Boeing, but somewhere along the line I met him and we used to have contacts back and forth. I was more aware of him, I think, than he was of me. I probably told you in a discussion before, one time in Seattle, I got the word that there was to be a raid on Communist Party headquarters. Well, everybody converged there and I think he was in the group.

Mr. Frederick: And potentially that would have come through maybe Stan?

Mr. Canwell: It may have. I know it was a firm tip and the word got around and everybody was converging at about the same time.

Mr. Frederick: In that day and age, and we're talking mid—I assume—mid-'30s, what would be the pretext for that raid?

Mr. Canwell: It was just a bunch of radicals or subversives concentrating on trouble-making in general and the labor waterfront activities. Harry Bridges was moving very strong at that time.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I understand that. I understand that. But I would assume that potentially—or was law enforcement involved in that?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, it was the major and the chief of police.

Mr. Frederick: And that would have been Major Dore?

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember who the major was at that time.

Mr. Frederick: I was just thinking about the pretext for them to do that.

Mr. Canwell: Oh, just determination that it was time to bust them up, and that's the way they operated. It was time that things shouldn't all go one way. The comrades were pretty good at violence and the police were, too. They just had to know what they were supposed to do.

Mr. Frederick: So it was time for a little "payback"?

Mr. Canwell: Well, yeah, they evened the score. The Communists and their entire philosophy always developed a contempt for authority, a contempt for police as such. So this putting on cops was not a new thing, it was just what you could get away with. So a raid like that wasn't very well-coordinated; they just decided they were going down and put them out of business, so that's what they did. They went down there to clean their offices out and tell them they were out of business. It, of course, didn't work—they just went somewhere else.

Mr. Frederick: Would that be reported in the press?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, probably. I don't remember. I would suppose that it was. It might not have been depicted exactly the way it happened, but there probably was a news

report that the police had raided Communist Party headquarters. I don't recall that any arrests were made. They threw their desk out through a window onto the street.

[End of Tape 23, Side 1]

Mr. Canwell: To understand the Communist situation at that time from the radical standpoint, one must realize that the radicals were probing. They were moving in wherever they could get a hold. They enlarged their base. In Spokane, important penetration was in the Great Northern Railway union shops and the Communist Party built up a very strong unit within there.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, did that begin in the '20s? That campaign? Or is that in the '30s?

Mr. Canwell: I would say that any awareness of this would date in the early '30s. There was radical movement in labor; in fact, William Z. Foster and Gurley Flynn were thrown in jail in Spokane, I think, in 1913. They were out here operating particularly in the logging industry and some in the mining. But they really got nowhere until in the early '30s.

The situation in the logging camps was so bad that it was a natural area for them to work. The grievances were valid. The Wobblies, as they called them at that time, organized and made certain demands and some gains for labor.

I think that they were timely and would never have had a following if the lumber barons had done an honest and effective job of taking care of their workmen. But they were exploiting them for every ounce of energy and whatever they could produce or contribute. Of course, the Wobblies had a heyday. Then all they had to do is come in and set some timber fires and they could just about get what they wanted.

But the major organization from the standpoint of the Communists did not take place, to my knowledge, until they were getting into the '30s. Then these radicals were sort of brought together and they had some political clout and support. They moved from that point to rather an effective control on the waterfront and some of the logging areas, particularly over on the coast. Then it moved along quite rapidly because they were getting what they demanded.

Mr. Frederick: So the Great Northern shop organization campaign potentially was in the early mid-'30s?

Mr. Canwell: That was the first labor penetration of any consequence in Spokane. People like John Hartle headed up the Communist Party and the labor organization movement. Barbara Hartle eventually married John and she became an important functionary in the Communist

apparatus; left John, and had a varied marriage experience after that. But, anyway, the penetration was in the Great Northern shops and it's interesting that one of the lively units of the thing was up near our place in the mountains, in the hills.

They organized a very strong unit up there, took over the Grange and everything else, and were quite effective up there.

And they didn't know me. They just knew the Canwell name. I'd be up there once in awhile practicing with my revolver and that's about all they knew about me.

When I ran for the Legislature the first time, out of, I think, six votes up there in Mt. Carlton Township I got five of them. After my legislative activity I got one, and five against me. But that was one of the places that they were moving into—the farm communities and with a base of operation at the Great Northern shops. A lot of the old bolos in the Communist movement were identified with that shop movement.

Mr. Frederick: Do you remember which Grange up there?

Mr. Canwell: No, I just do not know that. I didn't have anything to do with the Grange there. I just remember that this one group took over the Grange unit and it was about the same size as the Communist group there. They took it over lock, stock, and barrel and used its facilities for their activities.

Mr. Frederick: Would that be up there in Peone Prairie?

Mr. Canwell: Well, it's north of there. It's up in the foothills of Mt. Spokane. There is an area they call the Foothills, but that's not what I'm referring to. I'm referring to the actual foothills of the mountain up there.

There was a Grange organization and it was taken over by this group and the people who didn't like the political activity just dropped out of it. They never were very active members anyway.

Mr. Frederick: With regard to local industry or occupation, you've got the Great Northern shops out there. Was there any other foothold gained?

Mr. Canwell: That was the major one. The problems at the time, they were just coming out of a world war and a depression and the people were pretty unhappy. The Communists very quickly expanded their strength by finding jobs for people. Somebody just comes to a meeting and he's unhappy and unemployed and all that, so the foreman is a commie, he sees to it that they have a job. And it works. It's a good organizational tool but it doesn't necessarily make the beneficiaries of that doctrine Marxists. Some of them couldn't even read.

Mr. Frederick: Please describe the Communist Party activities within Spokane.

Mr. Canwell: Well, the Communist Party is an organizational gambit. It works from the top down. You assign somebody in a union or group to recruit, so he makes friends. He finds out what people want, then attempts to give it to them and with much conversation about it. In Spokane it was divided into two factors. It was the intellectual, which was the real communist movement. Then there was labor, the radical parading, demonstrating, noisy faction of the thing, which provided financing through union dues.

In Spokane we were, sorry to say, unfortunate enough to have a Communist of world importance living here. He was an attorney and was very important in the Communist Party nationally before people had any idea what it was all about. He was a national officer of the American Civil Liberties Union, national member of the National Lawyers Guild. Benjamin Hamilton Kizer was sort of the godfather of the intellectual group in the town, the pseudo-intellectuals. The people who wanted to be intellectuals and weren't. And anyway he was a leader on that level.

I took him into camp quite early because as a reporter I volunteered to do publicity for the Russian War Relief, which he headed. I took pictures for the Russian War Relief and, of course, got the blessing of Ben Kizer. He didn't know me from Adam, but he knew I was a willing worker. So we had people on that level.

Then back in the beginnings we had important Communists who were writers on a scholarship level. There was a heavy penetration without the knowledge of the publishers or the people of the newspapers. That took place, of course, across the land. They planted sleepers in the major newspapers. And we had them here.

Ben Kizer was sort of the godfather of the group. As in Sherlock Holmes, there was a sinister character who always surfaced. Well, that was the way with Ben Kizer. Everywhere you turned, why, Ben Kizer was there but people didn't understand what he was doing or why.

Then on the labor level we had the Hartles and people like that. An interesting point was that I was covering these people. They never had a meeting that I wasn't there usually, during the '30s period. Late '30s and early '40s. I was pretty well accepted because I took pictures for Russian War Relief and other things like that. So anyhow, the apparatus was moving on that level and very rapidly.

On the labor level it was an entirely different thing. It's controlled but the people in it haven't the slightest idea. For instance Betty Webster knew about Ben Kizer. She knew that sometimes he'd appear to get some of their people out of jail without being asked to, but other than that she didn't know anything about him. But she did

know everybody on the trade-union level.

So it didn't take me long to figure out there were different levels of this thing and they were all on a need-to-know basis, like any good intelligence operation. You don't know any more in the Communist Party than you need to know. And you just do your job, they keep you busy and that's it.

But anyway we had this division. We had Kizer and the intellectuals on one side and then we had the intermediate characters who were liberal politically. They went along on all the Communist agenda without any realization of what they were doing. It was just the thing to do. So that was the picture in Spokane and particularly when I came back in the late '30s, early '40s. The apparatus was very strong here because it was well-organized, and numerical figures have little to do with control.

As I have mentioned previously, when I was in New York, it was pretty generally understood on certain levels that this was the most important enclave of the Communists in the western world, here in the Northwest, and that this was where the activity would develop.

Mr. Frederick: Why was that? When do you believe that began and why was that?

Mr. Canwell: There's a very sound reason for it. When the Communist planners and schemers in New York and Germany began to envision a world takeover, they were thinking on a different level than perhaps they do now. As I have pointed out, the Pacific Northwest was viewed as an area that should be penetrated and eventually taken over by the movement of a land mass or military operation down through Alaska to the Pacific Northwest.

Well, along about into the '30s we began to build things like Coulee Dam. And Coulee Dam opened the floodgates. It made it the most important defense area in the free world. It had the power for aluminum production, and nuclear energy developed at Hanford. Seattle's Boeing Company dominated the skyways of the world because of their access to aluminum and other things and the genius behind it. Suddenly this became the most important defense area they could control. They had good organizational control here. They had good political penetration.

It was impossible to accomplish that in New York or Chicago in an effective manner. They could generate propaganda there and here they generated organization and political control. It was an entirely different thing. It changed the picture of the world Communist movement. And for that reason this became very, very important, as I pointed out. The power, aluminum, nuclear energy, all of these things made this the focal point for the defense and protection of the free world and also the target for takeover.

Mr. Frederick: I hear you. But where my mind's at, at this point in time, is in the '30s and I don't see what you say really having any major impact until the '40s, until the war.

Mr. Canwell: It was beginning to come on in the '30s, as the development of Coulee Dam opened the gates to what the potential was here, for the greatest hydroelectric facility on earth was being developed here in the deserts of Washington State. That was early in the '30s, although Grand Coulee was not completed until 1942.

Prior to the '30s, as I have stated, after the Soviets became leaders of the international Communist movement as a result of the Bolshevik revolution, they anticipated a military invasion of the U.S. through Alaska, penetrating Washington State, after neutralizing the populace with propaganda.

So the thing grew and enlarged as we went into the aerospace age and with the nuclear age we were in the heart of it. For that reason the Northwest became more important even than the original plotters and schemers had in mind. They were thinking of a physical takeover and that went by the boards just as their use of violence and radical accouterments vanished as they penetrated the scientific field and others with their agents and people. That's, of course, why Martin Dies and people like myself, who used the legislative powers to prevent that penetration, became such enemies of the total order, because that's where the action was. Where the potential was.

Mr. Frederick: The woman who was your school bus driver when you were going to the—

Mr. Canwell: Orchard Avenue School.

Mr. Frederick: ... Orchard Avenue School, you later met up with in the mid, late '30s.

Mr. Canwell: It was when I came back to Spokane which would be 1938. I just, by accident, bumped into her because I was looking into some commie gathering or something. I then suddenly realized that she was a key figure in it.

[End of Tape 24, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: A major threshold within your career was, again, meeting up with Mrs. Webster?

Mr. Canwell: Webster, yes. Betty Webster. She later became Mrs. Graham. Married a local Communist labor leader, I believe.

Mr. Frederick: Why did she assist you in your activi-

ties?

Mr. Canwell: She was just beginning to realize that she was being had, as everybody is. She was a heavy contributor to the local Communist Party, helped organize it. Senator Ed Beck, who was from my district, was a member of the Communist Party and a member of the state Senate, and had been within her early study group. She had provided money to send him to a Communist school and other things. Then he had obtained a state job with the Weights and Measures Department; something that had to do with examining the trucks in her truck line. And they gave her a lot of trouble as she began to waiver in her duties and commitments to the Communist Party.

So she was just beginning to realize the facts of life about the apparatus, and then in explaining my concern and interest she was very willing to be helpful. With a little probing, for instance, she obtained the mailing list of the district Communist Party, which she provided me. And any questions I wanted answered she answered, like about Ed Beck—she told me all about him. Jim Haggin, who became Dave Beck’s chief lieutenant, was also part of the local Communist Party and she gave me information on Haggin. Of course, every meeting that was coming up, I was informed where and when and who would be there, who the speakers would be.

That’s when I began to put together a sort of formalized set of records. That’s something that nobody understood. When I became chairman of the investigating committee, they didn’t realize the extent of the sources of information that I had and I didn’t do any talking about it. But that was part of the beginning of it. I have records back from the sit-down strikes and I had gathered material in Seattle about Communist activities on the waterfront and things. I had lots of dodgers and floaters, political throwaway materials where Hugh DeLacy, other Communists, had moved into politics. So I had a great deal of information along that line and I began to more formally put it together at this time.

Mr. Frederick: What was your format? What type of categorizing did you do? And what type of discipline did you maintain in maintaining your format?

Mr. Canwell: I used a system that I still use. One of indexing. I would index the name, address, age, whatever I might know about the individual, the unit he might belong to, any information I might have on family background or anything along that line. I would extend that into folders. I still use much the same system. I may index and then it becomes more extensive than that; then I’ll have a folder, and you see them all over the place. And that was about it.

I always felt nobody can remember everything and certainly I cannot, and I always relied on a system of rec-

ords, and notations. Subjects that I study or was interested in, I may make notes on them. What I call daily file notes. And I’ve always kept three-ring notebooks and legal pads and that sort of thing and it’s still a habit of mine. “Timothy Frederick comes to see me on the 18th of February,” I’ll probably make a notation of it. I might even make a little notation about what took place. But that is a system that I’ve always used and relied upon and never desired to try to deceive anybody in the thing. It was just a matter of personal records, and information. So that’s the way I operate.

Mr. Frederick: Is there a category within that format that talks about agenda?

Mr. Canwell: I’m not sure I got the question.

Mr. Frederick: Within that format that you were using would there be a section that’s associated with agenda? That would have to do with calendar time.

Mr. Canwell: Not likely. The daily file thing would be like a diary. It might have blank spaces. Often did. And I have forever operated that way. Prior to that time I remember this little notebook that I had filled with onion-skin paper. That was back in the days in Chicago and New York and that general area. I made many notations that way and unfortunately a great deal of that material was lost.

I always followed pretty much the same format. Say I had a card on Jerry O’Connell or Ben Kizer and maybe I attended a meeting of a United Nations group or something where he was a speaker. I might just note that on my index card. But more likely I would make a daily file note and somewhere along the line I would bring that up to date. Those things became permanent because I would just identify daily file or DF, Date; Re., and that was it. So I might just make a scribbled note on it but I had it captured.

Mr. Frederick: Now would that be transposed into that file or would that become a clipping file?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, eventually, usually it was transposed into a folder. I utilized quite a bit of that in the Goldmark case because I had conducted a running investigation for ten or fifteen years on one person. But months might elapse when I’d never make an entry but somewhere there I had it all. It would depend, of course, on the importance of the individual involved. But there would be random things.

Like a reporter might contact me for an interview and so I’d make a notation. His name, and if it was *Time* magazine or *The Seattle Times* or whatever it was, I’d identify him with his paper. I might just make a brief no-

tation as to what was said there, or maybe not, other than the fact that it occurred.

So it's just a running diary, but not trying to be very complete. Just a reminder. The University of Oregon wanted copies of this sort of thing assuming it was a diary. It wasn't that, it was just a utility for doing what I was trying to do.

Mr. Frederick: As of 1938, did you become a local player with regard to the insights that you were gaining and the records that you were keeping?

Mr. Canwell: In general, I became known to the people working in the field. And anything that I had was available. Of course, it's a two-way street. If somebody comes and asks you... somebody in the FBI asks about Joe Doaks, you know he's interested in Joe Doaks. So it works both ways. The Bureau gives very little but they also have to ask. And that would be true of the various agencies I worked with.

There was a factor involved here when a new agent might be assigned to intelligence, we'll say in the Immigration Department, and he's not acquainted with the area. He may not even be too informed on the Communist thing.

So I think of that particularly in the Immigration Department. They had a new agent here and they asked me if I'd sort of take him under my wing. And I did. We worked together for a long time. I'd send him out to interview some Communist and only give him part of the information on the character but he would do it and then he'd come back with what he found out.

I'm thinking of one particular agent, Jim Sullivan. He's now dead so it's not embarrassing to him. But he became quite expert on the Communist thing, and, of course, very friendly to me. As we worked in the radical penetration of the Yakima Valley in later years, Jim Sullivan, of course, was very helpful to me. Well, it worked that way across-the-board.

I remember one time I was invited to address the 6th Army Intelligence gathering in Seattle. They had a gathering of their officers and intelligence people from quite a large area. They asked me if I'd come and talk to them for a half-hour and they kept me there three days. Well, I had a very good working relationship with these people because I wasn't asking for anything and I had a reputation of being fairly well-informed and what I had was available to responsible people.

Mr. Frederick: So it's a bit like collecting baseball cards?

Mr. Canwell: I suppose. I often think back of my work here. I worked quite closely with the FBI when they wished to work closely with me. If they had an agent

who "knew not Joseph," why they just did something else.

Mr. Frederick: The reason I said, "like collecting baseball cards," is that you were gathering an archive and it was more than just gathering that archive but that was the core that took on a life of its own—

Mr. Canwell: Well, if it was gossip it was so identified. I always had a high regard for evidence, for material that you could take to the bank. It has to be accurate. You have to be able to defend it in court. At least that's my thinking and my approach to the thing. So if I gathered a piece of scuttlebutt about somebody or something it was so identified, and then later if it proved useful or it proved in error it was properly handled. I was not gathering gossip. That was never my intention.

You have to be quite discriminating and maybe it helps to have the ability to analyze people over and above average or ordinary ability.

I think of the Russian War Relief thing. There were two McCannon sisters. They were twins. They were active in the Communist apparatus. They manned the office of Russian War Relief but one of their sisters also worked there, too.

It would have been easy to just classify her, or bunch her in with the Communists. I never at any time did so, because I didn't know. But, anyway, in my record-keeping my records were always very valuable because they were definitive. They were dated, they were accurate. And if not accurate, information was so identified and usually not passed on.

Mr. Frederick: Before you were married, before you married Marsinah and you were bouncing around the countryside for so many years, you did come back in the area in 1938, where did you keep this? Where did you keep your initial collection?

Mr. Canwell: Well, sometimes at home. I had boxes of stuff. It was a pretty random sort of thing. I had a lot of books and notes and things that I did keep up at the place in the hills but not with significant records or information.

Mr. Frederick: Now, when you say home, you mean in your mother's home?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, when I would come back to Spokane, I always had a pad there.

Mr. Frederick: Didn't she ever wonder when Albert was going to move out?

Mr. Canwell: She was more anxious that I come home.

Mr. Frederick: It was not a problem?

Mr. Canwell: The problem with my mother was that she'd hope that I'd come home and settle down and finish my education. That was her overriding concern. And besides that, we had a large family, she was a very busy person and very active in her church and other areas and I was one of her great concerns, of course.

Mr. Frederick: You would come back and alight... you'd bring in another box into the house, that's just what she needed.

Mr. Canwell: Quite often I used to have stuff stashed in the basement or some place for safekeeping.

Mr. Frederick: Okay, so there was a basement then.

Mr. Canwell: Oh, yeah, there always was a basement in the houses we had.

Mr. Frederick: So we're not talking about piling up a corner in some bedroom?

Mr. Canwell: No, no, I couldn't...it wouldn't have been very secure.

Mr. Frederick: Well, that makes sense, literally, the knowledge of a basement. That makes sense.

Mr. Canwell: Well, I used to dabble in writing things. I have manuscripts and things that I preserved and that I thought were immortal. They weren't. But my overriding concern was this Communist, Marxist, radical thing and I was seeking answers and never felt that I had really arrived anywhere along the line. It was an ongoing thing. It developed into a place where I felt, like everybody else did, that something should be done about it in Washington State.

And, of course, I used to go to Communist meetings that would be called, maybe a sit-down strike on the courthouse lawn, or whatever, and quite often I'd call Ashley Holden who by that time was political editor of the *Spokesman-Review*. And so there was a great deal of discussion of this whole Communist problem and he was informed and concerned about it. Like everybody else, I said he should do something. It, of course, got around to the point, well, "Why don't I do something?" And that's where this political thing developed.

Up to that time I was all for somebody else doing it. Everybody had that thought in mind, that there was a problem and somebody should take care of it.

Mr. Frederick: Were there illegal aliens within the party, within the region, that you bumped into?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, in the early party apparatus here, I don't recall that I did. There were people who were immigrants and if there were any illegal aliens active in the Communist apparatus they were floaters. They were people who came through with speakers or organizers.

It's surprising the degree of organization that those people developed very early. And it's the thing that concerned me. It was always an indication that there were brains there that were not identified. And it was quite obvious that the people active in the party were not capable of such sophisticated organization or direction.

Mr. Frederick: But isn't that a spin-off, a by-product of education?

Mr. Canwell: Part and parcel of the same thing. What is education? It's an accumulation of accepted facts, dissemination of information, and there again these—

Mr. Frederick: Excuse me, Albert, what I was thinking of in terms of education was... education into, literally, on political organizing.

Mr. Canwell: Well, you'd have to define... you'd have to be very definitive in where you separate the two. What is propaganda, what's indoctrination, what is true.

Mr. Frederick: I hear ya. I wasn't addressing the issues of truth or untruth but with regard to they had received microbursts of education in terms of how to organize, how to view things in a political sense. Which is a focusing... it's a focusing exercise.

Mr. Canwell: Well, this in general originated and grew and developed in Germany. The Germans are organizers, and tend toward scholarship and learning, but they're also very doctrinaire people, very strong disciplinarians. They decided something's true so you should accept it as truth. But to what degree this is, or was, valid education, that's an area of debate that would go on forever. But you know who it was who said, "What is truth?"

[End of Tape 24, Side 2]

Mr. Canwell: Along the line of our discussion there relating to illegal aliens, I probably should have said, "Not to my knowledge." I was not aware of any and therefore had I been aware of such I would have discussed it with my contacts in the Immigration Department, but I don't recall having done so.

I did interview various Communist functionaries who came through town. I would bring them to the Press Club, we'd photograph them, interview them and I would exploit that contact for all that it was worth. But other than knowing who they were, or suspecting who they

were, when they would come through town I had no precise knowledge of their legal status as citizens. And one or two I was seriously concerned about I'd turn information to the FBI as the interviews occurred.

Mr. Frederick: Yesterday we had the opportunity to begin to explore the Communist Party apparatus matrix within the Spokane region, circa late '30s, early '40s.

I would like to take the opportunity today to ask you to share in this discussion with regard to your theories and/or knowledge of what was behind the Communist Party.

Mr. Canwell: As I observed the organization of the Communist Party, I quickly came to the determination that it was not so much a Marxist theory as a group of thugs who were out to take power. After their intense period in Germany, they functioned as a criminal operation in the Soviet Union, where they took over the democratic Kerensky Revolution, so I never saw it as a philosophical thing. It was a group of thugs using Marxism and various weapons associated with the common people, their poverty, their struggles, their injustices. They took advantage of all of that to accomplish power, but they were not idealistic, in general.

I'm not speaking only of Lenin; I'm thinking of the high command of the Communist apparatus as a bunch of thugs, who never were anything else. Ruthless, murderous, calculating thugs who were out for power and they were under very strong discipline from person or persons unknown to me at the time.

And, of course, you develop a secret police and an informer system within such a structure and it's as vicious as anything can possibly be, because you have no one you can trust, and no one you should trust. Stalin would routinely kill off his closest followers because they might be potentially dangerous. So you're dealing with a totally, completely ruthless, satanic force.

I don't know how far to go in my thinking about the thing but I never, after a cursory examination of the thing, had the idea that we were fighting Marxism. That was just a tool.

The Communist leadership, I think in their Second or Third International, said, "How do we get communism?" They said, "We get it through socialism." And that's the step. You use socialism and the natural appeals that it may have to the underprivileged to make them think they're going to gain power and betterment and, of course, they don't. It's just a matter of controlling them.

And so they work for socialism. But socialism in the long run adds up to what we see in Europe along the Iron Curtain, every place it falls by its own weight. Someone said that it is well-known that man will not till the common field with the diligence with which he tills his own. And therein is the basic weakness of the whole socialist structure: You do not let the individual profit by his own

endeavors and diligence. And he will not work effectively for the state. He'll work to the degree that he is compelled to work.

My first quarrel with the Communist who tried to indoctrinate me, or recruit me, was, he kept mouthing the phrase that they were going to create a society in which each would contribute to his ability and receive according to his need. Well, anybody who can think at all would know that somebody would have to tell the citizens how much they should contribute and how much they needed and enforce that, and therein the whole thing falls flat.

Mr. Frederick: With regard to that leadership mindset agenda, this is what you attribute to the Communist Party's effectiveness in organizing within America?

Mr. Canwell: It's pretty hard to narrow down the Communist philosophy and its tactical approach to their problems without trying to ignore some of the obvious. I think these people were dreamers and schemers, the brains behind it, most of them... a great many of them were German and many of them of Jewish extraction. But they were mental powers and they were scheming and dreaming, determining how they could establish a world order and utilize the people for their own destruction or control. That was applied over and over but, I think, the dreamers in this thing only saw the military and force application as an intermediate step in gaining control of the world.

And so they did think along those lines, of coming down through Siberia and Alaska to the Pacific Northwest and their colonization and endeavors in the labor areas and things were somewhat supported by the thinking that eventually they'd have the muscle to take over. And they were a lot of dreamers. They dreamed things that changed the course of the world for the worse.

But that's what evolved out of largely German communism. They were thinkers, dreamers, and the Soviet thing offered an opportunity to seize and grab power, so they worked along those lines. But back of them were also brains somewhere along the line that may have had other motives: political, religious and whatnot,

I should probably say I'm no philosopher. I just examine the thing as it unfolds or occurs to me and my expressions of opinion are an outgrowth of that and, as I say, I'm no scholar. But I can read Marx, Engels, and others and pick their thinking apart because it's very obvious they were not honest, they had no intention of being honest. Marx just didn't want to go to work.

They were constantly probing and reaching for power and they developed a cell concept. You established a little cell and it divides like an amoeba and that's the way they operate. They always did operate that way. On the campus, or anywhere else, they'll get a little group together, subtly put some control in there but make these people, these students for instance, believe that they are

thinkers, that they're independent brains, that they're arriving at these conclusions on their own. They excessively flatter them. They do everything they can to keep them happy. And I may go into that a little as we get into the University of Washington and the approach that they took there.

It's a devilishly clever system of organization because you just get people interested and then you never give them time to think for themselves. I remember talking to Isabel Costigan who was one of the ex-Communists. She'd never been a very devout one. She went along with her husband. But I asked her, "Well, what holds these things, these people, together?"

Well, she said, "First we always had a good time. We'd get together as a social activity and each one got what he wanted." She said her husband, Howard Costigan, loved to orate so he'd make speeches. And she said, "The women had a social relationship. They liked to get together and visit and talk. And then there was Ward Warren, another member of this group who just liked to fight." So somewhere along the line they all got what they wanted. Their meeting might end up in a brawl, but Ward Warren would get what he wanted out of it, Howard Costigan would be lecturing and orating, and Isabel Costigan would be meeting and visiting and talking with the other girls, and that was not all of the girls.

Some of them were vicious as could be and were used by the party in a recruiting sense. But in general it was just a social activity and pretty hard for somebody to come along and put the finger on them and say, "You are all evil," because they weren't. Just a cross section, particularly on that level, of the labor and academic groups.

The thing that always intrigued me is: Who pulled the strings? Who held all of this together? Who gave the advice? And that is where the mystery lies.

Mr. Frederick: Why doesn't it suffice that the Marxist-Leninist theme, and down into Stalin, that they were pursuing class world revolution, in response to, I would assume, the industrial revolution? That is, attempting to deal with the industrial revolution?

Mr. Canwell: I think one has to conclude very quickly that these people, at the nucleus, have complete and total contempt for human life. They place no value on it whatever except their own. And so you're dealing with... well, you're playing on an uneven ball field. You're playing against people who'll kill you if you don't agree with them. And they have no compunction about starving you to death or exploiting your services or anything that gains their ends. And the individual is absolutely nothing. Their whole concept of civilization is in collision with ours.

[End of Tape 25, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: Potentially, in your mindset, was there a competitor like the fascist movement or the nazi movement that you would equate in terms of ruthless evil?

Mr. Canwell: No, there was no conflict in my mind because I felt they were all part and parcel of the same thing. And fascism, you know, what is it? Nazism and communism...just shake them all up in a bag and you have the same thing: a disregard of the individual and his rights, contempt for God and faith.

[End of Tape 25, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: We've had the opportunity in the past to talk about your specific interests when you were employed at the Spokane Sheriff's Department. During your tenure with that office, what were your specific undercover activities in the Communist area? With regard to the Communists, did you have an opportunity to use electronic surveillance material on them?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I did quite a bit of that. And then in later years we did a great deal more of it. I encouraged agents who might be sent to me for some training or help to ground themselves in the local Communist movement. Wherever they were, people who had access to electronic equipment and the spools of wire and the things that we needed, I usually got them to doing that sort of thing. So a great deal of it was done for me, or for my benefit, merely as training for new agents.

The Counter Intelligence Corps had a unit here and they worked very closely with me and even provided me one of the undercover agents that they could no longer use, turned this agent over to me.

Well, there was that sort of thing going on all the time and you could callous your ears listening to these recordings with too much trivia. You know, they might have a bug on the telephone for Ben Kizer and he'd gotten soft in the head. He got to a place where he believed his own hype. And, you know, you can wear yourself out listening to this stuff.

But we were doing a certain amount of that and I was learning everything I could about it. I obtained the recording equipment and one way or another could always get the wire and tape that I needed to make surreptitious recordings.

Quite often we merely planted a bug in a hype's room or prostitute's room and listened directly, so that we knew what their conversations were and who was coming and going. Much of that was not done for permanent records. It was done just as a matter of surveillance. Anyway, I did a certain amount of that.

Mr. Frederick: What was the activity with regard to the Communist Party that you discovered? Did this have to

do with front organization campaigns?

Mr. Canwell: The most important thing that I encountered was the operation of the Russian War Relief. It came right along at the wartime. Ben Kizer was the head of it and several key Communists were active in the office. They had a never-ending flow of their people coming to town and appearing, making talks. So usually I had advance information on that, and was called on to take pictures, which I did very happily. And I was able to identify people that I otherwise would not have had identification on.

But I did provide these photographs to the Bureau. And occasionally I'd plant one in the paper for publicity for them. And, in general, they liked me. But that was one of the major things.

I would hear, through Betty Webster and others, of meetings that would be called or were going to take place. I remember one time in the very early period, Barbara Hartle and, I believe, Bob Patrick were instructed by the party to face arrest, to violate city ordinances that had been quickly put together to prevent their street-gathering. And they had been advised to resist that and go down and break the law in effect and submit to arrest, which they did.

And later Barbara told me how surprised they were when early the next morning Ben Kizer showed up to spring them. And that, she said, was the first time she knew anything about his function within the party organization.

But in general there were labor meetings. There were things like the New Deal Club which met from time to time. Then there were the front activities such as the Association for United Nations. There was a league of women that was not a Communist organization; it was just controlled by them as many such things were. There were peace groups. The party had a functionary in the library, the head of the library, and she was a stooge of Ben Kizer's. We kept pretty close tabs on her and the people who came there for meetings.

But there was just a lot of that sort of activity going on. Part of it was totally Communist. Part of it was just merely front groups utilized by the apparatus and some of them set up by the party, some of them merely infiltrated, the way they always operate.

Then we had offshoot groups down at the teachers college at Cheney. They had quite a bit of activity down there that I knew about and occasionally would cover some of it.

Mr. Frederick: What type of groups were they?

Mr. Canwell: They were usually called a study group, or a rap group. Sometimes they gave them specific names. There was a Communist attorney here whose job it was to

sort of coordinate that kind of thing. Well, I think of one group that used to meet and this attorney's particular job was to put on quite a display with a white woman there. He was black. And that was to illustrate the fact that there was no discrimination in the party against blacks.

It was about that time when I had been provided an undercover agent that the Counter Intelligence Corps could no longer use. They, in effect, gave this informant to me. And he and his wife became active in several of these Eastern Washington State College groups. They had distinctive names that more or less identified what their level in the apparatus might be.

One of the things I found, when they had a new recruit or somebody who was coming into the party and they were not too sure of them, they would just drop in on him by surprise. I remember I was busy taking a statement from this undercover person when suddenly a carload of the comrades pulled up in front of the apartment house and just walked in the door uninvited. I had to go out through a back window where there was a mound of ice. I slipped and nearly broke my neck.

But anyway that's the way they'd function. They'd have these little groups and a lot of social activity. But usually a propaganda pitch to put over. In general they were recruiting devices to get students and faculty into Communist Party activity.

One of them became quite a notorious case. This person, Vernon Todd Riley, was transferred in 1943 to the underground; from Professional Section No. 7 in Spokane to the underground in Rockville, Maryland. Because I had an informant in the group at the time we even got a copy of the transfer card. In July of 1942, he had been appointed as a Section Organizer for the Communist Party in this area. And then when this agent got in trouble with the cancer division of the U.S. Public Health Service that he was doing some work for, he was subpoenaed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and perjured himself. Then in his defense he had letters telling what a fine citizen he was, from Ben Kizer and two other attorneys I won't name now, but they were Spokane attorneys, Kizer being the only identified Communist of the three.

But that's the sort of thing that just went on from day to day and night to night. You could wear yourself out covering these things and trying to get somebody else to do the recording so that you didn't have to be tying up equipment or wasting time on a lot of trivia. And most of it is trivia.

They get their message over. They'll select the victim. They bring this person into the orbit and flatter them in every possible way, tell them what intellectuals they are and eventually they get them wedded to the party. But it works.

Mr. Frederick: Were there sources of power on the

campus out there?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, there was a very strong faculty representation on the Communist level. And during later time, during the period of my committee we did do quite an extensive investigation at Eastern State but never held a hearing and never did anything with it.

Mr. Frederick: Was that due to time?

Mr. Canwell: Time, largely. We were overwhelmed with the workload and the lack of funds. We were very much underfunded. Had I not been working for nothing I don't know how we could have done it.

Mr. Frederick: Did you find approximately the same ratios that you found on the University of Washington campus out here at Cheney?

Mr. Canwell: Almost the same. I would say that percentage-wise it was a much smaller school at that time. But the faculty penetration was considerable. I'd say percentage-wise it might have been more than at the University of Washington.

But we did also have two or three people out there who were good anti-Communists, one of them being the coach. There were some good people there and there were some real stinkers, as there always are in such situations.

Mr. Frederick: Was there any propensity with regard to discipline, academic discipline that would be susceptible to Communist Party influence?

Mr. Canwell: The discipline...I imagine you mean of the recruit, or somebody who got into the party apparatus. The discipline routinely used by the party to control student recruits—and that would be down there as well as at the university, or anywhere else—was in the grading potential of the faculty member. He's able to whip people in line very quickly by the grading process. And that was done down there.

There was an English professor, I don't think of his name at the moment, but he was a long-time comrade who was a companion and got his instructions from Ben Kizer. Very much the same type of pseudointellectual. We heard of situations where students were given a 4.0 grade for participating in Communist demonstrations against various defense facilities.

Mr. Frederick: I hear you. What I'm referring to is academic discipline in terms of sciences, humanities, sports, with any particular group or groups that were more susceptible to the Communist Party line?

Mr. Canwell: The thing I learned very early was the Communists did not waste their time in the hard disciplines, mathematics and things like that, but were very active in the English Department. That was true at the University of Washington and it was true down here and at Washington State University. Every place we looked into, the infestation in the English Department was the heavy one. There was a reason for that, of course. In the first place it's much more flexible. They intended to train and replace the journalists who were getting old in the various newspapers and being replaced by graduates of the so-called schools of journalism or communication. Those are connected with the English Department.

And so they produce a great number of articulate idiots, who go on to TV and other places like that, as well as some fairly able people. But the English Department was the vehicle.

[End of Tape 26, Side 1]

Mr. Canwell: Our committee was, of course, handicapped by a lack of personnel. You just cannot expend the agents and the effort to that sort of thing. I had very early decided that we were not going to concern ourselves with the substance of teaching because I felt that it was a field beyond our competence and time and so on. So we did not go into what professor so-and-so was laying on his class. We'd get a lot of reports of that sort of thing, indoctrination. I particularly remember at Washington State University there was a basketball coach there who became quite famous but his trips with his players were a matter of a lecture course in communism. He just laid it on them at every opportunity. But we did not go into that sort of thing. I didn't feel I had the time nor the competence to challenge their teaching. I felt that could be handled properly by other bodies.

Mr. Frederick: During the '40s would you work that far south?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I'm thinking about WSU. That was after we were engaged in our committee investigations. Prior to that time I was doing some work at the teachers college and gathering some information there, but not at WSU.

Mr. Frederick: You stayed within the confines of Spokane County then fairly much?

Mr. Canwell: At that time, yes. I had about all I could do locally. More than I could do actually. I spent a lot of time day and night working on this sort of thing not knowing how successful or for what purpose it was being done in many cases. Locally I had very good working relationships with the FBI most of the time; sometimes

not. Sometimes there would be a new senior agent or somebody who didn't feel that fell within the purview of his orders. So when I didn't receive any cooperation, I didn't seek any.

But at the same time the Bureau set up two members of the Police Department to handle informants. Most of the time I didn't get along too well with them; well, I wasn't asking them for anything and they were playing at being super secret and it wasn't necessary. I knew more about what they were doing than they knew about what the party was doing.

And I say that because I had people like Betty Webster. I had Ann Tormino, another informant who had been informing for the FBI but they had more than they needed and one way or another she was directed to me. But I had people like that and it was all I could do to keep some sort of records and files, and information flowing to my files and increasing my knowledge of the local apparatus.

Mr. Frederick: When you came back in town, 1938 and up through the early '40s, you mentioned that you did some work for the Washington Water Power Company.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, this is a thing that needs a little background review. When I decided to return to Spokane, one of the organizations I was working with was International News Service, the Hearst setup. And to do what I intended to do here I needed identification. So I arranged with them to give me INS credentials. So they said, "Nothing to it." They advised Cap Hammer, the head of the International News Service in the Northwest, in Seattle, to issue me such credentials as I needed. And so I became the INS correspondent for Spokane.

I mentioned earlier that what I didn't know at the time was that they already had a correspondent. And that was Ted Crosby who's Bing Crosby's brother. He was connected with the Washington Water Power. He was a public-relations man and many other things. I mentioned earlier that, as we set up the early Press Club and I was being identified as the INS correspondent, he began to look at me kind of like a bastard calf. And so finally I had the INS advise him of what was going on.

Ted had been in World War I, had been an intelligence officer at the Presidio and knew something about communism. So when he realized what I was doing, we became fast friends and he siphoned quite a lot of work to me from the Washington Water Power where we worked together on projects.

The public-power people, organized Socialists, were trying to take over the Washington Water Power utility. They had their missionaries and people going all over the area, holding meetings. One of the jobs I did was attend a great many of those meetings, photograph the people there, and that essentially was done for the Washington

Water Power.

Mr. Frederick: Did you have an opportunity to use any electronic surveillance equipment with regard to that campaign?

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember that I did. It wasn't particularly necessary. They had somebody come through like Harold Ickes. And he'd make a tour of the area and in most cases like that I'd accompany them as just a news photographer. So it wasn't as much a matter of keeping track of subversives as it was just knowing what the general movement was. And they did have agents who were well-known Socialists.

I'm trying to think of the name of one who used to come around like a circuit-riding evangelist. All the commies and liberals would respond to a call to meetings and the big push was on public power. Unfortunately we had a Republican congressman who was going right down the line with them: Walter Horan at Wenatchee. He believed in public power and so he was a great help to them and no particular help to me or to the Washington Water Power Company. Anyway that was one of the tasks that I took on.

Somewhere along the line I did quite a lot of work for the mining industry. They had a good deal of radical activity in the unions.

Mr. Frederick: Now was that during the '40s, early '40s?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I'd say it started along in that period of time. I had information as to who the Communists were in north Idaho.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, before we move into that area I was thinking that with regard to the private-versus-public utilities campaign—and it was hot and heavy in the '30s and '40s and since then—what would put you on the other side of the fence with regard to the Grange movement. That was a major plank within that organization. Did you spend time following the Grange movement, the various players?

Mr. Canwell: Not very much. I was aware of their interest and it was a more or less valid one. They wanted extended electric facilities and cheap power. I at one point joined the Grange, I think after we moved out to the farm and I didn't particularly like what I saw, so I just dropped it. But I didn't have much to do with the Grange, was not concerned about them. I recall I knew that a unit of the Grange up in the Mt. Spokane area was taken over by a number of the Great Northern Communists. But other than that I didn't concern myself.

Mr. Frederick: One of your political antagonists, who we'll have an opportunity to visit about later on, was Charlie Hodde from the Addy, Washington, area, Colville area. I was wondering, always have wondered, the genesis for that antagonism. Did that develop when you came back into town in 1938 from your work for private-power concerns?

Mr. Canwell: I don't think there is any association or knowledge on my part of Charlie Hodde. I think he was a member of the Legislature at that time and a self-styled economist. That was sort of his field. He gave the impression that he knew a great deal about taxation and economics and sort of specialized in that. But I didn't come in contact with him seriously until I was in the Legislature.

He was very close to the group that I had under surveillance, and not at all friendly to me. He's a complex person. He's likeable and if you had time to get acquainted with him I suppose you would automatically like him. But he was antagonistic to me and what I was attempting to do and if he were able in any way to interfere with our organizing attempts at the Legislature, he would. There was a certain amount of resistance built up.

Later, after our hearings, he became Speaker of the House. And of course I had quite a bit of conflict with him over that. Well, we were winding up our committee investigations when I really came in conflict with him. We obtained information, or I did, from inside the Communist apparatus that the Speaker of the House was going to swoop down on our headquarters and appropriate our records. And Hodde was the Speaker and the one who was ordering that. Fortunately, we knew in advance it was going to happen.

But, anyway, Hodde just didn't like what I was doing or anything about it and when the question was debated about the re-creation of the committee he was so emotional that he actually shed tears on the floor of the House in a speech opposing it! So I don't know what went on with Charlie. I think he was essentially an emotional basket case. But I don't know. I left the door open as far as I was concerned. I didn't give him any trouble and tried not to let him give me any.

Mr. Frederick: And you were saying then that within that time frame, the '40s, that you began to do some, potentially, some work with the mining industry, in Idaho?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, up in the silver area, Coeur d'Alene. My particular contact and long-time friend was Henry L. Day, who was president of the Day Mines and an important person in the Hecla and other activities there. He was pretty much regarded as a key figure in the industry. He was very concerned about the penetration of the labor unions up there. There was a heavy Communist penetra-

tion in the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, and I, fortunately, had early information on that.

Henry Day did what he could to help us. I tried to set up an organization where we would be funded without me being employed by them. Quite often we would arrange for somebody to be employed by the mining industry who was actually doing undercover work for me. Nobody knew how the thing operated but that was one of the secrets of how we were able to operate without funds.

It was an honest, honorable thing. Communists were in there to try to take over the unions and therefore control the industry. And these precious metals, of course, were always one of the basic industries necessary for defense.

So I had a long continuing association with the industry and particularly with Henry Day. He was my contact. He would write to me, and call me when he wanted to know things that I might have information on, so we had a good working relationship.

Mr. Frederick: Did you incorporate in the '40s or was that an ad hoc group?

Mr. Canwell: No. We operated under a variety of names. I remember I had the Canwell Security Agency. And there were different things like that under which we operated, but we were not incorporated. We did later in about 1960, when setting up Freedom Library & Bookstore Inc., incorporate that phase of the thing.

Mr. Frederick: But what I was talking about is a contract monetary payment and how you would handle that?

Mr. Canwell: In general I tried to get, speaking specifically of the mining industry, I would attempt to get them to employ people that I wanted them to employ who were knowledgeable in the field and maybe even would infiltrate the union setup.

Mr. Frederick: And so there, then, would be no reimbursement involved?

Mr. Canwell: No, no direct reimbursement. I needed money but I was trying to avoid control, so much of my activity was financed out of the family coffer. I tried to figure out a flow of income that somehow didn't obligate me to a specific agency. I could have gone to work for Boeing at any time I wished, but I didn't. I had my reasons and they seemed valid to me: that employment meant control and supervision by people who might not understand what my mission was deemed to be.

During this period of time we had a very close relationship in my family, Marsinah and I did, with Ted Crosby and his wife. They were among our closest friends and a great deal of social activity that took place out at Montvale Farms involved the Crosbys. We enter-

tained Bob Crosby out there. I don't remember that Bing ever came out. We didn't get along too well with him. But Ted was a regular guest out there and Bob occasionally, when he'd come to town.

Mr. Frederick: Why not Bing?

Mr. Canwell: Bing was an actor. He was not a very loveable or likeable person, actually, and did not get along well with his family. His family felt that he was not treating his first wife right and there was a lot of friction there. Bing's mother just worshiped Bing because she felt that he had made it big. But she did not encourage any reparations between Bing and Ted.

Mr. Frederick: What social changes did you see, if any, within the region due to the effects of World War II?

Mr. Canwell: I don't know that I could specifically define changes. Things began to readjust to a sort of normal employment situation. There'd been very rigorous times during the war. There'd been a great deal of government by decree, actually. And that's natural and would occur in a war situation. But Spokane began to sort of readjust. Coulee Dam had been completed and there was, in general, an upswing in employment, I believe. I remember the Works Project Administration (WPA) was functioning and operating along in that time, and the OPA. I did work, photographic work, for both organizations.

Mr. Frederick: What is the OPA?

Mr. Canwell: Office of Price Administration. And the man who headed that locally was a long-time friend, Jay Kalez. He was a former newspaperman, but essentially a politician and bureaucrat who found a pleasant way of life. He eventually was appointed to head the WPA here. He called on me; at one time he was having a great deal of labor problems and the reason he was having the labor problems was that he would not appoint Communists to be foremen and so on. He hadn't taken that step. And they had explained to him that he wouldn't have any more problems if he'd do that, so he did. And the Communists moved into the WPA in considerable strength. It gave them an opportunity to employ their comrades, to get government money, to feed in the public trough. Anyway, I was fairly close to that as it unfolded, because of my relationship to Jay Kalez.

Some of that is kind of vague now, but it seemed to me there was a general economic upturn after the war, largely because of Coulee Dam. There was a great deal of employment generated there. Then following that, of course, the development of the Columbia Basin Irrigation Project. It brought a lot of money into the area.

Mr. Frederick: Did you observe the effects of rationing, World War II?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, yes. I was very aware of that. During the peak of that time I was working with John Young in the narcotics investigations. The reason I remember that is that we would get down into the wheat country or places and the stores would just be stacked up with butter. They couldn't get rid of it. But the people in the city couldn't buy it.

I remember having a photograph taken by one of the anti-Communists over in Seattle when they were loading a Russian freighter with butter. We couldn't have the stuff but they could send it over there to grease the tractors. This picture, I'm sorry, I'm afraid it burned up. But there was a Russian sailor standing there on the ship thumbing his nose at the Americans on the shipside, on the dock!

I never suffered from rationing because when we'd get out of town I'd get a bunch of butter. And at the same time, we had milk cows out at the farm. We had raised our own beef and other things so we had no real problem. Sugar, gasoline and butter were principle items rationed.

Mr. Frederick: And you didn't see the effects of that within the community as such?

Mr. Canwell: I didn't see any unhappy effects of rationing there. The only thing I was acutely aware of was the rationing of butter and that seemed so silly. It was just a propaganda gimmick because we're right here in the heart of one of the major dairying areas and the dairy producers didn't know what to do with their products.

Mr. Frederick: You left the Sheriff's Department and about what time was that?

Mr. Canwell: I don't know whether it was in '44. I suspect it might have been. I could be inaccurate on that. I just

decided I'd had enough of it and I think that coincided somewhat with Ashley Holden's efforts to get me to file for the Legislature.

[End of Tape 26, Side 2]

FORMATION OF THE CANWELL COMMITTEE

Mr. Frederick: When you left the Sheriff's Department, which would be mid-1940s—

Mr. Canwell: Yes, along in that period of time.

Mr. Frederick: You did not have a specific occupation or business to go to other than your farm and your consultative work?

Mr. Canwell: That was about it. This was an operating farm at the time we took over there. We raised hay and livestock and that's an area in which I had some experience. So I didn't lack for things to do. There were never-ending tasks out there in raising cattle, mending fences and chasing horses—a little bit of everything.

Mr. Frederick: That farm then was self-supporting?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, it was at the time when we attempted to operate it as a farm. We raised purebred cattle there for awhile and neither John nor I were making it a full-time endeavor of farming. We were doing what had to be done on the weekends and sometimes a good share of the night. I don't know how much experience you've had in putting up hay. In those days it was kind of primitive. We would mow it and pitch it onto a hayrack and take it to the barn. It was pulled up with forks and dumped in the inside. Then at times we chopped some of this hay. Most of it was horse hay that grew in the meadows on our farm. We had quite an extensive meadow area. That was real work to try to farm and then do other work in addition.

My brother, John, was, I think, operating a medical laboratory at that time. He was not a very good farmhand but he was very willing. Somewhere along the line we put in an irrigation system out there, six-inch steel pipe. We bought the reclaimed pipe from the city and put the whole bench land area under irrigation. So, it was considerable of a farming operation. And not terribly profitable, of course. But we did raise a lot of our own food, too.

Mr. Frederick: The method you put up that hay, was that cheaper than baling it?

Mr. Canwell: Well, we got into baling shortly after. We initially used the primitive equipment that we acquired when we purchased the farm. We acquired a team of horses, a real pair of knotheads. But anyway, we utilized them in this haying operation. Often we'd be running a mower with our tractor late at night, cutting the hay by moonlight.

Mr. Frederick: What kind of tractor did you have?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, it seemed to me the first one was an International Harvester tractor. We had a Case. We had several of them. We'd trade up or buy up to get a little better piece of equipment.

Mr. Frederick: What type of cattle did you raise out there?

Mr. Canwell: We raised polled Shorthorns. And we had a pretty good-sized herd of about all the area would handle at one time. That was sort of a hazardous venture because these cattle were very expensive, quite valuable, and you always had the danger of some sidewalk hunter coming along and shooting one of them. It was too close to the city. I can remember losing a head or two that way.

Mr. Frederick: And at the peak how many head could you have out there?

Mr. Canwell: I just do not recall. Among the Shorthorns, the purebreds, we probably never exceeded forty. That's just an informed guess of what we had.

Mr. Frederick: And you always kept beef cattle out there, you didn't get into any dairying?

Mr. Canwell: No, well, we had a milk cow or two for our own use. We did not go into dairying. The place had been developed to be a dairy farm by the early settlers or the man who established the place.

Mr. Frederick: Who was that, Albert?

Mr. Canwell: His name was Binkley, B-I-N-K-L-E-Y. I believe they called him Judge Binkley and I don't know why. I don't think he was a judge. He had a railroad system here, one of the interurban systems I believe. He developed Montvale farms out there at a time when other industrialists were doing the same thing. They built some rather elaborate estates along the Little Spokane River. This was one of them. Binkley was the father-in-law of Aubrey White, who established the park system out there. Aubrey White and his wife lived in Montvale when we bought it. We bought it from them. Binkley was the grandfather.

Mr. Frederick: What type of construction material was the house made out of?

Mr. Canwell: It's a frame construction, quite modern. They started out with a one-room contraption and then with some good architectural advice, contractors, and carpenters, they built the present house. It was built onto that one room originally. There were three large stone fireplaces and chimneys that still are operable there. It was a country estate. Very comfortable place for someone who had the money and could afford it and develop it.

Mr. Frederick: Did you, with regard to the Legislature, entertain the idea of running for office while you were employed at the Sheriff's Department or did that come later?

Mr. Canwell: That came slightly later. To reiterate and expand a little on what I mentioned earlier, to my best recollection, one day I was covering a sit-down meeting of Senator Ed Beck and Jim Haggin, a labor leader. This sit-down strike was called to take place on the county courthouse lawn. I heard about it and I think I called Ashley Holden and told him he might want to be there. So we observed this activity and I think that somewhere along the line I discussed in some depth the Communist penetration locally with Ashley, plus what the situation was statewide. He was informed on that because of his Seattle activity.

We discussed that and, as always, like everybody else, I thought something should be done about it and at that time, he said, in effect, "Well, why don't you do something about it?"

And I said, "Well, I'm doing what I can. I'm telling you."

And that's what everybody did. They told somebody else, wanted somebody else to do the job, some other mouse to bell the cat. Either then, or shortly after, he suggested that I run for the Legislature. There was a legislative race coming up. Of course, I poo-pooed the idea because I was a Republican living in a strong Democrat district and, more than that, a left-wing Democrat district, such Communists as Ed Beck representing that district in the Senate. And so I didn't think it offered any great opportunity. I really had no interest at that time. But either then or shortly after, he ran a story to the effect that I was going to run for the Legislature, or I might run, and I knew something about communism. Well, it was a very popular subject at the time. Everybody was talking about it and nobody was doing anything.

Mr. Frederick: Did he do that without your permission?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, he wrote it, I think, as though I were a possibility, or that I might be induced to run, or some-

thing along that line. It was a feeler. Not my intention to do that. And as the thing shaped up, I had no idea that I could be elected in that district and I didn't work too hard at it.

Mr. Frederick: What was the response to that article by Ashley?

Mr. Canwell: There was a pretty good response and some of the Republican leadership contacted me to see if I would be interested. At that time we had a Republican, one Republican in our district in the Legislature. That was Jim Blodgett. He was from a well-known north side Spokane family. I don't remember how my candidacy snowballed. It came about that I filed and ran as his running mate. But he did all the work. He had a grocery store. He'd print up all the signs and stick them in lawns. I didn't have anything, really, to do with it. I was too busy. I thought it was a futile thing to begin with. But, anyway, a certain amount of activity generated interest.

My opponent in the campaign was Frank Martin, the governor's youngest son, a recent graduate of Gonzaga Law School; a very attractive man, well-liked, and I thought he'd be a walkaway. I think everybody else thought so, but he wasn't. That year they "threw all the bums out." I came in on the wave. In this district there was almost a clean sweep.

Mr. Frederick: Frank Martin was occupying that seat?

Mr. Canwell: No, he was running.

Mr. Frederick: Was that seat vacant?

Mr. Canwell: It had been vacated, the House seats vacate every two years. Ed Beck was in the Senate and I don't remember who was in the House. There was a race for the Democratic nomination and the Republican nomination. Frank Martin got the Democrat nomination. I obtained the Republican nomination for one of the divided districts. There were several very far-left-wing people in that district, and had been. I hadn't paid too much attention to it.

So in 1947, Jim Blodgett and Canwell obtained the Republican nomination for that district. I wasn't particularly known and anybody who did know me, I had probably put in jail. I ordinarily would not have beaten Frank Martin under most circumstances.

Mr. Frederick: You were running then on a "got to do something about the communist threat" platform?

Mr. Canwell: I remember that I made only two statements about what I would do. I wouldn't vote for any new taxes and I'd do something about the Communists.

That was sort of picked up and parlayed from there.

Mr. Frederick: Do you remember where those two statements were made?

Mr. Canwell: They were made about the time that I agreed to run; made to Holden and he took it from there.

Mr. Frederick: Ashley was at the *Spokesman Review*?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, he was. He handled politics and was probably the major reason why Harry Truman stood down in front of the building and pointed it out as one of the two worst newspapers in America.

But a series of stories followed. Mostly along the line of something being done about the Communists. And I was elected—surprisingly.

Mr. Frederick: Was there ever a joint appearance with Frank Martin?

Mr. Canwell: I don't recall. There may have been. The candidates were always invited to appear at political or social groups and I don't think Frank Martin did much campaigning. I think he thought he had it in the bag. So if I appeared with him it might have been at the Chamber of Commerce or some meeting of candidates before such a body.

Mr. Frederick: And you remember participating in that type of activity?

Mr. Canwell: Some. I occasionally would respond to an invitation. There would be active political groups who wanted a speaker. They want their people to eyeball you. And so you're invited to that sort of thing and in general if I attended I merely said that I was against increased taxes and in favor of doing something about the communist situation in Washington State. That would be about the sum and substance of my input.

Mr. Frederick: And Jim, you said, handled all the campaign signs. Did you have a brochure that you passed out when you went to those meetings?

Mr. Canwell: I believe that I did. I think we had a brochure or a card that had our pictures on it and Republican orientation. And that was about the size of it. But Jim did make up a lot of signs at his grocery store. He had a means of doing that and knew, or thought he knew, the importance of having some signs around, so he put up these signs: Blodgett & Canwell. I was pretty well associated with Jim Blodgett much to my benefit, I'm sure, because the Blodgetts were known in that district for many, many years. They had a store there from the earli-

est times. Blodgett's Grocery and Mercantile Store.

Mr. Frederick: Did you ever go to school with Jim?

Mr. Canwell: No, I never did. I didn't know him at all until this campaign shaped up.

Mr. Frederick: Why was he so generous?

Mr. Canwell: He's a good guy. He's just a heck of a nice guy and I think he liked what I was saying and doing.

Mr. Frederick: And you were about the same age?

Mr. Canwell: About the same age, not the same size. Jim was about six feet two or three inches, a tremendous guy.

Mr. Frederick: And you don't remember if you ever spoke in the same room with Frank Martin. But you did not debate Frank Martin.

Mr. Canwell: No, I did not debate him and if I met him anywhere it was on social occasions. Beyond that I just don't recall. I know that he was a formidable candidate because of his general appearance and family connection. In fact, his father, Governor Martin, had been one of the few Democrats that my family supported.

Mr. Frederick: And if I remember correctly Governor Martin ran for the governorship in '48.

Mr. Canwell: It was along about that time.

Mr. Frederick: I think he was probably running for the primary at that time but it was for the governorship.

Mr. Canwell: I don't know. It seemed to me he may have been appointed or something. Along in '38 or '39, I went over to Olympia to meet with him regarding the formation of the Spokane Press Club. So he was governor at that time.

Mr. Frederick: He came in, if I remember correctly, with Roosevelt and didn't leave until 1940. Then, if I remember correctly, he ran as late as 1948.

Mr. Canwell: He was politically active there over a long period of time and I don't remember the particulars.

Mr. Frederick: Governor Langlie beat Governor Martin in the 1940 campaign. And then Mon Wallgren came in '44 and I believe that Governor Martin did not run against, in the primary, Mon Walgren. But he did make another shot at it in '48. The reason I bring that up is that, as you have said, Frank Martin appeared to be the shoo-

in. He came from a powerful political family and Governor Martin was running for that governorship as late as '48, after serving all those years. So it was a formidable group of people that you were running against.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, it took an upset, a miracle, to beat that combination because it was a Democrat district and an attractive Democrat from an attractive well-liked family that got a great deal of Republican support. I think anybody making book on it would have given me no chance at all. But this was the year they threw them out.

Mr. Frederick: Was there any liaisioning or discussion with the county Republican chairman? Did you get any assistance with regard to how to conduct the campaign, anything along that order?

Mr. Canwell: Not a bit. And in fact the Republican county chairman had a habit of stealing most of the campaign contributions, and I think that he got any that came my direction. While we knew him socially, I had a very low opinion of him.

Mr. Frederick: So what you're saying is that there was a problem with regard to that relationship?

Mr. Canwell: That's right and I obtained a little support from local people, like Charlie Hebbard—a powerful Republican—who were in my corner and realized that any money that had been contributed to the party for the legislative race wasn't filtering down to me. He knew that and he did, as I recall, put up \$1,000 or so. I got a little help like that but in general I got no worthwhile help from the Republican organization. Unfortunately the county chairman was spending the Republican advertising money through the Virgil Warren Advertising Agency. And Virg Warren was a stooge of Ben Kizer's.

Mr. Frederick: Was Ben a Republican?

Mr. Canwell: He was always known as a Democrat but he would have been either one if it was convenient.

Mr. Frederick: And who ran the Republican Party machine in the county during that time?

Mr. Canwell: At that time it seemed to me it was Bill Howe. I don't remember who else. But Howe was quite a longtime county chairman. Before Bill Howe, there was a character I should remember, but do not. I know he was in there but was not a very wholesome character either. They were taking advantage of the new liquor laws to appoint people to manage liquor stores and so on who, well, they had to be acceptable to the party and the way they became acceptable was that if they kicked back,

made a lot of booze available or whatnot.

Anyway, there wasn't a very satisfactory situation there and the substantial Republicans, of course, didn't know that anything questionable was going on. They contributed their funds and did their party duties and that was it. That was why we elected Democrats about ninety-five percent of the time—not the sole reason. I think that the tide was with the Democrats when Roosevelt came in and was so popular.

[End of Tape 27, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: What did Marsinah think about all this?

Mr. Canwell: Marsinah loved the action. She's not a person who wanted to participate out in front. She's a very modest person. But she's very much in favor of everything that I was doing and always was. Without that constant support and agreement I couldn't have done much of anything because I needed that support and faith in what I was up to.

Mr. Frederick: Did she have the opportunity to appear with you during that first campaign?

Mr. Canwell: No, I don't recall that she did. I rather think not. I don't think that I made many public appearances and I don't recall that she did. I think, of course, by that time we were living out on the farm, a pretty rugged situation. I do not recall her participating to any extent. I didn't myself. I didn't attend a lot of rallies and gatherings and hoopla. I was a little too sophisticated for that.

At various times I handled publicity for political candidates, two of them being prominent Democrats whom I mentioned earlier: Charlie Finucane and Joe Drumheller. My reason for doing so was that I was trying to unseat the Democratic congressman. So I had done that sort of thing. Marsinah knew exactly what was going on.

I always remember Charlie Finucane because I wrote some copy kind of humanizing him. He was kind of a stuffed shirt. A very attractive social lion type and I was trying to make him acceptable to the rank and file. I wrote some copy having him identify himself in a radio talk as, "This is Charlie Finucane." And his old man was a real stuffed shirt, a British type character, who, when he read this copy, put thumbs down on it. He said he didn't raise *Charles* to talk that way. Well, I did write copy for him and he wasn't elected.

Mr. Frederick: And at that point in time you had a large family and how many children did you have then?

Mr. Canwell: It must have been four. They seemed to come along in rapid succession. I know we ended up with six.

Mr. Frederick: Marsinah would have been very busy then with the farm and the children?

Mr. Canwell: She was a wonderful mother who worked hard at being a mother. When we were going together before our marriage she said she always wanted to have a large family. I said, "You don't know what you're talking about. I came from a large family." Well, it was jokingly said. But she did, she wanted a large family. She still will stop and pay attention to infant children in a restaurant or anywhere. She's fascinated with them.

She still talks to the daughters on the telephone almost—well, it seems like almost daily, but it's very often and they consult her with all of their problems. They visit and have a wonderful time together on the telephone and it costs a fortune. They come out here whenever they can. Last summer they were all here for a family get-together and we hope they'll be back again this year. We will have been married fifty years. That's quite a while.

Mr. Frederick: And the anniversary for that?

Mr. Canwell: Is July, the third of July. So it will be "hell's a-poppin'" out at Montvale in July.

But anyway, part of this time we were living out at Montvale farms. We bought the smaller farmhouse before we acquired the large house. We were all trying to live there together at the time.

I should have remembered this when you were asking about shortages and rationing, we were trying to remodel this farmhouse while we were living in it. We had to move quickly out of our former residence to get the benefit of the sale and we all moved into this farmhouse. We were trying to replace windows and plumbing and they weren't available.

I remember we sent all the way to Walla Walla, to a friend of mine who had a plumbing business, to get a bathtub. That was the sort of situation we had. The rationing was a greater problem for us from the standpoint of materials than anything else. Food was no problem.

Mr. Frederick: And within that fall of '46, there would be a new adventure. Where were you when you got the word on the election?

Mr. Canwell: I think that I was at work. I think I was indifferently watching the returns because I thought they'd be fatal. But as the returns started to come in, it looked like a Republican landslide within the district, which it was. It was an almost clean sweep, even out in the "Holy Land" where they never elected a Republican, they elected some.

Mr. Frederick: And where is the "Holy Land" located?

Mr. Canwell: Out there around Gonzaga University. That general area. But we carried, as I recall, every seat that was open. Anybody that survived was on a holdover from the Senate or something like that.

Mr. Frederick: Do you remember what went through your mind at that point in time? That potentially you'd "finally grabbed ahold of the bear's tail and now what?"

Mr. Canwell: Well, I was not terribly impressed. That is from the standpoint of being pleased or overwhelmingly pleased. I thought I was embarking on something that was going to involve a whole new way of life and I didn't particularly feel qualified to assume a position in a legislative orbit. I was probably modest in that, because I was as well-qualified as most people. I had a news background and observed legislatures in session and so on, but I was aware that I was taking on a great responsibility.

Mr. Frederick: What are the mechanics associated with that? You heard about the election and then what do you do at that point in time?

Mr. Canwell: Well, the county commissioners certify your election. You get a sheet of paper that certifies that you have been duly elected in this particular district by the numerical superiority of your vote and that's it.

Mr. Frederick: Are you contacted? Were you contacted by the clerk's office?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, probably. I don't remember just what the process was there. We were immediately contacted by swarms of people who wanted things done in the Legislature. You'd be surprised how many people suddenly like you and want you to do things for them.

I've often been amused at one of our social friends. He was so pleased that I was elected that he wanted to shake my hand and say how he'd always supported me and had been one of my contributors, although there weren't any really. It turns out that this character wanted me, when I got in office, to get him the job of director of the Liquor Control Board. That's all he wanted.

So you're submerged by that sort of thing and a hundred organizations have an agenda that they want to inform you about. In those days we weren't paid a salary. We got a little fistful of stamps issued to us and that was about it until you got your daily per diem at the session, which wasn't very much. As I recall it didn't cover my daily expenditures.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, do you remember what it was then?

Mr. Canwell: It was, I believe, nine dollars a day. If it

wasn't nine it was six, but it wasn't very much and you had to pay your hotel and food and eat. If you drank, you didn't have much of a problem. There were always people around trying to buy you a drink. But at that time I was pretty much dry. The compensation was very low and while I'm not in favor of overpaying these characters—I think it should be somewhat a public service—I do think they were entitled to a little more than they got when I was there.

Mr. Frederick: And during that election the majority changed. It was Republican at that point in time and so your leadership would not be established or there would be a modicum of leadership there. You'd have to wait until the session was convened before that could be sorted out?

Mr. Canwell: Yes. The Legislature in general has to be organized and you elect a Speaker. As I recall there was a contest between Herb Hamblem and Charlie Hodde. I think Charlie had a following of sorts.

Mr. Frederick: And that would have been a courtesy at that point in time considering the majority.

Mr. Canwell: The majority were, of course, bound to elect their own Speaker. That was almost a cinch. And later there was a coalition in the Senate, but in organizing the House that's one of the first things you do. It's the first campaign promise I had to break. I'd said I wouldn't vote for any new taxes. The first thing you get to vote on is an appropriation to operate the House. So, that is a "new tax." But in general I did not support the wild tax schemes of a lot of the legislators. They did not like that because every House member would have a little bridge he needed in his flood area, or something. And if you weren't for it you were against him. I took a dim view of most of that boondoggling. Wasn't out to make friends and influence people. And at that point I didn't care if I was ever re-elected or not, it never entered my mind.

I did, in general, get the committee assignments I requested. And maybe it's because I was not overly optimistic. I didn't wish to get on the powerful committees where you needed experience. I didn't apply for them but I applied for the ones that were important to my district that I felt I might be influential in.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, do you want to talk about the reasoning behind your committee assignments?

Mr. Canwell: My committee assignments—there was no discussion as I recall, no opposition to my requests. I got the committee assignments that I requested.

Mr. Frederick: And what is the procedure for that?

How does that work?

Mr. Canwell: Seems to me that the caucus-party caucus-meets and they discuss the membership and their requests for service on the various committees. Usually the financial committees and so on are made up of experienced, long-time legislators. I did not ask for such assignments. I asked for Colleges and Universities because that was going to be a field of my interest. Game and Game Fish, I was concerned about some of the legislation that the game characters were trying to railroad through. I didn't feel that a game warden should have powers that a law officer investigating a homicide or a murder wouldn't have. But they wanted the game wardens to be able to just walk into your house and examine your refrigerator and things like that. So that was the reason I asked to get on that and did get there.

Liquor Control, I suppose I just felt I might be able to serve on that committee and I don't remember why I requested it, but I did.

Parks and Playgrounds is important to me because of Mt. Spokane State Park.

And State Institutions I asked for because they had the insane asylum and Lakeland Village and other institutions within my district.

And, in general, I don't recall that there was anything that I didn't get. At that point I don't think the Speaker, who has not been elected yet, has much of any input other than being on the caucus.

Mr. Frederick: Who was the caucus chairman?

Mr. Canwell: I don't recall that now.

Mr. Frederick: Did you have an agenda with regard to those committees or that would come once the constituency began to make the contacts?

Mr. Canwell: I think that I filled in a list. I think we were given a form showing what committees there were and I indicated the ones I wished to serve on. And that was my best recollection of how the procedure works.

Mr. Frederick: And with regard to those committees did you have an agenda yourself with regard to proposed legislation?

Mr. Canwell: Not particularly. By the time the Legislature went into session there were a great many department bills prepared to lay on the legislators and particularly the chairmen of committees. So there was an abundance of that sort of thing. You had to examine those and decide whether you wanted to support the department's recommendation or requests or not. But there was just a blizzard of that sort of thing that people in the depart-

ments wanted done. They wanted more money. They wanted more power. And they wanted to expand in various ways.

I was particularly interested in the Colleges and Universities Committee, because of what is now Eastern Washington University being in my district; and the Parks and Playgrounds, I am sure that I was particularly anxious to serve on that committee, and State Institutions, because they were in my district.

Mr. Frederick: Before you went to Olympia you would not have known if you would have received those committee assignments. I was going to ask if you had liaisons with the teachers college and at that point in time it would have been—

Mr. Canwell: Well, I had considerable contact with the teachers college—Eastern Washington College of Education—and certain professors there and the extent of that I don't recall except that there was quite a lot of it. They are very interested in their legislators because it's from them that all blessings flow. Whatever they want, hope to get, they hope to get through good relations with the legislator.

Mr. Frederick: You had meetings with them out there on campus?

Mr. Canwell: I believe that I did. I think I was invited to a faculty affair or two out there and then individual members of the faculty contacted me in the city. But I don't recall the particulars on that. I just know there were contacts, that there were things they wanted and one of the things they wanted was eventual university status. Because they wanted it, I wanted it. And that's where I tangled with Pearl Wanamaker—superintendent of public instruction. She didn't want anybody to do any individual thinking in the areas of education. You were supposed to come to her with your hat in your hand. I just didn't have that view of people. She wasn't that important to me.

Mr. Frederick: It sounds like I would say a part of that campaign was to break out of the normal school mode?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, it was. They'd gone on for a long time operating a teachers college out there at Cheney and I think over at Central Washington and probably Western Washington. They were all going through the same thing and they were flexing their muscles. They wanted to go somewhere from just being able to give a teacher's certificate or bachelor of arts degree. They have quite a school out there now.

The only nice thing I ever heard from any of them was a couple of years ago they had a new president out there, Dr. Schilt. I don't know who put a bee in his bonnet, but

he wrote me a very nice letter thanking me for my part in converting Eastern into a university. This is going back, you know, years and years. Somebody must have prompted him and put it on his desk. But he did write this very nice letter.

Mr. Frederick: What you're saying then, during the 30th Legislative Session, that the normal schools gained college status?

Mr. Canwell: They became more diversified. I believe the degrees they were asking to be able to confer were master's degrees. The arguments, pro and con, were all in the House Journal. And so what they wanted, I worked to get for them.

Mr. Frederick: Did you have a liaison with Medical Lake and Eastern?

Mr. Canwell: Eastern State Hospital? Not until after I was elected and in service. I did visit some of those institutions. It seemed to me it was the first week or ten days of the session when you did that sort of thing because the professionals are all very busy organizing the House and Senate. The new members are standing around on one foot or another with nothing to do. And so you go visit your jurisdiction. I remember doing that. I went to Steilacoom—Western State Hospital—and other locations.

[End of Tape 27, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: We left off yesterday in our discussions with regard to committee assignments and what that would entail and particularly with regard to institutions. I would like to put that on hold right now, temporarily, and back up a bit and visit with Albert with regard to his relocation into Olympia, his first impressions of the institution of the Washington State Legislature, and the arrangements he made for where he would stay when he was over there.

Mr. Canwell: Well, of course, it was an important dislocation in my life, to suddenly up and move and direct my attentions to something new and neglect the old. Naturally I went down there with all the trepidations that a new member who probably talked too much during the campaign would go through. I was enormously impressed by the Capitol structure down there. It's an impressive, imposing thing that, if it fails to touch an individual, he doesn't have much substance. It's a very impressive edifice and you're a little inclined to feel a responsibility not to desecrate that setting.

I think it impresses one with a responsibility that suddenly has fallen his lot. It did with me. I was very im-

pressed and very uncertain and feeling my way around there and leaning on people who knew more about it than I did. Fortunately my seat mate was one of those. He was pretty well-informed on the procedure and protocol. So you adjust to the activity and in wide-eyed bewilderment proceed. I think you lose a lot of your self-confidence when you first walk in through those portals, and that's probably a good thing.

It's a most impressive building. That's why I was among those who were sort of shocked at the pornographic art they plastered on the walls in the House. It was, I felt, essentially in poor taste, no taste, and shouldn't have happened. You know, there's a place for barnyard art and it isn't in the Capitol of the State of Washington or the United States Capitol. Bad enough, some of the people whose images are portrayed there, but certainly that magnificent structure should not be devoted to pornographic art.

I know that beauty is in the eye of the beholder. I remember one of the members of the committee deciding what should be done about this horror was Mr. Lindsay of the Lincoln bank in Spokane at that time. He voted that they should retain that horrible mess there and I asked him why he didn't have some of that art in his bank. He didn't have a bit of it. There wasn't anything like that. It was all dignified, a big portrait of Abraham Lincoln, birds in flight over his bank's fountain, and everything was beautiful and lovely, but still he was in favor of maintaining that sort of obscenity in the state Capitol. I never could understand that.

Well, anyhow, I was duly impressed by the Capitol, the whole facade of it. It just tends to dignify an individual and his conduct if he's a normal person.

Mr. Frederick: Were there any particular personalities with regard to House staff that were helpful in those first few days?

Mr. Canwell: There was one who tried to be helpful and that was Ray Moore. He was assistant clerk of the House. Unfortunately I knew too much about him, so he wasn't helpful to me. But there were people if you asked who would volunteer to provide help. If you didn't know where you were going, you could ask the sergeant at arms. There were people in an official capacity who were helpful. There were senior members who, if you didn't follow the right protocol, would help. I remember one time trying to address the Speaker of the House and I'd just stand up. The procedure is to say, "Mr. Speaker." And I wasn't doing that, so I wasn't being recognized. Well, you go through that sort of thing and you're so involved in your little project or whatever is at issue that you forget or neglect the niceties of procedure. There's a reason for them, they work. But you conform or you're a barefoot boy.

Mr. Frederick: Was there a mechanism in the House at that point in time, in 1946, that facilitated the instruction?

Mr. Canwell: It seems to me that there was an early caucus formed. I remember there were lectures on rules. Mrs. Utter, I believe, taught a class on the legislative rules and procedure and it was very helpful. Gave you some insight into what was going on and what you had to do.

Mr. Frederick: That would have been sponsored by the clerk's office?

Mr. Canwell: I believe it was. I think that both houses had access to her lectures. I think they put out a little booklet, *Rules of Order*, and that Utter was the author of it. You find out why they do certain things and what procedure to follow.

Mr. Frederick: When you mentioned Ray Moore, one of the assistant Clerks in the House, what was the problem there?

Mr. Canwell: The problem was that he was that his sympathies and acquaintances in the Legislature were such that you felt it was necessary to be on your guard against Ray Moore. Anyway, I had considerable information on such people when I went to the Legislature. Ray Moore's father was a lobbyist for the Washington Water Power Company. And not one of my most-admired people. He was the sort who would walk through a dining room or kitchen and pick up a legislator's tab or reporter's tab. If you held still for that, obviously you're under obligation to the guy. Well, that wasn't the sort of thing anybody could do for me and so I was in some conflict or friction with the whole family. But I also had information on Ray Moore that put me on guard.

Mr. Frederick: Did you know Mr. Moore Sr., or know of him from the Spokane area when you were here?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I knew him in Spokane and had nothing particularly to do with him. He was officially the lobbyist for the utility and functioned during legislative sessions. But he was an official of the Washington Water Power Company.

Mr. Frederick: And in your dealings, your undercover work that you did for Washington Water Power, you would come in contact with him or—

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I had, in my work with Washington Water Power Company. My dealings were almost entirely with Kinsey Robinson, who was president of the utility, or with Ted Crosby, who was in charge of public

relations.

Mr. Frederick: Where was your desk located?

Mr. Canwell: My desk? You mean in the Legislature? Well, I'd have to show you the official photograph. I think I have it in the folder here. It was pretty remote. I was back in a corner of the Legislature. There were a few seats back of mine, but Jim Blodgett and I were up about eight or ten rows from the back corner.

Mr. Frederick: What type of clerical support did you have?

Mr. Canwell: Clerical, I had almost none. That was one of the weaknesses. There was a stenographic pool. You could go get a letter written. Most people didn't, or at least a lot of them didn't. The way I did, I typed my own letters and I didn't really write very many. My communication with my constituents left a lot to be desired. I just didn't have the time and you didn't have that kind of stenographic help. Later I had, from the stenographic pool, a very helpful gal back there who eventually was one of those I hired for my committee staff, the only one I hired who sought the job. She was very, very competent and very loyal, I'd say, to the country and to me. She was that sort of person. A good person and whatever letter-writing I did at that time she did for me.

Mr. Frederick: Where did you stay when you were in Olympia?

Mr. Canwell: I stayed at the Governor House Hotel. I made reservations there before going to Olympia and I don't remember what the reasons for selecting the Governor House were. It was a little closer to the Capitol. Good quarters. They had a restaurant and so it was a desirable solution to the residency problem. Some of the legislators who came there with their family lived in motels out in more remote areas. But a great many of them lived at the Governor House and also at the Olympian Hotel.

Mr. Frederick: Did you have your typewriter in that room.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, that was a constant companion of mine. I don't remember utilizing it much in my room because I wasn't there very much. Get up early, and sessions and activities usually lasted quite late. By the time you had dinner and attended any social functions why you were ready for bed. At least I was.

Mr. Frederick: When did you have time for constituent mail?

Mr. Canwell: I really didn't have enough time for that. I received an enormous amount of mail. You do need stenographic assistance to handle it or process it. I would try to go through it and pick out the ones that were familiar or from my district and ignore many of the others; I just couldn't handle them. But you get a tremendous amount of mail from people, little organizations or groups who want something done. They set up a committee and they write you a letter and if you don't answer it, you're a horrible person, but most of it I couldn't answer. I just didn't have the time.

The stenographic pool was very helpful but you more or less confined it to your legislative responsibilities. You had things that you had to answer or forms to fill out or committee assignments and things that did require a little assistance. It was available if you stood in line long enough.

Mr. Frederick: And was that the procedure?

Mr. Canwell: That was pretty much the procedure. Very inefficient but it also prevented a lot of trivia mail, too. I think they ought to reinstate some of it. I get a flood of mail from current legislators and I'm sure they wouldn't know me if they saw me on the street. I get more confidential loving letters from these people than I care for. Heaven help you if you send \$25 to some politician. He has free postage and never forgets you.

Mr. Frederick: Let's begin to explore the leadership within the House during the 30th Legislative Session.

Mr. Canwell: Well, I remember a few of them. I mentioned George Kinnear. I think I became acquainted with him there. I don't recall that I knew him before that. There were people like that.

Mr. Frederick: And his position?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, just a senior House member but I don't remember what committees he was on. I'm talking now about members of the Legislature. Wasn't he majority floor leader? He could have been. I just do not remember those things precisely but as you know, he was a very attractive, experienced legislator and is one of those that you might turn to for advice or he might be volunteering some advice because they like to control the subordinate members. But I don't remember all of them from that standpoint. There were a lot of new members in the House when I went there.

Mr. Frederick: George Kinnear stands out as a—

Mr. Canwell: He stands out because we became acquainted with him socially as well as politically and what-

ever activities there were over there in the little time that my wife spent there I think that we moved in those circles.

There were such people as Mr. Comfort, I've forgotten his first name, but he was a newspaperman, I believe, from Sunnyside. He was, I believe, a longtime member.

And, of course, I knew the various Spokane people but most of them in my session were new there, just elected, almost a new slate.

Looking over the names, I just don't see very many that I turned to. There were people like Fred Ashley from probably Colville. I wasn't very fond of him. I thought he was a blustery character.

There were senior members of the Legislature that I didn't necessarily turn to. I probably turned to the press for as much advice as anything because I knew these reporters, had confidence in them. They were experienced in the procedures there.

Mr. Frederick: Who would they be?

Mr. Canwell: Well, that would have been Ross Cunningham of the *Seattle Times*. Fred Neindorff of the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*. And Ashley Holden of the *Spokane Spokesman-Review*. Now, there were others but these were outstanding men and they were people in whom I had confidence. They were trustworthy people and I became quite well-acquainted with them. I had, of course, known Holden for a long time. But I suppose that I turned as much in that direction for immediate advice or to get questions answered as I did anywhere.

Herb Hamblen was here but I didn't know Herb very well, just knew him slightly and that was about it.

I see a great many names here but in most cases they became significant after my induction into the Legislature. There were people like Tom Bienz, who I knew well. There were others in the Senate I knew but I didn't turn to them very much. They had their activity and we had ours in the House.

And my activities unexpectedly burgeoned. I was out on a number of these junkets very early, and then suddenly I had this Capitol Club investigation dumped in my lap. I had to learn a lot of things in a hurry there. And I was very busy. You're never lacking for advice. People are laying it on you from every direction.

Mr. Frederick: You remember George Kinnear. You remember Representative Comfort?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, and the Spokane contingent, most of those. I was at least acquainted with them.

Mr. Frederick: Speaker of the House Hamblen.

Mr. Canwell: Hamblen, yes, I just barely knew Herb.

He was one of those who was around in Republican politics. Much-respected but not a person that I knew very well. We were not particularly socially associated. Marsinah and I had a very narrow group of close friends because we just didn't have the time to socialize. We may have belonged to things like the City Club and others but didn't go there much. In general, we just didn't do a lot of socializing. Marsinah and her sister, Jane, were busy raising kids and they seemed to be all over the place.

Mr. Frederick: Who were some of the powers within that session, in that House?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I would say that Kinnear was certainly one of them. There was a Raugust from down in the Ritzville area. He was quite a powerful but quiet man. There was Bob French. I had known him too, prior to this time. They were cattlemen up in Okanogan. And, as I mentioned, Fred Ashley, I knew.

Mr. Frederick: Fred Ashley was from Spokane?

Mr. Canwell: He was from the eastern Washington area. It might have been Colville, but he was pretty well-known in Spokane. It seemed to me he had a real-estate business or something.

Then there was Johnston, an attorney specializing in mining. I knew him quite well prior to the session. I think he had served there several sessions.

Mr. Frederick: And you knew of Charles Hodde?

Mr. Canwell: Charles Hodde. I became acquainted with Hodde during the session. I don't think I had known him before other than by reputation, or I knew he was around and active in the public power movement.

I don't think these people paid much attention to me. They didn't consider me of any great importance. The experienced members kind of basked in their own importance and new members were only as important as they might be useful. You're not a very important person normally as a new member of a legislative body, whether that's the U.S. Congress or Senate or in the state Legislature. You're supposed to just keep your mouth shut and do your job and learn. You get along quite well if that's what you do.

Mr. Frederick: And what were the powerful committees in the House?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, the powerful committees, of course, are the Appropriations, and Rules and Order. There were standing committees. I don't remember what they all were. Some of them were like Parks and Playgrounds, Mines and Mining, and Military and Naval Affairs. On

that Kinnear was the chairman. There were various names that I recognized there. But of these regular standing committees the most powerful are the judiciary and the money areas.

Liquor Control Board was quite important at that time and there was a great effort on the part of drys to have at least some legislation governing the flow of liquor. Most of it was ridiculous. But it was something to compensate the constituents of that belief and so the governor and leaders of the Legislature went along trying to concoct some sort of legislation to have the drys feel that there was some control being exercised.

The Fisheries Committee was a very important one on the coast. On committees like that, I didn't ask for membership or service because I felt I knew nothing about it and it wasn't within my jurisdictional area.

Forestry, State Lands and Building; Game and Game Fish, that I did ask for; and Harbors and Waterways, flood control. The farm people were more interested in that. I had no great interest. Insurance, Judiciary, Labor Relations—that's a very touchy area because the labor forces were very strong and very liberal, so conservatives didn't try to penetrate committees like that with the idea of having any very great influence.

[End of Tape 28, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: So you said that Appropriations and the Judiciary Committee were—

Mr. Canwell: They are powerful committees that usually are dominated by senior members.

Mr. Frederick: Would it be possible for you to go through the membership of the Appropriations and to give your impressions of those players?

Mr. Canwell: Well, on Appropriations they had a chairman, Montgomery. I don't remember anything particularly about him. "Army" Armstrong was on Appropriations. He was a Communist and finally broke with the party or wanted it to appear that he had. There was Howard Ball, he was a funeral operator, a new member; Comfort, the newspaperman. Mort Frayn was a printer from Seattle and an experienced member of the Legislature. Leo C. Goodman I merely remember. And Haefel was from down in the Moses Lake basin area somewhere. George Kinnear was on Appropriations. Harry F. Kittleman, Lehman. Milt Loney was another heavyweight. Lyman, Sverre Omdahl. Most of these people I knew slightly or became acquainted with. Warner Poyhonen, William D. Shannon, Thompson, Z.A. Vane, Max Wedekind, and Ella Wintler. Mrs. Wintler, I believe a Democrat, was a very responsible person. And Wedekind was pretty far-left labor. Vane, I just merely remember him

slightly. Those are the names that were significant on the Appropriations Committee at that time. But the Appropriations Committee was pretty well-controlled by the muscle in the House. The same in the Senate. They were people with experience and worked their way to the top, often longtime members, and appropriately so. It's a very important committee.

Then, of course, Colleges and Universities. I was on that committee. Mort Frayn was on it. People who had an interest in the University of Washington or the university an interest in them, were likely to be on that committee. George Powell was a new member, came there when I did. His sister was quite important politically in the field.

There's George Yantis. I didn't become acquainted with Yantis until I asked him to serve on my committee. He was excused because he was having health problems. But he was quite a respected member, I suppose partly because of his long service. He was recognized as pretty far liberal. He was sort of a Ben Kizer type. Oh, a brain, I guess you'd say that he was. At least he had that reputation. When we got down to the short strokes on setting up a committee and wanting to balance it, I tried to get Yantis to serve and he did. I used to go down and visit him from time to time when he couldn't attend meetings. I'd keep him informed on what was going on.

Let's see, Education and Libraries, Fisheries—

Mr. Frederick: Who was on the Rules Committee? That would be a very important committee.

Mr. Canwell: On the Rules Committee, Rules and Order. Hamblen, of course, was on it. He was the chairman of the Rules Committee. And Comfort, Corey, Hodde, Kellogg, Kinnear, Loney, Riley (and that was "Saltwater" Riley), Schumann and Grant Sisson, who eventually ended up on my committee. And Perry Woodall was a considerable power in the Legislature, an attorney and a very able one. I think he ran for governor once and didn't make it. Yantis and Zent. Most of those people I either knew at the time or became acquainted with during the legislative session. They were, in general, a pretty able group of people. Comfort was one, a person of substance. Corey I just slightly remember. And Hodde I, of course, remember. There was Kellogg, I don't think he was a very active person but was a competent legislator. Kinnear, Loney, Riley, Schumann, Sisson, Woodall, Yantis, and Zent. That represents pretty much the established power in the House at that time. They were experienced, and people who knew the procedure and what the job entailed.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, what were the powerful factions with regard to lobbying and the powerful constituencies out there? What comes to mind?

Mr. Canwell: Well, the Joint Labor Lobby was the powerful thing. They were there in force and they had an enormous following because it's easy to identify yourself as pro-labor. If you are in office, you know, that's one of the things that's done. That I'd say was the most powerful committee functioning in the Legislature, or is known as such, but I felt it was the most powerful one.

Mr. Frederick: The Labor Committee?

Mr. Canwell: The Joint Labor Lobby.

Mr. Frederick: The Joint Labor Lobby was the most powerful lobbying group that you were aware of?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I would say they wielded the most power that I was aware of.

Mr. Frederick: Who else would be there with the big, big players?

Mr. Canwell: Well, people would come down in connection with this and the welfare lobby. They were inter-related pretty well. There were people like Bill Pennock, who had been a former member. Tom Rabbitt, a former member. Both Communists. Several of those people were down there almost every day and they were part of the Joint Labor Lobby. They were connected with the Old Age Pension Union, as well. They were ever-present but had lost considerable of their wallop by having their candidates defeated in the recent elections. The housecleaning went pretty well across the state at that time.

"Old Man" Pettus was another one of those who was quite influential, particularly with the old-age group. The Old Age Pension Union and that group were a pretty powerful force. The members were not Communists per se, they were just controlled by the Communists. Set up by them and utilized by them. But the old people who just wanted a pension or a bigger pension found themselves in that orbit and very friendly to the people running it. You know the tactic: You find out what the people want, you give it to them and work for it, and you pull the strings. It was pretty easy for them to develop a substantial following of people who would come there if they wanted a demonstration on the steps of the Capitol building or whatever; they could always provide warm bodies. But back of it were people like Pennock and Rabbitt and Pettus and many others like that.

The ability to set up committees, too, didn't extend just to the Un-American Activities Committee. They set up a committee—a cultural survey. They put the husband of the head of the Seattle Repertory Theatre in charge of this thing and there was \$30,000 appropriated for writing a report, which anybody could have done in an afternoon at the chamber of commerce. It was just a payoff by the

Legislature to the Communist Party. Well, that was the sort of thing that went on all the time but the average person didn't know what the significance of most of it was.

Mr. Frederick: You're saying that Burton James had a contract to write?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, he got the assignment. I don't remember just how. They passed a bill to set this up. But he was given the assignment and it was a mediocre, pedestrian thing anybody could have done, but it was \$30,000. That was strictly understood within the party as a payoff to the party for their participation in some of these projects. But Burton James went on it.

Mr. Frederick: Did you see anything else like that during that session?

Mr. Canwell: Well, that is the outstanding one because we made an issue of it somewhere along the line. There was, of course, the Dikes, Drains, and Ditches committee. When its meetings were called, it was understood by the comrades that it would be a meeting of the Communist Party utilizing one of the committee rooms. Various things like that were called to my attention; I was aware of them. I didn't seek them out on my own.

Mr. Frederick: Were you involved in much of the floor action or were you pretty much out of the session at that point in time?

Mr. Canwell: My participation in floor action was almost nil. I was there to vote yea or nay and that was about it in most cases. It was well along in the session before I made a floor speech. I say speech. I addressed the chair and the House and had some message. I've forgotten now what it was. I thought it was important at the time.

Mr. Frederick: You commented on one of the demonstrations.

Mr. Canwell: Well, there were demonstrations. They'd bring a great number of people down to Olympia to demonstrate on some issue. Education groups might do that. There was more of it in the old age pension area. That was more productive. They could get more warm bodies, more sympathy, and make it appear that there was a great demand for legislation. There were demonstrations and probably a lot of them I didn't pay any attention to. I remember there was one pension group that did come down.

Mr. Frederick: When you had the opportunity to tour the mental institutions, or mental asylums as they may

have been referred to in those days, was that fairly early on in that session?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, it was right at the beginning.

Mr. Frederick: And the first stop was at Steilacoom?

Mr. Canwell: That's the first one that I remember; the one that had significance because, as I think I mentioned in our conversation, somebody in authority wheeled out Frances Farmer, the actress who had been committed to Steilacoom. She was made a sort of showpiece. She was obviously heavily sedated, in kind of a zombie state. I just instinctively resented what was being done there, but I wasn't far enough along to know just what I would do about it.

Later, I think, during the time of the Capitol Club publicity, a number of people from Steilacoom, attendants and others who worked there, contacted me about that. Had I not been so terrifically involved I would have tried to do something effective about it. But it was a scandalous sort of thing that I understood went on habitually and was a kind of thing that just shouldn't happen. Later, Frances Farmer's mother came to my committee office and gave me a rather lengthy statement on Frances Farmer's experience in the theater and the Communist Party. She went into the horrible treatment down there at the institution.

Again it was the sort of thing I'd have liked to have done something about, but human limitations and limitations from the standpoint of experience made it impossible. You don't know exactly what you can do. You try to find out. But that was one of the things that stuck in my mind and subsequent events made it even more important.

Mr. Frederick: Now that would be the Western Washington State Hospital?

Mr. Canwell: I believe that's the way it was identified.

Mr. Frederick: Considering your limited background in that field, what could you see when you walked through that mental hospital at Steilacoom?

Mr. Canwell: Well, it's what you see in any institution. They have to have a certain amount of order. I would say it was in general a clean operation. It wasn't a hazardous environment but they obviously were controlling people with medications. And they were controlling Frances Farmer. I don't think that was unusual at the time to heavily rely on medications to control patients who were otherwise uncontrollable. It's a very sensitive area and it's one that's a medical problem, too; one in which I don't feel competent to be too critical because I lack training and experience. But we took a quick tour

through the place, it appeared to be clean and orderly. And the fact that such a thing as the exploitation of a patient like Frances Farmer could occur was a very sad thing.

Mr. Frederick: Now what were you told later on about that exploitation?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I was told by attendants there that a person or persons capable of committing the act would make Frances Farmer available to his friends and others. It was kind of a "fun thing," this important actress being exploited sexually by these crude people. I felt it was a horrible thing. And I'm sure others did later. I think there has been some publicity on that elsewhere since that time.

Mr. Frederick: Did they mention that occurred with other patients?

Mr. Canwell: No, I think that this was specifically directed at the Frances Farmer situation. If there were others I don't recall that any such violations were in reports that I had. People willing to report confidentially on that sort of thing are a lot different than those willing to publicly testify, because their jobs are on the line. They're not willing to testify so readily. I didn't pursue it from that standpoint very much, because I was just too busy. Put it on the back burner, I suppose.

Mr. Frederick: And they said that the administration was aware of this and/or a party to this?

Mr. Canwell: The persons reporting to me were, as I recall, attendants there. Nurses or people on that level and the person responsible for this Frances Farmer thing was not the person in charge of the whole institution. It was somebody on a wing or floor or something like that. It was not necessarily known to the administration but it might have been. I can't conceive of any administrator tolerating this sort of thing regardless of what sort of a person he or she might be, because it was politically explosive. So I wouldn't think that was an institutional policy there. I think there were some culprits who should have been prosecuted.

Mr. Frederick: And you just didn't have time?

Mr. Canwell: I didn't have time. I was in over my ears every day of the session after things began to roll.

Mr. Frederick: And what do you retain with regard to the Northern State Hospital, Sedro Woolley?

Mr. Canwell: Other than having been there that's about all I recall. We had a quick stop at these places. You

walk through, you meet some officials, they're on their best behavior. Totally it's a sad situation. I'm very unhappy when I have to visit such places and I suppose most people are, with the result that they neglect to do anything that needs to be done.

Mr. Frederick: And did you travel from the west side over to Eastern State Hospital or—

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I did. I remember going to Eastern State and Lakeland Village but it's not very clear in my mind. I just know that I did because I went there later several times but it's hard for me to separate that.

Mr. Frederick: So you did see the school for the mentally retarded?

Mr. Canwell: Yes. There is an interesting story in connection with that. The political reporter for the *Spokane Chronicle* practically ignored me in the Legislature. He hardly knew that I was there and I don't think he knew much about other people, he was only interested in the budget. He got the governor's budget and he had his nose in it for thirty days or so. He didn't know I was there until I had something to do with this facility for the mentally handicapped down here and then suddenly I was an important person. Then I found out he and his wife had a child there. That was a great concern of theirs and suddenly he realized that I was doing something in the session.

Mr. Frederick: Do you remember his name?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, yes, Doc Riley. He was a political editor for the *Chronicle* and always a little source of amusement to some of the other newsmen. He was able enough but he was very narrow in his concerns. I remember he went up to Lake Louise and joined the train of a British ambassador and he rode all the way visiting with this ambassador for hours on end. There was all kinds of world news breaking with which this ambassador was connected and this reporter's lead story in the headline was, "Ambassador so and so would like to see Coulee Dam." Well, anyway his

name was Riley. He didn't participate in the conservative politics of Ashley Holden and felt very much in competition with him and maybe in contempt.

Mr. Frederick: That covered the travels associated with the State Institutions House Committee. Were there other travels? You were on the House Committee for Colleges and Universities.

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember that there was much traveling. I attended functions and affairs; for instance, the Fisheries Committee and others put on a fish feed. And some things like that. I just don't remember the particulars any more. In general my travels were confined to brief visits over at the West Coast institutions and the University of Washington because I was on the Higher Education Committee. And we held meetings. There were faculty meetings in Seattle that I was invited to.

Mr. Frederick: And you had an opportunity to attend those?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I was usually invited to them and some of them I did attend. The University of Washington, of course, owned and controlled the Metropolitan Tract in Seattle and it was an important real estate enterprise. It had a great many people concerned and wanting to influence the members of the committee who would make decisions on what was to become of the Olympic Hotel and other things like that which were actually owned by the University of Washington.

Mr. Frederick: Lease arrangements or—

Mr. Canwell: The Metropolitan Tract as such was under the jurisdiction of the Legislature. It was, I think, physically owned by the University of Washington but, through that process, controlled by the Legislature. And, of course, the lease on the Olympic Hotel and so on were up for grabs. There were people very anxious to influence legislators. I can well remember at one of these meetings that somebody was giving a talk about the dire predictions for the Metropolitan Tract. There was supposed to be grass growing on Fifth Avenue in the near future. I didn't buy that. I told them I was not a property management expert but I didn't think that a city like Seattle, one of the important harbors of the world, was going to deteriorate in that manner.

[End of Tape 28, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Let's take the opportunity to briefly review the legislation that you introduced and/or spon-

sored.*

Mr. Canwell: I see something here authorizing exchange of certain lands near Mt. Spokane State Park. I had asked for the parks assignment because this fell within my district. I was well aware of the problems of Mt. Spokane, having practically grown up on the sidehills of that, and did sponsor legislation to make it possible for the park to exchange—or I think largely exchange—land that they owned that was not contiguous to the park in exchange for land that was. There was a little complaint that somebody might make some money on timber there, but in general I thought it was a good thing and I supported it and people in my district wanted it.

Then I see that I was on something here: libel and slander suits. I don't remember what I was doing. It has Canwell and Stevens on it. And again there's a bill here authorizing the sale of land at Medical Lake. And that was similar to the transfer of land at Mt. Spokane State Park as I recall, authorizing state parks to sell certain not-needed land. That's more of the same legislation.

Mr. Frederick: And that was by department request?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I believe that it was. There is an item here on the Western State College fund, and Young and Canwell, others on that. I suppose those were department requests that I supported. The Central State College and Eastern State College fund, all of those bills usually were presented by the schools or their people. If you were in agreement you dropped them in the hopper. One having to do with college degrees, of course, got right down to the problems of the teachers colleges. This was specifically aimed at Eastern Washington College of Education. This is the legislation in which I found myself in collision with the superintendent of public instruction, and she was very adamant and had the opinion that no legislation should flow from anywhere except her desk. We were in immediate conflict and perhaps that made me work a little harder for it than I would have otherwise.

Mr. Frederick: And her name?

Mr. Canwell: Pearl Wanamaker. She was very adamant about supporting her authority and position in education and very intolerant of opinions of a legislator, particularly a new one. I remember Pearl telling me she'd teach me a lesson, or something to that extent. So she did. I went to work, and, I think, was responsible for getting the legislation through by visiting with other members and swapping and trading and we got what we wanted.

Mr. Frederick: And that was House Bill 24.

Mr. Canwell: I believe that was it. It says House Bill 24 here. It started Eastern and, I suppose, the others on the way to becoming colleges and universities. I got little credit for it until just recently when I received the letter from Dr. Schilt, the recent president of Eastern Washington University.

But, anyway, I was not the enemy of education per se that I was labeled far and wide. Of course if you oppose these people in any way you "hate kids." If you don't support all their appropriation requests or demands it's because you're "against education" and "against children." I often found myself in that position, reluctantly. But I was not a complete Philistine. They just thought I was. Or they wanted to think so; I would say that was the case.

Mr. Frederick: And we've got House Bill 172 about signatures on initiative petitions at polling places here.

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember that. I know Blodgett was the chairman and the two of us were on it, I suppose it was some bill that a department had requested. I don't know. I just find my name there.

Mr. Frederick: Blodgett is prime sponsor.

Mr. Canwell: Uh huh.

Mr. Frederick: It appears not to be a department request.

Mr. Canwell: I don't know what it was.

Mr. Frederick: What were some of the more humorous incidents that you recall from that session?

Mr. Canwell: Well, one very humorous incident occurred right at the very beginning of the session. The liquor interests, and they were largely the beer group, at that time conducted a very heavy lobby of the Legislature. I think the first day before we'd gone into session they distributed cases of beer to every legislator's door and to members of the press. And significantly they ignored Canwell and reporter Holden. I don't know how dry Holden was but I was pretty well known as a dry. And so they left us out and it seemed to me like they were declaring war. We didn't have much else to do so I suggested that I drop a bill in the hopper putting a five-cent tax per glass on the sale of beer, doing it strictly with my tongue in cheek.

And so Ashley wrote his story. It appeared in the early morning *Spokesman Review* and before breakfast we heard from their state lobbyist named Nave Lein. He was really shaken up. Couldn't imagine what we were trying to do to him. So Holden told him what had hap-

* For a list of bills discussed in this section, see Appendix B.

pened. He thought they were declaring war, and so I wanted to play, too, and this was what we were doing. Anyway from that time on we were just inundated with cases of beer. I didn't know what to do with them. I gave them away; tried to get them out of my way. But they didn't make that mistake again. It was humorous because it was entirely predictable what Nave Lein the lobbyist would do. He'd just come all apart at the seams.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, as you had the opportunity to spend some time in those earlier days in the session and to attend caucus meetings in the House, what could you divine as the Republican agenda for that session?

Mr. Canwell: It seems to me, and did all along the way, that the Republicans were interested in an economy approach. There'd been wild spending. The Legislature had taken the state from a position where it was potentially one of the wealthiest, most comfortable states in the Union to a place where they were bankrupt, and it was through this liberal legislation. The Republicans in general wanted a common sense approach to the use of public funds. That was the overriding thing. Then one of the important issues that kept surfacing was this Communist issue.

Everybody kept pointing out how horrible the situation was and asking why didn't somebody do something about it. To understand that one should probably understand that a great many families in the state, and particularly, to my awareness in Eastern Washington, were sending their sons and daughters to the University of Washington, an advantage that they themselves had never had, and were very anxious to provide formal advanced education to their children. And in so doing they were coming back spouting lines that were completely unacceptable to the people who were paying the bill.

There was a great deal of unrest and complaint and trying to determine who was responsible. There were those who wanted to go down to the university and take some of these professors out and make an example of them. There was a great deal of that sort of feeling. So, every legislator was getting some of this. The University of Washington particularly had become not only a local, but a national scandal. It was hitting hard at the heart of what the people wanted in education and wanted for their sons and daughters. So, there was constant pressure on legislators to get with it and do something.

It was not too difficult for me to get legislators to come to a meeting in one of our committee rooms, or somewhere where we had the space, and discuss the possibility of producing legislation touching on this issue. There were pretty wild people, too, who wanted to just cut the university's budget off right at the ankles. And there were others who wanted to do all kinds of things, but nobody was coming up with an answer. We would have

these meetings and the members would be all for doing something. I might read the copies of legislation that we had acquired from other states pointing out what the national Congress was doing and what the possible solutions to the problem might be. But nobody had a distinct, concrete idea.

I shouldn't say nobody. There were people like Tom Bienz who had been very active in the American Legion. The Legion had been active in supporting the Dies Committee. So there were people like that. And Sid Stevens who wanted to drop a bill in the hopper. It was a very pedestrian sort of thing that would not have been effective and probably would not have passed anyway. Well, this sort of thing was going on almost every day or evening.

Mr. Frederick: Did that begin early in the session?

Mr. Canwell: Quite early, yes. I did not necessarily take a strong leadership position until it became apparent that nobody else would. They were all talking about it. Everybody thought something should be done and nobody had a solution. At that time I recall we relied on George Kinnear. We felt, he's an attorney, an experienced legislator from Seattle where a lot of the problem was evident. He indicated a willingness to go along and an enthusiasm for the idea that something should be done, therefore we relied quite heavily on him. It was hard to get him to meetings. He was a very busy legislator. And so that is what was taking place on that level. Materials we gathered and put together, and ideas, ended up in his briefcase. Time marched on and nothing was done. And so, as a result of that, somewhere very late in the session I recovered the materials from Kinnear and then disappeared for two or three days and worked on this thing and came up with House Concurrent Resolution No. 10, and that became the resolution that passed the House and Senate.

The bills that I had examined, I felt were not always applicable to our area or the problem as I saw it unfolding. So I tried to enhance the recommended legislation and we worked somewhat from the House Committee on Un-American Activities resolutions and the California committee. They were good, but I felt that they needed a little fine tuning, so I dressed them up a little. But anyway the House Concurrent Resolution No. 10 was ultimately a product of those two or three days that I took putting it together. Then as I recall I called on an attorney provided by the House. Like our stenographic pool, we also had a pool of attorneys, two or three. One of those helped me put it in shape. And that is the story of the creation and production of the concurrent resolution that later became the Un-American Activities Committee in Washington State or the Canwell Committee. But that was very late in the session and it was, you know, touch and go whether we'd have a bill or not.

Mr. Frederick: Let's pick that theme up there just a little bit later on because there was an investigation predating that, that you were assigned to. And that had to do with campaign contributions and the Republicans' interest in exploring that.

Mr. Canwell: Well, if you're talking about the Capitol Club, the so-called Capitol Club, that was another scandal that a lot of people were talking about and nobody was doing anything about, because most of the people affected by it, or hurt by it, were Democrats. The bureaucracy—the bulging, growing bureaucracy—was made up of Democratic appointees so the Republicans per se didn't have as much concern about it. But it was a good issue. There were a lot of people like myself and others who didn't feel that a person should have to pay tribute to the administration to have a job. And we got to looking around and not only the employees in the Highway Department and others, but the women who scrubbed the floor in the Capitol at night had to kick into what was supposedly a Democrat war chest. It was a pretty scandalous thing. So the Republicans decided they had an issue and something to get their teeth in there. It was surprising to me that I was selected to chair the committee.

Mr. Frederick: And who did that selection?

Mr. Canwell: I would suppose it was Hamblen, but I do not know who pushed papers up to him. It seemed to me that he made the appointment of me as chairman and there were a couple of other people serving on that committee. Yes, Canwell, and Lehman, and Poyhonen were the Capitol Club Committee.

Mr. Frederick: Was that the formation of that, that would be a special committee?

Mr. Canwell: That was a special committee of the Legislature.

Mr. Frederick: And potentially Perry Woodall, did he sponsor that?

Mr. Canwell: Perry Woodall was the moving force behind it as I recall. He was a long-time experienced legislator, and a pretty shrewd politician. He recognized there was an issue there and then the next step is to get something done about it. That's where the surprise came in, when they asked me to do it, because I didn't have the prestige in the Legislature at that time to take on the governor. That's what was involved, the governor and the chief of the State Patrol. But, anyway, it was assigned to me.

Mr. Frederick: It might be an opportune time to review

your impressions of Governor Mon Wallgren.

Mr. Canwell: Are we on tape here? My feeling about Mon Wallgren was that he was first a very attractive person. A consummate politician. Smart, and I would not say particularly ruthless but went along on such things as the Capitol Club because it provided a fund, a lot of money, that they didn't need to account for. Much of it was used for Wallgren's entertainment trips to California and whatnot. But he was a most personable and perceptive person. I expected him to be very antagonistic to me. And so they have the annual party at the governor's mansion. I've forgotten what they call it, they have it every session. And Wallgren latched on to me, took me up to his study and we spent most of the evening just getting acquainted with each other, which surprised me because I wasn't that important. But I think he suspected that I had not abused him in the Capitol Club hearing.

Mr. Frederick: And this was after that hearing?

Mr. Canwell: The hearing came very early and I think that this dinner at the mansion was after the hearing because whatever it was I expected him to be very antagonistic and he was not. Very shrewd. And he probably ascribed more importance to me than I possessed. But my feeling about Wallgren was, he was an able governor. He was a product of his time. He was an astute politician and in Congress he had done what many young congressman had done. They tried to get next to the throne and they did it, many of them, by way of Eleanor Roosevelt and that approach. Wallgren and Truman were a couple of poker buddies and the reputation they had was that they were very dependable winners. Nobody—no congressman—ever lost a big pot to a lobbyist as far as anybody knows. And so their prowess as poker players, I think, had to do largely with playing with lobbyists in the national capital.

Anyway, he came along, a very attractive person, very acceptable to the Democrat Party and conveyed a more conservative image than perhaps he possessed. But he was a likeable guy. I remember him in that way.

Mr. Frederick: Were you notified by the Speaker of the House with regard to the chairmanship of the special investigative committee?

Mr. Canwell: I think, yes. I think I was asked if I would accept it or take it. It may have been Woodall who was carrying on the negotiations. And very likely Woodall—Perry—may have suggested to Herb that I would be a good prospect to handle it. Perry Woodall probably knew more about me than Herb Hamblen did.

Mr. Frederick: What was your impression of Perry

Woodall?

Mr. Canwell: A very likeable, astute politician. One who was sure of himself. An able debater and a very, very representative legislator. A good one, I would say. You have to be partisan on one side or the other and you have good people on both sides. He was one of the very able ones, and experienced—a lawyer with capabilities.

Mr. Frederick: How did you go about conducting that investigation and what did you find?

Mr. Canwell: Well, first I looked up to see what the resolution setting up the committee involved. What was authorized. As I recall, it authorized me to subpoena persons and records. Then I did some brief checking, talking with people about what my authority was there. And I proceeded from that standpoint. There was a request on the part of Herb Algeo who was the prime suspect in the thing, he was chief of the Washington State Patrol, but he was the bagman for the Capitol Club. I had a request from him that he be permitted to have his counsel there. So I questioned what my position was there, and it was optional; I could let him have counsel or not and so I said, okay, bring your attorney.

And he did. It was Lyle Keith of Spokane and he was sort of a stooge of the governor's at that point—an attractive person, but not brilliant. He was not of the first order of intelligence although he thought he was. Well, anyway, he came in representing Herb Algeo. I began to question Algeo and asked for records and things. Keith began to interject and impose his presence there and I had to reprimand him, which was very distasteful to him. We had some, as I recall, some rather hot words. He said that I should remember that I was no longer a deputy sheriff and I told him that he should control himself or I'd have the sergeant at arms remove him. Anyway, there was quite a hassle there right to begin with.

Then we went on to the production of records. It seemed that there were no records. Herb Algeo had brought a shoe box and he had a bunch of cards in there. Well, this was to represent the records of thousands, untold thousands of dollars, that had gone through this device.

[End of Tape 29, Side 1]

Mr. Canwell: Those shoe box index cards supposedly contained the names of members and I examined it briefly and determined it was very incomplete. As this hearing proceeded I would get many, many calls particularly from the wives and husbands of state employees, who couldn't understand why their John or Ginny had to shell out ten dollars or fifteen dollars a month from a meager paycheck. I would get that sort of thing. Then I perused this

box of records and they were obviously, deliberately, very incomplete. Well, as it went on after a few rounds with Lyle Keith and Herb Algeo, who was himself too astute to cause such disruption, we arrived at a place where I had to turn in some sort of a report and I did.

I wrote one and I think the substance of it was that the time was not sufficient to do the job as it needed to be done. I asked for an extension of more time and a larger budget. I think they had assigned \$200 for the budget. I had no idea what we'd need or why we would need it, you know, how extensive the hearing would become. But it more or less terminated on that initial hearing. I think probably I gave the press some statements, or they were there covering it, there were quite a number of headlines that assumed an importance or gave me an identity that I wouldn't have had otherwise, I suppose.

It also caused me to do some serious studying about the legislative process and powers. That, of course, in turn became very important in my helping to draft the House resolution on un-American activities.

Mr. Frederick: How were the mechanics of that handled? Did they receive cash on that? Were there delegates there—an agency that collected that Capitol Club money?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, as I recall, they preferred that it be paid in cash, not by checks. There were several protections built into this thing. They did not take checks from anybody in a department that received federal funds. They were astute enough to know that they were criminally liable if they did that. So it was evident, and implied, that people in those federally funded departments paid their dues, but they paid in cash. That's part of it. This is why I needed more time. We couldn't possibly subpoena a great number of these people and put them under oath and take testimony from them in the allotted time that I had for this. I think there were three days allotted for the hearing! In general, the payments into the Capitol Club were in cash. But there were checks, also. There weren't department deductions as such.

Mr. Frederick: And where would those funds go from the campus, where would they go?

Mr. Canwell: They went to the office of the chief of the State Patrol, Herb Algeo. From what one person told me there were times that his desk was just covered with green stuff. They gave one dance at the Armory or somewhere and paid for an orchestra, \$100 or \$150. But the rest of it went into the slush fund and usually a great deal of it was accounted for by trips to California. They'd go down to Hollywood and that area and have a bevy of girls and general entertainment for the governor that the budget didn't provide for. And Lyle Keith, sucker that he was,

married one of these so-called starlets. A real trollop. He came back from one of these California sessions with what he thought was a movie star. She was just a little hooker.

Anyhow, it was an informative, educational experience and one in which I approached the thing with great uncertainty because I was inexperienced. I didn't know exactly what I could do with what I found and that's why I asked for more time and we didn't get it.

Mr. Frederick: What did the chief do with that money? Did they ever deposit that in the bank?

Mr. Canwell: No, they never produced any bank records, any ledgers or books. All we had was this shoe box which was kind of humorous and I think the press made something of that. And most of my comments in my report were a matter of a tongue-in-cheek thing because I wanted to pursue it in greater depth, under the proper circumstances and the Legislature did not pursue it. Anyway it launched Canwell.

Mr. Frederick: And there was a move to replace the chief of the State Patrol then?

Mr. Canwell: I don't recall that there was anything. There were probably those who suggested that he should be fired. I don't recall. Probably Perry Woodall has comments on it.

Mr. Frederick: Getting back to the campaign to put together that Joint House Resolution No. 10, you talk about the—we'll say, the benign neglect of George Kinnear with regard to spearheading something like that. Did you perceive other opposition within the House and/or the Senate?

Mr. Canwell: The opposition to my activities had been somewhat muted, I think, by the fact that in getting a background report on me through their channels, Ben Kizer and people in Spokane had given me a better clearance than they would have given me at a later date. The organized opposition that would have developed had that not been the case, I think, would have been quite severe.

That's where Ray Moore flubbed the ball. I think he was placed in a position of reliance in that particular area and my expected opponents did not give me the opposition that I would have had, because they had gotten some sort of clearance on me that I didn't particularly know about. There was ritual opposition toward having anything done by people like Pennock, Rabbitt, Pettus, and others, and, of course, in the Communist press. But there was not the opposition that would have developed had they thought that I was for real. That gave me an opportunity to do considerable recruiting and work that did not

receive opposition.

Mr. Frederick: And there were members of the Legislature in the 30th session that were Communist Party people?

Mr. Canwell: Thirtieth session. There were some. They had gotten rid of quite a number of them in the house-cleaning of that session. And there were, to the best of my recollection, twenty-four, I believe, identified Communists in the Legislature the session before I went there. I've forgotten now how much it was reduced but there were some of them still there. And a sleeper or two that had never been out in front.

Mr. Frederick: Were they wired in the 30th session and/or the 29th session, so you had some idea what they were about?

Mr. Canwell: Well, specifically we should get down to Canwell. I did not electronically surveil members of the Legislature. There were people doing it and I was aware that it was being done. I had no connection with them and they had no connection with the Legislature other than they wanted to know what was going on.

Mr. Frederick: Were you privy to any of that?

Mr. Canwell: A great deal of it at the time. Mostly verbal at first. Later I came into possession of an enormous amount of electronic tapes, wires, recordings.

Mr. Frederick: And that would have been from the 30th session or predating the 30th session?

Mr. Canwell: Those recordings predated in some cases, many cases. There were people like Pennock, Rabbitt, Pettus and many of those known Communists who were under heavy surveillance by a number of agencies operating in general from Seattle.

As the electronic means of surveillance developed and grew, it became a very common practice to make sure somebody—somebody who was spouting the party line and made himself a suspect—that somebody was likely to drop a microphone on him.

Mr. Frederick: Were you aware, from those wires or tapes predating the 30th session, that there were wires coming out of, let's say, a caucus room on campus? Or a hearing room?

Mr. Canwell: I was aware that extensive surveillance was occurring. I became aware of the extent of it later on. I just knew that it was happening, there were people that I trusted and I knew, knew what they were talking about,

who conveyed information to me. And as I began identifying the Legislature, that became more pronounced. But I knew some of these people or knew about it prior to that time.

Mr. Frederick: And that would have included potentially caucus rooms or hearing rooms or auxiliary rooms within—

Mr. Canwell: Not as much that sort of thing as it would be surreptitious meetings and liaisons between the suspect people; the coverage of large assemblies, there's nothing secret about that. There's always a lot of it done.

Mr. Frederick: So what you're saying then, during the 30th session, you didn't receive a lot of organized opposition?

Mr. Canwell: No, I did not. The first indication of unrest in that area, that department, came through Ray Moore. There had been a bill promoted in the Legislature to grant released time in the schools for religious instruction. And I was fundamentally opposed to that, but it also happened that the Communist Party was, too, so that was one of their big projects and here I was right in line with their thinking. And so later on when I made my maiden speech in the House and pointed Pennock and Rabbitt and others out, Ray Moore was just livid with rage. He wanted to know what I had been doing on that released time thing. And I said, "Well, I'm just against it." But he was pretty much disoriented because he had been relied on, I think, for more than he produced.

Mr. Frederick: Who came up with the strategy of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember. I think that it was the result of my discussing the legal approach to the thing. A concurrent resolution had certain powers and authority that a one-house resolution would not have. I don't remember the day-to-day, hour-to-hour process that occurred there but it had to do with the legal authority of a committee, and an interim committee gained more by a joint resolution.

Mr. Frederick: And the advantages to a joint resolution?

Mr. Canwell: Well, you had both houses supporting it. It passed both houses so that represented the total Legislature.

Mr. Frederick: And that would be veto-proof?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I believe so.

Mr. Frederick: And also would not be subject to review by referendum?

Mr. Canwell: I don't think it was subject to any review. It would take a separate bill to attack it. I don't think it was vulnerable in that way. The opposition did try to challenge its legality. It went through to the state Supreme Court and was upheld there. Two or three attempts were made by court justices and others to interfere with the process.

Mr. Frederick: And an initial suit was brought by Bill Pennock and the Washington Pension Union?

Mr. Canwell: I rather think it wasn't; there was a challenge. The state treasurer, Russell Fluent, was a somewhat concealed member of the Communist Party but fairly well known to be a Communist. He refused to pay our vouchers. That was the technique used. I think maybe Pennock was a party to that. But the treasurer refused to pay our vouchers and that put us effectively in a position that he could put the legislative committee out of business. And that went through the court procedures.

Russell Fluent was one of the signers of the lawsuit that went to the state Supreme Court, testing the constitutionality of our committee, along with, I think, John Caughlan, and William Pennock.

The thing that I might well point out here is that all along the line I had the best possible legal counsel. A friendly person, Frank Holman, former president of the American Bar, volunteered his services to me at any time that I felt I should call upon him. And that gave me about as good legal counsel as I could have. In addition to that I had the friendship, and later employed, Ford Elvidge, distinguished constitutional lawyer, 33rd degree Mason, a man who eventually became governor of Guam, and he was in my confidential counsel. A person I could call on any time and ask for a constitutional opinion or determination. I wasn't operating blindly on this thing. I had good, substantial, reliable legal counsel. And the state—it didn't cost the state anything.

Mr. Frederick: Now the first gentleman, was he from Seattle?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, he was of a well-known family in Seattle and he became president of the American Bar.

Mr. Frederick: And the second gentleman was from—

Mr. Canwell: He was from Seattle, too. Ford Elvidge.

Mr. Frederick: And this would be review of resolution language?

Mr. Canwell: Well, this had to do with any legal problems that developed once we set up an operation. He was not a party to the creation or formation of the House concurrent resolution.

Mr. Frederick: And what was the intent of the resolution?

Mr. Canwell: It was—you've got it there—the intent was to do a thorough investigation of the situation as it existed at the time of the 30th Legislature. And the only responsibility placed on me was to make a report to the next Legislature, which I did.

Mr. Frederick: And what was the budget for that?

Mr. Canwell: The budget was an informal thing. It was privately agreed that we would stay within the certain budget format. There was, I believe, \$250,000. I believe that was the amount appropriated for the—what did they call it—the Legislative Counsel. It was an interim committee. And then it was agreed between us that we would use, or have access to \$100,000 out of the \$200,000 or \$250,000. That was an informal understanding. I don't recall that there was anything written about it. But it was generally understood that was what we had to work with. Grossly inadequate, of course. We had seven investigators and four members of the clerical staff, as well as the seven committee members, and witness expense.

My best recollection is that in formulating this resolution, that I carefully studied the House committee's resolution and the California resolution. I patterned it pretty much after those two, inserting things that I thought should be there that were not. It was too late, too far along the line to get very much legal evaluation of this resolution. It went through as I presented it to the Legislature. No amendments, no debate on it.

Mr. Frederick: What was it like attempting to recruit members for the committee, and who appointed the chairman of the committee?

Mr. Canwell: The Speaker of the House appointed the chairman of the committee. I wrote into the resolution that that would be the case because I wanted to keep the control of the committee in the House and there were valid reasons for that. I could not—did not wish to—entrust the control of the committee to people who might end up on it from the Senate. And it wasn't particularly to make me chairman, but it was to keep that control within the House. I wrote into the resolution that the Speaker of the House, I think you'll find it there, was to appoint the chairman of the committee. He then delegated to me the responsibility of coming up with a recommended list of members with whom I could work.

Mr. Frederick: And the party split within the Senate during the 30th session was 23 to 23. The party split in the House was 71 Republicans and 28 Democrats. So it appears from what you say that there potentially could have been some powerful enemies within the Senate and/or not necessarily ideologically enemies within the Senate, but someone else could have chaired that committee.

Mr. Canwell: It could have been, had the resolution not been written as it was. And I think would have been proper to define that approach, because actually the resolution originated in the House.

Mr. Frederick: Did you have any competition in the Senate?

Mr. Canwell: In the Senate, friendly competition on the part of Tom Bienz and then very antagonistic, but concealed, opposition from Harold Kimball. Harold Kimball ended up on my committee, partly because of the difficulty of finding acceptable people, or willing people. As I recall, Fred Neindorff was very partial to Harold Kimball. I knew a lot about Harold that Fred Neindorff didn't know. But I did feel that if he ended up on the committee I could control him. That is, I could keep him within bounds.

And there was a reason for that. I mentioned before that when we had our Yakima paper printed in Seattle we had it printed in Harold Kimball's plant. Harold Kimball was also at the same time printing the Communist publication. So, I knew a lot about him; he didn't know about me. There was that feeling of antagonism on the part of Harold Kimball, who exaggerated his own importance. He had an enormous ego and people with that kind of ego usually are incompetent, they just don't know that they are.

And anyhow that was the opposition that I had in the Senate. There was one senator who in the investigation of the Communist apparatus we define as a sleeper. I will not identify him here but he could be discovered if you explored who voted against the committee in the final analysis. But anyhow the principal opposition in the Senate was underground.

Bienz did not give me any opposition. He was very cooperative and very anxious to be on the committee. So Tom Bienz ended up on the committee and I identified him as secretary to the committee. I don't recall how much he functioned in that specific capacity.

Bob Rutter was very friendly.

[End of Tape 29, Side 2]

Mr. Canwell: We were discussing the Senate members of my committee and I think probably this is as good a

time as any to give a little thumbnail sketch of them.

Tom Bienz was very active in this field and very anxious to do something about it. He was an American Legion activist and a splendid person. I have no criticism of him and I can understand why someone like that might feel that he didn't need too much advice from someone my age.

Then there was Bob Rutter.

Mr. Frederick: Before we move on to Senator Rutter. Senator Thomas Bienz, a Democrat, was a retired drug-gist from Spokane?

Mr. Canwell: Yes.

Mr. Frederick: Member since 1939.

Mr. Canwell: He was an experienced member. I don't remember how many sessions he had served in. Very popular person in his district. Well liked. And was a Democrat at that time. He made, I think, a political mistake in switching parties but he couldn't tolerate what he was encountering and did switch parties somewhere along the line.

Mr. Frederick: There was some controversy with regard to Senator Bienz and this was when he was a member of the committee at the point in time when he addressed the Realty Board here in Spokane?

Mr. Canwell: I believe so. Yes, it was done in distinct opposition to understandings that that kind of thing would not be done. Maybe this might be the place to point out that very early in the operation of the committee I called the committee members together and laid out what I felt had to be done. I think I provided them a great deal more information than they had ever had. I tried to make it as significant as possible because to do the job I had to have complete support from the committee. I had to have such an understanding and so I explained what the situation was, what had to be done, the tremendous problems at hand, the fact that it was not properly funded, that I was not salaried, I would have to put full time in on this committee but to do so I didn't wish to waste my time. And I obtained an understanding with them that I would have a free hand to do so.

That was a very important step in this program because if these members of the committee started spouting off to the press about things that they didn't know anything about, the committee would have been out of business immediately. I knew enough about the Communist apparatus and their procedure to know that could not be permitted and get the job done. So I had to have an understanding with them that I had certain leeway, that no statements, for instance, would be made to the press with-

out clearance by the chairman. And that in general no statements would be made.

There were many understandings like that and I was putting it up to these committee members, we do a job or we don't do it. And at that same time the question of records came up. I had, by that time, significant files and I had friendly cooperation with federal agencies. It would be possible for me to come up with a great deal of material from them in an investigative sense if I could have the assurance that it would be protected. That was one of the points that was never understood by anybody. There never were any committee records. There were Canwell records that were used and records were infiltrated into those records and utilized for a matter of convenience and that had to be understood by the committee.

It was acceptable to most everybody except Harold Kimball. He wouldn't even attend meetings. But I had a showdown and run-in with him very early. When the committee passed the Legislature—the resolution passed—the first time I'd had an opportunity to talk to him he was on the elevator with his briefcase, leaving. This is the incident where I was going over to the Senate to see somebody and he said, "Well, I'll handle the West side and you handle the East side," and away he went.

I understood that he was heading for Washington D.C., and he was going to visit the House Committee on Un-American Activities there. I had to call the committee in Washington and explain to them that he was not the chairman of the committee and was not speaking for the committee. Of course, our rupture was pretty complete there and he wouldn't attend meetings. But he couldn't do any damage either.

So, anyway, that was Harold Kimball. He was essentially a good person. He just was ignorant. And an egomaniac and did not have the knowledge or experience to fortify the position he was trying to assume; and he had no position. Well, I accepted him on the committee because I had been present when he had been printing the Communist paper; I'd taken copies of it and they were in my files and I had letterheads for Communist fronts that he was on, so I felt that he was not a major problem.

Then in casting about for another member, they were pretty hard to find in the Senate, people who would devote the time to it and take the risks involved. Bob Rutter, a cattleman from Ellensburg, formerly from Spokane, a likeable, lovable person, a kind of a Will Rogers type, offered to serve on the committee and was agreeable to the operational terms. So he became one of the three members appointed by the president of the Senate to join the committee.

Mr. Frederick: We've got Senator Tom Bienz, who was a veteran of the Legislature. We've got Senator Rutter who was a freshman, and Senator Kimball, also a freshman. In reference to Senator Bienz in his statements be-

fore the Realty Board in Spokane, was that before your talk with the committee or after?

Mr. Canwell: I think it was after, well after. We had very firm understandings that a hostile press could murder us, could put us out of business. And to talk irresponsibly to get notice in the paper would be destructive of the committee's intent and capabilities, and not helpful to the individual.

Mr. Frederick: Okay, I'm still confused. What he said is that—he said to these realtors, or the Spokane Realty Board, that there's approximately 150 Communists employed at the University of Washington, which is going to put some heads through the ceiling. And, obviously, he didn't have a clue as to what he was talking about, even in terms of political appropriateness of doing something like that at that point in time. Did he do that—he did that after he was on the committee?

Mr. Canwell: Yes. It was a stupid thing to do. He should have known better but he didn't and I don't think he was trying to do anything as reckless as it turned out to be. But he didn't understand that and that was the case with a lot of people. You had to understand what was in collision in the whole thing. You're not just dealing with a chamber of commerce or something. People like that were under constant pressure from the outside to assume a more important position than they actually held on the committee. And Tom always felt kind of fettered. I'm sure he felt that he knew more about how to operate the committee than I did, and I granted him the right to his own opinions on the thing, but I still had a job to do. I tried to prevent that sort of thing and I had specifically pointed out that it should not be done. I think in a loose moment, he made this statement. We do not play the numbers game with the Communist Party, or their attorneys—the ACLU. The minute you do you are in hot water.

Mr. Frederick: He mentions that his interest dates from 1927 when he learned of the communist movement in Europe while a delegate to the American Legion convention in Paris, and since then he's read all available literature on the subject. What I hear you saying is that he was a good heart and he supported the ideology and was concerned, but he appears to be—let's put it this way—very passionate.

Mr. Canwell: Well, I think that it's understandable that, for a man in his position—and he had a considerable knowledge of the Communist activity, experience, background, a long period of activity in the American Legion—it was very difficult for him to restrain himself and assume a subordinate position in this fast-moving commit-

tee that had a potential for enormous headlines if that's what you wanted. I could be sympathetic to him but I also felt the deep-seated antagonism that accompanied it. I didn't have the time to hold hands with these people. I was just too busy. That is a mistake that I had specifically mentioned; that we were not going to publicly identify our targets and we were not going to state that there were X numbers of Communists in any particular group or area. It wasn't significant. It was not what we were out to explore. And it was hazardous. They will do just as they did with him, they, of course, immediately started taking him apart. And it built up friction between the chairman and a member.

Mr. Frederick: So potentially—and we'll have opportunity to explore this later on—but potentially he was somewhat of a non-player then on that committee.

Mr. Canwell: I wouldn't put it that way. He did everything I asked him to do, and I didn't ask him to do much. That, I think, rankled him a little because the thing was moving so fast and there was so much activity that probably I was remiss in this area. But I was working day and night and when I wasn't reading reports of the investigators, I was listening to wire and tape recordings of material that had been made available to me. I was just enormously busy. I did not have the energy, nor the time, to go beyond what I was doing and so I had to get an understanding in advance that these people would go along with me and understand the problems.

To the best of my ability, I'd call a meeting once in awhile and lay out enough information that they would know that we were getting somewhere. At the same time I was not willing to have anyone become a spokesman for what we were doing. The first six months of our operation we didn't make a statement. I didn't make a statement. The press was constantly after me for stories and I just didn't respond. I'd just tell them we were working and that was it.

Mr. Frederick: Was that broken by any of the committee members?

Mr. Canwell: Not particularly. I think the only pronounced instance was this case of Bienz giving numbers of the University of Washington, which put me on the spot. I had to say yes there is, or no, there isn't. So I had to say he was talking when he should have been listening. It was a bad situation. I don't recall that there were any major departures. I had a little problem with the chief investigator. He was a little inclined to puff up like a toad if somebody complimented him. He had talent but a reporter like Ed Guthman would quickly analyze him. I had selected him because he did have a lot of knowledge in the field and experience and he had a reputation for hav-

ing stolen every report and volume on communism in any office where he'd worked. So I had the advantage of access to whatever records he had. Then I tried to control him. When he finally got too powerful, I eventually fired him.

Mr. Frederick: He was making statements to the press during that process? Unauthorized?

Mr. Canwell: Well, the press was working on him very diligently. And by the press I mean phonies like Ed Guthman. They analyzed him very quickly.

Mr. Frederick: This would be in '49 maybe? Down the road?

Mr. Canwell: This was during the committee hearing period. Ed Guthman had requested an interview. He wanted to do a feature story on Bill Houston, who was the chief investigator. Houston came to me because he knew that was *verboden* and still wanted to do it. And I told him, I said, "Ed will cream you. He'll make a fool of you." "Oh, no," he said, "I can handle myself." So finally I let him go ahead with this interview. Ed, of course, had been telling him how he was the brains of the committee and was not getting his proper recognition and all that and Bill was swallowing it. And so Guthman did; he just creamed him in the story. And Guthman was not as smart as he thought he was either. He could have treated him better and retained a friend. But he didn't. He referred to him as "blustering Bill Houston" or something. Guthman couldn't restrain himself. Anyhow that was one of the areas where I began to have a problem. I took care of it by removing him.

Mr. Frederick: But that was one incident though?

Mr. Canwell: That was one major incident. There was a little awareness that he was talking too much.

Mr. Frederick: Along the line.

Mr. Canwell: Along the line, a group at the Elks Club had surrounded him and made him exalted ruler of the Elks. And they also had a liquor cabinet. He could not handle that. It was at that point that people like Guthman and others were moving in on him. They thought they had an opening, which they did. But it had to be taken care of by removing Houston.

Mr. Frederick: You mentioned that Senator R.L. Rutter, Republican, rancher from Ellensburg, supported the concept, favored the investigation and claimed no special knowledge of communism or investigation techniques, which would give the reader an insight that maybe this

man was fairly well on an even keel.

Mr. Canwell: Bob was a pretty stable person. He was a stable legislator. He did not profess any great knowledge of communism but an antipathy to it, an awareness of what was going on and had been going on and the pressures brought on him as a member of the Senate from people who were concerned about the Communist situation. They had a problem right in his backyard at the Central Washington College of Education. So he was an interested partisan and very happy to serve on the committee and an able senator or worthwhile person. I would say that he was a great complement to my committee.

Mr. Frederick: Senator Harold Kimball, editor, publisher, out of Ballard in Seattle, freshman, was commander of the Seattle Assembly of the National Veterans Association at the time of the Veterans Bonus March, and helped form the Commonwealth Builders, which is an interesting background. And then the Commonwealth Builders didn't stay with the Washington Commonwealth Federation, in terms of being co-opted by the Communists eventually.

Mr. Canwell: I think that probably his greatest problem was that because of his successful association within the Ballard community, these organizations and groups, and his importance as a prominent printer and publisher, he assumed that he knew more than he did know. He really didn't know anything about the technical operation of the apparatus. They come along with a front and they want him to sign on. He did and I had the printed materials. And at his printing plant I had an early opportunity to observe the man without his knowing that it had any significance.

His wife was the real brain in the printing operation and work force. She ran the Linotype and everything else and Harold was the big shot with the chamber of commerce and the veterans' groups. But so often that is the case. Harold just did not know his limitations. And I never should have put him on the committee but it was a last-ditch thing to put this staff together and get out of the place.

And he did have a "friend at court," a good friend, in Fred Neindorff, who could always rely on him for any information that he had in the Senate. Relationships build up between congressmen, or senators, legislators, and the press assumes great importance because of the friendly relationship between an individual and a member of the press.

That, I think, was pretty much the case with Harold Kimball. He had a good background and read well. And he was cooperative with the press, and their interest in that time, and the anti-communist movement. So Fred Neindorff was very anxious that he be selected. I

couldn't find a viable candidate and so I said, "What the heck, I can handle him."

Mr. Frederick: And potentially that would have been Fred's conduit into the committee then?

Mr. Canwell: It was to be a contribution on his part but that would happen with any reporter or anybody who wanted to do that sort of thing. He wasn't exercising any control on the committee. I think he quickly came to understand Harold more thoroughly than he had before. So there was no liaison between Kimball and Neindorff in the committee operation. Kimball had his nose so out of joint after my blocking his move in Washington, D.C., which I had to do, that he never cooperated.

Someone filed an injunction in a justice court and it was to hold the committee in abeyance until this decision was made, maybe it was on our budget. But anyway the attorney assigned to our committee by the Legislature out of the attorney general's office was a good, stupid guy. He just didn't know what he was doing and so when this issue came up and I asked him what to do he said, "Well, we'll just have to suspend operations until this is resolved."

In other words, you were letting a justice court judge put the Legislature out of business, and I didn't buy that. So it was at that time that I called Ford Elvidge and explained the situation and Elvidge said, "Well, what are you doing?"

I said, "Well, I'm not budging, I'm not moving; they're going to have to carry me out of here like they did Woods of Sears, Roebuck."

Elvidge liked that, he said, "Just hang tough," he says. "Just don't let 'em serve any papers on you."

Well, Harold Kimball was the only one they served papers on. So the committee went on but without Kimball.

There was a lot of hardball played at this time, had to be. I wasn't going to let a bunch of fuzzy-brained radicals decide what the Legislature could do. The Communists put a four-block patrol around the Armory and marched and chanted and yelled and hollered. I sent the cops out to jail the leaders, Jerry O'Connell and Bill Pennock. The wagon came up, they threw them in and took them down. They posted bond and were back out on the streets soon. But at least that's the way things were happening then.

Mr. Frederick: Senator Kimball had mentioned that he keeps himself informed on Communist activity in the state and says that he's the only member with firsthand knowledge of the subject. But he thinks that Canwell is a qualified investigator.

Mr. Canwell: Well, poor Harold was caught up in something that was over his head. He's a good guy,

really. But good people are dangerous when they don't know what they're doing.

Mr. Frederick: Did you ever have words with Fred Neindorff with regard to his—

Mr. Canwell: Oh, Fred Neindorff and I were in conflict all the time. Fred was—he was an aggressive newsman. And I understood the business. I was constantly on guard to keep him from doing violence to what I wanted to do because his interest was news and "his paper," as he called it. Reporters like that are forever out after a story. They want to make news as well as report it. Fred was a constant problem but an enduring friend. His wife was very important, one of the best researchers I ever encountered. She volunteered enormous services to the committee and organized other people to do research for us.

Mr. Frederick: From my reading I get the impression that Fred Neindorff was sometimes confused with regard to being a newspaperman and a street player. I saw that being confused all the time with him.

Mr. Canwell: Well, you often see that in the press. They identify themselves both with their paper and the issues and they become crusaders. It's the nature of the thing. Fred Neindorff was a very able, competent reporter and one of the best I ever associated with or came in contact with. But you also have to understand reporters. You have to know what they're doing and it isn't always what you want done.

[End of Tape 30, Side 1]

Mr. Canwell: Probably this might be a place to drop a word on the press and the committee. We had gone into this pretty much with the understanding that there would be—the three major newspapers—would be represented by their political editors in covering the committee activities. We had a very good rapport, understanding. Ross Cunningham was to represent the *Seattle Times*. Neindorff the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer (P-I)* and Holden the *Spokane Spokesman Review*. We had a very amenable relationship. I explained to these people why I wasn't just out releasing stories to the press. It wasn't my business to make headlines. I knew how to make them but that wasn't what I was doing, and they went along pretty well in this. When the committee hearings were assigned I had assumed that these three men would be the major news contacts. Then word came down that Ross Cunningham would be replaced.

An interesting thing, the information came from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police intelligence. It was quite interesting that they knew more about what was going on

at the *Seattle Times* than I did. They said that Cunningham would be replaced and the implication was that it would be by a “plant.” There was quite a bit of information provided on that. So, I took it the way it came.

Pretty soon when the committee hearings started, Ross Cunningham was no longer covering it. The managing editor of the *Seattle Times* had selected Ed Guthman and placed him in that position.

It was a point of considerable conflict on a higher level there because I knew one of the owners of the *Times*. I was quite well acquainted with him. And in talking to Ross Cunningham I asked how this came about and he told me that he had no control over it, that the orders came down from the top. Somewhere along the line I talked about Guthman to one of those who owned the paper. He says, “Well, I get a lot of complaints, but it’s out of my department. I don’t mess with the news end of this thing.”

And Ross Cunningham, I recall at one of these meetings, said, “Well, we think he’s a commie but we can’t do anything without proof.”

You have to have some proof and *bona fides*, too. I didn’t wish to project myself into that level. It wasn’t my business who they assigned to cover the thing except that I didn’t want a Soviet agent doing it if I could avoid it. I remember Cunningham saying, “Well, you might be absolutely certain that somebody is having an affair with your wife but you can’t shoot him until you catch him in the saddle.”

And that was the case with Guthman. Cunningham said, “We know what he is but how do you prove it?”

Anyway it went on from there. I just kept my eye on him, I didn’t discriminate against him in the handling of the news and I didn’t favor him. I just watched him and he proved to be about what I had been informed he was.

Anyway, the information on Ed Guthman was relayed by the Canadian Mounties.

Mr. Frederick: Would that have been filtered to you through the FBI contact? You don’t see agents of the Mounted Police knock on doors in Seattle, Washington.

Mr. Canwell: Their intelligence unit was like such other intelligence units. They’re pretty independent. They’re not out pounding a beat. Somewhere along the line, we had set up an organization on the West Coast called the International Association of Law Enforcement Officials. We kind of informally put this thing together and at least one of the members was connected with the intelligence unit of the Mounted Police. As I recall, the information that I had came through that. It was unofficial, not to be used. But it was informative.

There was so much of that sort of thing. There isn’t any place that you could just write it all down, say this is what happened and what didn’t happen then. Things

were moving so fast that it took constant miracles to stay on top of the situation.

My secretaries would put together briefs, investigative reports. In the morning I might have half a dozen of those to go through or take home at night. It seems I never got any sleep.

Mr. Frederick: Senator Kimball, then, would have taken himself out of play quite early on within that process?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, effectively. He had just refused to come to briefing meetings and I didn’t care one way or another. I wanted the bulk of the committee to understand what I was doing and go along with me on it and I tried to keep them informed from time to time. The member of the committee who was ill, I mentioned his name here—

Mr. Frederick: Representative George Yantis.

Mr. Canwell: Yantis. I went out of my way. I would drive down and visit him. He was not well. And I kept him well informed on what we were doing and asked his advice. I knew what his position was, he was a doctrinaire liberal. But I felt a good citizen. Nothing wrong with him other than, you know, you don’t take time to just visit in those areas as extensively as that type of person likes to do. They like to talk. But I went out of my way. I would go down and contact him and keep him informed. In fact I probably told him more about what the committee was doing than I did some of the other members. Anyway I did my thing. His health deteriorated and he died during that period.

There was no friction or antagonism between Yantis and Canwell. We had a pretty good understanding and it was on my request that he join the committee. I wanted at least some input from that level. It seemed to me that he would provide it and not overdo it.

Mr. Frederick: What would modify that? His illness? You wanted a seasoned practitioner on the committee but you didn’t want someone who was going to attempt to dominate, or co-opt it, or take it over.

Mr. Canwell: No, in his case I hoped that he would be able to attend these informational meetings that I put together. It developed that he was just not able to, so I’d go see him. I kept him very thoroughly informed, to the best of my ability, on what we were doing. There was no quarrel with a man like Yantis. All of this conversation about being unconstitutional and denying rights never occurred. You know, it was fictional.

Mr. Frederick: He died in December of ’47.

Mr. Canwell: He died fairly early in the operation. But there was a period of time, when we set up the committee in Seattle in which we made absolutely no public statements. I was gathering materials. I was seeking agents and employees and at the same time trying to keep the committee pacified and quiet while this process proceeded. I don't remember how many times I went down to see him. It was more than I really had time for but I didn't want a situation to develop where it appeared that we selected somebody because he was going to die.

Mr. Frederick: Well, Albert, if the man had cancer, particularly in that day and age—not saying that you selected him because he was going to die—but if a man at that age has cancer it's—

Mr. Canwell: I discussed this with him when I asked him to join the committee, as to what his health was, whether he could do it or whether he wanted to do it and we visited to quite some extent.

I've seen quotations by him and things by writers quoting him on things that I'm sure he never said. You know, you can credit a dead guy with anything. And that quite often happened among these liberal writers and commentators who, on the radio and in the air, quote men like Yantis as saying things that they never said. We had a very compatible arrangement. We understood each other. He understood the problems of serving on the committee. He explained his limitations and I tried to work within that framework. There were two or three members of the committee I'd much rather have die in midstride than Yantis; he was giving me no trouble. But as to his having cancer, or what the nature of his illness was, I don't know that I knew that at the time. I just knew that he was incapacitated, but was still serving in the state Legislature.

Mr. Frederick: What I hear you saying is that House leadership didn't have too much to do with the formation of this committee.

Mr. Canwell: It was delegated, of course.

Mr. Frederick: Herb—Speaker Herb Hamblen—did he—

Mr. Canwell: Appointed a chairman and delegated the responsibility of selecting a committee to the chairman. I think that is usual procedure. The Speaker might have firm convictions and firm friends he wants to place on a committee, but normally in an interim committee or a committee such as this, I think that he first would select a chairman and then try to get that chairman a committee to work with.

And so that is delegated. I think that's proper. And the usual thing. I think the evils of the thing would be on

the other side where he wanted to impose his will on the membership of the committee. I would think that would be the weakness to overcome—if he wanted to put somebody in there, appoint the chairman, and if he then wanted to appoint somebody to control the chairman. He, of course, was in a position to do that but he didn't. He didn't function that way and it was pretty late in the session, too. If we were going to have a committee at all it had to be put together fast.

I think if you're going to fault Herb Hamblen, you have to fault him with his selection of a chairman. I think that's where you'd have to begin. It's not doctrinaire that a freshman be assigned a chairmanship. It's just not the usual thing because he's not normally qualified to, nor does he have the support or backing to obtain the appointment or maintain it. But there's nothing unethical or unpolitical about selecting an outstanding person—or a person you conceive to be outstanding—for a particular job and appointing him, disregarding the other factors.

I think that's what Herb did and I think that, as I said this morning, instead of being a horrible appointment, that it was an inspired one. He had a sucker who would do the job. How would you find somebody who would spend three years at his own expense doing a job, a controversial, no pay, no recognition job? It was just a task to perform and how do you get some sucker to do that?

Mr. Frederick: I think potentially that would be a part of the equation and I would still hold, or question, Speaker Hamblen on that issue also.

Mr. Canwell: I think that he was very perceptive. Why did he select me to handle the Capitol Club thing? There was probably a lot of senior members there who would have enjoyed having a few headlines.

Mr. Frederick: What is your speculation on that?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I think that he knew enough about my background to believe that I would do a good job and not embarrass him. He knew that I had a background in law enforcement and probably knew of my newspaper reporting and other things that gave me suspected qualifications. But it was not on a friendship basis. I didn't know him that well.

Mr. Frederick: And we've got Representative Grant Sisson.

Mr. Canwell: Grant Sisson, yes,

Mr. Frederick: Republican; and George Yantis was a Democrat.

Mr. Canwell: Yes. Sisson, I believe, had a furniture

business in Everett or up that way somewhere.

Mr. Frederick: Mount Vernon. Farmer.

Mr. Canwell: Oh, Sisson was at Mount Vernon. I was thinking of Stevens. Sisson was from Mount Vernon. Long-experienced legislator, a good guy. A good work-horse who wouldn't make a lot of waves but he was very anxious to serve on the committee and he requested it and implored me to put him on the committee. I remember he assured me he wouldn't give me any trouble, he'd be very cooperative. He just wanted to be on the committee.

Mr. Frederick: He said that he favored the investigation of communism but claimed neither a special knowledge of same, which seems to be a seasoned politician speaking there.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, he was strictly a politician. They do their job. They function effectively. They're dependable. They learn from experience. If they're not otherwise rascals, they're the best you can come up with.

Mr. Frederick: And then we have Representative Sidney Stevens.

Mr. Canwell: Sid Stevens. I put him on the committee because he was all primed to drop a bill in the hopper that, when I examined it, I felt it was very inadequate. He, again, was somebody I think had been active in the Legion and was very determined that something be done about the Communist situation. He met with us at various times in precommittee meetings and was just gung ho to drop this bill in the hopper and I didn't think it was a good thing. In the first place I felt it wouldn't pass. It would open the thing up to a lot of debate and nothing would happen.

Mr. Frederick: You always have the opportunity to go visit with the Speaker and have, you know, the Sidney Stevens bill "taken care of" in the Rules Committee.

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember a whole lot about my contact with him except that I knew he wanted to drop this bill in the hopper and I felt it was inadequate. So I told him if he'd bypass that approach and join me on mine—sign my bill, that I would put him in that position, the cosigner of the bill. That's all he had to do with it, and I, then, put him on the committee.

Mr. Frederick: He was again, if I'm not mistaken, a freshman?

Mr. Canwell: He was a freshman.

Mr. Frederick: And a Republican, and a small factory owner from Seattle.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I thought he had some sort of a small furniture business. I remember he was very anxious when we set up our offices to provide the furniture. I didn't want that kind of thing done at all. And so I explained to him, and his nose was really out of joint. Here was a chance for him to get some benefits and he wasn't going to get them. So I told him to figure out exactly what his profit would be, let me know, and I would give him the money out of my own funds. Anyway, we had a little hard feelings over that but I wasn't going to be a party to that. No committee member was going to sell a desk or a chair or anything else to that committee who can benefit by it. So anyway, we had a misunderstanding. I don't remember whether I paid him a commission. I know I offered to. But I was not going to be a party to that sort of an operation.

Mr. Frederick: He said he traced his interest in the subject to his work on the Americanism Committee in the American Legion and I can assume that would be in the Seattle region.

Mr. Canwell: I think it was Everett, but his interest in communism came through the American Legion and his post, I believe, was at Everett. The Legionnaires worked hard in that area. They had a publication and they talked about it a lot and were effective, but a problem too. He was a product of that. The Legion can produce people like Bienz, or people like Harold Kimball and Sid Stevens who are not sophisticated in their knowledge.

Mr. Frederick: He wanted to participate because he went to the Legislature with the intention of doing something about communism. He was concerned about modern youth rejecting parental authority, a tendency which he attributed to communist influence in the schools. And my immediate response would be, I don't think the man would be carrying heavy intellectual baggage.

Mr. Canwell: That sort of an approach to the problem, and it is very pedestrian and very common, of an unsatisfactory situation at school, is that you immediately look for culprits and probably they're at home. But that's a very common thing and to then feel that you can generate solutions by waving a wand, you can't do it. It starts at home, church, schools and many other places.

You encounter that all along the line. We have it now and you'll have it tomorrow because people are what they are. They are what their backgrounds are, their family backgrounds, their educational backgrounds, their community contacts. You hope they're not misused by, or exploited by, people who have ulterior motives. But I

never felt I had any solution to the school problem and I never felt it was entirely teachers, or texts, or payrolls. I think it's a continuing problem that's a part of the rolling of civilization and you'll always have those problems. They had them from the time of the early philosophers right on.

But people come along and think they have a fast solution and if they get elected to the Legislature that's the drum they beat. You don't necessarily have to be antagonistic to them, you just have to realize their limitations.

Mr. Frederick: I would see potentially a Senator Rutter, a Representative Grant Sisson. I'd say that was it, Albert. You and those two guys and they're not carrying heavy intellectual baggage. I mean that is a hell of a responsibility.

Mr. Canwell: It was a particularly great responsibility which I felt deeply and was always concerned about; you know, just how do you do it. I had a great respect for some of these people but I might not have a respect for their background knowledge and so you have to work with what you have.

[End of Tape 30, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Albert, we left off yesterday's session with a thumbnail sketch of the committee membership and let's continue that theme today. And let's talk about those who you contacted within the Legislature, who would not participate and/or your, let's say, your first choices for that committee.

Mr. Canwell: I have a distinct recollection of trying to get Ed Riley, "Saltwater" Riley, to participate in the committee. He was very friendly to our initial endeavors and cooperated and helped every way possible, but he did not wish, when it got down to the case of selecting a committee, to serve on it and he certainly did not wish to be the chairman. While he was entirely in sympathy with the program, he explained that he had a business and a family and knew how the Communists operated and he didn't think that he could participate on that level. Well, he's one that I remember well because I admired him very much. I felt he had the legislative experience and know-how and the proper attitude toward the Communist activity. I was a little disappointed that he would not be a part of it.

I mentioned George Kinnear yesterday and I felt at the time that, as this shaped up, Kinnear would be a good chairman of the committee, would be able to write the legislation, and have influence in getting it through the Legislature. But that did not materialize. I don't remember others that I drew a bead on, as you might express it, or people that I thought should take a leadership position

in this program.

When it came right down to the final moves and the Legislature was drawing to a close, members of the committee who would function intelligently had to be selected. I proceeded, with the help and all the advice I could get from people who knew the individual members and their actions in past legislative sessions, and I tried to come up with a committee. Herb Hamblen, by this time, appointed me chairman of the committee and had delegated to me the responsibility of acquiring a committee that I could work with and, hopefully, get the job done. He delegated that responsibility to me and I worked diligently to try to come up with, hopefully, a successful working committee. I think I came up with a pretty good group of people:

Senator Bob Rutter, a distinguished person. I think I was very fortunate to get him on the committee. Tom Bienz, it was inevitable that he'd be on it because he had taken such an active part in the American Legion and other areas and in his district in Spokane in opposing the situation that was unfolding in the state as regards the Communist Party activities. And he was a former member of the Legislature so he knew of their activities there. He was a splendid choice and very ambitious to get on with doing a job. We were not always in agreement of how it should be done. But I felt fortunate to have him on the committee. He was a fine person. A loyal American, concerned, with an excellent background. He just about had to be on the committee and I was very happy that it worked out that he accepted and we appointed him secretary to the committee.

Then Harold Kimball I touched on yesterday. I felt that he had many problems. He was a good person but not too wise. He was not very cooperative with the committee, although he did nothing, and couldn't do anything, to give the committee or its chairman much trouble. Things moved too fast and he couldn't keep up with them, and didn't wish to.

On the House side, Sid Stevens, it was inevitable that he be on the committee because he had an American Legion-prepared bill that he intended to drop in the hopper.

Grant Sisson from up in Mount Vernon, a longtime legislator, a fine person, very cooperative, was very anxious to serve on the committee because the Communist thing was a hot issue anywhere along the West Coast of Washington State. He was familiar with their activities in the Legislature. Very anxious to serve on the committee and he did. I selected him.

I don't know whether we were on tape when I was discussing George Yantis. I had wanted him on the committee for balance. He was pretty much in the liberal orbit but not a radical, not a Communist.

Have I overlooked any of them?

Mr. Frederick: As you have mentioned, the authoriza-

tion bill passed approximately about the last five days of the session. What did you do at that point in time?

Mr. Canwell: When the resolution passed, I believe I had discussed the situation as it unfolded, as to who the chairman should be and the members should be. I immediately went to work on that because it very quickly developed that the chairmanship was being narrowed down to me.

Mr. Frederick: Who did you have those discussions with?

Mr. Canwell: The various members of the Legislature who had from time to time met in meetings to discuss this. I wouldn't at this point remember precisely who they all were but they would probably include Tom Bienz and there were others.

Mr. Frederick: What were, or who were the other candidates for consideration in chairing that committee, if they would have accepted that?

Mr. Canwell: It narrowed down to the fact that there were no prospects. Nobody really wanted it in the upper echelon of Republican House members. I can't remember anybody who really wanted the assignment and that was part of the problem. You had to come up with a chairman and it just about had to be somebody who had been working within the orbit of the pro-committee, pro-investigation group.

Mr. Frederick: How large was that group?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, usually there might have been ten or twelve in it or we might meet and there'd only be three or four. And sometimes members of the press were part of these meetings and discussions. There was just a running discussion on how the thing should be done, mention of the fact that other states and the Congress had investigating committees. But, as I mentioned, there was great disappointment in the fact that George Kinnear had not put together legislation on the thing, because we all had relied on him.

Mr. Frederick: What was your schedule when the resolution passed and when the chairmanship of that committee was conferred on you and who conferred that upon you?

Mr. Canwell: Herb Hamblen and I were in communication and discussing who should be chairman. I don't know how it eventually came about that it narrowed down to me, but it did and Herb made the appointment, of course, after he was required by the terms of the resolu-

tion to appoint the chairman. I don't think there was any great enthusiasm on Herb's part toward Canwell, it was just that it was a decision that had to be made. It just about had to be made from the ones who had manifested concern about the problem and then, of course, the person who dropped the bill in the hopper might reasonably be expected to be the selected chairman.

Mr. Frederick: In those early days after the passage of that resolution did you sense the distancing of House-Senate leadership from that process?

Mr. Canwell: No, I think there was a general goodwill toward the program without having any idea about what was going to be done or how it was to be done. I don't think there was any resistance on the legislative level to my being appointed chairman. There might have been a little unhappiness on the part of someone like Tom Bienz who would very much like to have been chairman of the committee. But I had foreclosed that by writing into the resolution that the Speaker of the House make the appointment. I did that because I felt the control should not slip out of the House because that's where the Republican control was. It didn't seem to me advisable to let it be a hit-or-miss thing. It was too late in the session to do much maneuvering around. It had become an accomplished fact, the resolution passed, and the task then of the Speaker was to appoint a chairman. It was one of the last acts of that legislative session and had to be accomplished and disposed of and go from there.

Mr. Frederick: What was your next step?

Mr. Canwell: I did shortly go to Washington D.C. But I think the next step was to look about for a headquarters, a place to base our operations. We finally decided on setting up operation in the field artillery armory. There were quarters available there at a modest fee. We acquired such space and then began to get some desks and chairs and look for staff.

There were a great many requests for employment by stenographers and so on. I very early decided that I couldn't afford to just select a staff from people who were sent to me, because I'd have no way of evaluating them properly. So I began to put together a staff, both of investigators and secretaries. I don't remember how fast we moved along on that.

One of the things we agreed on in our first meeting of the committee was that we would not make any public statements about what we were doing or going to do until we knew a lot more about it. And that was pretty well understood; that would be under my control and jurisdiction.

Mr. Frederick: And what was the purpose of going back

to Washington D.C.?

Mr. Canwell: I wanted to talk to the people at the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Get whatever advice I might be able to get. And I did. I remember talking to Bob Stripling, who was the chief investigator for the Dies Committee and had become quite well identified in the Communist investigation situation. He was a very able man and, of course, a lot of fireworks developed immediately when they began probing into this hornet's nest. They had gone through the process of legalizing, or getting legal opinions or determinations on the legislative investigations, the resolutions that they had sought and procured. In general I wanted to know all that I could, and should, know about the authority and potential for doing the job that was underway. I think at that time I may have gone to see J. Edgar Hoover. Anyway I spent probably a week in Washington doing groundwork as a basis for my procedure of forward movement in setting up the committee and trying to operate it. I don't remember what all I did do there.

I had good advice from Bob Stripling. He had been into this thing with both feet and was getting all the flak that you get in that direction, and more than he wanted. I remember he was telling me that his best advice to me was go home and forget it. But he said, "I'm sure you will not do that and therefore I will help in any way I can."

He may have introduced me or given me access to some people that I wanted to talk to at that time. I don't remember who they all were. I'm sure I visited with our member of Congress from the fifth district at that time. Somewhere along the line, and I don't think it was this trip, I went to see Alfred Kohlberg in New York, who had been in communication with me as my name began to surface in the Legislature and particularly in relation to the Communist issue. That was his particular concern and interest. He carried on a very wide correspondence and I was one of the recipients of it, and somewhat impressed by the man. I went to see him whenever I was in New York. We became quite good friends.

Mr. Frederick: Did you have, before that first trip to Washington D.C., did you have an agenda list or a target list with regard to various groups, organizations that you were going to focus on, and did you discuss that with Bob in Washington?

Mr. Canwell: Stripling? I had a great deal of information in hand by the time that I was selected to be chairman of the committee and much of it, of course, had to do with Communist activity in the Seattle area. I had material and information on front activities there. The degree to which I may have discussed that with Stripling, I don't know. I don't think he was too interested in my problems in Seat-

tle, just aware that there was a real problem there and that I was taking on a very difficult responsibility.

Mr. Frederick: Did he share with you potential contacts with Immigration, FBI, military intelligence and even the American Legion?

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember--

Mr. Frederick: Review contacts.

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember to what degree that happened. I think I met his staff at that time and I believe that I met--whether I met them before that or not I don't recall, but--J. B. Matthews and one other man there, an ex-Communist, working for the committee and advising the committee.

[End of Tape 31, Side 1]

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember who all I may have met in that particular situation. I do remember that I asked Stripling for copies of their reports and I came away with a cardboard carton full of what became very valuable reports. Things like the *Fish Report* and I think that he also either provided me, or suggested that I obtain, New York reports. There had been the Rapp-Coudert Committee somewhere along the line. The State of New York had held some hearings in which they'd touched on Communist activity. And quite a lot of that material was made available to me. Extra copies they had and so on. So I took whatever I could get, I always did that. Still do.

Mr. Frederick: You had an opportunity to, as I understand it, for the first time, to meet J.B. Matthews.

Mr. Canwell: As I mentioned before, I wracked my brain to try to remember where and under what circumstances I met him. It may have been there but it's not clear in my mind. Ben Mandel, I remember, was there. I think the record will show that Matthews was on the staff at that time, but I have no clear memories of that.

Mr. Frederick: Were there discussions with regard to expert witnesses and--

Mr. Canwell: Not at that time. I think the first discussion as to expert witnesses may have been with Alfred Kohlberg. He had made it his business to know all of these people and be in contact with them. I think that he, at all times, was able to give me some pretty sound advice and suggestions in what direction to go in seeking witnesses.

I don't know where we first shaped up the outline for the original hearing. I think Louis Budenz was one of our

first witnesses. But I had put together an idea, a format, that if we were to do our job, first we had to show that there was a problem, what the problem was, how it operated locally and how that integrated or was a part and parcel of the national and international situation.

I felt that our hearings had to be somewhat educational. They had to inform people of what the real problem was and could be. So I set up a first hearing particularly with that in mind and to address the problem of the Old Age Pension Union, which had become a scandal. A Communist scandal. They were manipulating these old people and taking their money. I tried to outline a course of events which would be supported by expert testimony. And then, of course, I looked for those who were already testifying in such cases. And who recommended whom I don't remember at this time.

Mr. Frederick: Louis Budenz was at Fordham University at the time?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, he was. I believe at that time that he was on the faculty at Fordham. He had been managing editor of the *Daily Worker* in New York and, I believe, at that time was attached to Fordham.

Mr. Frederick: Was he on contract with any federal agency?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, I'm certain that he had a very intimate relationship with the federal agents charged with this particular task because it was, of course, right out front and center having been managing editor of the *Daily Worker* and high in the councils of the Communist Party. So to what degree he had a working relationship with the general agencies I don't know. I never asked. But certainly he had the approval, if asked, of most such people.

Mr. Frederick: And you would listen to Bob Stripling and Alfred Kohlberg on that?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I'm sure that I sought any help or information that I could possibly get from Stripling. I immediately had my respect for him supported by contact with him. But everything I knew about him prior to that indicated that he was a person who knew what he was doing.

Mr. Frederick: When you had the opportunity to visit with the central headquarters of the FBI did you get any commitments from them?

Mr. Canwell: This was more a friendly contact as such things have to be. You don't go to the FBI telling them what to do nor did I have such intent. I just wanted to meet Hoover and I remember so doing but I don't re-

member precisely when or under what circumstances it occurred, although I think that doors were opened to me by our Congressman Walt Horan who was on the Appropriations Committee for the Justice Department. A call from his desk to Hoover or to the attorney general or anyone else like that brought immediate results.

Mr. Frederick: What was your initial impression of Hoover upon meeting him?

Mr. Canwell: A highly efficient man, I wouldn't say bureaucrat; just a person who was very well organized; he conducted a well-organized operation. The complexes that he may have had did not show through to me. It was just a friendly contact. I wanted to meet the man and did. It seems to me that I went there again with my chief investigator later on. I don't remember what the circumstances were there. I think he wanted a meeting, too, and that was largely what that was about.

I remember the attendant in Hoover's office took our hats, took them back into the laboratory and put the hairs or things that they got out of the hats under their microscopes and made a report, just a humorous thing.

But I was favorably impressed by Hoover and always was. I thought he was conducting a very competent department and I came, over the years, to know a great many of his agents.

I would see him from time to time when I would be in Washington. It was quite often I stayed at the Mayflower Hotel. Every afternoon, or it seemed like every afternoon, Hoover and his assistant would rendezvous in the bar at the Mayflower Hotel so I'd see him there. But I never presumed or attempted to presume on such acquaintances or associations, it's not my way of operating.

I never had occasion to ask the bureau for anything except some information in the Hiss case. Things like that. I never made a practice of zeroing in on the bureau when I was in Washington. I had too many things to do. And that borders on the frivolous, anyway.

Mr. Frederick: Where did Alfred Kohlberg's interest within the Communist movement originate?

Mr. Canwell: Well, Kohlberg was an importer of Chinese silks and art objects. Very early he had become involved with the Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR). And being a very astute individual he very soon recognized that it was a Communist device and that their interests were not America's interest or Alfred Kohlberg's. So he split with the IPR and he was one of the first ones to put me in contact with people in that area, that orbit.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, excuse me, was Kohlberg publishing his house organ, *Plain Talk*, at that point in time.

Mr. Canwell: I don't think that he published *Plain Talk*. He may have financed it. And I'd have to wrack my brain to remember who did. I don't think of him as the publisher of *Plain Talk* or *Mercury* or any of the things that he might have put some money in.

Kohlberg made a practice of corresponding with legislators. He kept close track of the legislative endeavors around the country and the people prominent in them, particularly in the areas that he felt were important to his interests. It was through that, that I had the first correspondence with him. I think I'd received numerous letters from him that I never answered. We discussed the other day that I didn't have a stenographic staff. I felt I knew him, I believe he had even been in contact with me by telephone a time or two and invited me to visit him when coming to New York and I did. I found him very helpful. He, incidentally, was the person who put me on the Alger Hiss case. He knew about the Hiss case because he had contacts, relatives of Whittaker Chambers and other contacts that gave him inside information, some of which he imparted or discussed with me.

Mr. Frederick: Did he have any discreet official relationship with intelligence agencies or the Congress in Washington D.C.?

Mr. Canwell: Did Kohlberg? I don't know. I think he had a very friendly relationship because of the position he took in opposing the Institute of Pacific Relations and probably *Amerasia* magazine and some of those things. He was a very, very astute individual.

Mr. Frederick: He was a street player?

Mr. Canwell: Well, in a sense. He sat in an office down at the lower end of Manhattan in which he was conducting a worldwide business. But it was not a very pretentious sort of thing. He became loosely identified as the "China Lobby" and that was his overriding interest—the situation shaping up in China, the interference in that program by State Department officials who were subversives; many of them later proved to be. He gave direct opposition to that. I think he helped finance Walter Judd and such people. When I say finance, maybe he didn't need to. Judd was a member of the Congress. But anyway, he took an important interest in the China situation.

Mr. Frederick: It's your contention then, that the Far Eastern desk, at that point in time, was subversive, in the State Department?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I think it was heavily penetrated by people who wanted to defeat and destroy Chiang Kai-shek and support the Communist position in the Far East. Such a vast subject, and there's been so much testimony

on it that it probably would be unwise for me to go into it in any depth at this time. But there were activists like Edgar Snow and his wife, Nym Wales. There was Philip C. Jessup, who was credited with the statement that we should let Korea fall but not let it be obvious that we pushed her, or something to that effect. There were people like that in the picture, Owen Lattimore of the Office of War Information, an adviser to Chiang Kai-shek, and others, who were, I am certain, Soviet agents.

Mr. Frederick: And would you attribute that type of activity to John Service?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I would say he was part of that apparatus. Some of these young diplomats were idealists and, I suppose, bought some of this philosophy thinking it was right, I don't know. But there were those who were directing the thing who were very vicious. The hearings on the IPR are very exhaustive and, I think, very, very explanatory of how the Far East was lost.

Mr. Frederick: Was Manning Johnson employed by Alfred Kohlberg?

Mr. Canwell: Not that I know of. George Hewitt was, merely to help him out, but I don't recall that Manning Johnson had any particular connection with Alfred Kohlberg. I don't associate the two in my mind. I did bring Manning Johnson out as a witness as the record will show. And I've forgotten whether it was the first or second hearing.

Mr. Frederick: But potentially Manning Johnson would have been accessed through Alfred Kohlberg?

Mr. Canwell: I don't think so. Manning Johnson had become a convert to the Catholic Church and was a devout follower of the radio priest, Father Caughlan—they still sell his copy. I see it advertised in the *Wanderer* and other places. But, anyway, Manning Johnson's conversion, if that is what took place, from the Communist Party came through the Catholic Church and their activity. I think that was true of several of the people active in the anti-Communist movement.

Mr. Frederick: And who was your contact with that movement and where was it located?

Mr. Canwell: I had no official contact with it. I don't remember when I first contacted Manning Johnson or whether it was through one of my employees. He was a very articulate man and, of course, a black, a Negro, and had been part of the victimization of the blacks by the Communist Party. They exploited the unhappiness of Negroes in every possible way and then drew as many of

them as possible into the Communist orbit. That would include people like Manning Johnson and George Hewitt who, as I recall, was known in the Communist Party as Tim Holmes.

And, I think, there was quite an endeavor on the part of some of the leading Catholics to follow their current pope's advice and oppose communism. That activity fluctuated back and forth but I would say that Manning Johnson came in through that door.

One of the other people who came through that same approach was Bella Dodd who had been very active in the Communist Party, and particularly in the education movement. I met her early in New York when I was seeking witnesses. I went to her office and had a visit with her and was convinced that she wasn't all the way out of the party, which was quite often the case with these people. They'd revolt and think they had left the Communist Party, but all of their friends and their thinking were influenced through those channels. It takes them quite a long time to actually get out of the movement, even though they think they're out.

It's awfully hard for me to separate everything that was in my mind, everything that was going on back there in New York at that time. I can remember that the New York Public Library and its archives were always a point of call for me. But to determine exactly what time, which meeting, and what I was doing, I don't know at this point.

Mr. Frederick: Did you meet with representatives from the New York State Legislature?

Mr. Canwell: No, I did not. I obtained copies of their reports. I don't remember whether I met Coudert or not. It seems to me that I did somewhere along the line. But I have no clear recollection on it.

Mr. Frederick: How did you go about putting together your investigative staff?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I sought advice from people who I knew within the anti-Communist orbit, largely on the government level. One by one I found here and there someone who was competent, capable, who wanted to stay in Seattle, might be up for transfer. I think that was particularly true of Aaron Coleman. He was in the Department of State and I think was due for transfer or assignment. I more or less borrowed him from the State Department. That's a loose way of saying it but that's about what it added up to. He had an understanding he could go back when this assignment was over.

Mr. Frederick: What was his position with the State Department?

Mr. Canwell: He was in the—I want to properly define

this. He was in the intelligence area and I don't remember at the precise time what his duties were. He was pretty well known in Seattle as a person who had expert knowledge in the field and was a very fine, very reliable person. I don't know whether Stan Leith at Boeing had something to do with that or not. They became pretty close friends I know. And eventually Aaron Coleman, before going back to the State Department, I think, worked for Boeing for a little while.

But one by one I found the individuals and mostly they came well-recommended, like Ernie Stith. I think he was in the Civil Service Commission. Anyway he went from my committee to the CIA. I think retired there.

They were high-type individuals. Coleman and Stith were the finest type of investigator that anyone could ever find anywhere. They were gentlemen, educated, skilled, and dedicated to the work or assignment.

Mr. Frederick: Do you know if Houston practiced law before entering the federal bureaucracy?

Mr. Canwell: I do not believe that he did. I remember John Boyd, who headed the federal Immigration & Naturalization Service in the Seattle District, introduced him to the Supreme Court.

I don't know what the procedure is, an attorney who can practice before the Supreme Court will introduce one of his colleagues, or friends, or a new person. I remember that there was that connection in the Immigration Department and Bill Houston, but how far back it went or what all was involved I don't recall at this time, although he came well-recommended.

Mr. Frederick: And he did come from the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. Canwell: I believe so. I think that he came directly from the Civil Service to my committee.

Mr. Frederick: And what was he involved with there?

Mr. Canwell: I determined in the conduct of the hearings to delegate the responsibility of questioning the witnesses to the chief investigator because of the simple reason that I did not wish to open it up to a circus atmosphere where the legislative members of the committee were questioning witnesses.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I hear you. What was Houston involved with? What was his capacity in the Civil Service Commission here in the Pacific Northwest?

Mr. Canwell: I do not recall at this time. I believe that the Civil Service was one of the first federal agencies to get into the investigation of communism. They were in it

long before the FBI made a big thing of it, with result that they had put together a great deal of information, personnel information.

[End of Tape 31, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Mr Houston then was involved in screening current federal employees and/or incumbent employees?

Mr. Canwell: I don't know precisely what his duties were. He was not on the lowest level in government service. I don't remember what his classification was. The information that came to me was that he was very expert in the area of communism and had made a considerable study and developed a great interest in it. And it seems to me that my original recommendation did come from the Immigration Department and the fact that he was available. He's another individual who wanted to stay in Seattle.

Mr. Frederick: And where did John Whipple come from?

Mr. Canwell: I believe that he was also Civil Service, a splendid individual. I don't recall what my first contact with him was but he was a person that I felt fortunate to place on my staff. A very able, well organized, experienced individual, discreet, likable. One of my best investigators, I felt.

Mr. Frederick: A little more subtle or a little more facile than William Houston?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, Bill Houston was inclined to be a little blustery and you had to hold him down all the time. Whipple was not that sort. He would determine what his assignment was, he'd do it and do it well and he didn't volunteer much information, if you asked for it he had it. He was a very able man.

Mr. Frederick: Were William Houston and John Whipple hired as chief investigator and assistant chief investigator?

Mr. Canwell: I don't believe that Whipple was employed as assistant chief investigator, I think that he was assigned that position later. Houston was distinctly hired as chief investigator. But I don't recall just on what basis Whipple came to the committee. I heard that he was available and I think that I sought him out.

Mr. Frederick: And where did Earl Tibbetts come from?

Mr. Canwell: Earl Tibbetts was—I think that he may have been in the Civil Service, too. He'd originated in Spokane. And a good person, not of the competence of Whipple or Coleman, but a good routine investigator who would follow instructions on an assignment and make an intelligent report, but he was not of the caliber of Coleman, Whipple and Stith.

I finally found it necessary to assign him to nonsensitive areas, not because he was not trustworthy, but because his wife was involved in things that, we felt, caused her to be hazardous to our security.

Mr. Frederick: You're talking about Earl Tibbetts?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I probably should not put this in the record. Tibbetts was a fine person, but the ramifications of this are such that I probably should not go into it now, but none of it was a condemnation of Earl Tibbetts. He was a fine person. Did his job to the best of his ability. And in my operation I was always probably overly cautious.

Mr. Frederick: And where did Everett Pomeroy come from?

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember whether his brother was mayor or what. There was a political connection there and he was recommended to us. I think we did put him on the staff for awhile. I don't remember anything either negative or positive about Pomeroy. I don't think he was with us very long.

Mr. Frederick: And Dana T. Robinson?

Mr. Canwell: He was an auditor, bookkeeper, whom I employed. He had been the bookkeeper or auditor for the State Fair Association, I believe. But he was someone who was well-identified in his concern about the issues we were investigating. I was looking for an investigator who could keep books. And Dana Robinson was a happy choice.

Mr. Frederick: Then he was not from the Internal Revenue Service?

Mr. Canwell: He may have been. I just do not remember what all of his background employment may have been. He was one of the best selections that I made because he was a meticulous keeper of records and facts.

The state auditor put a crew in our office for an entire summer going over all of our records, vouchers, and everything. I set up a desk for them because they were there all the time. They were diligently looking for any errors or mistakes that we might make. And in the total summary of the thing, after they spent a whole summer there

and they turned in their financial report, there was a one-cent difference between their report and the report of Dana Robinson. And when it was audited Robinson was right. I believe the auditor put them in there; they just wasted an entire summer, two men's employment trying to get us, a complete waste of taxpayers' money.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, an audit is a two-sided street.

Mr. Canwell: Well, whether it was the auditor or—

Mr. Frederick: Does an auditor waste their profession if they do the job?

Mr. Canwell: In this case they did. These men were, I think, reluctantly doing what they were told to do. They would take every voucher that was turned in and they went over it with their adding machine. I had fun with them because I was spending more money than of my own than the state could, or would, cover. My hotel and food and things ran \$12 or \$14 a day where the state, I think, allowed me \$6. Other committee members received a \$15 per diem but, as I recall, we decided on the lesser amount allotted to other state employees for the chairman, to blunt any criticism on that issue. So I had a lot of room there to have fun and I would sometimes turn in a statement or bill from a restaurant at the Washington Athletic Club that was a few cents under what it actually was. I just wanted to give them something to do. So they'd meticulously go over this stuff looking for some place where I was gouging the state and, of course, I never did. The state was gouging me.

Mr. Frederick: Did you consider others who were not in civil service for employment?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I interviewed quite a number of people.

Mr. Frederick: And what were the qualifying parameters associated with that? Funding or slot positions for a number of staff or talent?

Mr. Canwell: That was always an issue because we were on a very limited budget so we couldn't just go out and offer attractive salaries. I always put a great stock in personal evaluation of individuals. What sort of a job I felt they could do and would do. Their general attitude toward the whole thing. And in this process I probably screened a great many people and rejected them. Not for any valid reason except they just somehow didn't ring the bell. I always would picture what I would do if such a man approached me asking personal questions or questions that were none of his business and so on. They had to be people with enough finesse and diplomacy to do that

sort of a job and I was looking for that, too.

Mr. Frederick: And what was the criteria for hiring the clerical staff?

Mr. Canwell: The clerical staff? First would be efficiency and perhaps recommendation by persons that I might have confidence in. I just out-of-hand rejected strangers who came to me seeking employment as stenographers because I felt that was the most sensitive area in which we would work. They had to be reliable, dependable people, but they also had to be skilled. And I put together one heck of a staff there. Only one who came to me, and was employed, had done stenographic work for me at the Legislature and that was Viola Fritsche. We called her "Barbara" Fritsche because of the famous character. But she was a very dependable, reliable person and always presumed on the fact that she was the first one hired. The other girls recognized that she was not necessarily as skilled as they were but they went along and she did a good job.

Louise Hine was someone recommended to me. I hesitate very much to say who recommended whom here. Some FBI agent might say, well, I know someone who's done some work for us and she's a good gal and she's looking for a job. Or somebody in the Immigration Department might say the same thing. I just don't know where I got them but they were dandies. Louise Hine, Harriet Wielgos, and Donelyn Jaeger.

They were highly proficient and they're people who develop a loyalty to their boss. It's the nature of this sort of thing. They would just work diligently any kind of hours. It was often necessary to take statements late at night and these people were always very cooperative in those areas. One of the ablest ones was Louise Hine. She was a very proficient person.

In following Colonel North's case I remember the loyalty of his secretary. Well, that's typical of that sort of woman. They attach to a boss and his project and he can do no wrong. They do their job and they're wonderful people. Government could not flow or operate without them. They're everywhere, in congressmen's, senators' offices, the departments of government, FBI, everywhere. They're people who assume a responsibility over and above what their employment requires. They do their job and do it religiously. And I have a great respect for these people.

I mentioned Viola Fritsche, who had done work for me at the Legislature and I employed her as my first stenographic person in the operation of the committee. Then Louise Hine, Harriet Wielgos, and Donelyn Jaeger were people who had been recommended to me and who I interviewed personally and checked into their professional background and abilities. We did a pretty thorough background check on people like that and when we finally

employed them I never was disappointed. Just very fine people who did a difficult job which was not always popular.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, what I would like to do at this point in time is to read House Concurrent Resolution 10 as a backdrop for our further explorations. I apologize for the time that this will take.*

[End of Tape 32, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: Albert, you had a variety of decisions to make with regard to committee course, objectives and goals. What was the process that you used to establish those objectives and goals with regard to selecting a course of investigation?

Mr. Canwell: The first thing that I remember doing is calling a meeting of the members of the committee at which time I had outlined what I thought was a necessary agenda to be followed if we were to fulfill the requirements of the resolution. I pointed out to them the extreme shortness of time. The factor of time, the very limited funds available to us, and that it was going to require a full-time operation by the chairman if the job were to be done. I took them completely into my confidence as to what I thought the responsibilities of the committee to be.

I was, of course, seeking their agreement on a general program. And as I recall the only member of the committee not present at that time would have been Harold Kimball. But we did have the authority to designate a quorum and so we had unanimous agreement on what our problems were. Also it was very evident that it would require an enormous amount of time by the individual responsible for setting up and operating this committee. There was no regulation, no stipulation as to compensation. Whoever did the job, and I was willing to do it, would have to do it, in general, at his own expense and it would require an enormous amount of time away from home.

I went into that phase of it and the fact that I was willing to do the job if I had the necessary support of the committee. It could not be done if we wasted our time in headline-seeking. It had to be a highly professional job. The investigations had to be conducted by competent employees. I had to seek out and find them.

There was a question of records. I had an enormous amount of personal records in this field and it seemed necessary that they be available to the committee. But it was not acceptable to me that they become the property of the committee.

Then, more sensitive things developed or became obvious that, in the record-keeping and the fast-moving op-

eration of the investigations, there would have to be an integration of record material. I had an agreement with other agencies that they would cooperate and help if they were not involved or embarrassed in any way by so doing.

I went into all of these things, what the potential was, and stated it quite frankly that either we do the job and do it right or not do it at all; that I was unwilling to go into a political boondoggle situation; that I felt that it would need professional direction; that I was prepared to provide that but I could only do so with the complete cooperation of the committee. As I recall the limited discussion, there was very general agreement that I should go ahead and that I would have the complete support of the committee in the task undertaken.

It was either at this first meeting or later that it was understood that my records and those entrusted to me by friendly agencies not become the property of the committee. They were a tool or a convenience made available to the committee and necessary in its function, but should not become the property of the committee as such, or carelessly passed on to the next Legislature. We had one responsibility and that was to conduct the investigations and make a report to the succeeding Legislature and that's what I intended to do, but I needed the tools with which to do it.

There was very general agreement. The members of the committee were cooperative and helpful. Very willing to do anything that they could and offered to serve on subcommittees and do the tasks that might develop. I had no disagreement, no ill feeling or that sort of thing. But that's how the operation developed.

Well, that's about the way the thing shaped up. There's a question of employing professional personnel. I was very determined that we have competent, reliable people. That this was not to be a circus. That we were not to let the radicals exploit it or take over. We had a job to do for the Legislature. We were going to do it in a thorough-going, dignified manner and we proceeded along those lines with general understanding.

Mr. Frederick: Was there a mechanism established for scheduled communication with Speaker Herb Hamblen?

Mr. Canwell: There was no formal schedule established. He did not attempt to exercise any control over the hearings and investigations and, in fact, indicated to begin with that he did not wish to become overly involved in that area. That's why he was selecting a chairman and a committee to do the job and he did not supervise in any way that I recall the ongoing procedure of the investigations.

Mr. Frederick: And I can take from that, that there would be no communication to Herb Hamblen with re-

* For the text of the resolution, see Appendix C.

gard to your wish that the records generated by the committee were yours?

Mr. Canwell: No, that was strictly a matter of policy and methodology between the chairman and the committee. It was understood that it had to be that way. That we were handling sensitive material in many cases and much of it we would not have if we did not have the understanding that it was protected, that it would not become generally available to the press and everybody else.

I might well illustrate that. In reading the resolution you will recall that I had the authority to require various divisions of the government to cooperate, produce records or whatnot. In the case of the Red Squad in Seattle, it was very important that we have access to their records because they had kept definitive records over a period of years on the local Communist activity. And they had shared informants with the FBI and other agencies and groups and these records were kept in that division in the Police Department.

When I explained to the mayor that I wanted them, he resisted violently until I explained to him that I had the authority to seize them and that I was not going to misuse or abuse them. So it was finally agreed. I sent a couple of agents down there with copying equipment and we copied the entire Red Squad files.

Well, obviously those particular things should not be turned over to a succeeding inquisitive legislative body. You could determine who the bureau and other agencies' undercover people were, many things that, while it was very necessary that we have these, it would have been very indiscreet to improperly use them, and I had no intention of so doing, but I did acquire them. That was the sort of thing that was ongoing and you couldn't discuss this piece by piece with the Speaker of the House or anybody else. You had too much to do. You had to operate on the premise that you were operating from a position of integrity. And lacking that it could have been a disaster, of course. If somebody with the skill acquired all these records it could have been unfortunate and, of course, in most cases they wouldn't have been available.

There was a great deal of material made available to me as chairman in a strictly confidential relationship and understanding that I would not betray the confidence of some agent who had his neck out. We gathered a tremendous amount of information. We organized it, collated it and were not responsible under the terms of the resolution to turn that over to the succeeding Legislature.

Mr. Frederick: With regard to target objectives, how was that agenda formulated?

Mr. Canwell: It was more or less forced on us. The University of Washington and its faculty had become, not only a local, but a national scandal. The principals in it

were out in front every day of the week releasing news and identifying professors at the University of Washington as belonging to these front organizations and were quoted as making statements in support of them. So it was generally understood that you had to get at these characters. They were not employed by the State of Washington to be propaganda agents.

Still, there were people like Mel Rader who was out there every day and many nights and was identified with all kinds of obvious Communist fronts—Harry Bridges' Defense Committee, and other things like that. So it wasn't difficult to have an agreement that when we got to the University of Washington we had to subpoena those people, find out what they were doing. That was, of course, on a developing agenda.

On the first hearing, since there had been so much flak over the old-age pension situation and the Old Age Pension Union, we immediately targeted the pension union and Bill Pennock. Naturally these prime targets were out in front: the Washington Pension Union, the Labor School, the Repertory Theatre, the University of Washington staff, those things were right out in front. They were in the papers everyday. They were obvious targets of our concern.

And in announcing our first hearing, I think, we announced that we would explore the activities of the Washington Pension Union, and we did subpoena Bill Pennock and others. I'd have to go back and see what additional witnesses we brought in there to build a foundation for our proceeding investigations.

It is obvious, if you read the first report and the introduction of witnesses and the variety of their testimony, that we were partially engaging in an educational program. We were setting a basis for continuing investigation. But we first needed to set the record straight as to what the problem was, show that there was a problem, how it functioned locally, nationally, and internationally. Some of these witnesses introduced at this hearing were brought with that in mind. Louis Budenz, for instance, had become quite well-recognized as an expert, an anti-Communist expert who had an important Communist background and therefore was a witness whose testimony was worth hearing, particularly in this context.

There were various people here that we subpoenaed because we had to cover an enormous amount of area in a week's time. So we brought in people like Jess Fletcher. He was a labor leader, very important Communist who had broken with the party. We introduced him as a witness, and his wife, Judith.

I had mentioned Nat Honig. I don't recall just what he testified to but I think it had to do with Communist activity in the Newspaper Guild.

Then we introduced Joseph Kornfeder, a very important witness; Joe Zack, as he was known in the Communist Party. He was the only American who was a member

of the Comintern and he gave me very important information in executive session.

Captain George Levich was a former Soviet ship's captain and had interesting testimony.

There are various people here who had information about the Communist movement in Seattle, the Pension Union, and so on. And the table of contents in the committee's report, the roster of witnesses, they cover what took place there. It's a verbatim record of the testimony. And no attempt was made to edit it or do anything other than to hold the hearing, question the witnesses under oath, and proceed from there.

It might be of interest to throw a little background light on some of these witnesses like Joe Kornfeder. He was in charge of labor activity for the Communist Party in the entire United States. And he revealed some information to me that was startling. I don't think he understood the importance of it at the time. But anyway he was a very important witness.

Budenz' testimony is worth reading by anybody. A very scholarly man.

And I see that we did have Manning Johnson in the first hearing. I knew we had him as a witness. I'd have to go back and read his testimony to see what we were probing for but I think it was partly the penetration of the Negro group throughout America by the Communist apparatus.

I see we have Dana Robinson testifying. He must have just merely testified as to facts and figures about the committee's budget. I do not recall now.

Many of these witnesses in this first go-round were ex-Communists like Ward Warren, Howard Costigan, Isabel Costigan. Some were not as far out of the party as they wished us to believe.

[End of Tape 32, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Albert, what I hear you saying is that the investigation of the Old Age Pension Union, and the investigation of the Washington Commonwealth Federation, were somewhat proscribed?

Mr. Canwell: The Washington Commonwealth Federation figured in the hearings, I think, largely because of the activities of certain witnesses who had been members or parties to their activities. I don't recall everything that they were testifying to, but I think that may have involved Howard Costigan.

Mr. Frederick: In essence what you are saying then potentially is that you were investigating Communist Party activities within the Pacific Northwest, specifically Washington State, and, in particular, the Seattle area. And their activities were involved with readily identifiable support groups or organizations. There was the

Building Service—

Mr. Canwell: The Building Service Union.

Mr. Frederick: —Union—

Mr. Canwell: Um hmm.

Mr. Frederick: —associated with that.

Mr. Canwell: There was some probing into the Communist penetration on the labor level and that was the largest West Coast AFL Union, I believe. They totally dominated it. I think that probably is why Jess Fletcher was testifying there, he had been head of the union. And we had taken a great deal of testimony in executive session from these people, pre-investigative statements. We decided that the Building Service Employees Union should come in for some exposure.

And the importance of that union activity should not be underestimated. Jess Fletcher was a rough, tough union character with about a fourth grade education, but smart as a coyote. He was important enough to be entertained at the White House. I had a photograph of him sitting in the Oval Office with FDR. And when Eleanor and her entourage came to Seattle they went out and stayed at the home of Jess Fletcher.

So, there was a lot moving there. And they were a mean lot. There were lots of old people employed in the Building Service Union. If they disagreed with party activity, there would be somebody there to beat up on them or kick them downstairs. It was not a nice operation. In fact, I recall that we had to ask the police to provide some personal protection for a witness or two who were billed to testify in this Building Service Union situation.

Mr. Frederick: So it was evident to you in the planning stages that there were identifiable numbers of players and/or institutions and those would surface with background information on their own accord. There was not an act of discovery on your part. I don't get the feeling from reading the record that there was an act of discovery on your part.

Mr. Canwell: We were not out knocking on the door of the union official asking them what they were doing. In most cases like the Building Service Union it had already become a scandalous operation with many, many complaints and so it was very early that people came to us with those complaints and we began to take a penetrating look at the operation. We weren't out knocking on doors looking for suspects. In most cases we were swamped with requests to do something.

Mr. Frederick: Louis Budenz then would give an over-

view from his perspective of the international Communist movement and in particular the Communist Party movement of America?

Mr. Canwell: He testified and I'd have to go back and read his actual testimony here as to what went into the record, but he testified about the total control of this AFL Union by the Communist apparatus. The union head took his orders from the Northwest director of the Communist Party. And he did exactly what they wanted done. People from that union came to us complaining about their abusive treatment and the insistence on participation in Communist enterprises, marches, demonstrations, whatever.

They want a demonstration, the word goes down, "We are marching," just the way it does on the campus or anywhere else, and the sheep fall in line. But more pressure was put on some of these people than they wished to have put on them to participate in such activity. They in most cases had a job and they had some income and that's all they wanted, but they didn't want to be out parading for the Communist Party.

Mr. Frederick: Now this is with regard to the Building Service Union?

Mr. Canwell: Yes.

Mr. Frederick: And that would be Local No. 6?

Mr. Canwell: I believe it was identified as Local No. 6. It was the largest AFL local on the Pacific Coast. They wielded enormous influence because of the type of people they employed—low wages, easy to exploit their concerns.

Mr. Frederick: There was an issue of dues being funneled out of Local No. 6 in support of Communist front or Communist activities—the Labor School?

Mr. Canwell: I know there was a certain amount of that. I don't at the moment recall the specifics of it, but it's the way they operated. They supported things like the Labor School, which was strictly a Communist training device and a propaganda device, in addition to that. They were able to bring speakers from the university and other places into the union meetings and issue statements in support of Communist political fronts. It was strictly used for those purposes and it was a front set up by the Communists. Sometimes they infiltrate an organization or take it over or influence it, but the labor union was strictly a product of their genius.

Mr. Frederick: Was there ever any attempt to recover any of that money that had been diverted?

Mr. Canwell: No, I didn't feel that was our function or our area. If there were criminal prosecutions to occur and illegal funds to be recovered, that was out of our jurisdiction, our scope of activity. At least I had to narrow down what we were doing to what added up to a legitimate gathering of the information that the resolution required.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I'm going to take the opportunity to begin that process of building a very cursory model of the environment that you surveyed in the late '40s with regard to initiating your hearings. We need to go back and in a very cursory way develop some type of back-drop. And I want to begin that process by reading several pages from Vern Countryman's work.

[Mr. Canwell requested deletion of the excerpt.]

Mr. Frederick: As we proceed into this interview series, and particularly so at this point in time, there will be attempt made to delineate the various organizations that were created and/or penetrated and/or co-opted by the Communist movement within Washington State. In a cursory fashion an attempt will be made to give the reader some basic insight into the basic components that Albert and I will be discussing in this interview series. And there will be some very basic generalizations.

There was one movement referred to by Vern Countryman and that would be the Unemployed Citizen Leagues that began to spring up within this state and around the nation by the early '30s.

Mr. Canwell: Before responding in reference to the Unemployed Citizen Leagues, I believe that along at this point in this interview, after you have requested to insert an extended comment by Vern Countryman, that I should offer a comment on that. And it should be associated with Countryman's text, because while I recognize his ability and his summary of the political situation as being quite valid, I also recognize him as a tainted source of information and my feelings on that should be a part of the record.

Vern Countryman, whom I came to know fairly well, is a very able and very tricky lawyer who is a functionary of the American Civil Liberties Union and served on its national committee. It was brought out in federal court in the trial of the six top Communists that he collaborated with one of the leading Communists in the writing of his book. It also was brought out by the government attorney, Tracey Griffin, that Vern Countryman had been recruited into the Communist Party on the campus of the University of Washington. So, I think that in giving him any mention in an interview with Canwell, he should be properly identified.

Mr. Frederick: The Unemployed Citizen Leagues began to spring up within the state and around the nation in the

early '30s. We can assume that they were in response to the Great Depression grass-roots movements and began to attract the attention of the American Communist Party?

Mr. Canwell: Such movements were all over the playing field at that time. There was a great deal of unrest and reaction and backwash to World War I and the Depression and all of those things that created a fertile area for enterprising organizers, whether it be Townsend or one of the many others. I didn't follow them too closely; I was just aware of their being there.

But in the Seattle and Washington State coastal area there was an enormous amount of this activity, many groups that sprang up and some of them were infiltrated by the Communist Party, some of them were taken over lock, stock, and barrel; some of them, I suppose, were created by the party. But, it was the general climate and it was not difficult to recruit people into those movements or get them to sign petitions on the hopes, for example, that they were going to get a pension or an increased pension. And that was the climate at the time.

Of course, it developed leaders and leadership and the Communist Party was very diligent in supplying that leadership. They are good at that. They're good labor organizers. The Washington Commonwealth Federation I think had thirty thousand or forty thousand people in it.

[End of Tape 33]

Mr. Frederick: The Unemployed Citizen Leagues, it appears, began to be focused upon by the Communist Party, and by about 1933 within this state there was a name change and that became then the Project Workers Union, which was in effect from about 1933 to 1936. And this was in response to the WPA programs and the various federal funded programs. We can begin to assume that at least by—within the state—at least by 1936 when the name changed again to the Workers Alliance of America that it would be pretty well co-opted at that time by the Communist Party. Not stating that in the Unemployed Citizen Leagues there weren't Communist participants then, but at least by about '36 the Workers Alliance of America was co-opted by the Communist Party within Washington State. And that is a component within the environment that Albert surveyed and addressed.

Another component within that environment would be the Commonwealth Builders, which came into being approximately in 1934. And there was a coalition movement, grass-roots coalition movement, in response to the Great Depression by a variety of concerned people—labor, farm—and one of their slogans was “End Poverty in Washington,” another slogan was “To Make the Voice of the People Felt Politically.” In 1935 there was a name change and that was the Washington Commonwealth Federation and again included in that would be Techno-

crats, Townsend Clubs, Commonwealth Builders, labor unions, and a slogan was used: “Production For Use.” The name regarding that group did not change from then on and there was a movement underfoot to begin to penetrate that organization by Communist Party members within Washington State. Eventually by the late '30s that movement can be termed co-opted by the Communist Party and became a tool of the Washington State Communist Party. That is a second component of the organizational apparatus that Albert had an opportunity to survey.

A third component above and beyond all these, above and beyond the Communist Party itself, which would have a hierarchical apparatus, was the Old Age Pension Union, which again was in response to the Great Depression and in response to the phenomenal movement in terms of grass-roots passion, the Townsend Club movement, which took on a life of its own, a massive movement across the country.

Mr. Canwell: Well, you have summarized well what the economic picture was locally and nationally and that's exactly what we moved into with instructions to determine the extent of the radical influence in those areas and to report back to the Legislature. We started out with this first hearing on the Washington Pension Union, bringing in some evidence, some testimony about the forerunners of this group and its final infiltration and takeover by the Communist apparatus. That was the first stage of our endeavors. We made no effort to write a history as such, of the rise of the general welfare movement in Washington State. We just covered it incidentally when witnesses who were a party to some particular phase of the program so testified, but we were not trying to write a history of the poverty movement in the Pacific Northwest or nationally. We were interested in to what degree those groups were being manipulated. And that's what we proceeded to try to do.

I saw that as my mission. We acquired total background files of the Communist publications that changed names from time to time, but their endeavors and their penetration of these movements is all recorded in our reports. We didn't have to do other than take their own word for what their interests were and they were very evident there. That was one of our basic sources of information. Then, of course, we identified leadership and had to probe into their activities, their backgrounds, who they were and discover what their connections were. And we didn't know all of those things to begin with. Most of this sort of thing was widely suspected because it was so evident.

It's into that climate that we moved. Not trying to interfere with the old-age pension movement as such. We had no interest in that phase of it. We just wanted to be certain that subversive forces were not using them. And

that was the basis of our approach. In that, of course, we came to know about the leadership, the ones who went to the top. We'd find a character like Howard Costigan active in the Washington Commonwealth Federation and in a lot of other front activities and it was hard to tell whether a person like that was just politically ambitious or whether he was another Hugh DeLacy.

We didn't start out with complete information. We just barely started out with a job to do that everybody was more or less aware needed doing. Demands were made on the Legislature finally to get down to business and do something. As you read in that summary there were various movements and attempts to correct the situation prior to the 30th Legislature and the installation of the so-called Canwell Investigations. There was a lot of effort in the Legislature put into those things. But they were handicapped by having a great number of the members of the House and Senate who were secret members of the Communist Party. And fate took part, I suppose, in the housecleaning, got a lot of those bums out in that legislative session.

But we didn't and I didn't initiate this program. It was something that was foisted on the State of Washington by the penetration of subversive forces. And they were well installed in labor and government and in education and in the media. Battles were taking place over the Communist control of the Newspaper Guild and many things like that. That was the atmosphere in which we set up operation. So to understand that, of course, you have to bring up the names of people like Hugh DeLacy and people who were unknown; for example, at one time you wouldn't know that N.P. Atkinson was necessarily a Communist. The testimony of these people revealed a great many matters of how the thing was penetrated and controlled.

And the hearings on the Washington Pension Union were a classic illustration of how good people and good organizations can be taken over by subversive forces. It's very simple when you're organized and financed and know exactly what you are doing, and you are working with disorganized people who are just good people who want something done for their own benefit and that of others like them.

That is in general the picture that I moved in, and the more I explored it the more I realized that I just didn't have the time to do everything that had to be done. All we could do probably is to lay a proper groundwork for continuing investigation. That I attempted to do as intelligently as I knew how.

Mr. Frederick: We'll have an opportunity to explore that, at that point in time. Getting back to this matrix, if you will, of various campaigns and organizations that the Communists within Washington co-opted, could you comment a bit on the path that they chose? And to me, outside of the party itself, it appears to be a bit opportunist.

istic.

Mr. Canwell: There was a great deal of activity in those organizations such as the Unemployed Citizens League and the Project Workers Union, Workers Alliance of America; of course, you might mention many others there. There were opportunities there for the exploitation of discontent and unhappiness and unfairness and everything that was involved in their economy at that time and probably every time, but that was particularly pronounced at that time. The Depression, the backwash of a world war and an upset on a national level in the political approach to the citizen's problems, all of those things were factors and there were busy little beavers in there working to advance their particular interests and causes and private positions. Some of them were strictly money-grubbing operations, others were idealistic things like the Townsend Movement.

And they were not necessarily subversive per se, they were reasonable products of the time. The thing that we were concerned about—I was concerned about, and the Washington State Legislature was concerned about—was the degree to which these people and causes were being manipulated by subversive forces and indirectly by a foreign power. And so, one did not set out being opposed to the Washington Commonwealth Federation or the Workers Alliance or the various labor unions. You oppose what was being done through them.

Now the Longshoremen's Union was quickly seized and dominated by a Communist agent. So that's what you were looking at. And the attempt was always made to make it appear that we were union busters, that I was anti-union and anti-labor. That was not the case. I did not wish to have labor exploited for alien, subversive reasons.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, with regard to your investigation, there was extensive insight provided into the Building Service Employees Union, Local No. 6. Was that the most dominated, co-opted union that you people ran across?

Mr. Canwell: I would think so. I would think that would certainly be at the top of the list. There were other unions that were heavily infiltrated and even dominated, but the Building Service Union was a strictly Communist-controlled union and it was run by people like Jess Fletcher and Dobbins and others. Some of them were thugs. And they were exploiting people. I would say that was one of the most effective operations and one of the first that we obtained a great deal of information about.

Mr. Frederick: I noticed in the hearing transcripts, the two volumes, that there is much mention of Harry Bridges. And you in no uncertain terms backed away

from that issue and/or from the International Longshoremen on the waterfront.

Mr. Canwell: You say I backed away from it? Oh, maybe I misunderstood you.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I said that in no uncertain terms you did not back away from the Harry Bridges thing. And that was a very powerful union and a very key union in those left-wing movements of the 1930s. And you spent a lot of time—or he, Harry Bridges, as a key player, appeared in various instances within the two hearing transcripts. Was the Building Service Employees Union the only example within Washington State that was co-opted to the extent that it was? What were the time considerations in exploring unions?

Mr. Canwell: We could not devote a lot of time to union investigation or exploring. The problems were always before you because that was a field of enormous activity on the part of the Communist Party. It was one of the places they worked most effectively. They are good organizers. And the Building Service Union was selected because it was the largest one. But there was the Aerospace Union and various other unions that were heavily infiltrated and we did not have time to devote to all of them.

Mr. Frederick: Are you saying that the Aerospace Union was co-opted or dominated?

Mr. Canwell: At one time it was pretty heavily infiltrated and I'd say even dominated. That's a story in itself.

Mr. Frederick: Was that before your hearings? That domination? Did it subside or—

Mr. Canwell: I would say that most of the domination there was before our hearings. I think we were instrumental in helping to break that control. And we did take testimony, I don't remember how much of it is in these volumes, but we took testimony on it. We had witnesses who came to us from inside the movement and were helpful in exploring it and, of course, we had a great deal of concern and help from the Boeing Company. That's where they were most active and most critically active.

There was a bunch of other union activity. We just did not pursue that as a top priority for several reasons. I can well remember trying to contact Dave Beck. I didn't want his unions to start right out attacking us as being anti-union, because we were not. And one of the first requests I made was from Dave Beck and I had a very hard time getting through to him. What he didn't know is that I had his confidential phone number and finally became impatient and called him on that number and, of

course, got right through to him.

And Beck himself was not a Communist, but his top aide was and he knew it. He volunteered that he would aid and abet us in our endeavors in any way he could, just tell him what we wanted, he'd produce. And I told him that day that—and this was probably the weekend or Thursday, along in there—I wanted to see Jim Haggin, his top lieutenant, I'd like to talk to him. And he said, "He'll be in your office Monday morning." Of course, in the interim period he transferred him out of the jurisdiction to the State of Oregon. So, I was aware of the trickiness of these people, but I also didn't want to be identified as a union-busting operation.

Mr. Frederick: Was Jim Haggin from Spokane?

Mr. Canwell: Yes.

Mr. Frederick: And he was an organizer over here, wasn't he?

Mr. Canwell: At one time he was a Communist functionary here. One of the first meetings I recall covering, Jim Haggin and Senator Ed Beck had called a sit-down strike at the courthouse and they had a meeting out on the courthouse lawn. But that was my first contact with Jim Haggin. I obtained a great deal of information on the Haggins from Betty Webster, but along about that time Haggin went to the Longshoremen's Union and right to the top with Dave Beck.

Mr. Frederick: Can you speculate on a potential strategy of why he would have Jim Haggin as an assistant?

Mr. Canwell: Because the Communists as such were the best labor organizers in the world. That was their specialized field of activity. And men like Beck took advantage of that. They were not anti-Communist, they were just pro-Beck and had no hesitancy to use a person like Jim Haggin.

Mr. Frederick: Do you think Jim Haggin had dropped out of the party by that point in time?

Mr. Canwell: No, he was still very active in the party and well-identified in their inner circles. I was privy to quite a lot of confidential information at that time.

Mr. Frederick: I hear you. I appreciate that. What catches me by surprise is that at that stage of the game I didn't see Jim Haggin, that his name appears that often within the transcripts.

Mr. Canwell: It wouldn't. There was no reason why it should. We did not subpoena him. We would have, had

he not skipped. But we went on to other things and I don't know that his name appeared at all in our hearings, but we were well aware of him.

Mr. Frederick: How could that be—that his name didn't appear?

Mr. Canwell: It would only appear probably if he was subpoenaed or some informed Communist or ex-Communists were to testify concerning his activities.

Mr. Frederick: Well, shouldn't someone like a Jess Fletcher bump into him?

Mr. Canwell: I doubt that Jess Fletcher, even though he was very high in the Communist Party, had the standing to be in confidential meetings that concerned men on the level of Jim Haggin. And the Communist Party operates pretty much on a need-to-know basis. Their agents and their people are used and they're informed to the degree that they feel it's necessary that happen. In my opinion, there would be no possibility that someone like Jess Fletcher would be in the high councils of the Communist Party on that level.

Mr. Frederick: And if he wasn't specifically asked, he wouldn't have probably divulged that?

Mr. Canwell: No, he was not asked, as I recall, anything about that. I wasn't after Jim Haggin. I already knew plenty about him. I just wanted to clarify the situation with Beck's union. I didn't want them starting right out yelling their heads off that we were union-busters.

Mr. Frederick: Well, why did you do what you did then, in talking to Dave Beck and requesting to see Jim Haggin, which potentially alarmed him? If you wanted to liaison with Beck, why didn't you go see him personally?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I was testing Beck's integrity, his statement that he was willing to cooperate with me. He wanted to help and he was against communism and all that crap, and he had one of the top ones as his top aide and he knew it. So, naturally I was doing my thing, too, I just wanted to let him know that I knew. I would have subpoenaed Haggin and taken testimony from him in executive session if he'd been produced. But it was very revealing that Beck wouldn't keep his word there, that he moved him out of town and out of state.

Mr. Frederick: And you would have asked Jim—knowing the answer—if he was a member or had been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I'd have pursued the thing from the

standpoint of the information I possessed that he didn't know I possessed. He didn't know—when I was covering his meetings that he attended in Spokane—who I was or what I was. And I had a great deal of information about him and I always found that useful to kind of shake the confidence of these people.

One good example that's right along this labor union thing, was that a woman who was in one of the labor unions in one of the meetings, I think it was the Building Service Employees Union, got up in the meeting and told how she was going to put this smart aleck Canwell and the Canwell Committee in their place and she was going to go tell them off. And so we were well prepared for her final appearance at the committee, but what she didn't know is that I had wire recordings of her liaisons with one of Harry Bridges' lieutenants. And someone had recorded a whole lot of bedroom activity on this woman's part.

[End of Tape 34, Side 1]

Mr. Canwell: Anyway, this woman came to our committee and I had the stage all set to bring her in. And then I read, from notes I had, a lot about her activities and she just about fainted and I let her go. She went to the Building Service Union and she practically had a nervous breakdown. Bill Dobbins was again laying the line out on the Canwell Committee; that was a major Communist attack and they were all geared to get the committee. This woman got up and told of her experience. And she said, "Mr. Dobbins, if they know that much about me, how much do you suppose they know about you?" And we had an informant in that group in the Building Service Union who told us about this. But it was a humorous incident and a case where it's advisable sometimes to show your claws and use your muscle.

And to get back to Jim Haggin's case, it would have completely unnerved him, I think, by what I let him know that I knew. And so that was a strategic move to get to Beck.

Mr. Frederick: I hear you. To potentially neutralize Dave Beck?

Mr. Canwell: That was what I had in mind. I just didn't want him to make any mistakes that were unnecessary. And I wasn't after their union, that was just one of the many things we had to do.

Mr. Frederick: As near as I can tell he was picking up the rebounders in the union movement and playing off the Communist movement in terms of that Beck's Business Stabilization campaign.

Mr. Canwell: That type of leadership always operated

that way. They're astute people.

Mr. Frederick: Walked right down the middle collecting politicians and industry, just right and left.

Mr. Canwell: Both sides. And he ended up on the board of regents of the University of Washington! You can imagine how much I trusted him, but it wasn't necessary that I do so. However, this union thing was a very sensitive area because the Communists knew how vulnerable anybody in politics might be to the charge that they were anti-union and union-busters and against labor and didn't want them to make a living, so it's a very, very sensitive area. John L. Lewis operated the same way. He thought he could use the Communists and, of course, they were using him, too.

Mr. Frederick: I can see an issue of degree of co-option, that Local 6 was all sewn up. I see an issue of logistics, it's close, it's in town, in Seattle. The key players were in town. They reverberated between the Washington Pension Union and the Washington Commonwealth Federation.

Mr. Canwell: I think there should be an awareness, too, of the significance of the Communist control of the Building Service Union. It meant in effect that they and their agents had keys to everybody's office in town!

Mr. Frederick: There would be a desire to take that capability out as soon as possible.

Mr. Canwell: I would think so. Yeah, I felt that way at the time. And we proceeded in that direction. And it was a vicious organization, exploiting these poor old scrub-women and others for money and financial support for their left-wing programs. It was a very vicious thing.

Mr. Frederick: It gave the appearance that it was rather ruthless. And from my reading, they used that—a portion of that campaign—they used that local as a “milk cow.”

Mr. Canwell: Yes, they exploited that sort of thing to the ultimate, no matter what. It didn't have to be the Building Service Union, it could be the Pension Union or a church group, if they happened to dominate it. That's the way they operate and they're very exploitative. They take advantage of every means of controlling their people. And if you can get them contributing, even pasting stamps on a party card or something, you have a degree of control over them. And they worked that and exploited very effectively.

It was heartbreaking to watch the Pension Union operate in extracting quarters and nickels and dimes from these poor old people who were going along with them,

but they're completely ruthless.

If there were other unions that we probed a little bit I don't at the moment think about them. I think particularly about the Longshoremen's Union, the Building Service Employees Union and some of the transportation groups, but the Aerospace Union—things that were very significant. And we accepted information more than we went out looking for it. We didn't have the staff or the time to cover all the spots. We just accumulated information, we obtained help from any agency that would give it. A vast number of tapes and wire recordings were turned over to me in good faith by people who wanted something done.

My recollections are that there just weren't enough hours in the day, there's not enough energy in one person to do everything that I had to do. Then I had my daily contests and conflicts with the press and my committee members and all of the things that were a part of that.

Mr. Frederick: Did you lose weight during that experience?

Mr. Canwell: I certainly didn't gain any.

Mr. Frederick: You didn't come in there heavy to begin with. I was just wondering if you lost any weight.

Mr. Canwell: No, I was rather slight—a slight build. I remember one of these critical writers referred to me as a “gimlet-eyed, slight individual” or something like that. I didn't know I had gimlet eyes, but he established that.

Mr. Frederick: What are gimlet eyes?

Mr. Canwell: I don't know. I suppose it would be something derogatory.

Mr. Frederick: I'm having the opportunity to understand how you commanded and engineered that committee. And so I almost know the answer before I ask. This also would apply to the IWA, the International Woodworkers of America, that you didn't have time or—

Mr. Canwell: I don't recall that we had time to look into that and some other situations. Our indexes might have contained a great deal of information. People would come in and make a report or a complaint, or phone in a complaint, or some member of the family would come in with information and it all became a part of the indexed record. But in many cases it involved things that we just didn't have time to look into. We filed it for future reference. Or we might be diligently pursuing some particular area, so we just didn't have time to assign somebody to such an investigation.

Mr. Frederick: Did you ever receive any contact from

Dave Beck, particularly so after the Jim Haggin thing?

Mr. Canwell: I rather think that much further along in the thing I did have a contact or telephone call from him. I didn't seek him out. I had accomplished what I wanted there. And somewhere along the time he was appointed to the board of regents, but I don't remember when that was. I had very little contact with him. I didn't seek it and I don't think he was too anxious to call my attention to his activities. He was a pretty busy man, very able labor leader, and like all such persons is totally unscrupulous.

That's one of the first things I learned in the newspaper business, that there are two people you can't rely on, one of them being a labor union leader, the other one being a preacher. You can't depend on them standing on their word. And that is one of the first things you usually learn about labor people. They're entirely unreliable, that is from a standpoint of integrity. And as a newsman you learn never to rely on what they'll tell you that they'll do or would do or something off the record.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, during that process did you ever get burned with anybody with regard to stating off the record.

Mr. Canwell: Ah, tricks were played on me. There was one particular incident where Ed Guthman set up a situation at the University of Washington where supposedly a professor had terrorized or threatened a student and the student had jumped out the window. Guthman brought the story to me and, of course, thought we'd just take the bait and run with it. At the time I said, "Well, I'll have to consider it and I'd like your word that you won't write anything about it." And he said that I could depend on that. So he wrote the story up and it ran in the afternoon paper. Of course, he walked into a trap because I didn't do anything about it. I merely advised the people who brought the story to me that it was a police matter and I didn't care to become involved. Ed Guthman was left with his face hanging out.

But a considerable newspaper background was helpful to me in such situations. I don't remember any particular incident in which I was, as you say, burned by the revealing of information. I was pretty cagey. And I had a friendly press in general.

Mr. Frederick: I view Fred Neindorff as a street player. I'm not in a position to gauge what type of power he had. But, how did you—this is just from my perspective now—how did you—and/or was it necessary to touch him up a little bit. I got the impression that he probably didn't have too much respect for you with regard to you as a street player maybe initially.

Mr. Canwell: Fred Neindorff was a constant contact. He was a good newsman and this was what was moving. He always wanted the maximum of information and it was a conflict there because I had no intention of exploring this matter in the press. I thought that it would be a reasonable byproduct but not the central purpose.

Mr. Frederick: What you are saying then is that Fred did not attempt to walk over you?

Mr. Canwell: No, I think that he made no attempt to exercise a control. He is a person who would have, had I given him a lot of trouble or if anybody else did. He is a person who would have used his total powers to have his way. But there was no conflict between Fred Neindorff and myself except that he wanted more copy flowing than was coming out and that was understandable. At the same time his wife was doing a great deal of research for us and for the committee. And so I became very well acquainted with the family.

Mr. Frederick: She was on contract to research?

Mr. Canwell: No, just a voluntary thing. If we wanted information in a given area she'd go to the library and the newspaper morgues and come up with the information. She was under no obligation to us, nor were we to her. She was just a very fine person with a tremendous ability to research facts. In fact, she was too efficient. I can remember that her husband, Fred, would assign her to look up something and she'd find more than he wanted to know. He just wanted the meat and potatoes and she would go to the finest points in the thing. Anyway, she was very competent and very helpful to us. And we, as I recall, depended on her to get other people to do research, newspaper research and other things.

But Fred did not attempt to exercise a control over me. He was a pretty busy reporter, too. He was a busy man. And he'd be in and out of the office just as Holden and Guthman were and there were other newspeople who frequented the place, but not prominently.

Mr. Frederick: Did you have any problems with Ashley Holden?

Mr. Canwell: No, you just wanted to be sure he didn't take liberties, you know. He was very friendly and he was a good writer and it was an issue that he was interested in and he'd never write anything bad about me. Of course, there wasn't anything bad to write, if you get the facts. But, he was a friendly person and an advocate of what I was doing, what I was assigned to do. I had no problem with him.

These people had free access to the committee, they came and went. They did not have access to our confi-

dential files, nobody did. And that's where Guthman would end up with his nose out of joint because he wanted to just get in and paw in our files and records, felt that he should be entitled to do so.

Mr. Frederick: Where did you stay when you were up there?

Mr. Canwell: I lived at the Washington Athletic Club, I think, most of this period of time.

Mr. Frederick: And how did you get over to the Armory?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, I don't recall. Sometimes I had the car with me, usually not. I probably more often than not would have one of my investigators or agents pick me up because then they could also report on their activities and the progress.

Mr. Frederick: How did you organize your staff, particularly in those early months?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, we started out with more work than we could handle. My stenographic staff were assigned to indexing and writing of reports. They prepared reports provided by the investigators and in the morning they would hit my desk and there would probably be three or four or a half-dozen or more briefs or reports on what the investigators had done. I made it standard practice for the stenographers to make an onionskin copy for that purpose. If I happened to be out of town some of those things would accumulate, but they were saved for me. I had about as good a control and knowledge of the investigative procedures as it was possible to have. But the investigators as they were employed were assigned to follow out leads and interview potential witnesses and so on.

Mr. Frederick: Do you recall a scenario associated with that? Where you began?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, only to the degree that first we acquired a base of operations and somewhere very soon we obtained space in the state Armory. And then the thing grew from there. The investigators and the stenographers were put to work immediately when they were attached to the payroll and indoctrinated in the procedure. I had a system, I think it was pretty generally used in the intelligence agencies, for record keeping. And they were all initiated in this procedure and followed the book or the rules.

Mr. Frederick: What was the primary record series that you were working with or compiling?

Mr. Canwell: I would say it involved the total Communist operation as we saw it or knew it or as it unfolded. When we subpoenaed the total records of the Seattle Red Squad, it became necessary to reduce those to indexes and to break them down according to their importance as individuals and potential witnesses and so on. So we had a technique for doing that and it was an efficient one and did the job.

Mr. Frederick: That was your primary record series then, the Red Squad files?

Mr. Canwell: That was just one of them. I had my own files and they were quite extensive. I don't remember at what point I brought in boxes of things for them to go through and index and in some cases to summarize and whatever. I started out with my own records and then I very soon had an enormous volume of volunteered information, some of it good, some of it not reliable, but some of it came from professional government investigators who were very frustrated at what was happening.

Mr. Frederick: Did you see that as an individual representation or did you see that as an agency representation?

Mr. Canwell: In most cases it was an individual one, but in the primary agencies there wasn't any hostility. You'd have to realize how these agencies operated and how their agents operated. And in, we'll say, the Immigration Department would be an intelligence department that specialized in this sort of thing. That would be true in the Civil Service and the military facilities or branches, Office of Naval Intelligence and various other such.

And the agents in those groups were very anxious to cooperate with us. They were willing to learn anything they could learn from us and in the process we developed a good working relationship with many agents. They were not specifically authorized in every case to do what they were doing. I wouldn't say that was always true. I think that the Immigration Department more or less assigned agents to work with us. And so we got the cooperation we wanted.

You soon learned that you don't go down to the FBI and say, "I want information on John Doe." You don't get it, they don't operate that way. But you might find an agent who was well-informed and who was very sympathetic to what we were doing and was probably more cooperative than Mr. Hoover would have recommended. Well, that's the nature of the business.

Mr. Frederick: It's a very politicized bureaucracy.

Mr. Canwell: Oh, in a sense it is, but these agents do become dedicated. And particularly in the intelligence field they felt so frustrated and reasonably so, there was

very little cooperation from the upper levels of the Justice Department and its agencies. They had respect for their superiors and their authority but you just have to know the chain of command and how it works.

Then along with that there were agents who were real zealots in this field because they saw what was happening and nothing was being done and they felt very frustrated.

So we had a great deal of volunteer help, friendly help, where people would drop around for a coffee or come in with a bit of information or seeking information. Anyway, our general operation enlarged in that way.

Mr. Frederick: And they would make contact with you? You wouldn't have to go out there and beat the bushes?

Mr. Canwell: No, in most cases people like that were introduced to me by some of our investigators. But there was a great deal of help that came through the friendly relationship with Stan Leith of the Boeing Company. They were right on the cutting edge of this thing. They, the Communist Party, were trying to infiltrate the Boeing Company and working diligently at it. And the Boeing staff were doing a very intelligent job of countering it, with the result there was a great deal of friendly cooperation between our agents, our activity and the Boeing Security Department.

[End of Tape 34, Side 2]

CANWELL COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I would like to take the opportunity today to begin this session by having you comment on the roster of names of witnesses who appeared during the first hearing. Could you please proceed to go down that list and mention what comes to your mind with regard to those individuals and why they were there?

Mr. Canwell: There will be several of them like M. D. Adams and Fay Angel whose names I just faintly recognize and would have to go back to the transcripts of testimony to refresh my memory. And some of this information was integrated into previous discussions.

There are some who stand out: Mrs. Agnes Bridges—she is the ex-wife of the West Coast Communist Harry Bridges, who died just the other day and he received very commendable treatment in the local papers. Mrs. Agnes Bridges was finally found by our investigators with the help of the Immigration Department; we wanted her testimony. She was a very frightened individual. Harry Bridges had threatened to kill her if she ever testified before a legislative committee. But we assured her that we could provide her protection. When she was brought in to testify we locked the doors, had state patrolmen to see that nobody came in. She gave her testimony and left under State Patrol protection.

She did identify her ex-husband Harry Bridges as a Communist and made numerous references to why she could not agree with him or get along with him. He, for instance as I recall, wanted their daughter to date Negro seamen to prove that they had no bias or so on. She didn't like that sort of thing.

Then we had Louis Budenz, one of the great authorities on communism. He'd been managing editor of the Communist *Daily Worker* in New York, and had testified very effectively before congressional committees. I was very anxious to have him, because I wanted to lay out an outline of what we were doing; that there was a Communist conspiracy that was international, national, and local. I felt that Budenz could do the best possible job on that, and he did. He did an excellent job.

Now the next one, Wilbert W. Cadle, I don't recall at the moment.

Howard Costigan had been a well-known radical on the West Coast, had been a leader in several of the liberal groups. He was a Communist, and a very able orator.

The interview would not be complete without expanding on the subject of Howard Costigan. Timothy, you mentioned Howard Costigan and asked me if we did not place him on our payroll at one time. My memory at that point is a little dim. We may well have. We were very anxious to retain Howard Costigan, keep him in the area, and we knew, of course, that he could be an almost endless source of information on the Communist Party at its very highest levels. Howard, of course, had crossed in the political skies like a meteor. He had become very popular in several of the early fronts, joined up with the Communists. I remember many interesting things about him.

Some of this information I obtained from Jess Fletcher, an important figure in the Communist apparatus, and one who knew a great deal about Howard. It seems that Anna Roosevelt Boettiger, FDR's daughter, had formed some sort of relationship with Howard while her husband, John Boettiger, was off to the war. The Boettigers had a home on an island near Seattle, and as I heard the story from two or three people who were involved in it, Howard began to develop delusions of grandeur. He thought that because of his relationship with Anna Boettiger, that she was going to divorce her absent husband John and marry him. He was politically ambitious and thought this would be a master stroke.

The way I got the story, Anna began to tire of him. She wasn't interested in his oratory, and whatever other attributes he may have had that appealed to her, she had tired of. I understand that she had asked him to move out of her island home. He did nothing about that, so she called on the heads of the Communist Party to get him out of her hair.

Jess Fletcher and a number of other important Communists came out in a power-driven boat to the island. They gathered up Howard's personal effects—shaving equipment, clothing, and suitcases—and threw them out in the boat. They then tossed Howard in on top of his things and away they went. This was the real end to Howard Costigan's dream of a glory road.

This incident also brought about a split in the leftist portion of the Roosevelt family. There was quite a difference of opinion on which Communist the Roosevelts should support. Some of them wanted to go on supporting Howard Costigan and his race for Congress, and others thought that it should be the Communist Hugh DeLacy. Somewhere in my files here, I have a letter from James Roosevelt, in which he is explaining what the family position was and ought to be.

That was one of the interesting sidelights on the career of Howard Costigan. We possibly employed him for awhile, although we certainly did not pay him \$2,000 as some have circulated. Our entire budget for all witnesses was only about \$1,500. We subpoenaed him and required testimony from him. At that time, he was, to our knowl-

edge, being blackmailed by the Communist apparatus at the highest levels to prevent him from testifying for the so-called Canwell Committee.

Among the things they were blackmailing him about was that Howard Costigan had participated actively in going down to Grays Harbor and gathering up the important information in the Laura Law murder case, and assisting in the disposal of it. One of the others on that trip down there was a prominent Communist attorney. I believe that Ward Warren was along. But I do know that at least the attorney and Howard Costigan went there, gathered up critical evidence having to do with the Laura Law murder and her Communist Party records, and concealed or disposed of it.

The party was holding this over Costigan's head, reminding him that homicide does not outlaw and that, if necessary, they would reveal what they knew about him. It was very obvious during Howard's testimony that he was pulling his punches. He was not testifying to things that both my staff and I knew that he could testify to. So during a recess, I pulled him aside and told him he had better make up his mind whether he wanted to sing loud and tell his story, or run the risk of the Communists exposing his part in the Laura Law murder cover-up. I told him, in any case, the story would be out if he failed to testify truthfully; he could have us tell it or he could have the party tell it, but he wasn't going to get on the stand and cleanse his skirts with the kind of testimony he was giving. As a result, his testimony, if not the "whole truth," was at least less equivocal.

His wife, Isabel, a very charming, lovely woman. I asked Isabel what kept them in the Communist Party. It was at this time that she explained that the Communists always kept you busy, they didn't give you time to think. There was a lot of entertainment and activity. She said in the case of Howard, he'd go to a meeting, he loved to orate and speak, so he got what he wanted. She liked to visit with the women in the party, and so she got what she wanted. They had a friend that always went with them, Ward Warren, a longshoreman, rough tough Communist character, she said he liked to get in a fight. So the three of them always found what they wanted in the Communist activity. I mentioned this earlier in our interview.

I don't remember Walter W. Churchill Sr., Mrs. Albert Crosetto, Ivy Dodd, just merely I recognize the names. Thomas Erling.

Then there's Sarah Eldredge. She was a very competent and helpful witness. She testified extensively in executive session, and her testimony, of course, is a matter of record in the hearings.

Then there was Jess Fletcher. He was the head of the Building Service Employees Union, the largest AFL local on the West Coast, and had eventually broken with the party. But during the time he was in the Party, and because of his importance in labor, he had very good politi-

cal connections. At one time we had a picture of him visiting with FDR in the Oval Office, sitting there in his stocking feet, and very much at home. Judith Fletcher was his wife, who supported this testimony. But Eleanor Roosevelt, when she'd come to Seattle, and she did often because her daughter and son-in-law were there, would go out and stay at the Fletcher home out in the boonies.

Anyhow it made these people feel very important that the president's wife would come and stay at their house. I think that Jess Fletcher had a fourth grade education, he was pretty smart, too.

Then Katherine Fogg. I think she had been a member of the Legislature. I remember she did testify.

I don't remember what Mary Gilbert's testimony was. It was given by a deposition. There's Alfred Gordon, another one I remember that we did use as a witness. John Hamilton, Mrs. Hamilton, Peter Hiller, were all people that had information, as I recall, on the Old Age Pension Union. Most of them were people who had been dragged into this device headed by the Communist William Pennock, a Phi Beta Kappa from the University of Washington, but he made a career of the Old Age Pension Union.

Then there's Erla Honig and Nat Honig. They were important on the national level. I don't remember—I think he had a newspaper connection at one time.

Frank Hough. Ruth Hough. Homer Huson. They're all names that I remember questioning and interviewing and having them on the stand at the hearing.

Manning Johnson was a Negro active in the Communist Party in the New York City area. He testified on the means and techniques used by the Communists to involve Negroes in the Communist apparatus.

Sarah Keller testified by deposition.

Joseph Kornfeder, I remember, was one of the most important witnesses that we had and I have mentioned him previously. He had been in charge of labor activity in the United States for the Communist Party. He was, I believe, the only American member of the Comintern, the Communist International. But he gave me very valuable information, both at this time and later.

He told what the first goals of the Communist apparatus were—to penetrate higher education and to penetrate the media, and the means they used to do it. A very reliable person with a memory—he didn't forget anything. He could remember names. He told me how the Communist Party had determined very early to control the media. They recognized that the older newspaper people were dying off and they'd have to be replaced. So they developed the idea of penetrating the universities and the schools of journalism and therefore providing the openings, as they occurred, in the media.

He remembered some of the significant things. He told how he had been advised not to question certain people, they were important people on newspapers. And he

explained to me that they were what they called “sleepers,” they had been planted and told to keep their heads down, not to make any Communist noises, but to just grow and develop and assume responsibility in their various newspapers. Being curious, I asked him if he could remember the names of some, and he did.

Then there’s Louis Larson. And there’s Captain George Levich—he was a Soviet sailor who had become the highest ranking captain in the Soviet Navy. He explained why he defected. He said he was very proud and felt very important of his rank and importance; then he began to wonder why there were no older superior officers, and it began to occur to him that when you’d been around the world a little too much and you knew too much, you began to question communism and the program, and so that would be the end of you.

I don’t remember W.E. McCarter or Carrie Mordaunt. I think they were witnesses on the old age pension thing.

Mrs. Lucy Osborn and Mrs. Mary Louise Redenbaugh I believe again were witnesses on the Old Age Pension Union.

Harriet Riley, I don’t recall at the moment.

Dana T. Robinson was the man we employed to keep our books. He was an auditor and a topflight man. He kept track of what we spent and where we spent it, and all the facts and figures.

Sonia Simone I don’t remember.

Howard Smith, I do. He was a very objectionable character. He was known in the Communist Party as “Pig” Smith. I recall that some of the people at the university were incensed when we announced that we were going to use this character as a witness. Among those who objected were Florence Bean James and Burton James. All of these people in the professional unit of the Communist Party at the university, which included the Jameses, would always have Howard Smith at their parties because he was good for a tap. As I recall he ran some cheapie hotels that were just cheap whorehouses.

I told them that he was good enough when he was in the Communist Party to be their guest; I thought he was well-suited as a witness, and was a better man than he was then. Well that was “Pig” Smith.

Ernest Paul Stith was one of our top investigators. A very able man. He went from our committee to the CIA. But he and Aaron Coleman were the agents that we used to contact the university professors. They were smooth people versed in protocol, particularly Coleman, who was a person that we got from the Department of State. Very, very able, very competent people.

Anne Stone and Cliff Stone, I merely remember their testifying. It seemed to me that they testified about the Aerospace Union, but I’m not certain at this time.

James Sullivan had been very active in old-age organizations and that sort of thing, and had been active in the Washington Pension Union. Testified as I recall to

nail down various leaders in the pension movement who were Communists, like Bill Pennock.

Arthur Truax, Sarah Wall, I just associate them with the Pension Union testimony.

Then there’s Ward Warren, I mentioned before, the friend of the Costigans who used to go to all of their Communist meetings together, and later left the party and became a very helpful witness, in that he knew them all. He had been professionally trained by the Communists, a very tricky character. I recall that in one of my congressional campaigns we utilized him. He would always want some dirty tricks played, and Marsinah would say, “Al won’t go for it. We just don’t operate that way.” And Ward Warren said to Marsinah, “Can’t we just win once and then become ethical?” Well, that was the Communist background.

Then there’s Ellsworth Clayton Wills. It seems to me he was also a witness, I think regarding the Pension Union, but also probably the Aerospace Union.

And that completes the list of witnesses there in the first report and what I recall about them.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, did any of these individuals have agents? Were they represented?

Mr. Canwell: No.

Mr. Frederick: Did they seek out an opportunity to testify or did they have agents doing it?

Mr. Canwell: No, in every case we sought them out, and none of them had agents. I doubt that we would have operated that way, we would not have done so.

Some of the witnesses, like Joe Kornfeder, Louis Budenz, had testified before congressional committees, and it was pretty well-known what they could testify to. It was my desire to put this in the record so that it would be obvious to people what the Communist menace was. Why there was a necessity of investigating them and taking some action to curtail their activities.

The important ones like Kornfeder and Manning Johnson, who I felt was important because he was a black. There was a great deal of effort put on by the Communists to alienate the blacks from the rest of the community, to make them feel put-upon and abused. The Communists had a way of doing this, they’d flatter them, and do everything to make them important. Provide them white girls, if that’s what it took, and some of them they got at the Seattle Repertory Theatre.

We brought Manning Johnson out because he had been recruited into the Communist Party and he knew their methods and techniques, and testified very ably on it.

I don’t recall any of these people having agents. I contacted Budenz in New York, and I believe that Alfred Kohlberg set up a meeting for me with him, but however

it came about, I was very anxious to have him testify. He was a responsible person. At that time I believe he was on the faculty at Fordham University. I was very anxious to get him to testify. We didn't specify what these people were to say or that sort of thing.

Mrs. Agnes Bridges—we were very anxious that she tell everything she could about her life with Harry and how she knew that he was a member of the Communist Party. I believe she had his card or had that information.

Of course, Jess Fletcher was very important to us because the Building Service Union had a great many old people in it, and these Communists were very abusive to these people. If they didn't go along with the party program or tactics, it was not unusual for one of their bully-boys to beat up an old person to teach them a lesson. We were quite anxious to expose that whole operation, and did so very effectively.

I think that Fletcher got as much religion as that type of person can get. He was still a fourth grader, rough, tough, union individual, and I think very forthright as a witness.

And Honig I've forgotten. I had some reason for subpoenaing him. I remember he was very disturbed because we wouldn't correct the record to improve his grammar—he was very sensitive on the thing. I explained to him that whatever was said there, that's the way it was, and that's what was published and printed. But that about covers the national witnesses.

In answering your question, no, none of them had agents nor did they ever contact me or our committee with offers to testify.

There were people who offered to testify whom we wouldn't use, that I felt were not reliable.

Mr. Frederick: They made contact with you or staff?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, there were several who contacted me and volunteered to be witnesses, but I don't at the moment recall the names. In later years I found my judgment was very sound in rejecting them.

We did not want colored testimony. We wanted it laid out straight. We didn't tell them what to testify about, other than a general outline of what our interests were.

I explained the reason why I let my chief investigator interrogate the witnesses, handle the interrogation. There were many times that I felt, because of my knowledge of a given situation, that I might have improved the contacts a little by some adroit questioning, but I did not wish to open it up to that sort of thing. We were complimented quite thoroughly by, of all things, the *Christian Science Monitor*, a very liberal publication. Certainly not a strong supporter of the Dies Committee or Canwell, but I was complimented in a news release by them for the orderly hearings that we held. And they said that it was the best in the nation.

Mr. Frederick: Did they have a correspondent there?

Mr. Canwell: Yes. They had one in Seattle and I suppose that this correspondent was also out at the hearing. I do have a news clipping and in our photographing of things, it might be pertinent to photograph that because it was unsolicited. I never talked to the *Christian Science Monitor's* correspondent.

We held very few press conferences, as such. I was always available to the press, but didn't give out much information because I didn't feel that was desirable or necessary. I felt that the hearings would speak for themselves. The reporters were there covering the testimony and they did a pretty good job in most cases.

I believe it was Holden who did an exceptionally fine job on the Agnes Bridges testimony. I was very impressed with the fact that we were able to get her there, and provide her security, and get her to talk.

Mr. Frederick: Where was she living at the time?

Mr. Canwell: She was living down on the Oregon coast. I have forgotten the name of the town. The Immigration Department knew, and finally released the information to me, on the assurance that she would be protected. We did so.

Mr. Frederick: As you designed strategy in preparation for the hearing, what was the process for expert testimony selection?

Mr. Canwell: It was mostly a matter of my judgment. At that time I knew more about that situation than the others. Tom Bienz was helpful, being very active in the American Legion and active in their Americanism Committee. But I think the final judgment in selecting the witnesses, the ones we brought from out of town, was strictly a matter of my judgment.

Usually I discussed these things in advance with the committee members, but I don't recall ever getting any obstruction or objections. The committee was pretty well in agreement with my approach. That is, that we had to demonstrate what the problem was, worldwide, nationally and locally, and how it applied to such things as the Washington Pension Union. How they were using these old people and their money to further Communist programs. And that, at all times, guided our selection of witnesses. Then when we got down to the local picture we developed testimony from people who were in a position to know, and were willing to testify.

We didn't rely much on unfriendly witnesses because we just didn't have the time. But we did call some of these witnesses and interrogate them, more in the university hearings where I believe that I repeatedly advised the people that the constitutionality of the committee had

been resolved. It wasn't a matter of debate or a subject that their attorneys should debate at our hearings. And that we were authorized to obtain this information, and compel testimony, and attendance, and so on. If they were reluctant or refused to cooperate, I would usually repeat the question two or three times to them so that there was no question but that they understood. I would advise them that the committee might proceed against them for contempt of the Legislature. So none of them were left blinded on what the consequences of their reluctance and stubbornness might be.

[End of Tape 35, Side 1]

Mr. Canwell: Our legal opposition at all times was from members of the ACLU. Right at the beginning, they had asked for a meeting with me with a delegation of their people, in which they outlined what our procedure had to be. I explained to them that that would be determined by the committee, and that if they were permitted to represent their clients, if they were permitted to be there, there would be no speechmaking, no rabble-rousing, they would merely be permitted to advise their clients whether or not to answer. And that is where their privilege would end. That was the stipulation that they agreed to, in order to get to represent their clients in the first place. We're under no compulsion in a legislative inquiry to let witnesses be represented by counsel. It's a matter of courtesy, a strategy if you decide to do it.

Whenever one of their attorneys would decide to scream and yell, and make a scene at the hearing, we'd throw him out. That's what I had the State Patrol there for, and that's why I wrote into the original resolution that we could direct the State Patrol to cooperate. So we did. Whenever there was an obstreperous, willful witness who was determined to take over the hearing, he was ejected by the State Patrol, and we'd go on with our hearing.

They didn't like that, they still don't, but it was practical, it was legal and proper. The legislative inquiry is no place to debate the constitutionality of the Congress or the Legislature. Those things are determined in courts and had been determined and that was understood by the ACLU members who wished to represent clients there. We did have to throw some of them out, like John Caughlan, a Communist and ACLU executive, a determined, obstreperous person. He had to be removed. This type of person as a liberal always harked back to the fact that legal procedures are not followed. Not one of them could pull this sort of thing in a court of law. A judge would have them in jail. But a legislative committee does not have the power of summary contempt. And I had explained that to them, and that we were going to do our job and we were not going to be interfered with or let them make a side show out of it, as they have in some legislative hearings elsewhere.

Mr. Frederick: With regard to some of the local folks who testified, who were former members of the Communist Party. Was there any work done before your hearings with these people? Let's say with the FBI or the Immigration people, where that may have become known to you through the network that they could be approached?

Mr. Canwell: That's a pretty hard question to answer. Certainly if such help were available I would have availed it myself.

In general, we did a lot of careful research and interviewing of witnesses. The word gets around if somebody's in trouble with the party. And there is a factor that I have mentioned before. That a great deal of electronic surveillance had been done by agents over the years. Almost every known Communist, suspected Communist or front-goer who appeared to be Communist or Communist-influenced, had been bugged by some agent. And sometimes there were two or three of them on one suspect. Anyway, there was an abundance of information available. And very reliable information.

We had very extensive sources of information. In fact, we had so many Communists in the community that we couldn't begin to process them, or call them in as witnesses in the hearings. At the University of Washington it was more a matter of rejecting prospects than it was looking for them.

So we always had an abundance of information, and as it became apparent that we were conducting a professional, businesslike operation, we got enormous cooperation. There were agents who were aware of a real and present danger, and nothing was being done about it and that feeling was very well-founded. Eleanor Roosevelt and Madam Perkins and others used their influence on the highest levels to prevent any cooperation at all. So agents who were concerned, of course, became quite friendly to my endeavors. I knew some of them prior to this time.

Anyway, the question of witnesses was never a very worrisome project. We sought out the ones that we felt were reliable people. And some very fine people got into the Communist Party and the apparatus. Particularly during the time of the Depression and others. It's very easy for these smooth agents to convince them that all their problems are in the system of government. But those people get in, they get out. Many of them are very good people.

Mr. Frederick: What I hear you say then is, witness identification, witness participation was not a major challenge to you.

Mr. Canwell: It wasn't a matter of coercion. It was a matter of selection. And of course, if you are going to use a witness, you want to know a lot about that witness. You want to know what his reputation is for truthfulness, and

you may do a full field investigation on a prospective witness, merely because you don't want to be had. And we did a great deal of that.

We would find people like Sarah Eldredge, who was very cooperative. Seemed to me that she had a son who was an attorney. I could be mistaken on that. But she was one of those who provided a great deal of good information, sound information on potential witnesses, because she just knew a lot of these people.

And we did a lot of independent research. There were many people who wanted to cooperate with the committee. American Legion people, for instance. So we'd assign somebody to go through the divorce dockets. And whenever you'd see a Communist couple being divorced and a Communist attorney representing one of them you knew which one of them was still true to the party. So we'd process an enormous amount of that information and utilized volunteer help where it was forthcoming and reliable. And there was a lot of it.

Mr. Frederick: Obviously your volunteers would work outside of the Armory?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, they did not work within the Armory. Occasionally one of them might have reason to come into the headquarters or office. We could not spend a lot of time visiting with people. When we did, there was usually a reason for it. But we did have people who did research for us.

For instance, Mrs. Fred Neindorff, Hazel Neindorff, did an enormous amount of research. Then she had a friend, an attorney's wife, who did a great deal of research at the libraries, and other things that we would assign.

Several of these people might be working in cooperation with one of our agents. They couldn't spend all of their time visiting either.

Mr. Frederick: How many people did you have approximately, voluntary?

Mr. Canwell: Voluntary? I just could not estimate it. I suppose there might have been twenty.

I pointed out that we had people go through the divorce dockets, because it's very revealing to find the Communist Party representing one of them and the other one aggrieved or leaving the party. So you arrived at information that was valuable. Some of it not.

Mr. Frederick: Did you or your staff have the opportunity to flip anybody? Or were they potentially out of the party or witnesses before you guys approached them?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I think so. It would be difficult to go into details about some of these cases. I'd say the outstanding one was Barbara Hartle. Now, we had informa-

tion about Barbara Hartle's determination or willingness to defect, before anybody else knew it. This occurred later on. But the way we had the information was such that I did not wish to reveal it. It would be damaging to the government's case against the six top Communists if it became evident that we had information from inside the jails or other places.

In the case of Barbara Hartle, I don't know if she even knew this. I went into the FBI headquarters in Spokane and told the resident agent that I was of the opinion that Barbara Hartle was about ready to defect, or to "spill her guts." Of course the agent said, "Well, we can't touch it because it's in federal court and we can't have anything to do with it." But he did go to Seattle. He passed this information on to the district head of the FBI and this man, at least once a week, had lunch with a man or two from the papers, the *Seattle P-I*, in this case. So this information was relayed this way, I suppose. I don't know this, I just have to put it together the way I think it happened.

So a reporter from the *P-I* interviewed Barbara Hartle, and she talked. I knew that was in the offing in advance. So I'd say probably she would have left the party before long anyway, but this way it was very opportune. She testified for congressional committees, she was the only one of the "Seattle Six" who spent a day in jail, and was probably one of the best and most competent witnesses the congressional committee ever had. She, incidentally, was a Phi Beta Kappa, she was no second stringer. She was under surveillance in Spokane by me long before she had any idea who I was. She testified, I think in one of our trials, that she had such a horrible picture painted to her of Canwell that when she finally met me, she couldn't believe it was the same person. She was a very effective witness, I don't think anybody has ever been able to challenge any of her testimony or identifying of Communist Party members, and she nailed them by the hundreds. Well, that was a case.

Then there were others I could probably go into. But in general we worked hard at trying to get people to leave the party. In fact, that's one reason why I went so easy on Melvin Rader. I felt he was a weak person and basically a good person. I felt that he was a good prospect to defect. So I pulled my punches on him a little, I even had some of my committee members mad because we didn't dump the load on him.

The party controlled the ACLU, which was in effect, the Communist apparatus on that level, the disinformation level. They took over and he became very reluctant and even wrote a book that got rave notices, unjustifiably. Anyway, Rader was one I targeted for defection and it didn't work.

Mr. Frederick: So what you're saying there with regard to Barbara Hartle, that potentially it was your sources that gave you a clue with regard to her, or were you supplied

by, say, Immigration?

Mr. Canwell: I would not say what the sources were. I think it would have been a surprise to the United States marshal who was in charge of taking her back and forth from jail to the congressional hearing room, for instance. It would have been a great surprise to him how I knew what I knew. I'm not about to tell at this point.

But I did know. I did know that she was wavering, I knew that Bill Pennock had threatened to defect and blow the whistle. And the next thing you know, Bill Pennock ended up dead. A "suicide."

Mr. Frederick: What year was that?

Mr. Canwell: Golly, I'd have to go back. If you determined what year the six top Communists were tried in Seattle, it would have been that year. But I'd have to go back to the records.

I made the mistake one time of giving a date that I shouldn't, and that was in an interview in the middle of the night when I was all tired out. I was asked when Sally Goldmark left the party. I had the date well in mind that she had given, but for some reason or another I misstated the date, and, boy, did I hear about it from then on. Well, I don't give these dates without going back and checking.

I'm saying something here that has never been said before publicly, but I don't think that Bill Pennock was a suicide. I think it was an expedited demise. Communists are very skilled in executions and they use two methods above all others. One of them is the sleeping pill. The other is defenestration, boost them out of a window and lock the door behind you. More Communists and hoodlums met their end that way than one could ever imagine.

Mr. Frederick: In the Pennock case—was that drug overdose then?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, it was, I believe the autopsy was that he had ingested an overdose of barbiturates. But an interesting thing is that the Communists had a pharmacist not far removed from where this took place. I don't know exactly what the procedure was, but I never bought the bill of goods that Pennock committed suicide. Except that in drug overdoses and sleeping tablets, a person can be induced to commit suicide, because after two or three tablets you lose your memory, so you go right on ingesting the pills. So many times a suicide is not a suicide, it's an accidental one. But it's a very convenient thing for those who wish to utilize it as a means of extermination. No charge was ever made that it was other than suicide, and I'll probably be the first one to state that it was otherwise.

Mr. Frederick: If I'm not mistaken, the Barbara Hartle

case would be in the early mid-fifties?

Mr. Canwell: Seemed to me that it was '55, I would guess. I can fortify that. I have a letter from the chairman of the committee, thanking me for my cooperation. I can pinpoint the date. It's one of the reasons that I know that Ed Guthman is a liar. Because I had arranged with the United States marshal and the deputy handling Barbara, that nobody have access to her in transit between there and the hearing room, and particularly Ed Guthman!

So for him to get on the stand during the Okanogan libel trial and testify that in one of these happenings or meetings with her while she was being conducted to the hearing, she told him that Rader had never been a Communist, that was a damn lie!

Mr. Frederick: What role did expert fees play, and if they did, how were those fees arranged?

Mr. Canwell: The expert witnesses, as I recall, were paid \$25 a day and their transportation and hotel expenses. In most cases we brought them right in and right out. I think it was Budenz, because of the extreme expense that he was put to, that I gave some money out of my own funds; it wasn't any great amount. But it was very difficult for him to take the time off from school and come out here. Ordinarily I suppose in a federal case they might pay an expert witness whatever the judge decided on, \$100 a day or whatever. We set upon a \$25 fee for expert witnesses, and then only the ones we brought in from outside.

[End Tape 35, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I heard reports, with regard to expert fees, that Howard Costigan was paid something like \$2,000. Thinking in terms of \$25 a day, that would be quite a few days. I know that some of these people potentially may have been working for the committee but—

Mr. Canwell: Such monies paid Howard Costigan I'd have to go back and see what the record is.* But we did employ him to do work. Since he knew everybody in the party he was able to direct us to a great many people, and was helpful in that respect. I believe that we did employ him to do that; I don't know that he was paid anything, but probably not for testifying. He was just subpoenaed one day, and by that time I was pretty teed off with him anyway. If there was such a fee paid to him, it had to do with continuing work. I don't even remember at this time which one of the agents had him under his direction.

* Mr. Canwell later determined that the total of all witness fees paid was \$1,510.

In general he was never a very satisfactory person. I think he lacked basic integrity. We obtained more dependable or factual information from Isabel, his wife, whom I felt at the time was a very fine person. It's unfortunate to be linked up with such a scoundrel.

If we employed him, and it seems to me now that you've mentioned it, that we did, but it wasn't with any condition of testifying at all.

I cracked down on him during his testimony because we knew he was pulling his punches. Some time later, he went off to California and worked for some labor right-winger down there. I don't know what became of him.

He is the only one who testified that I can think of that we might have employed for awhile. There was a man, a policeman, who was in charge of the Red Squad in the police station who we employed as a guard there for awhile, when we heard from sources inside the party that they were offering a reward for anybody who could crack our records and files.

Mr. Frederick: Did you have any attempted break-ins?

Mr. Canwell: There was only this information that we had, that at a Communist meeting a reward had been offered for, I believe, a thousand dollars for anybody who could get into our records. I felt that was kind of a frivolous thing, I never paid too much attention to it. But we did hire this Charley Neuser, Detective Neuser, to do watch work there for awhile during this time.

Mr. Frederick: He would be middle-aged at that point in time?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, he was still on the force. He wasn't old enough to retire. Had been on it for quite awhile. I'd be hard put to give an estimate of his age. But I would suspect that he was well into his forties.

Mr. Frederick: With regard to expert witnesses out of state. Did you get some leads from Alfred Kohlberg on that issue?

Mr. Canwell: Not as much of leads as I did help in finding the ones I was looking for. Kohlberg was very cooperative and had a very good standing with all of these people, but I don't recall any particular influence in this case. He was very helpful in the Hiss investigation, because he knew, I think, relatives of Whittaker Chambers.

I believe he directed me, or made contact for me, with some people who were knowledgeable in the Hiss situation. I don't recall at that time using any of them as witnesses. The possible exception might be Howard Rushmore. But I don't believe I got the information from Kohlberg on Rushmore. I think that came through J.B. Matthews. I think at that time he was on the staff of the

House Committee on Un-American Activities of the U.S. Congress, somewhere along in there.

But we obtained Howard Rushmore and J.B. Matthews. Both having substantial information in the Hiss case and the other high-level spy apparatuses. They were, of course, very willing, very cooperative witnesses. Very knowledgeable people and had thoroughly made a study of all of the available information in this espionage field. I think that probably Matthews and Rushmore knew as much about the Ware cell and the Perlo-Kramer group and other derivatives of it as anybody did at that time.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, could you elaborate on those two issues?

Mr. Canwell: Harold Ware, who was considered the top of these spy apparatuses, like Karl Marx Reeve was the son of Mother Ella Reeve Bloor. He had risen very high in the party and had the confidence of the people on the upper level. Now Ware, as I recollect, selected Perlo and Kramer as his two top agents. The Perlo-Kramer group was the group in which Sally Goldmark operated. She was in the Perlo-Kramer cell.

In that group there were such people as the parents of this folk singer, Pete Seeger; his mother and father were in the Perlo-Kramer group. Anyway, in exploring within that area I was always of a questioning nature, I want to know who runs what, and who's behind them and where the brains may be. In some of these groups it was very obvious that the brains were elsewhere.

But in the Perlo-Kramer group they were very close to the national committee of the Communist Party, very close to the Workers School in New York, very much a part of the total apparatus in Washington D.C. When a Communist bookstore was established in Washington D.C., Mrs. Louis Brandeis, an aunt of John Goldmark, established it.

So you keep putting all these pieces together, eventually you have a pattern, the jigsaw puzzle comes together. The Perlo-Kramer group operated, among other things, out in Accokeek, Maryland. Harry Hopkins had arranged with the owner of a house out of Accokeek to rent it. I believe the renters were Perlo and Kramer. Then they set up this spy apparatus there. Three lesbian Communists ran the affair. Anyway it's a long story in itself.

But the Perlo-Kramer apparatus was involved in all these things on that level. Alger Hiss' activities were an offshoot of the Perlo-Kramer setup and Ware operation.

Mr. Frederick: Talking about spying. What form did that take?

Mr. Canwell: In general the most important part of it had to do with, in the Hiss angle, the theft of documents and information. In the loads of information, suitcases,

and boxes full of records on the atom bomb that were transhipped to Russia through Great Falls, Montana, some of them would just have "HH" printed on them, which was Harry Hopkins' initials. Cleared by him. But they were operating on a very top level in the theft of documents and information. The total plans from A to Z. The atomic bomb was stolen and transmitted to Soviet Russia. And these people were doing things on that level and nobody could get at them. Take in the case of Harry Hopkins, he lived at the White House.

Alger Hiss was protected in the Department of State. They were babying him and carrying him along hoping eventually to make him Secretary of State. He helped set up the United Nations at San Francisco. He was coming along, he was being developed and I think they hoped eventually to make him secretary of state and even president of the United States. So their espionage ran deep.

Mr. Frederick: You've mentioned Harry Hopkins. What was his background? Why would you mention him?

Mr. Canwell: Harry Hopkins became a cabinet member. What was he, secretary of commerce? But he had the ear and the confidence of FDR. A very skillful operator, and one who knew precisely what he was doing. He weaseled his way into the confidence of the president and then was actually the voice of the president in many international meetings with diplomats and others. He had the complete confidence of the president, and I think at all times was a high-level spy.

You can't do much better than get yourself a pad in the White House. And two of these phonies did it. These two that I know of, Harry Hopkins for awhile and Felix Frankfurter, at one time.

Mr. Frederick: Do you recall during the first hearing and/or in preparation for the first hearings, of receiving assistance from Glen Hughes?

Mr. Canwell: At the University Theater? I don't recall that we received any assistance from him. Usually if someone like Hughes volunteered to testify and we decided to use him we would use him in a public hearing. We might take some brief testimony to get the gist of what he had to say. I don't recall any such thing right now of Hughes.

There were two or three letters from people offering to testify for the Jameses. I did not utilize them because we just didn't have the scheduling time, and in at least one or two of the cases I thought it was entirely frivolous.

One of those witnesses, I believe her name was Ann Brown. She said she had pertinent information on the Jameses of the Repertory Theatre, and it would of course be helpful to them. Prior to this time in the first hearings,

every time I'd go out to the coffee bar or anything else I'd see this "babe" out there blinking her eyes at me.

One of the investigators said, "What do you have going there? I'm curious."

I said, "I don't know anything about her except I look in the mirror every day and I know I don't have that sort of appeal."

So I sent one of my investigators and an Immigration man, just to follow her and see where she went. Well, she was living with the Jameses! That was interesting. The information we had was she was sharing the bed with Burton James, with Florence there in the house, who didn't seem to mind. It was kind of a revealing thing. This girl I didn't think had good sense, not too bright but kind of pretty. Typical of what they would develop at the Repertory Theatre for such purposes.

There were a few offers to testify and most of them came during the course of the hearings. Our schedule was just too tight to accommodate people like that. We'd take testimony from them, if they wished to give it in executive session, and then hopefully schedule another hearing. But we were unable to do that in the university hearings. That took all of our time, all of our money, and so we did what we could. But we didn't purposefully avoid helpful or pertinent testimony.

Mr. Frederick: Were there other examples of potential activity associated with the attempted penetration of your committee and/or penetrating you?

Mr. Canwell: One of the principle activists in this direction was Ed Guthman. I'm sure he had been assigned to that job and he always wanted to get into our files. He wanted to know what we had on professor so-and-so. Of course we didn't let him access them and didn't tell him anything that we weren't telling other reporters.

I described earlier how Guthman planted a story on us about a student jumping out of a window, then wrote a column saying the committee was investigating the incident. That was one of the cases where Guthman was trying to take us into his camp. I just didn't fall for that sort of thing.

Another case was the character alleging to be a retired intelligence agent, a colonel of Army Intelligence, who said he had been called back into service and assigned to our committee for our hearings. This is the intelligence officer who had been bucked off a horse and hurt his head and became completely irresponsible. He knew the language, he could talk the talk of these people but he did fanciful things. Now this guy was a nut. Whether somebody sent him or not I don't know.

When looking into his past, we found that he had been responsible for blowing up the Bridges case in San Francisco! The two government agents had a tap on Harry Bridges' room and had drilled through the wall and in-

stalled a microphone by his telephone. This fake colonel went down there and ingratiated himself to these agents, and told them if they wanted to go out and get something to eat he'd man the station. While he was there he got into their supply of liquor, and that was one of his problems. Anyway the next thing we had a newspaper picture of Harry Bridges pointing to this bug by the telephone, and cameramen taking pictures and everything else. Well, this was the famous colonel who had been assigned to my committee. So there were humorous things like that that happened from time to time.

There was an incident during the course of our hearing when someone attempted to kidnap our children from the country school where they attended. I had given strict instructions that nobody was to pick our children up except a member of the family. So the teacher was quite an astute person and she wouldn't let this person have the children. He was driving a red pickup and he tore off and away. So whether that had substance to it or not, I don't know. But in any case I called some of the heads of the Communist Party in Seattle and told them that the legal phase of my operations would be all over if anything happened to my children. I'd take care of the situation personally.

There were other things. Seems to me that somebody did try to break into our headquarters. More often than not it was some amateur trying to penetrate to serve papers or something like that.

[End of Tape 36, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: During that point in time when you were in the Legislature and you were preparing for those hearings, and in the midst of conducting those hearings, to your knowledge were you ever wiretapped or bugged?

Mr. Canwell: I always assumed that I was as I still do, that way you can't lose much. There were attempts down in Olympia. And this, I guess, was during the course of our hearings. There was an attempt to drop a microphone on a meeting that Fred Neindorff and I were having at the Olympia Hotel. Somebody from the room up above dropped this microphone down. I was astute enough that I'd have played games with them, but Fred Neindorff was an emotional type and he jumped up and grabbed the thing and he pulled it and looked up. Of course we knew who had the room up above us. It was Art Garten and somebody else; governor's stooges. Anyway it was a very crude attempt to record what we were doing.

The same time we were down there trying to see what could be done to get us the most favorable decision by the Supreme Court on the constitutionality of our committee, which was being challenged. Fred had invited a Supreme Court justice down for an interview and he took him out in a car by the park to interview him. He talked about his

hookup with the slot machine, pinball people, and all the stuff the mob had on him. It was making him jump through hoops. Fred had this justice all unraveled, he was just falling apart. Then Fred said, "But my paper, before we do this job on the slot machines or pinballs, we were very interested at the moment on the outcome of the Canwell Committee determination." That probably was the use of a little muscle to influence a Supreme Court justice. But anyway he went back to court fully in favor of a friendly determination for us, which we got, and that we were entitled to. Otherwise the left probably would have controlled this justice.

Mr. Frederick: And his name?

Mr. Canwell: James—I'll have to look in my notes again. It's one of those names I write down because I have trouble remembering it.

Mr. Frederick: What proportion of your funding did you devote to the first hearings?

Mr. Canwell: I would guess probably about half of it, because the first hearing involved six months or so of investigations. During that time we equipped an office, employed a staff. So I would say it was a little disproportionate there. The hearing itself you could narrow down to the fees and travel expenses paid the witnesses, and our rental which was already covered in our general occupancy of the Armory quarters.

Mr. Frederick: Previous to that first hearing as we have talked about, you were appointed to conduct an investigation of the Capitol Club, which led into the chief of the State Patrol's office as one of the members of that organization. How did you address that, and your involvement in that investigation, with regard to later on during the hearings, in relying upon members of that same institution, the State Patrol? How did you satisfy your own mind with regard to whom you let in and all those types of things?

Mr. Canwell: My feeling was that the chief of the State Patrol, who was bagman for the Capitol Club, was not very popular. Most of the state patrolmen were career men, and I think good men. I knew one or two of them personally. I found no conflict there. The State Patrol headquarters was in the state Armory so it was a very convenient thing. They were right next door to our committee. Fortunately they had a habit of hiring tremendous men, big men. I suggested, I think we agreed on it, that some of the biggest ones should be stationed around the perimeter of the room where we knew that certain obstreperous people were going to jump up and cause a commotion. So we had men who could take them by the

collar and the ass of the pants and waltz them out to the door, and throw them out. So it didn't take much of that to discourage that kind of activity. That happened to Bill Pennock and a fellow by the name of Long. Eventually to John Caughlan.

I had very good relations with the State Patrol and I had prior to that. When I was chief of the identification bureau at the Spokane County Sheriff's Department, I was one of the few available photographers around. The State Patrol, when they'd have a bad smash-up or something, quite likely they'd call me if I could come out and take pictures, and I did. I became friends with a lot of them during that time.

Mr. Frederick: When you say they had their headquarters located there, you mean literally—

Mr. Canwell: That's the King County headquarters. I don't know how they apportion their district. The state headquarters was at Olympia, of course.

Mr. Frederick: Where were they headquartered in Olympia, in 1948?

Mr. Canwell: It seems to me it was in a building across from the park. I don't remember, I was in there I think once, but I've forgotten.

At the time of the Capitol Club investigation, I had very little to do with the State Patrol. I did subpoena the chief and questioned him. His attorney was a shyster from Spokane, Lyle Keith, who I knew. But he didn't have very good judgment. I had to threaten to have him removed from the hearing.

The chief of the State Patrol and his attorney were present at the hearing. They were the only state patrolmen we saw anything of there.

Mr. Frederick: So you were confident in their loyalty to the endeavors.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I had no question at all about it. The average state patrolman, if you were to question him politically, he might be Democrat, probably more likely than not. But he would be anti-Communist. Many of them were Legion members or people who had some knowledge on that level. I remember one by the name of Welch was from Spokane; one that I had known over here during my connection with the sheriff's office. He was one of the lesser ones in size, but a good guy. I had no reason to question the loyalty or the activities of these people at all. They were just very fine police officers, they had a good organization. It's unfortunate probably that the control of it was political so that the governor would be able to appoint a chief of his choice. But the majority of them came up through the ranks, worked hard, were good officers. I

felt that they were very commendable. They were among the first to keep intelligent police records in this state.

They enjoyed what was happening out there too. Most people did. You know, the people who made all the complaints were subsequent complainers. At that time the majority of the people thought an investigation was well due. It was time that something was done, and it looked like it was being done right. There were no complaints. The labor leaders, the legitimate ones, the school leaders, the president of the university and various other ones were high in their praise of what we were doing and how we did it.

Nobody with good sense had any objections to our maintaining order in our hearings. It was high time that these phoneyes learned that such a function was not a playpen for the commies. I told them very frankly to begin with that there just would not be any of that. That anybody who created a disturbance or was not responsive as a witness would be removed. There wouldn't be any question about it. And that was well understood. The ACLU knew what they were running into. They didn't know just how firm it would be.

Mr. Frederick: Were there any other agencies housed in that state Armory at that time?

Mr. Canwell: The National Guard had to be. It was headquarters for the state National Guard. Other than that I don't know, I don't remember any. It was the State Patrol and then our committee, and the headquarters for the National Guard.

Mr. Frederick: Now you've mentioned that there was another legislative committee that was in session, either before, or during, or shortly after your first hearing?

Mr. Canwell: It was during the course of ours. I think that they held hearings immediately after our first hearing. And the chairman was Tom Bienz, who was also on our committee. He was a senator at that time. As chairman of this committee, he employed Tom Lally of Spokane, a rabid Democrat lawyer, to be their legal force, which I thought was very unwise to begin with, but Tom wanted to show me how a committee should be operated. So they did that. They had Tom Lally and they paid him some handsome fee for it. Al Rosellini just took the thing away from him, as he could. He was a very adept parliamentarian, very skilled and a very able man. I never questioned his talents. I sometimes questioned his integrity a little bit, but not his ability or his talents. He knew what he was doing and did it well.

Mr. Frederick: Bienz was in the Senate at the time?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, state Senate.

Mr. Frederick: What was the issue in the hearings?

Mr. Canwell: It was the Liquor Control Board, it seemed to me, in the amending; the intention to strengthen or amend the laws. I don't know what all they were up to. But it was a legislative committee. I just remember that half of them felt kind of sorry for Tom because he just naturally made a fool of himself. But he did learn and was much, much quieter after that.

Mr. Frederick: What was your opinion of Senator Rosellini? You knew him later on as Governor Rosellini.

Mr. Canwell: My opinion of Al Rosellini was that he was a very able man who did his homework. He learned. He did his job and did it well. But he was not a person who—well, I wasn't too sure what was going on there. It wasn't my job to look into it and I didn't.

But one of the prime crime families in this state obtained a contract to truck all the liquor around the state to the liquor stores. The potential for corruption was all there, but I would not say that it existed, I don't know. The de Julio family, I don't know whether they are still around now or not. But they were such Mafia as we knew about in those days and there are branches of the family that are strictly clean, all right, so it would be unwise to tag the de Julio family as a whole. Anyway, one faction of it did obtain the liquor hauling licenses. And I don't know how heavy the breakage was.

That's what that committee was about. I didn't pay too much attention to it. I was working about twenty-five hours a day as it was, and I had boxes and stacks of wire recordings and tapes, so if I had a few spare minutes I could listen to them, and I did. When I was through with them I dumped them in Elliott Bay. But I didn't have much time for dalliance. I remember people used to call Marsinah and say, "You think your husband is over there busy on this legislative committee, but you should see the blonde I saw him with," or something like that. Marsinah would say, "Well, that's my boy." She was not easy to take into camp on that.

Mr. Frederick: Did you have an opportunity to access campaign—that is the hearing—funding outside of the state Legislature? Was there money donated to defray costs and whatnot?

Mr. Canwell: There was money loaned to the committee at its close on the understanding that we would get the Legislature to make a supplemental appropriation and take care of it, which they did. I think there was \$10,000 or \$11,000. That was the only thing in the way of an appropriation or committee funding, as such. To pinpoint what my family or friends put into keeping me alive while I was doing this, my expenses were far over and above

what the state auditor would approve. So we personally ran on a deficit most of the time.

Mr. Frederick: I hear you.

With regard to a corporation or institution, or individual, or individuals who were sympathetic with your campaign and stepped forward to offer resources—monetary resources for the furtherance of that committee, is there a name associated with the individual or institutions?

Mr. Canwell: What are you trying to get at? If you've heard that some corporations put up some money for me—now that's probably essentially what you heard—

Mr. Frederick: What I'm asking is if there was.

Mr. Canwell: There was a friend of mine, a local industrialist, who made some funds available to me and without those funds I could not have operated as effectively and as efficiently as I did. No demands, no requirements, no understandings or agreements were entered into other than that I needed more funds than I had, and would appreciate any that I could get. But it was strictly on that basis, and the party who provided the funds was a person of such integrity that he would never have expected anything for his help.

Mr. Frederick: That was to facilitate your work?

Mr. Canwell: My work. Strictly to help me do the job that I had to do. And there were many things that I did that I could not have done on my own. I had to take trips to New York and Washington D.C. that I could not justifiably bill the committee for. There just weren't funds to do it.

Some of it was speculative. I mentioned that I advanced some money to Louis Budenz, never with any question or suggestion of what he was to testify to. I knew what he was capable of testifying to, and had done so in the past, and I left it at that.

Mr. Frederick: The assistance that you received from your benefactor was directed toward you in the furtherance of your work. Or was that associated with money donated that would be made up in a supplemental?

Mr. Canwell: No, it had nothing to do with the supplemental appropriation. It was strictly something to help me do what seemed to be an impossible task. As I look back on it I still say that we performed the impossible.

Mr. Frederick: And that individual?

Mr. Canwell: Well, he's dead. I could name him. He was Frederick Jewett. There were no strings attached

whatever. We had lunch at the City Club and I told him what my problems were, and he asked if a certain amount of help would be beneficial. And other than getting the help, that was the last I heard from him. I would see him occasionally, he was a long-time friend of mine. In fact, he built the big Episcopal Cathedral St. John's there on top of the hill. The reporters used to call it Saint Jewett's Cathedral.

Mr. Frederick: And you had an association with him in terms of selling that property and then moving out into the valley?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, we did. We lived in the house next door to what is now the cathedral, and he was very desirous of obtaining that property and enlarging the cathedral to that extent, with the result that we sold it to him at actually a sacrifice price. Probably could have gotten two or three times what we did. I never was a very good businessman.

But we used part of the funds from the sale of our house to acquire the river property we have. I was kind of remiss because he told me that if I needed money, let him know. I just never was very good at that sort of thing. I didn't do it.

Mr. Frederick: What were his business interests?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, lumber largely, Potlatch. He had an enormous amount of money to invest in charity and that sort of thing. He was always a very quiet supporter of a lot of good things. He was just that kind of a man.

Mr. Frederick: So he was from here then?

Mr. Canwell: He was from Spokane, yes. But the people who helped in the committee's loan were such men as—I was trying to think of the brewer, a prominent Democrat. There were three or four of them who were Democrats. Anyway they okayed the loan that the committee obtained for \$10,000 or \$11,000, on the promise that we would give it back if we could. And we did get it back for them. So nobody lost a cent.

Mr. Frederick: That would be Seattle and region?

Mr. Canwell: That was all Seattle.

Mr. Frederick: Rainier Brewing Company?

Mr. Canwell: I don't know. I don't recall that it was Rainier. What's this fellow's name? Seems to me that his first name was Sol. I just don't remember.

I remember attending a meeting. There were ten or twelve of them. They came to this meeting and we ex-

plained what my problem was. We had run out of money, we still had to close up our operation and we'd asked the Legislature for it if we could get it. If not, then they just were out.

Mr. Frederick: This would be after your second hearing?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, that was toward the windup of our committee operation. The next Legislature must have taken up in January, and they made a supplemental appropriation to take care of this fund.

[End of Tape 36, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Today we will be continuing the exploration of the first hearing. From yesterday I have a question with regard to follow-up. You mentioned that before the first hearing you had a meeting with Seattle area American Civil Liberties Union members, or officials. Could you please elaborate on that, and name membership with regard to whom you met with?

Mr. Canwell: My recollection of this instance goes back to our establishing an office in the Armory in Seattle. There probably were news releases at that time stating that we had set up business in the state Armory. And early in that situation I was contacted by people who identified themselves as the American Civil Liberties Union. And wanted a meeting with me.

So I agreed to that and it seems to me that they came out to the Armory. The ones I remember for certain were John Caughlan, the Communist attorney, and Ed Henry, who was not identified as a Communist, but pretty far out on the liberal side. There were several others that I do not recall. I'm not sure, but I rather think that Stimson Bullitt was there. Anyway, there were five or six of these people, and they came out with an agenda for me, to outline what our procedure should be, and what it had to be, and what the calling of witnesses would involve. It would require that any of these people who wished would be represented by counsel, and that cross-examination would be permitted, and the usual claptrap that these people would come up with before legislative committees.

I listened to them, and then I told them precisely what our procedure would be. That we would operate within the framework of the laws of the State of Washington and the federal Constitution. That the rules of the Legislature would be part of our procedure and that whether or not witnesses were permitted counsel would be optional with the committee; it was not mandatory under any of the legislative regulations in our state or others, or the federal Congress. And while I was amenable to their having counsel of their choice if they felt it was necessary, it would only be done under stipulation that they could

make no arguments before the committee; that such subjects as the constitutionality of the committee were determined in the courts and couldn't be determined by debate or harangues from attorneys, and we wouldn't have the time or the patience to entertain that sort of thing. If they wished to represent counsel there they would have to do so under the stipulations that I was laying down. They could be present; they could advise their client of whether or not to answer, and that was it. There would be no arguments. There would be no speeches before the committee. On those conditions I was willing to let them represent their clients.

Of course they resisted that, said it couldn't be done. I says, "Well, those are the facts of life. Either you subscribe to our procedure as I've outlined it, or your counsel just will not be there." So they reluctantly agreed to those terms. That was the end of that session. Of course, when the time came for the hearings, these reluctant witnesses with their counsel attempted as usual to take over the hearings, disrupt, delay, and do all of the things that they had been trained to do and always do. So we had provided to take care of that. I reminded them what the stipulation was, that they were only there to advise their clients and not the committee, and that they could proceed under that understanding. Otherwise, any attempts to deviate from that, they would be removed from the hearing.

Of course they immediately started to rabble-rouse and create confusion. That's where I made use of the State Patrol. We had a good-sized patrolman usher these people out. But that's the way we operated and proceeded, and it was the proper way. No decisions or determinations as to the constitutionality of a legislative committee can be made by arguments before the committee. That's not the proper place, and these people, of course, knew that.

That was my initial contact with the ACLU. I believe that Stimson Bullitt was there; kind of a mouse of a character. The vocal one was John Caughlan, and Ed Henry more or less entered into the discussions.

It became very obvious, right from the beginning, that our obstruction from the Communist Party was to come by way of the ACLU, and did so. The ACLU attorneys were creating a disruption inside, and a demonstration outside. ACLU state leaders such as Bill Pennock and Jerry O'Connell were leading the demonstrations—a noisy demonstration—outside. The Communists were outside and they were inside. We, of course, had to proceed, and when the noise outside became excessive, I had the police arrest Pennock and O'Connell and take them to jail. We threw out the obstreperous attorneys at the hearing and proceeded with taking testimony.

They always yap a lot about wanting their day in court. They don't wish to be heard when they're under oath, and that's the only kind of testimony that I cared to hear about or to entertain at all.

Mr. Frederick: Again, in reference to the first hearing: The individual of Howard Smith continues to puzzle me. I really don't understand why he was involved those years. Not necessarily in the hearing, but in the Communist Party orbit, within the late thirties and the 1940s. Albert, I get the impression that Howard was an informer.

Mr. Canwell: Howard Smith? He was an opportunist. Never an informed or doctrinaire Communist. He was just invited and pampered. Invited to their parties and pampered by these people because he was a good source of money. They didn't care where the money came from. That was more or less the case. Smith was not an informant of ours, we just found out about him, and eventually I believe one of our agents called on him and found that he was willing to testify about his activities. So I made the decision to subpoena him because I felt it would be an enormous source of annoyance to these people who tried to maintain a dignified facade and importance before the community, that they would use such a character over and over; that he was acceptable in their social gatherings. I thought it would be poetic justice to let him come and testify. I was having more fun out of that than anything else, because they called him in the Communist Party "Pig" Smith. And this was a good identification.

But he was never our boy, he was theirs and he double-crossed them.

Mr. Frederick: One of the reasons why I pursued that issue is that during the hearings you stated that you had detailed notes of something like 600 or 700 Communist meetings. He was prepared to address that in terms of participants, attendees.

It just doesn't ring true that he did not have ulterior motives for running with that group. First, why would he say that? Second, if that was the case, why would he do something like that? Take all that time—

Mr. Canwell: Where would a man like that ever gain access to such a group? The Communist Party was the vehicle and he had no scruples, he was a thoroughly no-good individual. I have no respect for him, and felt that these people should be ashamed of themselves for accepting his money and entertaining him in their academic groups and others. Theater people, the Jameses and others, are party to this. They didn't care as long as he came up with money and paid dues in the party and whatever the procedure might be. We had very little regard for him but we felt it was the proper way of bringing into sharp focus how these people actually operated and what they were.

So that's why Smith was there. He never was one of ours so we didn't give a hoot about him. We didn't trust him. He wanted to testify, he wanted to go on and on. And if we had permitted him to do all the talking he

wanted to do, he'd still be on the stand. He was just that sort of a creature. We didn't use that type of person to develop much evidence or information. If we didn't have it to begin with we wouldn't rely on his testimony alone. It wasn't worth it. But I felt that people like the Jameses and the professors at the University of Washington, some of them with doctorates and tenure, catering to this sort of a creature—well, it told a story in itself. Why did they even know him?

Mr. Frederick: Could he have been an informer for say, the Seattle Red Squad or the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization?

Mr. Canwell: No. In discussing Smith in every instance that I remember he was as repulsive to people in those agencies as he was to us. The Immigration Bureau had a great many contacts and informants. Of course they probably queried and questioned and observed him. But he came with no recommendations from anybody. He's just somebody that we felt ought to be put on display, and we did so.

Mr. Frederick: With the adjournment of the first hearing in February of 1948, had you had an ongoing strategy with regard to preparing the University of Washington hearings, or did you commence putting that campaign together those early months of 1948?

Mr. Canwell: I would say that the decision and the determination to conduct a hearing regarding the University of Washington started with Day One. It was one of our prime concerns, it was the concern of every responsible person. So we approached it carefully and thoroughly, did a thorough job, a very fair one. I had to make contact with the president of the University of Washington, Dr. Allen, and other people on that level. I had to convince them that we were not going to do what the Communists and their friends said we were about to do. We were not going to degrade or defame the university, we were going to expose a cancer in that body and do what we could to excise it. Report to the Legislature for action. That we were always aware of how sensitive the situation was.

These leftists clothed themselves in a great deal of respectability. To penetrate that false front you have to know what you're doing or you end up looking like a Philistine and accomplish nothing.

So we approached the problem of the University of Washington very early, and it continued all the time. I had numerous visits with Dr. Allen and others out at the university, and was available to them at all times. I was very frank and open with them as to what we were finding and the records of people like Gundlach and Rader, and Phillips and others like that. There were no secrets, the whole community, the whole state knew what they were

doing because they were in the papers all the time.

What they were doing, of course, was telling the president of the university that they were just liberals and objective liberals. That they were not up to any skullduggery. And Allen was inclined to accept their statements. It was only when it was proved to him with overwhelming evidence that they were lying to him, that he began to take a different stance. Decided that he'd better, and he should, cooperate with the legislative committee. But first he determined that it was a responsible committee, and that I was the person who would listen to reason and facts.

So our relationship went all along through this time while we were preparing the hearing on the Old Age Pension Union and other things. We were constantly working on the University of Washington.

I submit for the record now, and at any other time, that we did an unusually fair job in the handling of these professors and working with the administration and the president of the university, their regents.

We leaned over backwards, or I did—I came under criticism from my committee; at times, they felt I was pulling my punches. But I was trying to be exceedingly fair, and I was. I could not think of a time that I did not treat these people with more respect than they were entitled to. There was none of the rough-and-tumble stuff that they reported to the press and in their speeches, that was going on in their contact with our investigators. It was not anything like they portrayed. Of course you soon learn that they're in the business of lying. A lie and the truth, neither one has more value than the other, whichever they can utilize. So they would lie about the contact and treatment, by my agents, of their professors. And that's why I sent such men as Aaron Coleman, trained in the Department of State, a diplomat's diplomat; Ernest Stith, a very competent, responsible person. They are the men who went out and contacted these professors, and then were confronted in the public speeches and the press by lies about how they had treated them.

So you don't go very far in this business until you learn what their tools are, and how they operate.

Mr. Frederick: Are you talking about how they treated suspected Communists, or how they presented themselves across-the-board with regard to contacting the professors up there?

Mr. Canwell: With the professors that they desired to hold an interview. They, of course, were suspects—many of them were. But they weren't approached from that standpoint. They were approached by an agent who would say, "This is approximately the information that we have, we'd like to have you go down and talk to the chairman of our committee." And every one of those interviewed was treated with that courtesy and that option.

Of course they reacted violently, the ones who were

suspect. They were more than suspect; we knew what most of them were. You don't cover dozens and literally hundreds of Communist front meetings without knowing what the people are who are involved, and that they're under direction and compulsion to do what they do.

So we weren't operating in the dark. We approached these key figures courteously and quietly. There was no publicity accompanying it. No pressmen there or cameramen. Just an able agent contacting a professor in his office saying, "This is what we're about to do, and we want to talk to you." That was the procedure all the way.

We didn't need to frame anybody or look for them. There were so many we had to decide which ones to zero in on.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, what you're saying is that you did not contact any other professors, other than those who were suspect?

Mr. Canwell: No, we contacted quite a number of professors there. Some who were well-known liberals but men and women of integrity. And we wanted their input, we wanted to know what the general procedure had been out there, and how much effort had been made to bring them into the Communist orbit and activity. No, there were many contacted out there who were not subpoenaed.

The decent ones were quite cooperative. They were reluctant because they were fearful. They didn't want to lose their jobs. They didn't want to be smeared. And they had heard all this Communist propaganda about what we would be doing to them and to the university. So naturally they were fearful, some of them.

Some of them were very happy that at long-last the thing was coming out in the open. But it was an ongoing thing that took months to accomplish.

Mr. Frederick: As I understand the situation, there were several professors out there of long standing, who actually just threw those investigators out of their offices.

Mr. Canwell: It never occurred. They may have reacted violently and said, "I won't talk," that sort of thing, but it would take quite a bit of doing to throw Ernie Stith or Aaron Coleman out of any office. They weren't the type you'd throw out.

Mr. Frederick: It was a figure of speech.

Mr. Canwell: Yes.

Mr. Frederick: In no uncertain terms asked them, or told them to leave their offices and they did.

Mr. Canwell: They may have. If they reacted violently, of course, that was part of the reports that crossed my

desk. I think there were one or two like that. Herbert Phillips, I think was one. He always thought of himself as a tough guy. Of course either one of these men would have clobbered him; it would have been one blow. But there were people like that.

And there was a psychopath or two; Ted Astley, and there was one professor who was on parole from the insane asylum, he was a full professor; he would react violently. But a responsible, or reasonably responsible person would not react that way to a legislative committee that actually controls the university—the Legislature does. And I think Dr. Allen would have fired anyone who was too much that way.

Dunlap was another one who thought he was a tough guy. Actually most of them were a bunch of jerks. I may have covered this before, but in the approach to this problem and talking it over with my friend Stan Leith at Boeing, I said that I felt a little uncertain, being a non-scholar such as I was, going out to beard these full professors. He said, "Let's go out and eyeball 'em," and we did. Then I realized that they were a bunch of weaklings. They were just doing a job for somebody else, they were following orders. It was Stan who said, "Did you ever see such a bunch of sheep-killing dogs?" And then he commented on what a shame it was that such people were on our payroll. Well, I couldn't do anything about that.

[End of Tape 37, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: Was he speaking with regard to the faculty in general, or with regard to the—

Mr. Canwell: No, this bunch of suspect commies. There were ten or twelve of them that everybody knew about. And we went out to campus and wandered around, went to a few classes and peeked in a few offices, just to be able to identify these people, to know who we were talking about.

That trip dispelled any concern that I had about the disparity between my educational background and the effrontery of their degrees. He was just being helpful as he always was, whenever I asked for it.

I will say as I've said before, that there never was any validity to the complaints or statements of these dissident professors as to their treatment by the Canwell Committee. It was better than any of them deserved. It was expedient to do it right, and that's the way we did it.

Mr. Frederick: You say that it was better than they deserved. You mean that just as a figurative—

Mr. Canwell: That's a figure of speech. They shouldn't have even been in the positions they were in. That was a miscarriage, I think, of the educational intent, to have these characters who spent all of their time in commie

meetings and commie front activity and were mouthing the party line in classes and the press all the time, and were anything but scholars. They shouldn't have been there. They shouldn't have been on the payroll. But they'd built up a system that makes it very difficult to eliminate these phonies. Certainly there are fine teachers, great ones, and ones who do their work honorably and well. But these people, this type of person brings discredit on the whole profession.

Mr. Frederick: As you understood it, with regard to your contacts and your investigation in late winter and the early spring, approximately how many faculty members did you suspect or believe were current members of the Communist Party?

Mr. Canwell: I never compiled such figures. I was always too smart to do so. You don't compile extensive lists of suspects. You may note the activities of somebody and wonder why they're doing it. But you don't ipso facto, make them a suspect. Their index card may be flagged because you're interested in what they're doing, but that doesn't necessarily make them a suspect; they have made themselves a suspect. And that is about the way it was.

One of the mistakes that people on legislative committees have made is giving numbers. Joe McCarthy, in all good intentions, badgered by the press, gave some numbers that, of course, there's no way of supporting. They can't say that there's ten, or a hundred, or two hundred Communist professors at the University of Washington without the reporter asking the obvious question: "Name them." So you name them. "What proof do you have?" You get down to the fact that you're conducting a hearing and you can't win. You just don't play the numbers game. I told McCarthy that, but it was too late, he had gotten his neck out.

One of my committee members made the same mistake, Tom Bienz. He knew better than that, but some time, in the pressure and excitement of giving a speech before a Legion group, he answered a question and said that there were 150 known Communists on the faculty, and we had the proof. That was a statement that no one should ever have made, and, of course, I had to say so. But you don't play a numbers game, and I wouldn't here estimate, I never did estimate, how many suspects there were. All I knew was, there were too many of them. It was more than par for the course. You can have a nut or two on the faculty and justify his existence. But when they dominate the campus, that's something else.

Mr. Frederick: You're saying that they dominated the campus?

Mr. Canwell: They were very, very much in the public

mind. This little group of commies were the voice of the University of Washington. They had an excellent thing going.

Joe Kornfeder told me how they'd set it up. They established plants in the media very early. About the same time, they penetrated the faculty of the school. So they had something going there that worked. Of course, if you have good sense you don't play to that, but they were, in effect, the voice of the University of Washington. That's all the public really heard about the school was what the Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade were doing, or wanted, or what their problems were; the defense fund for Harry Bridges, or dozens more of these fronts.

That's what you heard from the University of Washington because there were press releases with a professor's name on them. Or they were identified as a speaker at a meeting. So that's what the public was getting. And then their kids were coming home spouting this stuff that the parents disapproved of. Believe me, it was the voice of the university, and a great many of the people throughout the state, responsible people, wanted something done. The Canwell Committee wasn't something that came out of the blue, it was an answer to the demands of the people of the State of Washington. The principle focus was the University of Washington.

Mr. Frederick: Was this campus-based or originated, or was this off-campus activity of these people?

Mr. Canwell: It was both. More of the meetings, of course, were held in homes, or halls, or meeting places downtown, other places. The Pacific Northwest Labor School. You know, you don't make many speeches on the campus of the University of Washington. You won't be heard. So that went on. They had a meeting hall just off campus where the comrades always rallied and held meetings. I'll probably think of the name of the place, but it was a fountainhead of press releases too, just like the Labor School. Any time they had some labor meeting where they controlled, or had a workable control of the union, then there were press releases. That's what the public heard, what they read, and it was just overflowing.

Take a man like Melvin Rader. I think we listed more than a dozen major Communist fronts that he was supporting. He was speaking for them. He was releasing press releases. He was pleading their causes. Day after day, night after night, I don't know when he found time to go to class. He was just one of many of them. But he was a prominent one.

Believe me, there was no resistance to our invasion of the campus from anybody, except this little bunch of comrades. The average student was delighted to have it happen. Many of them had been subjected to these professors, they knew they had to go along with them politically to get a grade. We didn't go into that very much,

but we heard quite a bit of testimony on it. But the general public, the responsible people, were all for the investigation and hoped for housecleaning of the University of Washington. To a similar degree the problem existed in some of the teachers colleges, Washington State University, and other schools. They were getting something for their money that they weren't in favor of; they didn't buy. There was no responsible resistance to our investigation of the University of Washington. If there was, I don't know where it came from.

There were unwise people. For instance, the dean of the law school, Alfred Scheppe. Asked by the commies and the ACLU, "What about the constitutionality of the resolution of the Canwell Committee?" That was when we were before the courts. And this dummy, I feel I should call him that, was dean of this prestigious law school. And he made pronouncements that, "reluctant as he was, he had to state that he felt that the committee and its resolution were unconstitutional." I don't know what he thought when the Supreme Court held that it was constitutional. He found that a nonlawyer, a hayshaker from the eastern part of the state knew more about constitutional law than he did.

There were that type of people. He wasn't a Communist, he was just a fathead. But that's part of what you have to contend with. There's a lot of that. And you can't be diverted by it. You can't run up a lot of blind alleys because somebody who should know better is spouting off.

Mr. Frederick: Through your studies, who were the leading lights, the more active people, within the Communist Party on campus?

Mr. Canwell: Just read the roster of witnesses that we subpoenaed. There was Rader, and Gundlach, and Phillips. I'd have to read the list to recall their first names. But they were among the leadership. There were others who were more brainy and more effective probably, but who were not out in front that much. Because these people were in the news every day or so, and the public was aware of them and their activities, they, of course, ended up on the witness stand.

They were very responsive to the Communist Party line, which was fed to them, or relayed to them from the Northwest head of the Communist Party.

Mr. Frederick: Who was that, at that point in time?

Mr. Canwell: That was Rappaport. Morris Rappaport. I might have a picture.

Mr. Frederick: And his position?

Mr. Canwell: He was in charge of Communist activity,

at least the open activity, in the Pacific Northwest area. Their district compared quite generally to the same area covered by the Immigration Bureau, the FBI; they have their divisions, and the party encompassed about the same area.

He was the top authority, and the rumor was that his strength had to do with the fact that he or his sister or somebody was related to Stalin and he had some wallop there that he would not have otherwise had. The Immigration Bureau and others built up a pretty good case against him. They were about to deport him, and then he pleaded bad health and got some doctors to state that his heart condition would not permit this "harassment." He left this area and went down to California and operated a chicken ranch down there. Some of our agents, not of our committee but people that I worked with, interviewed him down there. He laughed about a lot of these things, and the fact that they weren't able to deport him. He pointed out a car that was down the lane aways. He said that it'd been there almost every day, and "They have a lot of car trouble . . . couple of FBI agents." Anyway, he was the muscle and supposed brains of the Communist Party, and he's one that we had many, many wiretaps on that I listened to, where he was in conversation with people of some importance in the investigative field.

Mr. Frederick: Where was he from?

Mr. Canwell: Soviet Russia, I think. I don't know where his point of origin was; if I did I've forgotten, I probably have it somewhere. But he was the district organizer for the Communist Party at that time.

I remember an agent who was trying to bug every suspected Communist in the area. He wanted to bug the prosecuting attorney. The prosecuting attorney, of course, knew that electronic surveillance was being conducted by some of the agencies, so he was kind of cagey. Whenever he'd have an interview, a meeting with "Rap," Morris Rappaport, he'd take a rowboat and go out in Elliott Bay and have their discussions. So this agent was always very frustrated because he could never bug Prosecutor Shorett. But Lloyd Shorett was close enough to this operation that he'd have confidential meetings with Rappaport.

Incidentally, he was a key figure in the ACLU, and when we pursued that part of the Rader case, everybody involved in the Rader case was an ACLUer: Shorett, who waited until Hewitt was out of the state to make his statements about perjury; Ed Henry, who was Rader's attorney, ACLU. Everybody involved in that apparatus was an ACLUer. Very interesting. But someone like myself had to play it against the background of what we know, of what in many cases has never been in evidence or proved.

But Shorett was hand-in-glove with Ed Henry and Ed Guthman and others in cooking up this phoney Rader cause celebre, making it a major issue. The Canyon

Creek Lodge phoney story and all of that. They were all ACLUers, and on the state and national level of it.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, what you're saying is: You have personal knowledge that Shorett met with Morris Rappaport in a rowboat in the middle of Elliott Bay—

Mr. Canwell: Yes. When I say I have evidence, I couldn't come into court and lay it on line, so I haven't said much about this. But it occurred. I had access to an enormous amount of electronic surveillance, and agents who had worked at it. This was one instance that I remember because it was kind of humorous. This prosecuting attorney, of course, had access to the court records and things, and he knew what was going on, but he wasn't about to talk about anything except the birds and bees where he could be monitored. He's a real stinker. I have no respect for him whatever.

Mr. Frederick: Why is that?

Mr. Canwell: Because of these connections, of course, and then little things where—well, not little things, the fact that he was advised that if they wanted to talk to George Hewitt, it would have to be before he left town. He knew that. Ed Henry knew it. Everybody knew that Hewitt had transportation booked and he'd be leaving town at a certain time. So they wait until he's out of the State of Washington, out of the jurisdiction of the state, where a subpoena or process could not be served on Hewitt, then they make the big hue and cry about this supposedly perjured testimony. It was as phoney as a three-dollar bill, and, of course, they all knew it. But it was cooked up by these plotters and planners to do precisely what they did with it. Hewitt had no objection to testifying, he would have stayed two or three days if he had to, but we had to okay that, because we were paying his expenses and we didn't have money to waste. So I gave his attorney and the prosecuting attorney the option to move against Hewitt if they wished while he was in town. They didn't wish, of course.

Prosecutor Shorett's prejudice was also evident during the contempt trials when he refused to identify me as an expert witness. This refusal prevented me from receiving the \$25 per diem reimbursement for my time. He also refused to try the contempt cases as a group. These machinations, of course, meant that most of my entire summer was wasted in the trials, at a personal financial loss.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, with regard to the second hearings, commonly referred to as the University of Washington hearings, how did you make the selections with regard to witnesses and those individuals who you wanted to address?

Mr. Canwell: By that time my knowledge of what was moving on the national level, and international, but the national level particularly, was pretty thorough. I knew who could testify to draw a picture for the public of what the Communist apparatus and the problem was. So I sought out witnesses who, I felt, could best portray that and lay it out. Of course I wanted responsible witnesses, and got them. I got the best in the field. There were others we wanted to have who would have testified, but we just couldn't afford to pay their expenses, and in most cases they could not finance it themselves.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, what was the short list that you came up with?

Mr. Canwell: That would be evident in the list of witnesses—you're talking about the second hearing. I don't remember precisely. You realize that forty-three or forty-four years have passed since these hearings took place.

[End of Tape 37, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Albert, we were talking about a short list of individuals who you wanted to address.

Mr. Canwell: As for the short list, I should probably explain that we would not have gone out of the state for witnesses in the university hearings, had it not been for one significant thing that had taken place.

In my journeys to Washington D.C. and New York I had become aware of the case of Alger Hiss. And aware of the great frustration I described, on the part of intelligence agencies, members of Congress, the Senate and others who were disturbed at the immunities surrounding this character. And he was only indicative of a level of them.

To reiterate the reasons for bringing in witnesses in the Hiss case, a friend of mine in New York, who had become a close friend, was Alfred Kohlberg. Being Jewish he had considerable connections within that orbit. One of his concerns had been generated by, I believe, a relative of Whittaker Chambers, who was also known to Kohlberg. But the Hiss case began to assume enormous proportions because here was this fair-haired boy in the Department of State, on the rise constantly. And it was felt that he was a Soviet spy or agent with reasonable grounds to believe it was true. And nothing could be done about him. He seemed to lead a charmed life because nobody in the administration, high in authority, had any concern about the Communist situation or the Communist world expansion or penetration of the United States. There just was no ability anywhere to get at him.

The FBI was well aware of the Hiss case, the Perlo-Kramer group and their activities, but could really do no more than observe, because it required the attorney gen-

eral to point them in that direction. And he was not about to do it.

This frustration was very evident and particularly to Kohlberg who knew that Whittaker Chambers had gone to the proper authorities with his story, he'd gone to President Roosevelt, and to the secretary of state, and other places and had been completely frustrated. Kohlberg and Levine, who I think was the relative I'm talking about, had full confidence in Whittaker Chambers and his break with the party.

Kohlberg was repeating this to me. Telling of their frustration to me, and that they wished something could be done, but nothing could be. It was, of course, an indictment of the administration that this sort of thing existed.

In thinking it over, I decided I could do something about it. And that's where my research and knowledge of the legislative powers came into play. I decided I could destroy the immunity of this sacrosanct agent who was enjoying such privilege. So I pursued to take such steps. Ordinarily I would not have brought J.B. Matthews and Howard Rushmore to Seattle, had it not been for the Hiss case.

So you asked for a short list, well it just about boils down to Matthews and Rushmore. And they did testify about Hiss and others on that level.

In the meantime before doing this, I had consulted with everybody that I felt I should consult, including J. Edgar Hoover and others. He, in effect, told me that, yes, Whittaker Chambers was telling the truth, but there was nothing that they could do about it at the time, and also that "If you quote me on this, I'll deny it." But it gave me what I needed, the assurance that on the level of the Justice Department and the FBI, that I was on sound ground.

So I did bring Matthews and Rushmore to Seattle to testify, and Rushmore particularly put the Hiss case in the record. That was the first public testimony, revelations about the activities of Alger Hiss.

Therein of course is a considerable story. To destroy his immunity, our testimony had to become public and it had to be published. I had the reporters clued in on the case in advance; Ashley Holden of the Spokane *Spokesman-Review* and Fred Neindorff of the *Seattle P-I*. Of course, I did not alert Ed Guthman to what we were doing.

And Neindorff particularly took the copy of the release to Paul Ashley, who was considered certainly by me and many others to be the top libel authority in America. Every newspaper editor had his booklet on his desk. He's a very reliable authority on libel. I discussed our problem. It was a very explosive issue but of no value unless it was made public. Paul Ashley read the stories that the gentlemen had written. He questioned me extensively on my knowledge of the Hiss case and I'll never forget his statement. He said, "It's libelous as hell, but we can de-

fend it and I think we should go on it." So he in effect cleared the publication of the Hiss case for the *P-I* and the *Spokesman-Review*.

Then what was done about it was quite revealing afterwards. The Holden story was filed with his paper. An editor of the *Spokesman-Review* called Ben Kizer (an ACLU official formerly on the editorial board of the spy journal, *Amerasia*), a local Communist attorney and one informed in this area, and told him what was involved in the story. The next thing that occurred, the secretary of state of the United States personally called the publisher of the *Spokesman-Review* and the publisher of the *Seattle P-I* asking them not to run the story! And there was a considerable delay on the publication of it, due to that. But it was the first public information with privilege on Alger Hiss that had been revealed or released to the American people.

It, of course, is probably the one thing more than anything else that made Richard Nixon president. He pursued the Hiss case when everybody else on the House Un-American Activities Committee wished to drop it and apologize. And he paid for it later, when the leftist tabloids announced long before the Watergate affair was set up that he was to be impeached.

That's why the short list of the substantial witnesses in the second hearing, the University of Washington hearing, is narrowed down to Dr. J.B. Matthews and Howard Rushmore. But it's because we wished to put the Hiss case in the record, and there's testimony by them about atomic scientists and others who were questionable characters. It all is revealed in our July hearings in Seattle, Washington, at that time.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, who are the questionable atomic scientists?

Mr. Canwell: The principal one was, of course, head of the Manhattan Project. I have a book on him here, J. Robert Oppenheimer. There were numerous others. I'd have to go back and read the record now to recall all their names accurately. But they were people who were Communists and suspect Communists, who were on the highest levels of our security and the nuclear fission field, Oppenheimer being one of the principal ones.

But if you would read the second report, the testimony of both Rushmore and Matthews, you would find that was fairly well touched upon. We had no intention of doing a thorough in-depth job on the nuclear fission betrayals. We just wanted it brought into the open.

Mr. Frederick: How would you characterize J. Robert Oppenheimer?

Mr. Canwell: Pretty much the way I think Pegler did. He said he paid dues in the Communist Party, he was

married to a Communist, and sleeping with at least one other one. So that's about how I'd characterize him. He was a brilliant scientist, there's no question about that. Nobody I think, questioned his knowledge. They just questioned his lack of ethics or his vulnerability. If he were to be kept on in the government service he should be under constant surveillance and attended by agents who knew what his potential was.

Mr. Frederick: You believe that was not the case?

Mr. Canwell: It was not the case, no. He enjoyed a very free hand and respectability. You might explore what happened at the University of Washington. They tried to bring him out, not only as a speaker, I think they were going to have him on the faculty. And a great furor arose about that. He had no trouble getting lots of character witnesses, as such people always can.

But I felt that he was an extremely dangerous man, and very vulnerable, and very willing to cooperate with people like Harry Hopkins, who transferred our atomic know-how to the Soviets. I would say that politically he was amoral. People like that have no country.

Mr. Frederick: So what you are saying then is that your number one priority during the second hearings was the Alger Hiss case.

Mr. Canwell: That is what caused me to bring Matthews and Rushmore to Seattle at that time. We were glad to have them because Matthews could testify to things that we needed there. He was the top authority in the world on Communist fronts. So he was able to testify to great length in that area, and the issue at the University of Washington was the participation of the faculty in the Communist front movement. So Matthews was a very desirable witness. Rushmore was principally brought out to testify on Hiss and the atomic scientists.

Mr. Frederick: What was Matthews' base at that point in time?

Mr. Canwell: What was his base? I believe at that precise time he was on the staff of the Dies Committee or the Un-American Activities Committee. He had worked back and forth with and for the committees there. When I first became acquainted with him it seemed to me that he also had an office in the Hearst Building in New York. But he is a distinguished scholar, a person who had among other things been a missionary out in Malaysia, translated some of these dialects, translated the New Testament into some of the local dialects. He is a very genuine scholar.

An interesting sidelight on this is that his wife, Ruth Ingles, I think her name was, whom he later married, was associated with the University of Washington in some

way. She originally came to our hearings with the purpose of baiting people like Matthews and doing that sort of job. She ended up making a complete flip-flop and married the great redbaiter. In my mind, she became one of the great researchers in the field. She worked with J.B. Matthews in New York in amassing these tremendous files on the Communists fronts.

Mr. Frederick: If she attended those hearings, how was she going to embarrass him?

Mr. Canwell: She was hoping—like professors used to invite me to a party hoping somehow they'd make a fool of me. And I think that she, like lots of liberals, thought that this was a great opportunity, and Dr. Matthews was one of her targets. I don't think it was a well-formulated plan. It was just something that she felt that she could do and write something about. She joined the other side because of conviction. She was an able researcher and student. I think she even might have been on the faculty at that time, I don't know.

Some of our witnesses were faculty, some were not. Some were members of the Legislature like H.C. "Army" Armstrong. We subpoenaed him because he had been very active in the Communist Party out in the professional level at the university, and had also been active in the Legislature. He professed to have broken with the party. He didn't wish to be tarred with that brush. And he agreed to testify. When we got him on the stand he suddenly didn't really know anything.

So, then with malice aforethought as we brought other local witnesses, friendly witnesses on the stand we asked about "Army" Armstrong. And each one of them would say, "Oh, yes, Army was at the Communist meetings" or, "He was in the party," or so on. Well, Armstrong became very nervous then.

He said, "Nobody testifies that I left the Communist Party."

And I said, "There's no indication that you did, from your testimony. If you want to get on and tell the truth, as we know you can, I will let you. You can tell your story. Otherwise we're just going right on with our program." Well, that was "Army" Armstrong.

From the faculty there was Mrs. Maud Beal. I remember her, as I believe, a friendly witness.

There was Ted Astley and I think he was connected with the faculty in some way. A very obnoxious character.

And Professor Butterworth, because the Communist Party was using Butterworth very extensively. He had a doctorate; a name that was well-known in Seattle. There is the Butterworth family. So when he endorsed a Communist front or something, it had impact. We did know a lot about him. He was an alcoholic. One of the agencies had his apartment across from the university bugged.

Students would come in there at all hours of the night and get the party line mostly, and then they were assured of proper grades if they kept on good terms with Dr. Butterworth.

I remember the agents saying that Butterworth drank a lot of beer, and he'd roll his bottles across the floor like bowling balls and they'd smash against each other like ten pins. The apartment was such a mess that the maids refused to make it up. This was a guy that had tenure, a full professor at the University of Washington. So we thought it proper to highlight him. And we did.

Joseph Cohen was another one. A more respectable Communist professor.

I mentioned Phil Davis before. He was one on parole from the insane asylum.

Professor Harold Eby, he was quite an uncooperative witness but one who had been heavily involved in Communist front activity.

Professor Garland Ethel, he was another one about the same as Eby. Very heavily involved and very uncooperative.

Mrs. Katherine Fogg had been a member of the Legislature. She was not on the faculty there.

Rachmiel Forschmiedt we brought in because he was employed by the city Health Department but was a very active, very obnoxious Communist so we thought it time to bring him in and we did.

Professor Ralph Gundlach, a thoroughgoing Communist who had been under surveillance by the FBI for a number of years. We trod softly there at first, because we never wished to embarrass the feds in any of their cases. But Gundlach was photographed going and coming from a Communist high-level nest in California. He was, as far as we could determine, Melvin Rader's control in the Communist Party. Wherever Melvin Rader went, Ralph Gundlach was nearby. He was one of the two professors that George Hewitt recognized and identified as having been at the Communist school at Briehl's farm in New York.

It's interesting that the ACLU made no issue over Gundlach. He was one of the two identified by George Hewitt, and he was also an ACLU member.

Nat Honig was a national witness, and I've forgotten just why we brought him but we did.

There was Professor Melville Jacobs who was also in the Communist group and more or less one of the noisy comrades out there.

There were Florence Bean James and Burton James. We had many reasons for subpoenaing them. One of them, of course, was that Burton James had been given a \$30,000 or \$35,000 payoff from the Legislature to conduct a phony cultural survey. So we wanted that brought out. But he was the consort, husband of Florence Bean James, who was the principal target of our committee in those hearings. She had an extensive Communist record.

Hewitt was brought to Seattle to testify that he had met her on a high-level meeting of the Communist Party in Moscow, Russia.

I commented on J.B. Matthews.

Moro Jewell was a person who claimed to know a great deal about the early day Communist Party and had extensive records. I don't remember to what extent he testified.

Albert Ottenheimer was in the Repertory theatre group and was subpoenaed because of that.

Professor Herbert Phillips, on the faculty. A noisy, obnoxious Communist, a professor. Very active, very vocal.

Professor Angelo Pellegrini was merely subpoenaed because he was making irresponsible statements about the investigation and we felt that he should be given a chance to say what he had to say under oath. Not a bad guy, and he became quite an authority on foods and wines. But we didn't give him much trouble and he cooperated.

Professor Melvin Rader, of course, is a key figure in the hearings and has been in the party's propaganda in succeeding years. You have led extensive discussions on Rader previously.

Joe Roberts. Joe Dana Roberts was a newspaper man or ex-newspaperman who made quite a stir about his knowledge of communism. I don't remember to what extent he testified.

[End of Tape 38, Side 1]

Mr. Canwell: Then we had Professor Sophus Winther and Mabel Winther. They were more or less friendly witnesses. They had been in and out of the Communist Party. I would say they were somewhat cooperative. They told Dr. Allen more than they were willing to testify to on the stand. But we had no particular interest in them other than they had been in the party and could testify about how and by whom they were recruited.

There was Lane Summers. He was of interest to us because he was the father of a boy who had been recruited into the Spanish Brigade largely by Ralph Gundlach, and had died in Spain. His father was very, very upset about the whole thing. He had lost his son. He blamed the Communists at the University of Washington and the university itself, and wanted to tell his story. And he did.

There is Ward Warren, who was in the combine of Howard and Isabel Costigan. They were almost inseparable in the Communist Party. He was a friendly witness.

That about sums it up.

We were, of course, trying to get friendly witnesses who had been approached by the apparatus for membership or participation in their activities in the fronts. And we wanted the story told. I think it was quite adequately done on the testimony of a number of these people.

We entered the fray with the knowledge that we had to

do a number on the University of Washington. That was the principal Communist issue in the State of Washington at that time. And it should be remembered, we probably covered it before, but the scandal at the University of Washington had rubbed off on the entire state.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, in your travels in preparation to that hearing, that would have to do with Joint House Resolution 10 that formed the committee, did you hear of George Hewitt from Alfred Kohlberg during those travels?

Mr. Canwell: No. Alfred Kohlberg's connection with Hewitt came after Hewitt's troubles or problems. Kohlberg, in sympathy of the boy and knowing he had problems and had no income, gave him a job which was doing maintenance in his office. But my recollection is that I heard of Hewitt through the Immigration Bureau. He had been an effective witness of theirs and someone there knew that he had information on Florence Bean James. So it was suggested that we might be interested and I took it from there. I felt that we needed any testimony we could get about the methods of procedure in the Communist Party and the recruitment of blacks—Negroes. He was a prime example of a young man who had been brought in, flattered, and brought along, and made important and utilized, but had been smart enough to get out of it.

He offered two things, some concrete testimony on Florence James and knowledge about the inner-workings of the party on their recruitment program of minorities and Negroes.

He was not brought to Seattle to testify about Gundlach and Rader. He happened to recognize them in the meeting room. They were there being held under subpoena and he recognized them and surprised staff by informing that he knew them. Information was relayed to me and I extended the recess and took it from there. But Hewitt was not brought to Seattle to testify about those people. And had they not been in the hearing room, it never would have occurred.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, that's kind of interesting because George Hewitt is the only one who testified that Melvin Rader, in his opinion was a Communist. Isn't that extraordinary that this is—

Mr. Canwell: No, I don't think that is the case. I think that there was extensive testimony, certainly to us all along the way in our investigations, that Melvin Rader was a member of the Communist Party.

I believe I told you yesterday that I purposely went easy on Rader, because I had hoped to lead him to defect and testify. If he had done so, it would have been, of course, a ten-strike, because he was one of their leading lights and longest members. As I told you before, I

thought that we had convincing proof that he was the first recruit into the Communist Party on the campus of the University of Washington, recruited by a Soviet agent, a Communist agent, Lillian Reiseroff, who was brought here from Massachusetts to penetrate and organize the University of Washington.

I always was reluctant to name people as Communist if we did not have proof, as we did on many of them, like membership cards or that sort of thing. But in the Rader case as in the Hiss case, we never came up with a membership card. We had no record of his pinning stamps in a book. People brought along on that level were not required to do that. It would unnecessarily put them in a compromising position, and they're people the party wished to bring along to greater things.

So it was not surprising to me that we didn't come up with that evidence, but we did come up with a lot. We just didn't use it.

Mr. Frederick: This woman who purportedly recruited Melvin Rader into the Communist Party, about what year was that?

Mr. Canwell: I think it was about 1922, it corresponds pretty well with the year that Rader entered the university. I'd have to look up the dates. But I think she and another Communist agent worked the campus of the University of Washington in 1922. If I'm in error there it would only be one year. But I think that was it. I believe Rader enrolled there in 1922.

Mr. Frederick: Was she living at the time of the second hearing?

Mr. Canwell: We never pursued it. It was one of the many leads that I didn't have time or the facilities to go into. Had we come up with a succeeding committee some of these things would have been done. If she were alive I would not have been able to subpoena her. I'd have to get a House or Senate committee to do it, which I could have done had I found her.

The same is true about Pop Mindel and the Briehl's farm. There were things that had to be put on hold. I could not personally afford to continue such investigations. I have to leave them somewhere until some happenstance when I find it convenient. But I don't know whether Lillian Reiseroff was still alive or not.

Melvin Rader himself was of no greater importance than was evident on the surface at that time. It was only the endeavors of the ACLU and others who made an issue of this. Ed Guthman and Countryman were assigned, I'm sure, by somebody, to pick this up and make an issue of it. But we did not pursue the Reiseroff information.

Rader, I think if you read his testimony, was asked at the end of his testimony by me if he had any complaints

as to the way he was treated. He disclaimed any such feelings under oath. So at that time, at that point in the thing, that was not of overriding importance.

Lillian Reiseroff, as far as I knew, had gone to the University of Minnesota to work the campus there, and that's where I lost track of her. I didn't have the time or the inclination to pursue it beyond that at that time.

Mr. Frederick: The prosecuting attorney, Lloyd Shorett, called the FBI, if I'm not mistaken, and they said no, they have no record of Rader being a Communist.

Mr. Canwell: Shorett would normally say that. The FBI would absolutely never tell you that anybody was or was not a Communist. That's against their operating procedure.

I do know that the bureau had informants who attended Rader's meetings, who could put him in the Communist Party. I do know that. But I couldn't and wouldn't embarrass the bureau, or destroy the confidential relationship that I had with various agents. I just don't operate that way.

Had I known the false furor that would be developed around Rader, I probably would have brought other witnesses or evidence to bear. It wasn't necessary at the time. We felt that we knew all we needed to know about Melvin Rader when he was identified with twelve or fifteen major Communist fronts, and when wire and tape recordings that we had supported our view. But they could not be used as evidence. I had no way of using them, had no intention to, but it did fortify me with the knowledge that made me very certain that I was on safe ground.

One objection put forth by Rader's partisans challenged the fact that he could be lifted and hoisted out of Seattle to upstate New York and back and nobody would know it. That's child's play for these people. So I never gave much credence one way or another to that.

The thing I stake my bottom chip on was the fact that Hewitt identified these people when he had no opportunity to be briefed, no reason to be briefed, he picked them out of a crowd and named them and was willing to confront them, and Rader and his attorneys refused to face him. Now on the basis of those facts, I concluded that Hewitt's testimony was true and sound. And I so conveyed this information to the prosecuting attorney, and to Ed Henry, his attorney, and to the press. There was no confusion whatever. If Rader was not what Hewitt said he was, he should have confronted Hewitt. He had every opportunity—was almost compelled to do it. And he and his attorney refused to do it. The guy was a stupid Communist and nothing else. This man, Rader, I tried to compel to confront Hewitt and he knew better than to do that and he was advised, I'm sure, by his attorney, under no circumstances to do it.

Then the ACLU put together this phoney charade that they carried out and are still working on. But I was there and I did everything that was humanly possible to give Rader the fairest kind of a break. Offered to let his attorney cross-question Hewitt to any extent that he wished. Of course it never came about. He wouldn't do it.

Now for them to cry all these crocodile tears later and lie through their teeth, they are doing it to the wrong person because I was there. All I wanted was the truth. If Hewitt was mistaken, that was the place to determine it and they didn't want any part of it. They knew that he was telling the truth. It wasn't any accident that he picked these people out of the crowd of strangers and named them; Mel Rader and Ralph Gundlach, who had long been under surveillance by the FBI and had been photographed going into a high-level Communist device in California numerous times. So there was no question about the vulnerability of Gundlach. But they picked Rader because he had been brought along carefully to be what he was. And that's the way it was.

Mr. Frederick: Okay.

Mr. Canwell: Rader was not above participating in trickery. I encountered that in several cases.

Mr. Frederick: What you are saying is that George Hewitt was brought out here to Seattle to specifically testify with regard to Florence James.

Mr. Canwell: And to testify on the procedure of recruiting blacks into the Communist Party. That was the only thing he was required or expected to testify on.

Mr. Frederick: And subsequent in those hearings, there wasn't anybody locally who would say above and beyond that Melvin Rader was a participant within the popular front, and there wasn't anyone who would say that he was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. Canwell: Membership in the Communist Party is a thing that is bandied and brooded about but has little or no significance on the higher levels of the apparatus. Once in awhile you can nail a guy like Oppenheimer, who was indiscreet. He attended meetings, he slept around with Communist women, and married a Communist. He was not a discreet individual. But usually people brought to that level are more discreet than that, the party sees to it. That was certainly true with Hiss and many others.

But in the case of Rader he was used for what he was good for, and that was his name. His name and presence, and position—his presence at these meetings and his position on the faculty at the University of Washington. Beyond that they didn't expect anything of him. And I don't think they worried too much about how close he stayed to

the party dictates as long as he did his job. And he did it. When they told him to jump he just asked how high. There wasn't any question whether he'd jump or not. He did their bidding and he was useful.

I've seen the same thing happen in the case of Ben Kizer, a very important Communist who came to the place where he was senile and was not dependable for party activities, but his name was extremely useful. And they even use it today. That was the way with Melvin Rader. He was their boy. He would do what they wanted done. He would tout their fronts. He would give the necessary argumentation for so doing and retire to his pad.

Mr. Frederick: What you are saying then is that you make no distinction between a person in the 1930s who participated in the popular front. You make no distinction between that individual and the individual who joined the Communist Party.

Mr. Canwell: I'm not saying that. There were many people who joined Communist fronts. That's what a front is. That's why they exist.

[End of Tape 38, Side 2]

Mr. Canwell: To conclude in any way that people who joined the Communist fronts, or were deceived, or hoodwinked or succumbed to their propaganda are ipso facto Communists would be silly. That isn't what the fronts are all about. They were to influence and recruit people into general socialist activity. They were not, and should not, automatically be considered to be Communists. It would be like saying that just because somebody votes for Brock Adams that they believe in drugging and raping little girls. That isn't the way it works.

People have reasons for supporting these fronts, many of them sound very good. With a little persuasion by very knowledgeable, persuasive persons, they go along. There was just an enormous amount of that during the New Deal period. I think of my contact here in Spokane, Mrs. Webster. She went along with the Communist Party because she thought that they were for the workingman per se, and believed it. But she was only a Communist for a limited time.

In saying that, I should differentiate between these professors who led out in the front movement—that's an entirely different thing. The leadership is an entirely different thing than the followers. The leadership has to provide the effort, the bait, and they fish in troubled waters. The Communists always do. But to exonerate anybody who was prominent in say twelve or fifteen of these major Communist fronts and to say that he just wasn't a Communist—he named himself a Communist by so doing. It isn't incumbent on every investigator and every government agent to come up with documentary proof on

people who are in the Communist Party. It's desirable when you can, but it's often impossible. It doesn't mean that the person isn't guilty.

And along this line, with regard to Rader, as long as you have again opened this subject of Lillian Reiseroff and Pop Mindel, why didn't the people who were making this phoney case, who spent a fortune in doing so, and in carrying on the propaganda, why didn't they seek out some people like Pop Mindel and Reiseroff and others who could have supported or denied the testimony of Hewitt against Rader? They had the facility to do that, I didn't. If I were to do that I'd have to come up with my own funds to do it.

Countryman, who was operating with Rockefeller Foundation funds; Ed Guthman, who had the *Seattle Times* and the ACLU and other devices behind him; they had facilities, money. Any time one of those fellas had said, "I want to go talk to Pop Mindel," the money was there—they had no problem. If I wanted to do it I had to find some excuse to be in New York, and the time to spend delving into this, and that isn't cheap. And I would have been criticized for accepting the money!

To do the research, I'd have to hoodwink Mindel into thinking I was a Countryman or that sort. In fact I'd done a little bit of research back there. I conducted some investigations of the ACLU where I indicated that I was a newspaperman doing an article on the ACLU and obtained vast records. I know what *can* be done, but their partisans made no effort to expose the truth about Countryman and Rader. The information was there for those who wanted to find it, but they didn't look beyond their own assertions, because they knew the truth of what Hewitt had stated! They were trying to provide a false picture of the thing, and did it very effectively because they had enormous cooperation on the liberal level in the media and publishing field. I do not have that access.

One of the reasons that I tried over and over to be elected to Congress was that I needed the power base to do what I knew needed doing—what I wanted to do. But you have to realize that when I pursued the Rader case, even to the extent of responding to Dr. Allen's invitation to come over to a meeting—I did that at my own expense! Nobody paid my way and that was what I was always confronted with.

That's more or less the total Canwell operation—it's a one-man FBI with no funds. I have no apologies to make for what I've accomplished and I have no confessions to make about frame-ups or that sort of thing. I just don't need to do that, it isn't necessary, nor the way I operate.

Rader was just picked by his pals to be a cause celebre because they knew he was pliable, amenable, and useful, and would do and say what they wanted him to say, and he didn't know much anyway. That's about the picture.

Why would it be necessary for Ed Guthman to get on the stand and under oath falsify information in this Rader

case? Provable—things that were provable—things that he knew we could prove that were false—and still he did it. Must have been under instructions or directions to do that. I don't know.

But if you want to know why we didn't introduce witnesses who said that they sat in party meetings with Rader, that wasn't what most of our witnesses could testify to. They testified to being invited to front meetings and things like the Labor School and others that Rader was influential in. They were Communist devices and so if he was using his influence for any other reason than the fact that he was a Communist, I wouldn't know what it was, and I don't think it's incumbent on me to provide any alibis for his foolishness or his treachery.

Had I known that they were going to select Rader as their window dressing for their attack on the legislative process, then I would have made the case more thorough against him. I think he made it against himself when he refused to confront Hewitt. I don't know what more you could ask. I know if I were in his position and I were innocent, you couldn't have restrained me from confronting Hewitt!

Unless you already have a hidden agenda, you have to examine all of these things as they do in court. What would a reasonable man do? What would a reasonable man conclude? Many of these things are on that level, you just have to reduce them to what a reasonable man would believe, or what he would do, or how he would act. Other than that, you can't be infallible and you can't know everything. You can't be in possession of all truth or falsehood. You just have to work with what's available, and I think in the Rader case we gave him every break in the world. As shown in his testimony, he did not have any complaints until Shorett and Guthman and Henry and others plotted a program. Then Rader had something to talk about.

Along this line, and having to do with the Rader case, I was walking down the street from the FBI with Dick Auerbach, the district agent. I think we were going to lunch somewhere. I was bearing down on the Rader case. He says, "Why don't you forget it? You're beating a dead horse." He didn't want to say they didn't have any information, he just wanted me to forget the thing and go on from there.

That's been the situation there. I couldn't make a career of investigating Rader, but if I were to do so, I'd think he was my pigeon. He could have been an easy prospect. But I put that in the past and my critics are still beating the dead horse.

Mr. Frederick: Now Albert, some would say that this issue, the Melvin Rader issue, was the shoal that punched a hole through your hull.

Mr. Canwell: I don't think that it did. Only for those

who wish that to be the case. They wish to fly in the face of the evidence and the facts and come up with an answer that isn't true.

The Rader case didn't punch any holes in anything; not at all. In fact, it strengthened it because I worked the way that such an agent should work. Such a person who is being honest in investigations. And there's nothing truthful that was developed about the Rader case or the Canyon Creek Lodge that in any way legitimately embarrassed me. Not at all. Those are figments of the imagination created by people who are paid to do that and that's Guthman and Countryman.

[End of Tape 39]

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I'd like to take the opportunity to explore a few events associated with the latter half of that week, July 21 through July 23, 1948, and then have you have the opportunity to comment.

As we had mentioned previously, George Hewitt spoke on Wednesday, July 21, during the morning session and he was presented out of witness order, that is, called in before he was scheduled with regard to that, if you will, the witness docket.

As near as I can gather, there were conversations from the audience and Florence Bean James was one of those participants. Potentially in response to that, Mr. Houston asked permission to call George Hewitt forward to testify, briefly, which he did.

Among other things he was specifically asked, "Do you know this lady that made this demonstration?" His response was, "Yes, Mrs. James." And then he was excused for that day.

As I understand the situation, on July 22, Thursday, George Hewitt was scheduled to testify that afternoon, which he did do. Previously to that, some time around the noon lunchtime recess, potentially as that noon hour passed, one of your staff notified Melvin Rader within the National Guard Armory that Chairman Canwell wished to see him in his office. One of the reports from that exchange is that he did walk to that office. Where was that office located?

Mr. Canwell: It seems to me we were on the floor below the hearing room. There were two floors—our offices were on the first floor of the Armory, and it seems to me that the hearing room was on the floor above, that's my recollection of it after more than forty years.

Rader was summoned from the hearing room—he was under subpoena there and held at the hearing. We were not just certain when we'd get to put him on the stand. One of my agents, I believe it was Coleman, went up to summon him, told him that I would like to see him in my office. He said, "Sure," and he came very willingly, no protest.

But my recollection of precisely what happened was that I had been questioning George Hewitt on this subject prior to this—prior to sending for Rader, and I had asked Hewitt if he was willing to confront Rader with this information. So Hewitt said certainly, he was very happy to, and so I sent Coleman up to—I believe it was Coleman, to bring or to summon Rader, which he did. And he brought him down there. He had no hesitancy, until he came to the door, and it was opened, and he saw George Hewitt. Then he refused to come in. From that time forward in the Rader case, we got no real participation from Melvin Rader.

My best recollection is that the information about Hewitt's identification of Gundlach and Rader was given to a member of my staff during the morning recess. That's where I took over—I extended the recess, and this sequence followed that, and whatever the precise moments or times were, I wouldn't remember now—it wasn't long. We were moving ahead as rapidly as we could because we were so limited in both time and funds that we couldn't waste any time. But I felt that we had to clarify this issue because Hewitt was scheduled to leave at a pre-arranged time and we wished him to do that, because that kept the things within the budget that we had outlined.

It might be significant here to just inject the fact that I never talked to Hewitt in New York before the hearings, nor did any member of my staff. So there was no precise understanding about what he would say. It was understood on his part that he would be questioned on Florence Bean James and that then in general there would be questions about Negro activity within the Communist Party, or the Communist Party's approach to that problem. But there was no contact by me or by my committee with Hewitt in New York.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I want to continue this portion here, but before I do that, ask you—you say that you or staff did not contact or I assume, communicate with—

Mr. Canwell: We did not interview Hewitt. No member of my staff nor myself personally interviewed him in New York.

Mr. Frederick: Did you or your staff personally interview him—period—in terms of the East Coast?

Mr. Canwell: No, not at all—you mean after he returned?

Mr. Frederick: Before he came to Seattle.

Mr. Canwell: No. No interview with Hewitt whatever. My recollection is that we relied on conversations with responsible people in the Immigration bureau, and accepted their recommendation as to the reliability and ability of George Hewitt.

Mr. Frederick: Was that John Boyd?

Mr. Canwell: No, John Boyd was head of the Immigration bureau at Seattle, or that district. John Boyd was never out of the state, to my knowledge. My contacts, our committee contacts with him, were in Seattle.

I believe that John Boyd did take Bill Huston, meet him in Washington, and take him to the United States Supreme Court and introduce him, which is quite customary. People get—they can then testify before the Supreme Court—it's just a procedure that's followed. But I don't remember at what time. I think that was after our hearings, but I don't recall.

John Boyd and Huston were friends, I think who knew each other prior to our committee, but I don't know how well. John Boyd, in my estimation, was a man of great integrity, not one who would be a party to any trickery or that sort of thing.

Mr. Frederick: Was there an affidavit taken from George Hewitt once he arrived in Seattle?

Mr. Canwell: No, I think that whether he was met at the train or whether he went to a hotel and was met at the hotel to be brought to the committee, I am not certain at this time. It's quite possible that they met his train, which did come into Seattle about eight o'clock in the morning. Great Northern. And if so, then they took him right to the committee. They could and probably would have had breakfast on the train, and would arrive at the Union Station in Seattle at eight o'clock. I think that that's what happened, but travel vouchers and tickets and things like that would record that activity.

I don't know how significant they are, except it is significant that no one either had the will or the ability or opportunity to brief George Hewitt on Gundlach and Rader. It just could not have been done, wouldn't have been done, wouldn't have been one of the things I would permit, because, as I said, before I was always trying to bring Rader along, hoping to get him to defect. Knowing that would be the ten-strike if we could get this prominent professor with pretty close association with the party and, according to our information, the first recruit to the Communist Party on the campus to defect.

If we could get him to defect and testify, well, we couldn't do better. And that's what I was aiming at, but Rader's entire social life orbited around his left-wing acquaintances and family and it didn't work. I didn't always communicate my intentions to my staff, but I would not have permitted, nor would any member of my staff been a party to briefing him on something like that Rader-Gundlach testimony.

It didn't have that significance to begin with we wouldn't do it anyway, but if we wanted to pick a real target it wouldn't have been Melvin Rader.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, as I understand the process that you and your staff followed, in preparation for those hearings, is that you would review a variety of records, tapes, or recording wires, and interview various people who may have been, or may not have been associated with the focus of your investigations at that time. There would be potentially investigation reports compiled and/or affidavits taken.

[End of Tape 40, Side 1]

Mr. Canwell: You wish to have me answer that now?

Mr. Frederick: Why would a witness be brought to Seattle without a prior interview? And if that was the case, did that happen with other witnesses?

Mr. Canwell: I think I should explain what our standard operating procedure was. It was standard operating procedure for any investigator who conducted an interview to then make that report to a secretary who typed it and made onionskin copies. And everything that every agent did, and every act he took for the committee, was transmitted to the chairman in that way. There was a tremendous amount of copy for me to read, and I would draw some conclusions from that and other knowledge that I had, and then in staff meetings we'd discuss prospects who had been interviewed, and raise questions as to what they could testify to, and not, and that sort of thing.

There was no briefing of witnesses. Local witnesses were interrogated by our agents in advance to see what they knew, what their feelings were, what they were willing—what part they were willing to take or participate in. But it was a very efficient, and I think a very fair approach. Anything that I thought bordered on the flaky or irresponsible I eliminated, I cut it out, and I would have words with the investigators about it. We had a very thorough understanding about what our procedure should be.

Then, not only the chairman but several of these agents had very good working relationships with other agencies. So how much they may have discussed—they may have discussed some particular case with somebody in the FBI, or Immigration Bureau, or the Army or Navy intelligence areas, I don't know. But it would have been the sort of thing that as an investigator I would do. I would expect them to, but we didn't rely or transmit that type of information to the record or to testimony. It was just a matter of education, information.

There was so much material being processed by our committee through the acquisition of the records of the Red Squad and other things that we didn't begin to have time to do everything we'd like to do. But there was very little said to witnesses, once they were subpoenaed. They didn't know very much about what questions would be asked them on the stand, and it was, as I say, a fast-

moving but very efficient operation.

We didn't have the time nor the will, nor desire, to program witnesses. If we had somebody that was flaky, we just didn't use him. Occasionally we got one that—we subpoenaed some unfriendly witnesses that were pretty far-out, but we didn't tell them what they had to testify to, either, except they had to answer the questions of the committee. We felt we were legally entitled to ask and require and demand answers.

In the Old Age Pension Union thing, we knew people, of course, who were dissidents who were angry or disturbed about how their money had been used, and how many demands were made on them and things like that, we knew that in advance. So we could be very general in our subpoenaing of witnesses, but we did want to show what the Old Age Pension Union was doing to old people. So, of course, we got witnesses who could testify to it.

I don't know whether I've wandered here and not answered your question, but there was no affidavit taken from George Hewitt in New York, nor were affidavits taken routinely from other witnesses. I am certain at this point that we relied on the recommendation of agents who were operating in the New York jurisdiction, and people, some that were known to us, and known to be responsible and so in telephone conversations we might indicate what we were looking for.

The James case, the information I think had been forwarded to us quite early, that they had a witness who had met Mrs. James in Russia. Of course, that's exactly what we wanted, if that information were available we wanted it, and we subpoenaed it.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, as I understand it, with regard to your contact within the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, that person was John Boyd, who was in Seattle. Why would your staff be in contact with Immigration agents in New York, and how would that come about?

Mr. Canwell: My best recollection is that one of our staff knew an Immigration agent in New York. It may have been Huston who knew this agent. And I'm trying to separate or establish how my association with the Immigration Bureau developed as it did.

We had an Immigration agent who was actually assigned to our committee. I don't think it was officially done, but he spent all of his time, or most of it, with us. His name was John Zumwalt. An old-time, long-time, Immigration agent who knew everybody of substance in the Immigration Bureau. He was a good guy, he was too good. He was a fatherly type, would get too involved in trying to convert these commies to a better way of life, but anyway, that was his thing.

But he was very close to our staff. Worked closely with us. Would often, if I had tasks that I just couldn't assign my staff to, they were too busy, I wanted some

errands run, there were people like Zumwalt or people in the American Legion or other places that I could call on, who would run these errands. People who were reliable, responsible, but were not employed by us, and received no remuneration from us. They were just trying to help get a needed job done, and get it done effectively.

So John Boyd, I don't think had any great participation with our committee. He was on friendly terms with Huston. I think they both belonged to the Elks Club. I know Huston did, and it was his undoing. But I don't recall whether John Boyd belonged to the Elks Club or not.

I knew Boyd, I'd see him occasionally, very responsible person. He would not have been our contact with George Hewitt, for instance. And it's just too far in the distance to remember all of the little details. You're in a fast-moving operation, you do what you feel is necessary and responsible, and that's the way you proceed.

I decided very early that we would do this job within the framework of the law. I was inclined before this time to do a lot of things that I didn't do on this committee. For instance, I was somewhat of an expert on electronic surveillance, but I did not personally use that technique in our operation. And so I very early had the understanding with my committee that that's the way we were going to operate, we were going to do the thing legally and effectively, and to the very best of our ability. And we always operated that way. And it was a tremendous assignment, anybody has the slightest idea of what was involved in an operation like this, with limited funds and time, and limited to the size of the staff you could employ, and those things. Well, there just wasn't any time for any monkey business, and we didn't engage in it. Didn't have to, so much of this stuff was just laid in our lap and everybody in the state of any substance was concerned about the Communist situation in the state and the scandal at the university.

Our interest in him came about, as I said before, because somebody back there had advised us, might even have been the House Un-American Activities Committee, but advised us that George Hewitt had information about Florence Bean James, and it was known, I know, to the House committee that we were going to proceed against the Jameses because in most cases we checked to see what information was in the files of the House committee. We developed a pretty good relationship with staff members. Bob Stripling, chief investigator, was very, very cooperative. So who tipped us off to begin with, that George Hewitt could nail Florence Bean James, I don't at this time recall. If I had all of my notes that were destroyed by the arson fire here, I probably could pinpoint that down to names, and dates, and times, and figures. But I don't know.

We weren't irresponsible enough to just take some ex-Communist witness out of the blue and bring him from

New York to testify in Seattle. Of course, we determined—I determined a great deal about his background before proceeding to that step. But by that time I was not concerned about Hewitt's integrity, I thought it was well-established. And I think he so proved himself.

I don't know how much information I obtained at this point from contacts that I had made in New York and Washington D.C. when the Washington state committee was first authorized. One of the first things I did was to go back there, and I visited the House Un-American Activities Committee and became acquainted with Bob Stripling.

So some of these things had been done, contacts had been made, reliable contacts, some people had developed a confidence in me that inspired them to cooperate. But at this point, this time, it is very difficult to go back and word-for-word and step-by-step put this thing in the record in a satisfactory way. I don't think I can do it. I don't think anybody else could.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, did you or staff have phone contact with George Hewitt before his arrival?

Mr. Canwell: I may have, because I had to determine things like his expenses in travel, and that sort of thing, so I assume that I did. At this point I don't know how I handled it, or maybe I had a secretary do it. We had four or sometimes five very competent secretaries. And one of them was in charge of travel. They would arrange train or flight travel and track was kept of the expenditure so we knew that. I didn't have time to do all of that. No one person could.

But on Hewitt I don't recall that I had phone contact with him, I'm not sure that I didn't.

Mr. Frederick: Potentially, staff had contact with him?

Mr. Canwell: They could have had. One of our staff who was charged with the responsibility of arranging transportation very likely would have had contact with him. Be assured that he'd catch such and such train at such and such time, and he was willing to operate on the expense formula that we had. So that would not be unusual, it might quite likely be the case. Somebody like J. B. Matthews or Louis F. Budenz, probably I would handle it.

Mr. Frederick: What I hear you saying, potentially, is that various parties within the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization were serving as an ersatz agent, or a booking agent, for George Hewitt.

Mr. Canwell: Not really.

Mr. Frederick: You're telling me that you gained in-

sight into George Hewitt as expert witness with regard to parameters through the Bureau—

Mr. Canwell: If I did so—

Mr. Frederick: —and not him.

Mr. Canwell: If I did so; if it was through the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) rather than the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I would have called Agent X, whom I would know would know about George Hewitt, and I wanted verification as to his integrity and whatnot. It's quite likely that I would do that sort of thing. They weren't acting as agents for me, they were just responding as good citizens and I think as good Immigration agents.

George Hewitt was an effective witness for the Immigration Bureau and so if I asked John Doe Immigration Man in New York or Washington D.C. what his reputation is for loyalty to the country, or integrity, or honesty, whatnot, I'm sure that agent would answer. And I think even the FBI would, in a case like that, if they were using Elizabeth Bentley or someone as a witness and I were to ask them as to her integrity, why they'd snort; they wouldn't be using her to begin with if she didn't have integrity.

Anyway, that's the way the thing would have to operate. These people weren't acting as agents for me, they were cooperating in areas that they could legally do, and felt morally obligated to do. And most of them were experienced enough in this Communist picture that they were damn well concerned about what was happening in the country. And maybe a little inclined then to cooperate with somebody who evidently was doing something about it.

The Immigration Bureau was one of the departments that was having their troubles from on high at one time, along about this time. There were people in the executive branch who didn't want a glove laid on any of the commies, and a great deal of opposition was tendered to people who were doing this sort of thing, and certain people in the executive branch thought they were working too hard at it. That builds up a feeling among patriotic people that something's wrong in Denmark, and then it's natural for them to do anything they can legally or wisely do to get at the problem.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I'd like to review with you what has been reported by Melvin Rader with regard to that noontime or thereabouts early afternoon invitation from you to him to appear in your office.

As I understand that conversation was reviewed with you by Ed Henry and Paul Coughlin (Coughlin with an "i") sometime Friday with regard to that exchange, and there was a memorandum written up by Paul Coughlin

with regard to that exchange, which was purported to go as such: "Mr. Canwell wants to see you in his office."

Mr. Rader went to your office, stated to you, "I am sorry, Mr. Canwell, but I have been instructed by my attorney not to answer questions in his absence."

Mr. Canwell: "Don't be alarmed, we only want to make a few inquiries."

Mr. Rader: "I shall follow my attorney's instructions and leave the room."

Mr. Canwell: "Then ask Ed Henry to come to the office and talk with us."

Mr. Canwell: No such conversation ever occurred as that which you just read, written up by Paul Coughlin. It is all a concoction. The Rader contact was as previously described. Mr. Rader was willing to talk until he recognized George Hewitt in my office, turned heel and fled.

[End of Tape 40, Side 2]

Mr. Canwell: Timothy, you're now boring in on the so-called Melvin Rader case, which I suspect is what all of these interviews are about. Anyway, we're getting down to the meat and potatoes, exploring what I was doing in the state Legislature.

I think it is well time that I put something in the record here clarifying the Rader case; separating fact from the fable that has been built up. Rader and the Canyon Creek Lodge, the George Hewitt affair, and all that has been built into a monumental fraud. They have made of Melvin Rader a sort of cause celebre, as I mentioned, and the sky seems to be the limit on what will be said or claimed.

Melvin Rader, of course, was of little or no substantial importance but was a useful tool of the Communist apparatus at the University of Washington. Standing alone, he was a weakling who would have been of no great value to the party until they developed his usefulness as a propaganda instrument. Up to that time, he had been what has been reported as the first recruit to the Communist Party on the campus of the University of Washington. His lack of value to the party was due to the fact that he was not an aggressive type, the type they need to go out, enlarge the party, spread propaganda and recruit people. For these purposes, he was of no value. But the party then began to take advantage of the fact that they had carried him along on the campus and in their devices for many years and suddenly he had developed enough whiskers in the academic community that his name could be made significant.

So in their propaganda operation on and about the campus, in the Seattle area, and throughout the party's

Northwest District, they found Melvin very useful. He would respond to any call, any time, where he was required to be at a meeting, spout certain lines, assist the apparatus in their current endeavors, whether it be the civil war in Spain, or the saving of Harry Bridges' hide when he was in danger of being deported. The Communist, Bridges, had been built up to a place where he dominated the waterfront on the West Coast. His Longshoremen's Union (ILWU) held a life and death strangle hold on the shipping industry on the Pacific Coast and later on Hawaii. In this and other endeavors, they could use Melvin, and they did. They used and abused him.

Melvin was a "country bumpkin" who came to the campus of the University of Washington. He originated on a farm in eastern Washington near Walla Walla and his father had sort of despaired of ever making a farmer of this bookish youngster. He eventually decided to ship him off to the University of Washington to see if somehow a little exposure to book learning was what he needed. Maybe there was a place in the world for Melvin, but it certainly was not on their livestock and wheat farm.

Melvin's brother and other members of the family more or less were in favor of Melvin leaving the farm and the chores that he didn't accomplish very well, had no stomach for. So he was sent to the UW and maybe his brother considered it unfair, but all seemingly went along. Melvin came to the University of Washington and, of course, never left. He was one of the campus-clingers who hang on until somehow they acquire enough seniority in the academic community to have a permanent place. In those days, it was also a way of avoiding manual labor. It at first didn't pay very well, but it was a steady job. That is what Melvin did. When he came to the campus, a gawky, bookish country kid, at a loss for what to do, knowing nobody and having no friends, suddenly the Communist apparatus zeroed in on him in the body of Lillian Reiseroff, a Communist recruiter who had been dispatched to the UW campus.

The Communists on campus operated as they always have; as they did then and do today, fifty years later. They select a candidate; they analyze the individual and are aware that he has no friends, is ill-at-ease, doesn't know what he is doing there but doesn't wish to be anywhere else. So they create a seemingly accidental meeting. Lillian would say, "We have seen you on the campus; we know that you are around; there are a number of us who meet in a little discussion group. We don't have a lot of money or a lot of friends, but we do find companionship and have common interests. If you'd like to join us, we'd be glad to have you. Come visit our meeting. We have one tonight."

So Melvin is caught in the first cast of the net. They bring him in and, as is traditional procedure in this recruiting approach, they just flatter the hell out of him: "There just was never anybody who quite had the brains

that this boy does. Such promise!" They will remark that they never heard anything expressed as he expressed it. They heap it on. You would think it was heaped so high that it wouldn't take, but it does. So the campus recruit is represented as a great intellect.

This bookish boy had suddenly found exactly what he wanted; he found where he wanted to go and there were others going that way—they had an appreciation of his talents and importance in the world. That is standard operating procedure. It has been employed on every campus in America over and over a thousand times. The recruits that are picked up, most of them, stay with the Communist apparatus. They have been flattered into thinking that they are intellectuals. They are in the soft disciplines which do not require a lot of brains to hang there—especially in the English or philosophy departments—as long as they have teachers who will go along with the ruse, flatter them, give them grades, and carry them along the path.

So Melvin spent his time promoting the cause of international communism. And when I went to the Rader farm and introduced myself, Mel's brother said, "Oh, you're going to ask me about that commie brother of mine."

This is what happened to student Rader back about 1922. Lillian Reiseroff was a skilled Communist recruiter from Cambridge, who had been assigned this task. The University of Washington, in a Communist recruiting sense, had never been penetrated. It was virgin soil. So Lillian and a friend of hers went to work on campus and as far as we have been able to determine, the first payload brought up Melvin Rader. Of course, if Lillian followed the procedure that she and the other female recruiters follow within the Communist orbit, when they get a prospect like that, if necessary, they take him or her to bed. In any case, Melvin was thoroughly captured and when Lillian moved on to the University of Minnesota and other assignments, poor Melvin felt like an orphan. At any rate, he remained always in love with Lillian.

We found that to be the case; and in attempting to separate Melvin from the Communist Party, I underestimated his weaknesses. He was a very weak individual and what I didn't realize was the hold that was fastened on him by the Communist apparatus, particularly in the form of Lillian Reiseroff. With Lillian it worked; it took. With all of our special treatment of him, and blandishments, and concern to carry him along, he never would break with the party. As I said, that was one of the failures in my endeavors. I had aided and abetted a number of these people to break with the party. In the case of Rader, I thought he was a sure thing, but he wasn't. His allegiance outlasted the Stalin purges, the starvation of six million Kulak farmers engineered by the Seattle Communist Anna Louise Strong, the Hitler-Stalin Pact, the Katyn Forest massacres in which the Soviets blamed the Nazis for the Soviet butchery of the Polish Army, and he con-

tinues to serve as a hack for Party fronts and activities, and the smearing of the party's opponents.

I think that you asked why we did not use the same technique with other witnesses who were to be identified by Hewitt–Rader's nemesis—or others. It was not our customary procedure. This was such a sensational thing, and one that I wished at the time that I could avoid because I didn't have time to go into it, but I couldn't avoid it. So I went down and called an executive hearing in my office and sent for Melvin Rader.

You made some mention there about some interview with Paul Coughlin. I don't think that ever occurred. You may have gotten that from Rader's book or something.

Rader did come to the office with my agent. He did come to the door and saw Hewitt and then turned heel and would not come in. So at that point I sent for his attorney, Ed Henry. I brought Ed Henry down and I told him exactly what the situation was and what had occurred; that Rader would not come in and confront Hewitt. I felt that he, as Rader's attorney, would want to have him confront Hewitt and dispose of the thing right there. I gave him unlimited opportunity to question and cross-question Hewitt. There were no holds to be barred. Ed Henry put on quite an act. I'm certain that he had privately told Rader under no circumstances to confront Hewitt.

Whatever the case was I'll always remember Ed Henry sitting there putting his head down in his hands and sobbing, and saying that he wished that he had never had anything to do with the case. I again pointed out to him what the imperatives were. That I couldn't avoid taking this testimony, and if Rader would not confront Hewitt, and if he would not cross-question him with Rader and Hewitt present, then we'd proceed and enter the testimony and anything else that Hewitt would testify to.

Mr. Frederick: Why would you feel compelled, as you state, to pursue that issue within those day and a half of hearings?

Mr. Canwell: It was, I think, very clear-cut. A legislative hearing is not a court of law. You do not follow court procedures. You're not obliged to. You don't have the time for all the monkey business and time-wasting that attorneys engage in at court. We were a fact-finding committee. We were to take testimony, conduct investigations, make a report to the succeeding Legislature. What we would do with testimony would be determined by the nature of it. We didn't know in advance what someone would testify to. Nor were we bound by any such rule of verification by five witnesses as you have described.

We did know that witnesses would testify about Florence Bean James. Why we did not follow the same procedure with regard to Mrs. James is very simple to an-

swer. We had such an abundance of information and proof on Florence Bean James' Communist connections that it was not imperative that she confront this witness. The information as to her travel abroad would be available, it would be accessible to anybody who sought it out in the various departments of government handling such things. That was something else. We had no concern that we would not make a substantial case against Florence Bean James and her husband.

The thing's not as involved as your impression makes it appear. We had by stipulation agreed with the ACLU lawyers, who in effect were the lawyers representing unfriendly witnesses at the hearing—we had an understanding and by stipulation, they were there only with the ability to advise their clients whether or not to answer. We did not wish any arguments, speeches, extended cross-questioning. It wasn't that sort of a hearing. That would have served no useful purpose. And the witnesses indicated that they would not answer, so what argument should an attorney make?

If the witness wouldn't respond to the committee, and the committee chairman advised them what the law was and what the consequences would be, what could an attorney do other than advise them to answer or not to answer? And that's exactly the position that those attorneys were in. But what they wanted to do was make propaganda speeches and debate the constitutionality of the committee and make a circus out of the thing and draw it on forever.

In the case of Melvin Rader, I was making an exception. I wanted to dispose of that matter and I didn't want to prevent Hewitt from testifying as to his knowledge of these two men. It would have been very unfair, and I think unwise, for me to say we will just not entertain that testimony. My committee members would have been all over me.

There were executive hearings all along the line in which the committee members were present and these things were discussed. But it was also discussed that we would not permit these speeches and arguments because that was not what the committee was being held for. It was not what it was all about. We were not there to determine the constitutionality of legislative inquiry, which had already been decided before the Supreme Court. We were not there to arrest anybody. We were there to follow out the instructions of the Washington State Legislature in Concurrent Resolution Number 10. That was to investigate and inquire and obtain the facts and make a report to the succeeding Legislature. It wasn't to provide a forum for the "Revolution."

Not for Henry or others like that to make speeches. Coughlin, he's good at that. He could have been a great lawyer but he was a Communist flunky. You couldn't let people like that take over these hearings. It wasn't the purpose of the thing. I had no intention of letting that

happen. I told them in advance that would be the case. They were only there by stipulation, understanding that they could only advise their clients whether or not to answer—period. That’s the only function that these attorneys had there.

When I made an offer to let Ed Henry cross-question and grill Hewitt to any length he wished, I wanted to dispose of that problem right there in what they, if they were honest, would say is the fairest possible way. They always wanted to cross-question witnesses. So here was an opportunity for one of them to do it. He told me that he couldn’t get Rader to come down to the executive hearing. I could have enforced my subpoena on Rader and had him brought down there. Place him in contempt for not doing so. I didn’t do that. I wanted him to talk.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, you requested of Melvin Rader, as I understand the situation, if he, Melvin Rader, can’t speak with you without the presence of Ed Henry, then requested Ed Henry to come and see you. And that’s what they did.

Mr. Canwell: It was not said to Rader that he couldn’t have Ed Henry there. Had he said, “I want my attorney,” it would have been different. He didn’t say so. He just wouldn’t come in. And he bolted. He went back up.

Mr. Frederick: Melvin Rader shouldn’t even have responded to the request from your staff person to see you without an attorney. He shouldn’t have been—just walked through the door. He shouldn’t have done that.

Mr. Canwell: So when the attorney was down there why wouldn’t he come down at his attorney’s request?

Mr. Frederick: As I understand the situation, he was—Melvin Rader—that afternoon was on deck to testify. He was upstairs gearing himself toward that. And Ed Henry didn’t request that Melvin Rader accompany him to see you.

Mr. Canwell: I have no idea where you got such information. He was being held under subpoena with the thought that we would require his testimony that afternoon. But not certain. If not, he would have been held under subpoena the next day.

But in any case the correct sequence of events was that I sent an investigator off to request Rader to come to my room and he seemed to be very willing to do it, until he observed Hewitt there. Then he turned and left. Then I sent for Ed Henry. I think Ed Henry had been out of the room at the time. It was recess. He probably was getting a cup of coffee.

Anyway, I sent the investigator back to find Henry. And he did. He brought him down to the room and I ex-

plained to Ed Henry the whole procedure, the whole operation. I told him the importance of getting Rader to confront Hewitt so we could dispose of this. If he confronted him and it appeared that testimony was not proper or valid, it never would have gone in the record. Henry knew that. He knew that if he did not get Rader down there, and if he refused to respond, that Hewitt would be leaving town and the decision would have to be made: “Do we use this testimony or not?”

I told him, Ed Henry, that on the basis of what was happening we were going to use it. That’s the way the thing happened precisely. Rader chickened the minute he saw Hewitt. He could have come in and said, “Well, I won’t talk until my attorney is here.” We would have gotten his attorney. And he was aware of that.

I had permitted Rader to have Ed Henry as his attorney and had given him great leeway. And down there I offered to give him the sky as the limit. Anything that he said afterward denying that is a consummate lie. And Paul Coughlin being brought into the thing is just another ACLUer who was willing to falsely testify. In my experience, there isn’t one of them who wouldn’t.

I only met one reputable ACLU lawyer in my life. And he was in New York. He was secured by Kohlberg to represent Hewitt. He’s the only honest one I ever met. I had lunch with him. I told him what the situation was. He had been at the New York extradition hearings and other things. And was the only one I ever felt made an honest response.

But Paul Coughlin and that whole kit and caboodle, if you can find an honest man on the roster of the Washington State ACLU at that time I’d be the first to crown him. There wasn’t an honest one in the lot.

Mr. Frederick: You’re making reference to and you include Edward Henry?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, Ed Henry particularly. Ed Henry was an ACLU stooge all the way. And was collaborating with Ed Guthman, helped cook up this whole Rader plot with the prosecuting attorney. There never was any validity to it.

You ask why not Gundlach. We would have gotten to him next, but we ran into this stonewall and roadblock and with Gundlach again we knew we had enough on him to nail him anyway. So that wasn’t as important as having a witness that I was trying to bring along to wean out of the party. To have him accused in this sensational manner, I wanted to clarify it.

It was significant that he had that information. We had not had such damaging information against Rader. I stated before at no time did we ever have proof of a party card, for instance, membership on Melvin Rader. We didn’t on Alger Hiss, but he went to the penitentiary for perjury. We didn’t have the whole FBI to work on

Melvin Rader as the House committee did on Alger Hiss. Had we had just one agent with authority to go back and talk with Pop Mindel we'd have sent him. We didn't have that. But it was because of this very fact that we had this startling and damaging evidence from a credible witness who in every instance had proved reliable, that I felt it had to be disposed of and should be. I tried to, to the best of my ability. I don't know any way on earth I could have been more fair to Melvin Rader and Ed Henry than to open up this executive hearing. They always demanded the right to cross-question witnesses, then crawled when they had the opportunity to do so.

Mr. Frederick: Now as I understand the situation, there has never been any representation made, either by you, committee members and/or staff of that committee, citing notes taken from that meeting.

Mr. Canwell: There was no attempt made by me to convey to the Legislature in my report notes of any executive hearings. It was not required that I do so. Had I chosen to I could have. The fact that the succeeding Legislature under Mr. Hodde refused to print my report to the Legislature would give you an idea why I didn't bring in extraneous matter. I brought in what was testified to under oath, before court reporters, and the press, and witnesses, and the committee members. That I felt was what the Legislature was entitled to and was interested in. I'm sure that had I delivered a packet of confidential information to Charlie Hodde, well, I'm sure I know what would have happened to it. The same thing that happened to my third report. It never was printed. That was on the orders of Mr. Hodde.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, do you have a copy of that third report?

Mr. Canwell: Somewhere I do, yes. And I've always threatened to print it, because I think it should be printed. It was authorized by the Legislature. The only thing that they did was to make some stenographic transcripts, and they were not even duplicates. Each transcript was different. I was amused at the carelessness of the succeeding Legislature in their handling of such information.

Mr. Frederick: Why wasn't that submitted?

Mr. Canwell: It was presented, and then it was up to the succeeding Legislature to print it. And they did not.

[End of Tape 41, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: Why would there be a third report?

Mr. Canwell: Because the stated purpose of the com-

mittee was to do all these things and make a report to the next Legislature. And incidentally, in handling that I made the first and second transcripts of the hearings part of the report to the Legislature. They couldn't avoid or stop the printing of those reports, but they could block the printing of the third one, the report of the committee which stated its findings and recommendations.

As a responsibility as chairman of that committee, I did make a summary report to the Legislature which we classify as a third report, just as these two printed transcripts are the first and second reports, and in the transmission to the Legislature I made them all part of the committee's report to the succeeding Legislature. It was up to them to print the typed copy that was submitted as a conclusion or summary. They had already printed parts one and two. So those couldn't be stopped.

Mr. Frederick: You are stating that the committee's report was not published verbatim as you submitted it?

Mr. Canwell: It was not—it was never published. They did make some stenographic transcripts and they were not even duplicates.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I think I understand what you are saying. The first hearing and the second hearing are separately covered and bound. The third report that you submitted is found in the House Journals.

Mr. Canwell: It may be there, I don't know what they did with it. I know they didn't bind and print it. That should have been done. They had this committee functioning and spending a goodly amount of money and required to make a report to the Legislature and when the final phase of it was made, it was never published!

Mr. Frederick: It was printed in the House Journal.

Mr. Canwell: As I remember among other things there were two or three errors in the thing.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, as I understand the situation that later on that day, particularly after George Hewitt testified that Thursday afternoon, stating in no uncertain terms that Melvin Rader attended a Communist school at Briehl's Farm near Kingston, New York, and that only Communist members could attend that school and that school was for professional staff, at least that's George Hewitt's representation. And associated with that were university professors.

As I understand the situation, later on that afternoon Ed Henry approached Mr. Houston and made arrangements with Mr. Houston, or attempted to make arrangements, or requested arrangements for Paul Coughlin to question Hewitt, and that was to be potentially conducted

sometime Friday, potentially noon Friday.

Mr. Canwell: I'm not remembering the dates.

Mr. Frederick: Furthermore as I understand it, that Thursday night, Paul Coughlin telephoned deputy prosecutor Max Nicolai. Max Nicolai and Paul Coughlin discussed what transpired on Thursday, and they called Lloyd Shorett who was the King County prosecuting attorney who made a commitment to initiate an investigation the next day.

Mr. Canwell: You want my comment now?

Mr. Frederick: As I understand it, that Friday morning Paul Coughlin went to Mr. Shorett's office and the prosecutor dispatched his chief deputy, Herbert Davis, to cross-examine George Hewitt. Paul Coughlin arranged for a court reporter and a newspaper reporter to be present. During that Friday morning recess Ed Henry asked Mr. Houston if prosecuting attorney Shorett or his deputy would be present during the Hewitt questioning. Henry reminded Houston that pressure would probably be put upon Shorett to file a perjury charge, and that he should be there to hear both sides before deciding to file the charge.

Mr. Canwell: From what are you reading that information?

Mr. Frederick: These are from my notes here, and they would be primarily taken from the Melvin Rader book.

As I understand it Friday noon recess you went to the office and talked to Houston and some of the committee members. Ed Henry was told to return at about one-thirty. Herbert Davis went to the office at one-thirty and talked to Houston and committee members, requesting the right as deputy prosecutor to question Hewitt. He was told the committee would consult its attorney, Ford Elvidge. They didn't know if they would have to comply with that within a legislative hearing, and that they would get back to them at about five-thirty that afternoon.

What transpired is that once George Hewitt finished his testimony there was a noon recess, and that was the last this party ever saw of George Hewitt. And there was a report, I believe that you stated, that he took a plane and left at about two that afternoon. And if I'm not mistaken I believe that possibly Mr. Houston stated that he left that afternoon on a train, but George Hewitt was no longer in town.

My question is that there has been contact to the committee, staff of committee, by attorneys representing Melvin Rader. There was contact by Herbert Davis who was deputy prosecuting attorney with regard to staff

wishing to question George Hewitt. There was also contact by Paul Coughlin to staff requesting the opportunity to question George Hewitt.

Keeping in mind that George Hewitt during this time was for the most part testifying that morning, a little after nine-thirty up to noon recess, was there an opportunity that Friday for these various individuals to question George Hewitt?

Mr. Canwell: This sounds to me, and, of course, I read it before, like a lot of "Monday morning quarterbacking." A bunch of ACLUers, you've named more of them—I had forgotten some; Max Nicolai and Lloyd Shorett, top members of the ACLU. Paul Coughlin is a top member. Every one of these guys are ACLUers. So they, Ed Henry and the prosecuting attorney knew the precise time of Hewitt's departure, because I conveyed that information to them personally on the telephone inasmuch as I was concerned that Henry wasn't being honest. And they knew, the prosecutor knew, Ed Henry knew, and everybody in the ACLU knew that George Hewitt was safely out of the jurisdiction of Washington State before they moved or talked about perjury.

My best answer to the whole thing is that these people who always want things done in a court of law had their case on Hewitt and Rader handled in New York by an impartial judge who knew nothing of any of us. And what that judge had to say and how he ruled should be a matter of the record. Because he heard the whole testimony and he figured the whole thing was a frame-up. So I know that these people were doing, and Rader was doing, a Monday morning quarterbacking. They knew that Hewitt was out of the jurisdiction of the state and they could make their hue and cry, to say that Paul Coughlin arranged for a reporter to be present. Without knowing, I'd bet a hundred dollars to one that that reporter, if there was one contacted, was the phoney bastard, the plant.

I know how the whole thing was cooked up and who did it. There wasn't an honest man in the lot. Not an honorable, honest man in the lot. And that included Paul Coughlin who was the best of the them. But my recollection is that he was one of the attorneys who approached me in this group originally, when the stipulation was agreed to that they represent their clients at the hearings only with the limitations laid down by the committee. But this whole thing is a—

Mr. Frederick: Albert, excuse me for interrupting. In your opinion, why would they not avail themselves of the opportunity to interview George Hewitt? Particularly so in the presence of staff from the King county prosecuting attorney's office. Why would they not avail themselves of that?

Mr. Canwell: Because that was a phoney charade. That

thing was all set up after they knew that Hewitt was out of their jurisdiction. And to make a cause celebre out of Melvin Rader was the best thing that they could come up with. They thought they had something, and they knew that they could dish out their propaganda, they could shout about perjury and all that, after it was deliberately too late to do anything about it. Ed Henry, certainly having been in on the thing all the way, was able to supply the ACLU, of which he was a key member, with information and Lloyd Shorett was also a member of it. Max Nicolai was a member. You could take the whole bunch. There wasn't a one that wasn't a member of the ACLU.

For your information, my thinking on the ACLU is that it contains all the agents in place in America for the Soviet Department of Disinformation, and they're not amateurs. That doesn't mean that every ACLUer knows what's going on, he doesn't. It's like every other front. The kingpins and the brains function and operate and the rummies and sheep follow. But no one of these people is an innocent and that includes Lloyd Shorett, Max Nicolai, Ed Henry, Paul Coughlin. They were all people who sat in the highest councils of the ACLU in Seattle in Washington State, and who were plotting and planning, and scheming trying to figure out some way that they could salvage something from these hearings. And do what they had done to other legislative hearings, where they destroyed their effectiveness or delayed them, or caused such confusion that the public didn't know what it was all about.

In this case they were losing the round, they lost every round. And so they were making a fictitious or a false case on Rader and the Canyon Creek Lodge thing, which was essentially irrelevant.

Ed Henry, and particularly the newspaper reporter, knew that the whole thing was a lie because I laid the thing out before them as it unfolded on the Canyon Creek Lodge. All three reporters of the state's major papers knew every step of what took place in our investigation of the Canyon Creek Lodge. We tried very hard to be fair to Melvin Rader. Harder than he deserved, because—according to his testimony—with the part of the sign-up book that was salvaged, he could not prove that he was at the Canyon Creek Lodge at the time that he said he was. I just agreed that he might have been, because part of the record had been destroyed by a process that we had nothing to do with.

Mr. Frederick: Now you're referring to Melvin Rader with regard to his testimony, Friday, July 23rd? This is what you're referring to?

Mr. Canwell: I'm referring to the—

Mr. Frederick: What he said—

Mr. Canwell: What he said about Canyon Creek Lodge.

Mr. Frederick: Then on that Friday.

Mr. Canwell: Yes.

Mr. Frederick: Potentially it would have been late Thursday, July 22nd, that for the first time he heard George Hewitt state that Melvin Rader was supposed to be at Briehl's Farm in New York sometime in 1939, 1938, or 1939. There's two years right there, that he's got to recall.

Mr. Canwell: I've always said that personally I was never certain that Hewitt was completely accurate on his dates. But the New York Superior Court jury heard all of this testimony, and concluded that he was telling the truth and refused to extradite him. And the court was very disturbed at the treatment that this boy had been given, and by whom, and the court said something to the effect that the whole legal apparatus out in King County ought to be investigated, or something to that effect. Any record of this case should also include the transcript of the testimony and the ruling of the New York Superior Court hearing on the request for extradition of George Hewitt.

So, it isn't Canwell saying this, here is a responsible jurist to hear testimony and rules on it. And ruled against these jokers.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I hear what you are saying. What I'm responding to is your statement that Melvin Rader and his attorneys and the King County prosecuting attorney and/or deputy prosecutor really didn't want to talk to George Hewitt.

Mr. Canwell: Of course they didn't, or they would have. All in the world Lloyd Shorett had to do, when I told him that Hewitt was leaving at a given time and what this furor was all about, all in the world he'd had to do is say, "Will you hold him another day, or hold him an hour" or hold him any way. He didn't request that, they didn't cook this thing up until after he was well out of town. And then they began to make a real charade of it.

Mr. Frederick: I hear what you say, and today is the first time I've heard that.

Mr. Canwell: Well, nobody ever asked me.

Mr. Frederick: With regard to published material, secondary materials, primary materials, newspapers, statements by others, this is the first time, today, I'm hearing from you that you were in conversation with Lloyd Shorett.

Mr. Canwell: Yes.

Mr. Frederick: You were in conversation with him that Thursday or that Friday?

Mr. Canwell: Right after this thing began to boil. I don't remember the precise time but Hewitt was still in town. I advised the prosecuting attorney—there had been some threat that perjury charges would be leveled or something like that, and I called the prosecuting attorney, told him what I knew, and that the reason for putting the testimony was that Hewitt was supposed to leave town at a given time—as we always did on our witnesses. We set up their schedule, and in this case he was due to leave town and the prosecuting attorney knew that.

Mr. Frederick: You're saying that you called Lloyd Shorett and you say potentially when this began to brew. And potentially that would have been in the late afternoon of July 22nd, that Thursday.

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember everything that happened step by step at that time. I just remember that it was a problem that I had, and I solved it the way I felt it should be solved. I think that Ed Henry also advised the prosecuting attorney. The reason that I called was that I believe it was Henry who was making talk or threats about perjury. So I felt that the prosecuting attorney should know what was going on. And I advised that office. I believe that I later told this to Dr. Allen and Rader in a meeting out at the University of Washington. But I don't have records on that.

There was no question in my mind whatever that the prosecuting attorney and Ed Henry and everybody else knew that Hewitt was out of town when they called their big meeting and issued their hue and cry about perjury. I know that it was phoney every step of the way.

They always make a great to-do about their being unable to cross-question witnesses. You get these commie witnesses on the stand and they're tongue-tied. So then somebody identifies them as Communist. Communists are supposed to be grilled hour after hour by some commie attorney who's just making headlines, just doing it for that purpose. God, how many times I've seen them operate that way.

[End of Tape 41, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: You're stating that their representations to meet and question George Hewitt in preparation for the consideration of the potential filing of the perjury charge were not followed up by them, using your words: "because they knew that what George Hewitt said was the truth."

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I believe that people on that level in the ACLU are high enough in the Communist apparatus that they would have known on the first bounce that this was true. Therefore, what they were trying to do was to make propaganda, and they are masters of it. Falsehood and truth, they don't know the difference. All they know is what they can utilize. But if someone really is interested in this subject he ought to read the book, *Perjury*, by Allen Weinstein. This Jewish writer decided that he was going to expose the frame-up on Alger Hiss. And he went into it with that in mind. As he examined this whole devious trial, he ended up writing a book condemning Hiss. That's what would happen in any of this sort of thing, if you had the time and the funds and the determination to go get the facts.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, has there been anyone within the court process or within the newspaper process or through a variety, potentially of speakers bureaus that opposed you, questioned you, that somehow were not linked or supportive of a Communist conspiracy?

Mr. Canwell: There were very few. There's been very little honest attempt to interview me. Very, very little.

Mr. Frederick: Who would be the exceptions? Who are the exceptions?

Mr. Canwell: I'd have a bit of a problem right now thinking of one. There's one who wrote a book on Henry Jackson.

Mr. Frederick: I'm not talking about published material. I'm talking about just across-the-board.

Mr. Canwell: To use somebody who interviewed me. But there were people who interviewed me who lied through their teeth. Like Vern Countryman. He came out to my farm and the stories he told afterwards had no relationship to what our discussions were.

And recently after the Goldmark trial there was one instance where there were a couple of girls representing a radio station or something came over and interviewed me. They gave me a transcript of the interview. I didn't attempt to record it myself. They, I think, were reasonably honest.

You asked me who the guy was in the Repertory Theatre, John Gilbert. I went there in response to their interview and was interviewed out at their station, I think it was a public television thing. John Gilbert was the interrogator—again, in my opinion, there's no honesty, no attempt to get at the truth or to give a fair shake to the interviewee.

Mr. Frederick: Who were the exceptions that were your

critics?

Mr. Canwell: It would be hard for me to pick one of them. And not because I'm paranoid. It's because they worked at interviewing me and getting to me, where the other type didn't; "noncombatants" didn't see me as newsworthy. And I wasn't. So I become newsworthy when somebody like Vern Countryman decides to interview me. Ed Guthman, people like that.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I'm using the word "critic" above and beyond newspaper reporting or book writing. I mean across-the-board. Who were the exceptions?

Mr. Canwell: Of course I always had a friend or two at court, Ashley Holden being one.

Mr. Frederick: He's not a critic.

Mr. Canwell: No, if they're for me they are not a critic. If they are against me, they are a critic.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, the reason I ask is that through this series, and I would assume, potentially through—although I don't know, because we haven't conducted interviews up into the fifties and sixties. But what I hear you saying is that those who challenge you, your response has been to date, that they are part of a Communist conspiracy.

Mr. Canwell: That conclusion would be drawn by what they wrote; whether they wrote what the interview contained or wrote something else, and by their public records. If what they wrote or reported was false or if they have a record of supporting leftist causes, I have a justification in believing they're connected with—

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I'm talking about not just newspapers or reporting. Ed Henry wasn't a reporter. Paul Coughlin wasn't a reporter.

Mr. Canwell: No, they were Communist shysters.

Mr. Frederick: My question is, did you ever meet a critic in your career that wasn't a "Communist shyster"?

Mr. Canwell: There are many, many critics of me that I might not have agreed with but didn't think they were subversive. And just offhand, I would have to do a little thinking to think of who interviewed, who has written about me. I've been written about by some experts, like the Lynd family and many others.

Mr. Frederick: Were they critics?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, were they critics! They were damn liars. They reported things, put it in quotes that I never said. And it appeared in the *American Scholar*!

Mr. Frederick: Okay, they are an example of people who were critical of you and who were not Communist dupes. There is an example.

Mr. Canwell: They are Communists.

I've been interviewed by people like one of the editors on the *Chicago Tribune*. He was not particularly favorable to what I was doing. And I've been written up by people who I would say were objective reporters but who were not dedicated to what I was doing. But in thinking of them at the moment there were reporters in Seattle that covered the contempt hearings. Some of them were friendly, some unfriendly. They all interviewed me. And I never refused to talk to any of them on that basis.

In local papers there were people like Doc Riley, who covered the Legislature for the *Spokane Chronicle* when I was there. He certainly was not friendly to what I was doing or to me personally. But he did write stories about me that are, well, I don't remember that he wrote any critical ones. So I don't know. It's hard for me. I'm like Diogenes. How am I going to find an honest man who's critical of Canwell? You know you are asking an impossible question.

Mr. Frederick: Why is George Hewitt's testimony correct, and why are Melvin Rader and his attorneys, Ed Guthman, the *Seattle Times*, et cetera, et cetera, why, if you believe they are, why are they wrong?

Mr. Canwell: I'm inclined to believe such people only under oath. I want their declarations and statements made under oath. In general, my critics and Melvin Rader are not writing under oath.

A group of these ACLUers get together and they plot a format or a formula of a program and Rader writes a book and gets it published. Bill Dwyer gets a phoney book published. They can do it, I can't. I can't get that sort of publishing done. I'm only newsworthy as a scoundrel. Not as somebody who did an honest public service.

You don't have to be paranoid to just read tracks. Follow their paper trails. I have a whole stack of books over there on the table that were written by these people. They're my critics but they're not under oath.

Mr. Frederick: So what you're saying is because Ed Henry, I don't mean Ed Henry, I mean George Hewitt, testified under oath then that's the story.

Mr. Canwell: It doesn't make what he said truthful. Ed Guthman lied under oath, I heard him do it. But the witness who takes an oath of truthfulness may then be

charged with perjury for falsifying statements, as Alger Hiss was.

And these people place no value whatever on the truth. The truth or a lie is only valuable to them as it's effective. If telling the truth might help them, sometimes they will do it.

These people met with me. They knew what the procedure would be out there. And then they tried to violate it. They had their agents out marching around the State Armory creating a disturbance. They had their agents as lawyers inside the hearing. And they did the best that they could to disrupt it to keep it from functioning. I had the jump on them. I threw them out. And that's exactly what should happen to that type of person anytime he bobs up to disrupt a court or a hearing or to drown out the voices of witnesses.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, we're talking about Ed Henry. Did he disrupt the hearings? Did Paul Coughlin disrupt the hearings?

Mr. Canwell: Paul Coughlin did not represent anybody at our hearings to my knowledge. The stuff that's cooked up by Rader and his book or somewhere else telling what Paul Coughlin did is pure fiction, pickle smoke. It never happened.

Mr. Frederick: I'm not aware of Ed Henry disrupting the hearings.

Mr. Canwell: He didn't. The only person he represented there, I believe, was Melvin Rader. And Ed Henry was not programmed to create a disturbance in the hearing. If he had been, he'd have done it. Those people plot that stuff before they come there. We knew in one case in advance who the demonstrators inside the hearing room would be. And I placed a state patrolman near to where they'd be sitting and our advance information proved to be correct. So those people are programmed to do this. Ed Henry was not programmed to create a disturbance. If he had been he would have been jumping and shouting like some of the others.

Mr. Frederick: So you believed George Hewitt because he was under oath.

Mr. Canwell: No, that's not why I believed him, but he was willing to testify in a hearing where he could be charged with perjury if he falsely testified. I believed him because of the combination of circumstances: the fact that he could not have been briefed on who these professors were prior to the time that he spotted them in the hearing room. That's the reason that I believed him.

George Hewitt reported seeing them; he reported seeing them during the hearing to one of our staff. And at

the recess that information was conveyed to me. Now that all occurred within the framework of the one-hour span that the hearings were held. None of it happened anywhere else. So I'm inclined to believe what I see and what I hear and what any reasonable man would believe.

Now these people had every opportunity to deny it and didn't, until it was too late. Until the thing was moot, was out of the perimeter.

But anyhow I believed Hewitt in this instance because of the physical evidence that was before me. I saw Ed Henry in action. Of course, I knew a lot about him to begin with. And the fact that Rader came down there, saw Hewitt and backed away. He wouldn't come down. Then Ed Henry was summoned; he came down there. He couldn't get his client to come down, according to Henry. That is the physical evidence of the situation that I observed. Beyond that, I don't think I need very much.

They knew Hewitt was going to give that testimony. And when he did, it was not news to them. They had already started their backfires. Decided what they were going to do about it.

Mr. Frederick: And you state that Ed Henry didn't avail himself of questioning George Hewitt.

Mr. Canwell: That's right. He stated to me amid sobs that he couldn't get Melvin to come down to the hearing room, that he wouldn't do it. And that's when he put on his act and said that he wished he had never become involved in the case. You know it was strictly phoney. He was in it all the way.

Mr. Frederick: You are saying that Ed Henry was—

Mr. Canwell: He was in the deceptive end of this right from the beginning.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, with regard to George Hewitt, potentially the year of 1938. Briehl's Communist school or a Communist school conducted on Briehl's farm near Kingston, New York; the student body made up primarily of university professors, George Hewitt testified he saw Melvin Rader there. This was the basic representation that George Hewitt was going to present. I don't understand above and beyond those issues what an attorney, for the first time hearing that, would ask George Hewitt.

Mr. Canwell: He'd ask him what any intelligent interrogator would whether he was an attorney or a newspaperman. He'd ask him for specifics about this school and his teaching there and a great many questions. And then he'd spin it down on Rader and Gundlach. And the fact that Hewitt knew their names when he first identified them in the hearing room is indisputable evidence.

My staff and even some of the committee already

thought I was going too easy on Rader because we knew a lot about him. And in staff meetings and in committee sessions where we met, I'd discussed these things and they knew that we had a heck of a lot on Rader we weren't presenting. And then for me to refuse this testimony and accept a testimony about the Jameses would have looked pretty fishy. I wasn't about to do that. I gave him every opportunity to challenge it and if he could challenge it in any way I would not have let him put it on.

[End of Tape 42, Side 1]

As described in previous questioning, Ed Henry left the room and came back shortly and said that he just couldn't get him to come down; he wouldn't do it. And then that's when Henry put on this phoney show. And Hewitt was there. He could have questioned him *instead of sobbing*, no reason not to, but at first I wanted a confrontation, I wanted a face down between these two people.

You may remember that's what they did with Whitaker Chambers and Alger Hiss. They wanted them to confront each other. Wanted them to see each other and then make their denials. And that's what I wanted there. I wanted Rader to be able to make his denials in the presence of the accuser and his attorney there to question him. And I don't know how you could be any more fair than that. It was out of our regular procedures because we didn't have time to do that with every witness. But in this case we went the second mile. We did everything. And then put the testimony in the record. I don't know how anybody could ask for any more than I offered Rader and Henry. It was more than I was giving other attorneys and other witnesses.

I suspect that Rader and Gundlach may have themselves recognized Hewitt but maybe not; that was quite a lapse of time, I don't know, and I suppose they met a lot of blacks and "they all look alike." In one investigation I was conducting, I showed a mug shot to a black bartender of ours and asked if he knew him and the black bartender said, tongue-in-cheek, of course, "You know, Mr. Canwell, all coons look alike." People of a different ethnic coloration all look alike until you get acquainted with them.

In any case, had Rader confronted Hewitt and made his denials in that situation, I would not have permitted Hewitt to testify on the subject. We would have left the testimony as it stood in the executive hearing for examination and evaluation. But he wouldn't do it and there was no reason not to put the thing in the record.

There are some things that in my memory I wish I was more clear on. I'm sure that at various times I had been in contact with Lloyd Shorett, but I don't at this time remember what it might have been. It might have been people who had been arrested in the King County juris-

diction or something, and I think that I had a conversation with him before. So it was not out of character to, when I heard that they were trying to cook up some sort of a perjury case, for me to contact the prosecuting attorney and tell him what was moving. Of course, I was talking to one of the kingpins in their apparatus and there were others in his office.

Mr. Frederick: Would that apply to Herbert Davis?

Mr. Canwell: I don't recall anything about Herbert Davis, whether he was an ACLUer or not. He may not have been, I just don't recall anything about him. You mentioned Max Nicolai—a red flag comes up. Shorett I know, but I don't remember Davis.

I had two deputy prosecutors from my office handling the contempt cases. There again we were always accused of not letting the suspected subjects have their day in court, so I gave six of them their day in court. We cited them for contempt. But two prosecutors from that office handled the contempt cases and did a splendid job on them.

Mr. Frederick: As I understand the situation on Friday, Herbert Davis, on sight and with forewarning, wanted to access George Hewitt and ask questions and begin the interviewing process, and there had been accusations made Thursday evening through attorneys to the prosecuting attorneys office, issues of perjury. And that was the issue at that point in time to begin to explore that.

Mr. Canwell: I don't believe that to be true. I know what the claims have been. But if Davis had approached wanting access to George Hewitt, his approach would have been to me, the chairman. I was the only one who could make such a determination, and turn Hewitt over to him or refuse to. It would have to have been to me. It wouldn't have been through Bill Houston and so that stuff was all pickle smoke. It was cooked up after the fact.

Mr. Frederick: Well, were you available?

Mr. Canwell: Of course I was. I was always.

Mr. Frederick: On every time there was a contact during this you were available?

Mr. Canwell: Yes. All day every day I was at my office and many hours from there on into the night. People at my office knew where to reach me at night at my room at the Washington Athletic Club. I was always available.

Mr. Frederick: As I understand, Albert, they were attempting to contact authority from the committee to access George Hewitt, and they did not succeed.

Mr. Canwell: Of course they didn't, because if they had, they'd have contacted me or, if I'd have left, somebody else in a position of responsibility—and it wouldn't have been Bill Houston. Even at that time, I had realized that I would have to get rid of him.

Bill Houston did a very inept job of interrogating Rader on the stand, but I couldn't do anything about that because I had agreed with my committee that that's the way our procedure would be.

Had I left anybody in charge of the situation there, it would have likely been John Whipple or Aaron Coleman. And if they had contacted anybody in authority it would have been me. But I would have probably been there. There was no attempt made. I was always within reach. There never was a time that they could not contact me from my office or my staff.

Mr. Frederick: So what you're saying then or implying: Ed Henry, Paul Coughlin, Herbert Davis and, if I'm not mistaken there, I believe that Lloyd Shorett also showed up on that Friday, three or four people then were so incompetent to the extent that they couldn't communicate to you that you—

Mr. Canwell: They are not incompetent, they're damn liars and they were cooking up a plot.

Had anybody from the prosecuting attorneys office wanted access to Hewitt, I would have been delighted to give it, because Hewitt was anxious to talk. He was not trying to get away or out of sight. He was very willing to come back from New York if we could pay his transportation. By that time I didn't have the funds. Hewitt was not evading them and we were not protecting him. Not keeping him from the prosecutors office. And that whole story was cooked up after the fact by mostly Ed Guthman and his cohorts.

Mr. Frederick: As I understand the situation, Lloyd Shorett shortly after that called the FBI—

Mr. Canwell: He may have.

Mr. Frederick: —as the King county prosecuting attorney and asked if Rader, in their opinion, their official position, is a known Communist or Communistic, and they said, "No."

Mr. Canwell: I don't think that ever happened—the FBI doesn't function that way, even to constituted authorities. You have to be a federal judge or official to get any spontaneous cooperation like you are indicating. My friend, Dick Auerbach, or whoever they alleged to have contacted, would not give them such information whether he did or didn't have it. And this whole thing is a passel of lies. Chances are also very good that if someone like

the prosecutor had made such a request at the FBI headquarters that I would have been contacted in some phase of it.

There was no federal case there. You don't utilize the Justice Department at your will, at your beck and call. They have a certain procedure that they follow and if you want something you come with—

Mr. Frederick: Albert! They didn't say any of the above! They didn't say "yes," they said "no", to the question.

Mr. Canwell: That's what somebody said they said. They wouldn't say. They just—

Mr. Frederick: Well, they said—

Mr. Canwell: No, that's what somebody said that they said. There again somebody who's putting together a story not under oath, by the way, but they're putting together a story—they're trying to make it sound feasible and plausible. The FBI wouldn't give the prosecuting attorney such an answer unless he came there with a subpoena for information. And they wouldn't have to honor the subpoena if they didn't want to. It's only the federal courts that have access to the FBI files, and that takes a certain procedure.

The problem is, a knowledgeable person reads this sort of thing and knows when they are lying, but the general public doesn't. People who would read a Rader book or a Guthman article, they don't know that these people are lying, they have no way of knowing. They don't understand the machinery of it. I would know right off that the prosecuting attorney could not get such an answer from the chief of the FBI. Doesn't function that way. They wouldn't do it—they would be quoted, and they can't afford to be quoted. That stuff has to come through the attorney general and it has to come with proper subpoena or authority and nobody, including the county prosecuting attorney, has that sort of access to the bureau's records, it just isn't the case. And the FBI staff doesn't stick its neck out that way. One of the persons that I know would be least likely on earth to do it is Dick Auerbach.

Mr. Frederick: Moving on. On July 30, Shorett called Hewitt in New York. And Hewitt affirmed that it was not a mistaken identity, it was not a misrepresentation of fact.

Mr. Canwell: And he didn't volunteer to come out because of all the harassment he had received.

Mr. Frederick: It may have, but there had been no papers served at that point in time.

Mr. Canwell: There was no way for them to serve pa-

pers on him, but he would have come voluntarily if somebody had paid his transportation.

Mr. Frederick: He stated that Melvin Rader was there by the first of June, in '38 or '39, and stayed about four or five weeks. Interestingly, Shorett called him again on August 1, 1949. Hewitt then said that the date could not have been before '39, and it might have been 1940. So with these various representations of Mr. Hewitt, the sliding scale was the date.

Mr. Canwell: That always occurred to me and I couldn't understand it. Assuming that everything that he was saying was truthful, the ability to remember all of those things from ten years before in context would be quite a feat, and I know just as right here I try to recall dates and places that I have to go back and do some digging and research and count down. However, this whole attempt to pin down dates is frivolous. Whether or not Rader was at Briehl's Farm or the Canyon Creek Lodge does not affect his well-documented and publicly acknowledged support of Communist causes for the last 70 years.

Mr. Frederick: Okay.

Albert, before August 10, 1949, did you and John Boyd go see Lloyd Shorett with regard to the potential of filing perjury charges against George Hewitt?

Mr. Canwell: I don't recall that I did, and certainly not with John Boyd. I think Boyd, through the Immigration Bureau, would have been interested in protecting Hewitt because they were still using him as a federal witness. Tim, it is obvious that the attempt to whitewash Mel Rader is now the real issue here. The issue is to blacklist George Hewitt as a reliable federal and state witness.

I believe by that time, I probably was holding the contempt hearings in the King County Superior Court but I did not go see Shorett about Hewitt.

I don't know at what precise point I interviewed or had lunch with Hewitt's attorney in New York, but I told you before that Hewitt's attorney was a national ACLUer who had been employed by Alfred Kohlberg to represent George Hewitt. Actually, Rachlin volunteered his services. I had lunch with him. At no time was any effort made to relieve Hewitt of any responsibility.

The case went to Manhattan Superior Court and was heard for extradition, and I was not there; I was no party to it. But I know he was represented by counsel. He was penniless, and he at all times had indicated that he would be glad to come out here and testify if somebody would pay his expenses.

Mr. Frederick: With the support of the King County prosecuting attorneys office, Lloyd Shorett and Melvin Rader's attorneys, he presented a deposition before Jus-

tice William Hoar, and on August 10, 1948, perjury charges were filed and then began the long campaign.

As you have stated, this man was willing to come out here, but they had to begin a very long campaign to get this man to return to the State of Washington.

Mr. Canwell: Going through a Justice Court judge was totally improper. They later had gotten the governor to sign extradition papers; they went through all of the normal legal processes and it came to a hearing in court in New York. The court decided against extradition, which was a most unusual thing. It takes a pretty strong case for one state to deny extradition, because the Constitution says that they shall extradite. They don't have much option. So it takes a pretty strong case for a judge to rule as he did in the Hewitt extradition case. Somewhere along the line if I don't have it, I'm going to obtain a copy of the court's opinions and ruling. I think it might be well for anybody who is carrying the ball for Melvin Rader and that cabal that they read the court's opinion in that case.

Mr. Frederick: August 10, 1948, Lloyd Shorett sent the New York police a copy of the warrant for arrest with information as to Hewitt's residence and place of employment. No reply. Shorett wired the New York commissioner of police for an explanation. On October 19, 1948, he received a telegram from Martin J. Brown, chief inspector, stating George Hewitt's case was "still under investigation; will advise as soon as possible." That's October 19.

On October 29, 1948, Shorett wired again, received a second reply from Inspector Brown. "George Hewitt has not been seen at given address. As soon as located we'll apprehend." November 4, 1948, Lloyd Shorett wrote Inspector Brown asking for any information concerning Hewitt's whereabouts, no reply. November 22, 1948, wrote New York Mayor William O'Dwyer—no reply.

George Hewitt during this time frame appeared as expert witness, I assume, for the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization for the City of New York. Deportation hearings August 30, 1948, and September 15, 1948.

[End of Tape 42, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: In September 1948, Alfred Kohlberg complained to US Attorney General Tom Clark that Communists were harassing Hewitt and he needed police protection.

October 5, Deputy Immigration Commissioner John Boyd asked for New York police protection of Hewitt, and it was declined by the Hewitt family. December 12, Hewitt testified in the United States courthouse in New York before a federal grand jury chambers with regard to charges against Alger Hiss. December 17, George Hewitt testified before Representative John McDowell, Republi-

can of Pennsylvania, a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee. That would have been in New York City.

George Hewitt's whereabouts were reported during this period of time in a variety of New York City newspapers.

Backing up briefly—in 1948 Lloyd Shorett was elected judge of Superior Court and Dean McClean, being a Republican county commissioner—appointed Charles Carroll to fill out the term of Lloyd Shorett as prosecuting attorney. So Mr. Shorett then, is off the scene, and moves over into the court.

Albert, I've said in the past that it was my opinion that Fred Neindorff confused the role of a newspaper reporter with a street player, and as I understand the situation, there was a campaign mounted with regard to convincing Carroll not to pursue the perjury charges with regard to George Hewitt, to the extent that Fred Neindorff went to Carroll's home requesting dismissal of the Hewitt perjury charges. That he, probably misspeaking, stated that he was the father of the Canwell committee, and there was concern that continuation of the committee or an appropriation for the continuation of the committee would be jeopardized through this Hewitt perjury charge.

Dean McClean was visited by, I can only assume, Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization agents with regard to the Hewitt perjury charge. Also Dean McClean was present at the Carroll home when, I can only assume, two agents from the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization stated that Hewitt's testimony was vital to national security, particularly in the Alger Hiss case, Communist espionage activities regarding that case, and potential other cases that would be brought forward, and this perjury charge with regard to Hewitt—

Mr. Canwell: That sounds like Ed Guthman. Is that from his copy?

Mr. Frederick: No.

They were concerned that Hewitt may be smeared as a credible witness and asked him to duly consider the above with regard to the issues of national security.

There was a meeting initiated by Edward T. Stone, managing editor, *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*. Fred Neindorff was present, Dean McClean was present, they wanted to visit with Charles Carroll, again suggesting the dismissal of the Hewitt perjury charges. And out of that meeting came the famous votes remark, which reverberated for some months and years after that.

Mr. Canwell: I can well understand why Fred Neindorff, or the publisher of the *Seattle P-I*, any of them, would have been concerned about this case, and the Immigration Bureau was rightfully concerned because they felt, as was true, that a Communist ploy was designed to destroy a

major Immigration Bureau witness.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, we'll have an opportunity to pursue that.

But to continue here for a moment. And what I'm talking about is that there was some extraordinary campaign or a series of actions by a variety of players to thwart the Hewitt perjury charge. During this meeting with Stone, and Neindorff, and McClean, Carroll stated that there had been no accredited government agency that publicly asked him to dismiss the case, and expressed his concern that if he did there was the potential for 4,000 left-wing votes that might be forfeited, and there was concern that he was in the room with Dean McClean, a politician and county commissioner who appointed him to fill out the vacancy in that committee.

Mr. Canwell: You have to pick up the picture as it was occurring at that time.

Charlie Carroll had been a deputy to Shorett, and very anxious to become prosecuting attorney, he had been a very popular football player. Shorett had made him promise to pursue the Hewitt perjury case or he would not recommend him for appointment as his successor. So there were many sidelights of this thing.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I hear you. We'll have an opportunity to explore that.

Editor Stone replied: "What about the votes on the other side—the right side?" He went on to state that "the *P-I* has taken on many battles for the good of the community and usually wins." The gist of the meeting was an attempt to persuade him to not pursue those perjury charges.

Mr. Canwell: And he did so agree.

Mr. Frederick: February 2, 1949, the Republican County Commissioner Dean McClean in a newspaper article called upon Carroll to resign in the public interest; that Carroll should resign after being approached by federal and city government representatives to drop the Hewitt perjury charges in the interest of national security.

February 3, 1949, the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* reported another story. Carroll had refused to resign, and both Dean McClean and Canwell said representatives of the Department of Justice were seeking dismissal of the charges against Hewitt, and that Canwell said that the committee report would include recommendations that the Legislature investigate Carroll's handling of the case and also a statement from John W. Whipple, who had succeeded William Houston, that he attended the meeting at Carroll's home with McClean and two government agents and had produced evidence which had persuaded Carroll that he would have difficulty convicting Hewitt.

Carroll stated privately to federal officials in early 1949 that he would drop the Hewitt perjury charges if so requested by the US attorney general. As I understand it, the US Attorney General Tom Clark was approached by representatives of the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization with regard to the Hewitt perjury charges, and US Attorney General Tom Clark refused to have any specific interest in the Hewitt case; stated that he would not intercede on that issue. New York Governor Dewey was approached not to authorize the extradition of Hewitt, which was not successful.

Finally, on February 10, 1949, Hewitt surrendered to the New York City police, and announced that he would resist extradition. Governor Langlie forwarded an extradition request. February 22, 1949, Governor Dewey executed the rendition warrant.

With the Tom Clark statement, John Whipple issued a statement that, "It has been the position of the committee that Hewitt should come here and stand trial. However, we went along with the Justice Department in their request that Mr. Carroll dismiss the Hewitt case in the interest of national security. Since Mr. Carroll apparently does not want to dismiss the Hewitt case, we are just as anxious as he is for Hewitt to return and stand trial."

Within this period in time there was a communication to Alfred Kohlberg, March 17, 1949, from the governor, Arthur B. Langlie, thanking him for his enclosure. This is a continuation of this attempt to stifle the George Hewitt perjury charge. This is a letter dated March 2, 1949, from Alfred Kohlberg to Governor Arthur B. Langlie:

My Dear Governor:

In confidence I enclose a letter written yesterday to the Honorable Albert S. Canwell, chairman of the Washington State Committee on Un-American Activities, and a copy of a telegram sent last week to Governor Thomas E. Dewey, both of which I believe should have your consideration.

Honorable Albert S. Canwell,
Chairman Washington State Committee Un-American
Activities,
Spokane, Washington.

Dear Mr. Canwell,

Mr. Louis Budenz called me up today and told me of his conversation with you over the telephone last night. (This is dated March 1, 1949.) I am the employer of George Hewitt, who testified before your committee last summer. Mr. Hewitt works for me as a multilith operator. And so far as I know has no means other than his weekly salary. He has a wife and several children dependent upon him.

I am informed that a Professor Rader swore to an affidavit charging Mr. Hewitt with second degree perjury and stating that testimony he gave that he had seen Mr.

Rader at a Communist farm school in New York was untrue and that he, Rader, was in fact in the State of Washington at the time.

I was informed that on the basis of this affidavit the warrant was issued and that after Mr. Hewitt gave himself up to the police here the governor of Washington signed a warrant for his extradition. This warrant was received in Albany last weekend. Governor Dewey signed the extradition papers. All the above having to do with the affidavit and warrant of arrest and warrant of extradition having been confirmed to me by Mr. Charles Bittle, counsel for Governor Dewey.

Needless to say Mr. Hewitt is very fearful of what will happen if he is extradited to Washington State. His family will be left without support and will become objects of state charity. He has no funds to engage attorneys. No funds to secure bail, and if he did have he has no funds to live in the State of Washington while out on bail. Furthermore, if acquitted he has no funds with which to pay return passage to New York.

Mr. Hewitt has found two witnesses who also were connected with the Communist farm school and who in affidavit have identified Professor Rader as having attended with them. The originals of these two affidavits are in the hands of counsel to your committee. But the witnesses themselves are in New York City and who will pay for them to go to Washington to testify at Mr. Hewitt's trial, nobody knows.

In my humble opinion this entire case is a travesty of justice. As such, I think it will reflect when the facts become publicly known, as they must during the course of the trial concerning your committee, if the governor of Washington and the governor of New York agree to extradition. Another effect will be to cause other witnesses against Communists to have a sudden and complete loss of memory in order to avoid similar persecution. On this phase of the subject I think Mr. Budenz is more competent to express an opinion. And while I do not know whether the governor of New York and the governor of Washington and your committee and the Department of Justice for whom Mr. Hewitt has been a government witness in other cases desires this result, it will unnecessarily occur.

Needless to say Mr. Hewitt does not want to be extradited to the State of Washington for all of the above reasons. It seems to me, without being an attorney, that the governor of Washington should have submitted this case to a grand jury for an indictment before acting, instead of relying on the unsupported affidavit of the presumptive Communist because to let the facts become public would scare all possible anti-Communist witnesses. I have asked Mr. Hewitt's attorneys who are representing him on a, I believe, volunteer basis not to give any information to the press but now the facts cannot be suppressed once the machinery of law starts to grind.

I cannot imagine, I hope you may in some way be able to secure a reconsideration of this case.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Alfred Kohlberg.

Included in this communication dated February 24, 1949, Alfred Kohlberg addressed to Governor Thomas E. Dewey:

I was astonished to learn from Mr. Bittle that you had signed extradition papers on a warrant from the governor of Washington against my employee George Hewitt, colored ex-Communist, who identified a University of Washington professor as an attendant at a Communist school in New York in 1938.

I'm informed the warrant issued from Washington is based only on an affidavit by the accused Communist before a justice of the peace, accusing Hewitt of perjury without any supportive evidence and without grand jury indictment.

Hewitt has submitted corroborating affidavits from two other ex-Communists in telegram. Last October 13, you were quoted as promising the Communists would be treated as traitors. I can't understand extraditing Hewitt merely on the affidavit of the Communists, depriving him by loss of employment, forcing his wife and three small children on relief rolls or leaving him, even if finally acquitted, penniless in the State of Washington.

I trust you will pardon me saying that this action, instead of treating the Washington Communist as a traitor treats him with all the distinction when we render the grand jury indictment.

/s/ Alfred Kohlberg

It would be a part of the campaign and at least within Alfred Kohlberg's representations that we're potentially not talking strictly about an accused Communist, but now the man is a Communist.

Mr. Canwell: I'm going to jot down a name while I'm thinking about it. I have trouble remembering some of them but the attorney in the ACLU in New York, Carl Rachlin, was the one who represented George Hewitt.

Mr. Frederick: Alfred Kohlberg approached the American Civil Liberties Union; was referred to a New York City law firm of Theodore Diamond and Carl Rachlin. Carl Rachlin was also counsel for the Workers Defense League. Carl Rachlin took Hewitt's case. Interviewed Hewitt; Manning Johnson and George Peters all said that they had seen Rader at the Briehl's Farm School in the summer of 1938. He also examined the photostat copies of one certificate and three affidavits presented by Hewitt. Copies of the University of Washington Rader payroll records, January 1 to July 20, 1938, and September 1, 1938 to December 31, 1938.

I would assume the affidavits that he was referring to, that is Rachlin, the attorney for George Hewitt, would be the affidavits that were taken by your investigators the Saturday and Monday following the Friday adjournment

of the second hearings. Let's take a minute or two to explore that.

There were three affidavits that were addressed by George Hewitt's attorney. One of them was to a Quincy Mueller, who had been a long-time proprietor of the Canyon Creek Lodge, 1921 through May of 1942, and a Mrs. Ida Kirby. She was an employer housekeeper, 1938 and 1942, and then a Thomas Grant who leased Canyon Creek Lodge, I can only assume leased with potential option to buy at some point in time, in May of 1942.

On Saturday, July 24, 1948, Ida Kirby was visited by representatives from the Canwell committee. There was an affidavit taken. It was notarized by investigator Aaron R. Coleman and witnessed by investigator John W. Whipple. Ida Kirby helped search the premises. Found an index card that stated, "Rader, Mrs. Melvin M. (L 8-16-40), Seattle, Washington, 6017 30th Avenue Northeast, Prof. at U. of Washington, guest for one month." The affidavit stated that the original lodge had burned in the early months of 1938; that after the present lodge was built, "the exact date I cannot remember at this time,"

I distinctly remember that some time during the month of August when we were having our hottest weather, a tall, slender, seedy-looking man and a woman, slightly shorter than himself walked out to the lodge from Granite Falls, that they identified themselves as a university professor and his wife.

Mrs. Kirby could not recall their names. But the woman was pregnant and they stayed a few days, returned to Seattle and came back with a child or two and some baggage and remained at the lodge about a month. When they departed the second time, Mrs. Kirby drove them to an address in Seattle in the University District and somewhere on 30th Avenue Northeast and these people stayed at the lodge during only one summer while Mrs. Kirby was employed.

Mrs. Kirby stated that they stayed at the lodge in 1940, and this may be in reference to the index card. The writing on the card both in pen and ink and lead pencil appears to be the writing of Lucile Anderson, the niece of Mrs. Quincy Mueller.

[End of Tape 43, Side 1]

Saturday, July 24, 1948, affidavit notarized by investigator Coleman and witnessed by investigator Evert Palmeroy read in part:

When I took possession of said lodge in May of 1942 I took possession of all records such as registers, registration cards, and records of guests left in said lodge by Mrs. Mueller. I am of this date turning over and delivering to the Washington State Un-American Activities Committee all said records based on the records left by Mrs. Mueller, a large portion of which I have examined.

I fail to find any record indicating the registration of

any paid guest during the year of 1938. I did find, however, a record of one Mrs. Melvin M. Rader. Address, 6017 30th Avenue Northeast, Seattle, Washington, and with the notation penned in ink and in the handwriting of Mrs. Mueller or one of her employees as follows: 'Professor of the University of Washington, guest for one month' and also the notation in pencil on it as follows: 'L (8-16-40).'

This is the only record of either Mr. or Mrs. Melvin Rader I have seen among any of the said records. These records are being turned over to the said committee with the understanding that same may be used by them for any purpose that they may see fit with the further understanding that they will be returned to me at the completion of their use.

On Monday, July 26, 1948, Mrs. Quincy Mueller, notarized by investigator Coleman, and witnessed by investigator Ernest P. Stith, states that the first lodge burned in January 1938 and a new lodge was completed in May 1938; that Mr. and Mrs. Rader walked out to the lodge from Granite Falls in the summer of 1938 or 1940, stayed a few days, departed and returned with considerable luggage and a small child. That Mrs. Mueller could not recall how long they stayed the second time, but was sure that the Raders were at the lodge during only one summer between 1930 and 1942. Mrs. Mueller identified the picture as a likeness of Melvin Rader and identified the file card described in Grant's affidavit as one of the records she had turned over to Grant.

The above included a portion of the evidence plus a *Daily Worker* endorsement—the perjury charge against George Hewitt. Rachlin was convinced that Hewitt was a victim of Communist harassment. Attorney Rachlin filed a writ of habeas corpus scheduled for hearing in New York Supreme Court for Bronx County. Bronx District Attorney Samuel J. Foley advised King County Prosecutor Carroll of the fact and suggested that he send a representative and witness to contest the habeas corpus application. Carroll said that, "I haven't any of the money of the King County taxpayers to send witnesses and extradition agents who sit around New York, and wouldn't spend it that way if I had it."

On March 12, 1949, the hearing finally took place and the issue was one at that point in time of a writ of habeas corpus, which means that the extradition was going to be challenged and it was going to be challenged on cause. There was the photostat of the comptroller's University of Washington employment records, affidavits of Mueller, Kirby, Grant, Manning Johnson and a George Peters. And there was the Canwell committee second hearing transcript and the Canwell committee final report. New York Supreme Court Justice Aaron J. Levy presided.

Hewitt identified a photograph of Rader. He did not testify further. Manning Johnson identified a photograph of Rader. He stated that he first met him at Communist

Party headquarters with Isidore Begun, a member of the Communist Party in the education group. He met him in 1938 and he saw him going in and out of the office headquarters a number of times. He saw Professor Rader in the summer of 1938 at Briehl's Farm School to deliver a lecture, and he saw Rader there as one of the students in his class.

Cross-examined by assistant district attorney Lee, Johnson was asked if he was positive if the man in the picture was Melvin Rader. "Yes." Johnson stated that only members of the Communist Party who were carefully screened were eligible for attendance at the particular school. George Peters testified he was a party member, 1933-1939. He identified the photograph of Rader as the man in question. He first met him with Hewitt about eleven o'clock one day in 1938 near 2nd Avenue and 11th Street in New York City. He met Rader again around August or September at Briehl's Farm on about two different occasions.

Attorney Rachlin, counsel for Hewitt, then moved that the writ of habeas corpus would be suspended and Hewitt released from custody, and Justice Levy, after hearing a presentation from Prosecuting Attorney Foley, granted in their favor and granted the motion.

One thing of note is that it is somewhat a rare occurrence that a presiding judge during an extradition hearing will hear habeas corpus motion. It's not the purpose of an extradition hearing. And this was conducted, and he did hear and he did rule on motion of habeas corpus.

Mr. Canwell: That, of course, may be a little different in the jurisdiction in New York and in the court that this was heard, than might be the case here. In any event, I think that he was acting properly and legally because it was the proper way to dispose of this case, which was obviously phoney.

I don't believe that Judge Levy was acquainted with any of the principals in the case. I think he was just a properly unbiased judge. And fortunately there are a few that will give such consideration to foreign Negroes like George Hewitt.

It should be significant that an attorney of Carl Rachlin's standing in the profession would volunteer to take Hewitt's case without fee. He did this without being paid for it. I may have mentioned before that I did have lunch with attorney Rachlin in New York. And that as far as I know I didn't turn any affidavits over to him. They may have been provided some other way. I did tell him precisely what had occurred; about what I've told you today about what happened in the Rader/Hewitt case. And he took it from there.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, did you travel specifically back there to visit with him?

Mr. Canwell: No, I don't remember what my prime business was at the time. I'm sure that was a matter considered. I would have to go back to notes to find out what else I was doing there. It seemed to me that I had a meeting or an appointment with Louis Budenz, but I don't remember. It was just too far and there were too many of those things—they sort of run together. I would not have gone back there for this specific purpose because I couldn't do it at the committee expense, and I couldn't afford it on my own.

All I remember is that I was there and called my friend, Alfred Kohlberg, because I think he had telephoned or written me about George Hewitt's plight. He then made some arrangements for me to have lunch with attorney Rachlin. I don't remember where we did that—down in the lower end of Manhattan at Kohlberg's headquarters. And I can remember parking my car there and because a parking sign had been knocked down there wasn't any "No Parking" sign. I parked my car there and found an officer waiting for me when I returned for it. I tried to explain to him that there was no "No Parking" sign there and he said, "You can't park nowhere in Manhattan." That was about right.

But I remember a few things like that. I probably had been to Kohlberg's headquarters a time or two prior to that. We had become, I'd say, good friends or people who respected each other, as the years progressed.

The affidavits that were mentioned there probably were affidavits taken by Coleman, Whipple, or someone at my behest or suggestion. I may have been home for the weekend that week, I don't know.

Mr. Frederick: It has been reported that in the first part of June 1938 that Mr. and Mrs. Melvin Rader visited Canyon Creek Lodge. Stayed a weekend. Made arrangements to rent a cabin for the month of August and returned to Canyon Creek Lodge and spent that month there.

This would be in relationship to the George Hewitt testimony. There would be issues of transportation in terms of who provided transportation. Melvin Rader at that point in time did not own an automobile. Mrs. Kirby drove them back to Seattle after that June weekend stay. There are issues of pregnancy—Virginia Rader, who gave birth in February 1939.

Notation comment with regard to housekeeping staff that Mrs. Rader was visibly pregnant within August. Issues of teeth being extracted. Marry a dentist, the case of Mrs. Rader. Glasses being broken, being replaced by optometrist, Mr. Rader in Seattle.

There is a series of issues with regard to his whereabouts in 1938. And it brings into question what George Hewitt said. It also brings into question what Manning Johnson said, and Jay Peters.

Albert, what is your response to that?

Mr. Canwell: My feeling is that Manning Johnson and George Peters, I know Johnson, I didn't know Peters or if I ever met him I don't recall, testified; they were subject to cross-examination by the opposing attorneys, and so I presume they did a workmanlike job as attorneys usually do in such cases. I was not there and other than the general report of the court's ruling, the fact that these men testified as they did, I don't know anything about it.

My feeling is that Johnson, Peters, Hewitt, all of those people were familiar with how the Communist Party operates. I suspect that they felt this entire thing was a Communist ploy to take an important Justice Department witness out of the picture. So beyond that I don't know. I wasn't there. I didn't listen to the court proceedings. All I know is what the rulings were. And the court seemed satisfied that Hewitt was being mistreated and should not be extradited.

The people who helped him and supported him had nothing to gain by it. Alfred Kohlberg, an exceedingly wealthy man but a very patriotic one, when Hewitt was unemployed and out of funds and his family not eating regularly, gave him a job. Something to help him out. I'm sure that he probably influenced Carl Rachlin to represent him. But anyway these were people who had nothing to gain. They were just seeking justice. I'm sure that they felt, as I feel now, that it was just a Communist ploy to gain propaganda and levy it against the Canwell committee and to injure or remove an important Justice Department witness. I can see the party's interest in it. The interest of such men as Kohlberg and myself, it was just a matter of seeking justice and the truth. That's all we wanted then and that's all we want now.

Mr. Frederick: I hear you Albert, but Alfred Kohlberg was, I would view him as a partisan.

Mr. Canwell: He was what?

Mr. Frederick: I would view him as a partisan.

Mr. Canwell: I don't know in what way one could consider him a partisan to this case. I was just one of the many legislators around the United States that he corresponded with originally.

Mr. Frederick: I hear you. But he was a New York City Chinese textile importing business owner, 1948, 1949. Potentially his interest in China would be up for question.

Mr. Canwell: Another sidelight on Alfred Kohlberg was that he was a very, very well-informed anti-Communist. And he got that way by being dragged in and induced to join the Institute of Pacific Relations one time. Until he found out what it was about, he went along with them. And when he found out what they were doing, he turned

against them. And so you say he is a partisan; well, he's a patriot.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, partisan doesn't exclude patriotism.

Mr. Canwell: Not necessarily, you can be a partisan to a lynching, or anything else. But in his case he was not, other than ideologically, opposed to letting the Communists get away with such a ploy. He had no acquaintance with Hewitt prior to that time and entered into it because he felt that an injustice was being done. Now Kohlberg would often write to me, often call me. He was a very informed and helpful individual. But he wasn't anybody who was led around by his nose by anybody.

Mr. Frederick: He was also the publisher of *Plain Talk*.

Mr. Canwell: I think he financed it. I don't know that he was publisher. He put up the money for somebody to write and publish it. Just like I published *The Vigilante*.

Mr. Frederick: He was national chairman of the American Jewish League Against Communism?

Mr. Canwell: I believe so. He was generally known throughout the country as the chairman of the China Lobby. That was fictitious, but he was probably the outstanding leader in the move to oppose the Communist penetration of China. And did excellent work there. Helped people who I think were on our side and gave whatever trouble he could to the others.

Mr. Frederick: He was also a member of the Joint Committee Against Communism in New York?

Mr. Canwell: I think that would be true. I would expect to find him there.

Mr. Frederick: One of their objectives was to clean up the radio and television industry of pro-Communist actors, writers, producers and directors.

Mr. Canwell: I think he'd be for that.

I knew him well, I came to know him well. A very fine individual. I knew his wife, too, and unfortunately I couldn't afford to be back there and have as much contact with them as I would like to have had. But they were firm supporters of the total anti-Communist movement. A very commendable person. He didn't hesitate to take governors, or senators, or congressmen, or anyone else on if he felt they were wrong. And I'm accused, as I often was, of being anti-Semitic, which is untrue. They don't take into consideration such firm friends I had like Alfred Kohlberg, who was a leader in the Jewish community and

many, many others.

I remember a speaking engagement at Seattle University. They had pickets out there with big signs that I was anti-Semitic, I was anti-Catholic, I was anti-children or anti-education. They just covered the whole board.

Mr. Frederick: In the interim from the adjourning of the second hearing and the extradition, habeas corpus hearing in New York, in March 1949, Melvin Rader initiated an investigation of his own and pursued the Hewitt perjury thing. It has been stated here today with regard to the various affidavits—Mueller, Kirby—that there were additional statements by them and they were in communication with Lloyd Shorett or Carroll; the card issue of 1940 which was addressed to the address that they, Melvin and Virginia Rader, occupied in 1938 which they subsequently in 1939 vacated. This card was addressed and noted that address and it has been reported that this card had to do with an offer for purchase of lots when Mrs. Mueller was thinking of retiring, I would assume.

[End of Tape 43, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I'll ask one more time. It's your contention that Melvin Rader did attend the Briehl's Farm Communist School sometime during the summer of 1938?

Mr. Canwell: Let me divide your question.

I have no doubt in my mind that Rader and Gundlach attended the school and were identified there. I do not know anything about the year of 1938, whether that is an accurate identification or not. All I am certain about is that he was properly identified as the individual known to Hewitt as having attended the school. I think that it may be possible that Hewitt was a little vague as he started out on what the precise date was. I don't know. I didn't have anything to do with firming up the testimony on those dates or finding the supporting witnesses or anything else.

All I know about this is what I had to do with. I sent investigators up to Canyon Creek Lodge to determine the truth of the situation. To determine whether Rader was there when he said he was or whether he was not.

They went up there and the records were such that it could not be definitely determined one way or another. So I didn't use anything on that to condemn or clear Rader. I didn't know, I still don't. And nobody else does. Nobody destroyed records, that is nobody on the Canwell committee destroyed records. It wasn't their purpose or intent. It wasn't the sort of thing that they would do.

The ability of the Communist Party to secretly move personnel around the country is so well-known that I would not close that door. I think if they wanted him back there they would get him there and they could cover his tracks if they wanted to. I learned about this in cases

like Alger Hiss and others. I know what the party can do, will do and beyond that I'm unwilling to speculate.

I base my conclusions on Hewitt's identification of Rader and Gundlach by the manner in which it occurred. And then the subsequent activities of the participants. The fact was known to me then and a lot more is known now that Gundlach was in contact with Soviet agents in California. The FBI photographed a meeting with them. So it isn't unlikely that Gundlach would have been back there. It has been my opinion all along that Gundlach was Rader's control because the party just couldn't trust Rader to do the sensible thing. So Gundlach came along to see that he kept appointments, that he said the right thing, and did what the party wanted done.

So it was not a surprise to me when Gundlach was named. And when Rader refused to confront his accuser and his attorney did this phoney act, then I had to conclude that more than likely Rader was guilty as charged.

I listened to all of Rader's evidence that he dug up and came forth with. That was presented at one time in a meeting with Dr. Raymond Allen and myself and Rader. And I was neither impressed nor unimpressed. I know how such things can be done, and I don't know if they were or were not. I don't build my cases entirely on speculation. I do a little of it, but it's usually informed speculation.

Mr. Frederick: That would have been in the fall of 1949 that meeting took place? Possibly October, I believe.

Mr. Canwell: In 1949 or 1948? I don't know. I lose track of the date and time.

Mr. Frederick: The trial was in March, March 10, 1949, back in New York City.

Mr. Canwell: By that time I was out of the Legislature. And while I may have turned in some late reports or things, I was no longer a member of the House.

Mr. Frederick: One of the outcomes of the two hearings in 1948 was that the Canwell committee asked King County Prosecutor Lloyd Shorett to bring contempt charges against Professor Herbert Phillips of the University of Washington Philosophy Department; Professor Joseph Butterworth, the University of Washington English Department; Professor Ralph Gundlach, the University of Washington Psychology Department. Albert M. Ottenheimer, publicist for the Repertory Playhouse, Rachmiel Forschmiedt, with the City of Seattle Health Department; Florence Bean James, co-director of the Repertory Playhouse, and Professor Melville Jacobs, the University of Washington Anthropology Department.

The issue at hand was contempt of a committee of the Washington State Legislature, and there was a fine of

\$550 associated with that.

Mr. Canwell: It was possible, I think.

Mr. Frederick: And thirty days in jail. And there was an issue with regard to Florence, which I don't understand; that fine was reduced to \$50 and no jail. But those names that you forwarded were convicted of contempt.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I think all of the six except one was. And that one beat the rap by a hung jury, one juror. One juror held out. Otherwise there were convictions across-the-board. Melville Jacobs was tried twice.

It might be interesting to note that we were the only legislative committee with such success around the country.

I'll never forget those contempt trials. Because it occupied my entire summer at my considerable expense, largely because the prosecuting attorney of King County would not certify me as an expert witness which would have given me \$25 a day instead of six dollars or something like that. So most of the expense of these contempts, these six or seven trials that we had, were actually my personal expense. But I got convictions. I say I got it, we got it, the court got it.

Mr. Frederick: Did you have an opportunity during that process to work with or observe Lloyd Shorett?

Mr. Canwell: No. I'm not even sure that he was still prosecuting attorney at that time. I think he was, but he appointed two deputies to represent us. I think we had a little say in that selection.

Probably it was Shorett that ruled that I shouldn't be an expert witness, knowing that it would be costly. Another thing, we wanted to try the six cases in one case which would require one court session and reduce the cost to the taxpayers substantially. That was rejected, too. So we had to take each individual and have an individual trial for that person! The Communist apparatus brought in an attorney from San Francisco to join John Caughlan in the proceedings.

Mr. Frederick: It came out during the faculty tenure committee hearing in October, let's say the fall of 1948, that those who were under consideration at that point in time were Professor Melville Jacobs, anthropology department; Garland Ethel, English department; Harold Eby, English department; Ralph Gundlach, psychology department; Joseph Butterworth, English department; Herbert Phillips, philosophy department.

Melvin Jacobs, Garland Ethel, Harold Eby stated to the faculty tenure committee and eventually to President Allen that they were former members of the Communist Party.

Professor Ralph Gundlach during the Canwell hearings and during the interrogations or visitations by President Raymond Allen, the University of Washington, never stated that he was a Communist, and he went as far as to say that no one could prove that he was and he couldn't prove that he wasn't, or something to that effect.

Professor Butterworth, English department, admitted eventually to President Raymond Allen and to the faculty tenure committee that he was a current member of the Communist Party, and the same applies also to Professor Herbert Phillips.

The interesting thing to note is that shortly after the adjournment of the second series of Canwell committee hearings, President Raymond Allen, who had been observing all of this for several months and preparing a university response to the hearings and faculty issues and legislative issues and budget funding issues across-the-board, moved rapidly and communicated to the board of regents and forwarded these names that we just read off. Conspicuous from that list, and this is after the adjournment of the committee, were the names of Melvin Rader and Professor Cohen.

Mr. Canwell: We never cited either one of those for contempt. I think if you would read the transcripts of the hearing usually these witnesses who were cited for contempt were very contemptuous. They were reluctant, wouldn't answer, were smart-alecky. And I would repeat the interrogator's question to them so I was certain that they understood it and then I would explain to them that we might move against them.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I appreciate that. But President Raymond Allen's concern at that point in time was issues of former and/or current Party membership. And the issue of contempt or being cited for contempt was raised during those tenure hearing meetings, but they weren't necessarily pivotal to the argument.

Mr. Canwell: Probably not and should not have been.

None of these bums should have been working for the university to begin with. That's one man's opinion who observed them closely.

Mr. Frederick: At this point in time will be entered into the transcript record the verbatim account of the Report of the Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities.*

Albert, a couple of things that come to mind with regard to the report, is that within this series we have known for sometime that Representative George Yantis died in December 1947. Obviously he is not going to be associated, other than his name and the record of his passing.

There is initially in this document a point of interest and that is that Senator R. L. Rutter, Jr., who was from the Kittitas Valley area, resigned from the committee. I may be mistaken but I believe that at the time that he did that it was quiet.

Mr. Canwell: There was no controversy. I think it had to do with his business activities or his health. There was no misunderstanding with Bob Rutter. And the statements that were often made publicly and in talk shows and things that each member of the committee had disavowed the committee are complete falsehoods. In fact, I have a letter here I may dig out for you later which someone wrote to Senator Tom Bienz asking about this and to which Senator Bienz responded. And he gave a very laudatory report. I'll enter a copy into the record.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, what I am speaking to is that when he did resign he didn't go with a lot of clamor. As I understand it there wasn't a press release. He just visited with you, maybe the committee, and he was gone. And it was official. As I understand the situation he objected to expenditures, issues of committee expenditures in terms of amount. And he objected to the George Hewitt witness affair.

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember any such thing. I don't know where you would get that information. Certainly it wasn't from Bob Rutter. When he—I believe he did come visit me and tell me that he had various reasons why he'd have to cease to attend meetings. He just didn't have the time and he resigned. But there were no strained relations between me, the committee, and Bob Rutter. And any question about the expenditures of the committee were not at issue with any of these people.

The expense issue arose only when we ended up the session and were a little bit short and had to go to the succeeding Legislature for a small appropriation. There was no contention among the committee, no ill feeling, nothing of that nature at all. We were all compatible and good friends and we all felt that we had done a tough and good job.

Mr. Frederick: I hear you, Albert, but if he comes to you and states that there are issues of business, there's issues of personal concern and/or could be recurring issues of legislative concern also in terms of time, agenda. At this point in time, because he, Senator Rutter, was there through the hearings and then when the report is published it's noticed that he has resigned. Well, once, as I understand the situation particularly, once the hearings have been completed, it would be his choice with regard to the amount of participation that he could afford to give the committee.

* See Appendix D for the text of the report.

Mr. Canwell: I think that it would be a matter of sense of personal responsibility. If you were committed to that committee and its activities and there were meetings called, a responsible member would feel that he had an obligation to attend. There never was any such feeling on the part of Bob Rutter, any ill feeling. Nor with anyone else. It was entirely compatible. We all felt that it was a shame that we didn't have more money, more staff, and were not able to do a lot of things we'd like to have done. But there was no ill feeling.

A reporter in Seattle later made a great thing of this. He was a radio or TV character. He was on nights, Irving Clark I think his name was. He repeatedly stated false things like that. Somebody would call in the talk show and say, "The Canwell committee said so-and-so." And he would say, "Didn't you know that every member of the Canwell committee disavowed the committee." That was a blatant lie, but it went out over the air time after time after time. That sort of thing was done and it's become a part of the current thinking, I suppose. Anybody who was interested. But it was not the case and I have a letter from Tom that I will submit to you that belies the whole thing. If anybody had a reason for having his nose out of joint it was Tom Bienz, because I had to publicly chastise him.

Mr. Frederick: With those two exceptions the remaining members of the committee signed the report. And that would be—

Mr. Canwell: You mentioned Yantis and Rutter.

Mr. Frederick: Sidney Stevens signed and as "Representative." And Representative Grant Sisson signed. Senator Harold Kimball signed. Thomas Bienz signed. And Albert Canwell signed.

Mr. Canwell: This might be a time to refer back to my comments on the George Yantis thing. That's another one on which there has been a great deal of false information put out. Somebody wrote a book stating that he had been highly critical of the committee and of the chairman. That's not true at all.

These are people who are dedicated to a cause. They get their orders from somewhere else. They'll lie and cheat and do anything that is convenient or that they are ordered to do. And so you just have to eventually come to realize that is the type of people you are dealing with. I got to the place that I was very reluctant to believe such people even after they left the party. They are so trained to deceive and lie and do that sort of thing.

Mr. Frederick: Why in the report did you feel it necessary to spend as much time as you did on Melvin Rader and his two attorneys, Ed Henry and Paul Coughlin?

Mr. Canwell: First, let me point out that a disproportionate amount of space in this series of your interviews has addressed the case of one Professor Melvin Rader. Second, I gave no time or attention to Paul Coughlin whatever. He never contacted me in the Rader case. He had nothing to do with it. Ed Henry did, but not Paul Coughlin. And anything that's reported to that fact I think is an error.

Mr. Frederick: Albert on 1113.

Mr. Canwell: 1113 you say?

Mr. Frederick: 1113 begins with the Melvin Rader paragraphs, and then on 1114 is the Ed Henry, Paul Coughlin passages.

Mr. Canwell: Ed Henry and Paul Coughlin I believe were partners in the practice of law. And if—did I mention Paul Coughlin here?

Mr. Frederick: "Among the most vociferous critics of this Committee have been Paul Coughlin and Ed Henry, law associates, of Seattle. They appeared during the second public hearing as counsel for Professor Melvin Rader of the University of Washington."

Mr. Canwell: At this time I don't recall that Paul Coughlin appeared representing Rader, but he may have been there. If I said so here that must have been the case.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, what I'm asking is—why so much space devoted in your report to Melvin Rader and then these two attorneys, when to a considerable extent your report is not headed that way. It's more generic issues like academic freedom, and cross-examination, and right of counsel. I'm working toward the front of the document. Procedure and civil rights et cetera, et cetera.

Now I am, as a reader, going through here and seeing these generic philosophical concepts that you are addressing in response to the Communist menace and/or Communist activity, and then all of a sudden when one turns the page and here comes, boom, Melvin Rader and then Ed Henry and his law partner, Paul Coughlin. Is this more of the same with regard to the George Hewitt thing?

Mr. Canwell: It is entirely proper that I devote extra space to Coughlin and Henry, since they are listed in congressional reports as members of the Communist front, American Juridical Association, and of the ACLU, which was founded by numerous persons apparently members of the Communist International and later top national officials of the CP-USA.

Mr. Frederick: It looks like a response to a continuation of the campaign. That they are being singled out.

Mr. Canwell: I think I explained to you several times that in evaluating Melvin Rader very early as I did, I felt that he was a good prospect for recruitment to leave the apparatus. I based that on several things. That basically he was a decent person. Secondly he was a weakling, a nervous basket case. So I felt that somewhere along the line he'd break with the party. But he had become so reliant upon the ACLU and their people who had captured him or who were in charge of him that my expectations were futile, they were probably ill-founded. I think that left to his own devices I could have pulled him out of the thing. But he went back to his control all the time. And that's what my problem was.

Mr. Frederick: Did you ever ask him? Did you ever discuss that issue with him?

Mr. Canwell: No, it was pretty hard to get to him. I tried to get him at times, and the staff did try to get him to come in and talk to me. But he would first get his orders from somewhere else. He might agree to come in and then he wouldn't. I never had an opportunity to lay it on the line with him. And I think I only told one of my staff what my thinking and intentions were. I didn't—I never wanted it known that we were doing that sort of thing because the word would get back to the party and he might lose his head. At that time, the Laura Law murder by Washington Communists was fresh in our minds. We also took extreme precautions to prevent anyone from contacting Barbara Hartle—and especially protected her from Ed Guthman.

But I'd probably go back and read this and remember I mentioned Paul Coughlin but I don't think that he was present in the hearings. I know that Ed Henry was all the time. And Coughlin—of course all of them are in that clutch of ACLU attorneys.

Mr. Frederick: Would you like to comment on—

Mr. Canwell: The only comment that I would make here is that in making this copy I remember that there was a mistake or two and one of them I notice here and I went over it. Where it says: "the Communists already have made salutary inroads," I said in my original letter "substantial inroads into our education system." But anyway that's the only thing I think of at the moment.

The selection of personnel, I might mention the importance of having qualified and unbiased, uncommitted people; that is, uncommitted to any organization or subversive device; that in selecting personnel you have to be very careful.

While I might write a more extensive recommendation

at this late date, this is what, forty years later, I still think it sounds pretty good. And I think that the succeeding Legislature would have been very wise to continue a non-partisan committee such as the one we're talking about.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, would you please speculate on that—why that wasn't the case.

Mr. Canwell: The reason I think mostly was that there were people who just did not want it done and people in positions of considerable authority like Charlie Hodde. He didn't want any part of such a committee. He didn't want it continued and didn't want it recognized. Didn't even want its final report printed. But there were people like that.

Then there was a division of power in the Senate. Harold Kimball was never very friendly to the committee. I would not have selected him had I not known enough about him to know that I could keep him from causing very much trouble. But there were people like that in the Senate who, if a committee was created or continued, wanted to chair it or dominate it. And that was one of the factors. But an enormous amount of effort had been put into propagandizing against the legislative committee. It was beginning to roll even though press reports were very favorable. And we had a very good reception on that level. The false propaganda was beginning to roll, the subversives, the Communists did not want the exercise of legislative power to be directed against their activities. And in all manner since

then they have devoted all the energies that they can summon to oppose legislative inquiries. That is, of course, why the continuing attack on me, for instance.

I should not even be a blip on the radarscope of time at this late date. But still they write books shooting at me. Some subversive in England not too long back wrote a book and whacked me pretty hard. And there are many, many of these endeavors but they are not aimed specifically at Canwell or McCarthy, they are aimed at the legislative process, the power invested in the Legislature to do precisely what all the committees have done from Dies on to the Canwell committee which in varying degrees have used the legislative powers to oppose subversion. And most often wisely. Of course, it has always been an enemy of the Communist program and they have recognized it as such. I probably had as much to do with the Soviets increasing their Department of Disinformation as anybody else because I nailed one of their top spies, Alger Hiss. I proved that such men were not immune from exposure, that they could not always be protected by the executive department against the will of the Congress to prevent that type of penetration and subversion. And I had a good deal to do with that and I'm proud of the fact that I did. But that is what is involved and that is what is not understood, generally. That the real ability to oppose the Soviets, the threat of nuclear war, resides in our Congress. Because it has the ability to compel testimony, to appropriate money, to make public their findings, to do whatever is necessary to do the job. And, of course, that was something that the Communists had never encountered in Europe.

They could subvert a government agent or a government agency or even the total executive department, conceivably. But they could not subvert the entire Congress. And that is where the legislative power is absolutely essential and should be continued. Of course we should never have let the ACLU and the Communists destroy the House Un-American activities Committee, and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, which they did. And with the result that the state legislative committees fell by the way, too. And that was a thoroughgoing, tremendously financed program that was delegated by the Soviet Department of Disinformation to their agents in place in America in the National Lawyers Guild and the American Civil Liberties Union. And that's what we are up against and it's a problem we haven't solved.

[End of Tape 44, Side 2]

LATER POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

Mr. Frederick: Albert, last session we had the opportunity to discuss the report that you and your committee submitted to the Washington State Legislature and that would be in January or February of 1949. Would you please speculate on why or the reasons behind why the Legislature did not enact your recommendations. Did they explore your recommendations in that report? What is the situation?

Mr. Canwell: My recollection of the thing is that an enormous amount of resistance had been built up during the period of time that we were carrying on these very hectic investigations and hearings. I think there was not complete support in the Legislature for what we were doing. There were political divisions and things that were factors.

I think there was a great reluctance to support the re-creation of the committee because it then required the approval of those supporting the new legislation—approval of the Canwell committee and its work. And I think there was quite a bit of friction there. Then there were rivalries and jealousies in the Senate. For instance from Spokane, John Happy. A very well identified Republican. Supposedly conservative, but I think he did not like the amount of publicity that flowed to me through this enterprise. And Happy—I'm picking him as one example—he was a conservative because Ashley Holden had guided him in that direction. I don't think he had any particular political loyalties. He just liked the fact that he was serving in the Senate. He liked to make any headlines or get any press notice that he could. And there were people like that who were not about to see me justified or given any advantage.

And that followed through in the Senate. There was a chance of vacating the seat of Don Miller, who had been returned to the nut house. All we needed was one senator to make the motions, introduce the motion that Miller's seat be vacated and the machinery was all in place for the Spokane County commissioners to appoint me in the vacancy. Happy was very much opposed to this. He was the one we relied on to make the bid.

Then there was resistance from people like Harold Kimball, who smoldered all the time during our hearings and investigations. He had felt that he was the great brain that should be running the show. He's a psychopath actu-

ally.

But there was resistance within the Senate, within my own party on that level. So to get down to actually producing a succeeding committee to carry on these investigations, it would have been almost incumbent on anybody to then bring me at least into the discussion and their meetings and whatnot. And that didn't occur and wasn't about to occur.

Then we had some determined enemies such as Charlie Hodde, who succeeded to the position of Speaker of the House. He was so opposed to the re-creation of the committee that he made a speech on the floor in which he actually shed tears! He gulped and choked up, he was so emotionally concerned about it. So those were part of the things.

Then you have to realize that forces were moving to oppose this sort of thing, to oppose the use of the legislative powers to combat radical activities, Communist activity. There were enormous forces in motion and things that were not visible on the surface.

It should be remembered that some of the Democrats made a great issue of this because they felt that the whole thing had been anti-labor and anti-liberal and such things. So there was just a lot of cat-and-dog fighting without any firm leadership.

The thing that I had provided when I went to the Legislature was the determination that something be done and I worked to the best of my ability to organize support. We had meetings night after night in committee rooms, hotel rooms, everywhere, discussing this. That was not evident. There was not such leadership in the new Legislature, either the House or the Senate. There were many able people who, like people today, don't wish to become involved. They don't want to rock boats, they don't want any unpleasantness. You don't do this sort of a job without those things being a part of the scene.

That, to the best of my understanding, is why it did not materialize; there just was not specific leadership having integrity and ability combined in an endeavor to carry on these investigations.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, as I understand the situation within the 31st Legislature which would have been convened in 1949, Senators Rutter and Kimball introduced legislation for the continuance of the investigative committee and that legislation was modeled on the legislation that established your committee.

At the same time there was a proposal from the House that would, in essence, direct the Legislative Council to explore issues of potential subversion, Communist activity, and the Legislative Council was a creation of the Legislature: ten Senate members elected by the Senate, eleven House members elected by the House. And the supposed legislation stated that the Legislative Council would investigate or receive reports with regard to poten-

tial Communist activity or subversive activity detrimental to the state or the United States government. And at their discretion forward that to the state attorney general who would be then empowered to conduct an investigation which would be non-public; take testimony, evidence, and then report back to the Legislative Council and then upon review the Legislative Council would have the discretionary power to call for a public hearing and the attorney general would serve as counsel to the Legislative Council. There would be obviously power of subpoena and testimony from witnesses.

As I understand the situation, they specifically stated that witnesses would have the opportunity to be represented by counsel, they would have the opportunity to submit statements through counsel to the Legislative Council and that if anyone felt that they were adversely defamed or affected by witness testimony, they could make a written presentation to the council and request a review of the matter and hearing represented by counsel; the opportunity to call not more than four favorable witnesses, and at the same time have the opportunity to question those who they felt testified to the effect that they defamed the individual in question.

It was also stated that council members without majority approval from the Legislative Council could not make public statements. And if they failed to do so they would lose the right of privilege as legislators, members of the legislative committee and be liable to action of libel and slander.

As I understand the situation, this bill passed the House and was forwarded to the Senate, but the Senate modified it to the extent that it resembled the previous House Joint Resolution No. 10; that is, it modeled, they changed it to read in essence what the language was that supported the Canwell committee. And that was referred to conference and there was no decision made in the conference.

As I understand it, Senator Kimball offered a resolution in the Senate which again mirrored his introduced legislation. That resolution was passed and the resolution established the Senate Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American, Disloyal, and Subversive Activities. Senator Kimball, Republican freshman; Wilder R. Jones, Republican; Dale McMullen, Republican; Democrat Howard Roup; and Democrat Roderick Lindsay were appointed to that committee. There was an appropriation in the Senate and also there was an appropriation in the House each for fifty thousand dollars for the support and funding of a committee or committees that may be established by the 31st Legislature associated with un-American activity investigative committees.

Governor Langlie vetoed that appropriation and it has been reported that Senator Kimball requested that he do so, because of the Democratic-controlled Legislative Council, that council having the authority to review ex-

penditures of the Legislature. They felt that possibly the Democratic-controlled Legislative Council may take undue influence upon the, in essence, Kimball committee in the Senate.

Senator Kimball was left without appropriations and it was pointed out to him that it was not a concurrent resolution and they had no authority to convene that committee or hearings during legislative adjournment.

Albert, would you comment on that, please?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I think that it can be summed up in a few words.

All of the attempts that I saw to do something in this area were visionary and impractical. Much of it probably was inspired by conversations with the ACLU. Any idea that you should transfer the investigative activities of the Legislature to a justice department, i.e., an attorney general, is just as impractical as saying that the Congress of the United States should turn all this over to the FBI. You hear it all the time but it isn't sensible. It is not proper use of and respect for the legislative powers and/or the intent of the founders of this nation that corrective legislation should be written by other than legislators.

They had a good piece of legislation in the House Concurrent Resolution No. 10. It had been challenged in the courts and approved and supported by the Supreme Court of the state. So they didn't need to go far afield for a lot of these visionary, impractical things that wouldn't and didn't work in anybody's jurisdiction or area. They were impractical, impossible, some of them designed for that purpose; to confuse, to make it look like something was being done or could be done when a hemostat had been clamped on the exposure of Communist activity.

There is no justification ever for anybody going outside the legislative powers of the federal government or the individual states to determine what the procedures of the Legislature should be, nor what their concerns might be as long as they remain within the framework of the Constitution of the United States and that of the individual state authorizing them. They do not need outside bodies or committees to approve what they're doing. They have unlimited authority, just as they have in making war. You don't let some shavetail lieutenant decide that he is over the executive department or the Congress in declaring war. There are areas in which the powers of the Legislature cannot be curtailed and effectively get anything done. It just doesn't work that way. It wasn't intended to. And there are people who know that all of these frivolous things just muddy the waters and confuse people and do not get the job done.

That was the problem in the state House and Senate. There was no strong leadership. By strong leadership I mean somebody with the knowledge plus the determination to do the job. It just was lacking. They needed a Canwell or somebody like that, who was dedicated to the

assignment and knew that the answers had to be within the state Legislature and not running to the attorney general or the secretary of state or the auditor or anybody else. The authority resided in the Legislature and should be carried out and executed there.

Too many of these people just didn't understand what they were doing. They didn't understand the system and were not about to learn. And they went to the wrong people for advice.

Mr. Frederick: As I understand the situation in September 1948, this would be shortly after the adjournment of the second series of hearings in July, all committee members except Senator Kimball went to Los Angeles to attend a multistage conference on un-American activities which had been convened or sponsored by Senator Tom Bienz. Would you please comment on that?

Mr. Canwell: If that is the meeting that our committee attended, our committee members, I attended it. It was felt that for one thing it would be an educational thing. The California committee had operated very effectively and had done a consistent job. We were, compared to them, amateurs. And there were those who thought it would be well to have this joint meeting with them. I was indifferent, I just felt that the time and the money could be better spent. But it also took into consideration the fact that I had a committee who felt that they just weren't being considered important enough. I was running the committee with an iron hand and they had agreed to it, but they didn't necessarily like it.

So here was a chance for them to do something unusual. I think it was well worthwhile. We did have competent speakers there, number one of the speakers being Dick Nixon.

I went along on it because I felt that the committee deserved to make some decisions, and this was one they wanted to make and so I let them. I think it was beneficial. Many questions were discussed such as the question of right of counsel and people pleading the Fifth Amendment, and many such things. I think even up to that time not enough attention had been paid to our system of government, our legislative process, legislative powers, and the intent of the founders. So I believe that anything like the meetings we had there was beneficial to these people. Many of them were complete amateurs in this field. Good men and good people and wanting to do a job, but still very amateurish. So I was in favor of the jaunt to California for the little relaxation after a period of tremendous pressure. That's about all I can say about it. I went there. I thought it was beneficial, money well spent but we could have operated without it.

Mr. Frederick: Do you remember any of the speakers and what they addressed?

Mr. Canwell: My recollection at the time is that some of the speakers were members of the California Legislature. Nelson Dilworth, I think was one of them. There were other people who were informed in security. Some of them from industry and other things. I don't recall at the present moment who they all were. But I just remember the outstanding ones like Nixon.

It wasn't just a pleasure junket, it was informative and educational. Beneficial from the standpoint of developing cohesion within the committee member level. I think each one of them gave a talk of some kind. I remember I did a very poor job because I didn't make any preparation for it and was suddenly called on to give a major speech. I don't know whether there's a transcript of the thing around. If there is, I'd burn it. But that's what took place. It was in the courthouse at Los Angeles and the court was going on in various courtrooms along the line. I remember one of the famous movie actresses was there on some sort of a legal matter, and everybody went down and chatted with her while she was sitting outside waiting to be called. A few entertaining things like that. I don't remember whether Reagan was a speaker there or not. He might have been.

Mr. Frederick: That may have been a little early for him in terms of time?

Mr. Canwell: No, he had been very active in anti-Communism at that time. He had been active in the movie—

Mr. Frederick: Screen Actors Guild?

Mr. Canwell: Screen Actors Guild, and I think that was along that period of time he was first identified. He wasn't notorious or famous, but he was certainly an enemy of the left-wing radical group and had gone against the grain of the liberals by testifying for the, I believe it was, the House committee. I think I have the hearing testimony here.

Mr. Frederick: He was serving as an informer for the FBI at the time.

Mr. Canwell: Reagan? Not that I know of. I suppose that they were talking to him. They talked to me or anybody else that was doing a job in some area that they were interested in. I would not call him an informer. Imagine a very willing cooperating citizen. If the bureau asked him something I'm sure he would have answered. But he wasn't acting as an informant.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, as I understand the situation, he was given a code number and he was making reports back to the FBI.

Mr. Canwell: Possibly true, I don't know.

There were several people connected with the California Legislature there like Jack Tenney and others who knew all of these people and I'm sure were party to their activities. But what exactly was going on between the bureau and Ronald Reagan or anyone else I don't know.

Mr. Frederick: You mentioned that your committee was compared to the California committee and were you speaking of the Tenney committee?

Mr. Canwell: Tenney committee, Jack Tenney.

Mr. Frederick: And what were the comparisons made?

Mr. Canwell: I don't know that there was anything other than the conventional amenities that would take place at a time like that. We were highly complimented by members of the California committee. But that's political procedure.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I thought I heard you say that potentially some of your critics unfavorably compared your committee with the California committee, and if that's the case what were the issues?

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember any such thing.

Mr. Frederick: As I understand it, during that conference there was formed a permanent interstate legislative conference on subversive activities. Tenney was chairman and Senator Bienz from Washington was the Washington representative. What is the history of that?

Mr. Canwell: I just don't know that there was any history. If there was any history it was probably assigned or agreed that Tom Bienz should carry on correspondence or whatever with these people. He needed something to do.

Mr. Frederick: What about the history with regard to that interstate legislative conference on subversive activities? Did that have a life to it?

Mr. Canwell: No, I don't think that, other than having a paper name. I don't think it amounted to much of anything. We did have quite a number of people in the security field up and down the Coast who would participate in anything like that if it were beneficial and their help was needed.

I believe another one of those speakers at the Los Angeles meeting was Harper Knowles of San Francisco, one of the top authorities in the country on Communist activities.

Mr. Frederick: Let's spend some time today reviewing

your legislative campaign during 1948. Why did you choose not to run for re-election to the House?

Mr. Canwell: The reason was that the Senate was a more powerful body. It was in the same district. It was just as easy to be elected to the Senate as the House. And the senator I believe at that time, Don Miller, was in the booby hatch down at Medical Lake.

Timothy, I don't mind when you seemingly change modes on me. You probably get tired of the routine questions about my childhood, parentage, how many times I've played hooky from school and whatnot; and then suddenly it is as though you might have left the room for a coffee break and turned the questioning over to such rascals as Paul Coughlin of the ACLU cabal. Suddenly the questioning becomes that of not a friendly interrogator, but of a dedicated, determined adversary.

I feel that I could field any question that is tossed at me and, in fact, it becomes a little more entertaining when there is a little antagonism injected into the interview. I've always suspected that in the course of these interviews, someone somewhere was trying to "mousetrap" me but, anyway, I enjoy the change of pace and am aware of the significance of such questions as the recent one where I am asked rather snidely if, in my opinion, there were any critics of Canwell who were neither Communists nor Communist sympathizers.

That was a have-you-stopped-beating-your-wife kind of question. Left to stand alone, it would entirely mislead the reader, the student, the researcher who might be scratching over these interviews in years to come. Of course I had critics who were not knowledgeable Communists, Communist stooges, or whatever one chooses to call them. The campus of the University of Washington was crawling with that type. There were all types of campus clingers, who really didn't know what they were, but they were critics and at all times trying to embarrass the chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee. So I did have those critics. I don't pay much attention to them; like Mark Twain said about fleas on a dog: They are beneficial to the dog because they keep his mind off being a dog.

Going back to a previous question you asked me about the committee's critics, and since I do not wish the reader on a tomorrow or a series of tomorrows to be confused, yes, I had critics and I am going to name several of them for you, so there will be no doubt about the nature of your question and the nature of my reply.

I'm going to name three of them who just come to mind at the moment. One was a full professor at the University of Washington. His name was Phil Davis. He was very vocal; very critical of Canwell and everything that Canwell was doing. Then there was a member of the State Senate, Senator Don Miller. He was from my district and was extremely vocal and critical. He didn't like

anything about Canwell or what Canwell was doing. And there was a third one who I think was quite significant; certainly he was not a Communist nor, as far as I know, a sympathizer. He was the dean of the Law School at the University of Washington. His name was Alfred Schweppe. No doubt you may remember him.

The first two of these critics, Davis and Miller, are well-known, identified; they're on the record. They were both public servants. And, incidentally, there was another similarity between the two of them. Each of them had been an inmate of a state institution for the insane. Professor Phil Davis was on parole from the happy farm at the time that I first met him at faculty affairs at the University of Washington. I used to be invited out there quite often by some of these campus clingers who wanted to just eyeball me. They wanted to get a look at this wild man and hopefully embarrass me, if they could.

I remember well, at one of these faculty parties, one of these lipping lilies came up to me, saying, "Mr. Canwell, isn't there any way that you can gain headlines without ruining the reputation of a great university?"

Well, I would listen to a certain amount of that and then I would reach in my pocket and pull out a police mugshot showing a front and side view with identification numbers of Professor Davis; I could have, after all, released Professor Davis' public information to the press, but I did not.

That usually shut them up—I was able to have fun with this only two or three times before they got too smart to do it.

Then the Democratic senator from my district in Spokane County. I believe Don Miller was a graduate of Gonzaga Law School, and was an in-and-out, swinging-door occupant of a cell at the state institution for the insane at Medical Lake. The last exodus, as far as I know, for Don Miller was that he was paroled into the custody of the Spokane Democrat County chairman, whose name I believe was Aub Rowles. These are two identifiable critics; all critics were saying approximately the same things.

Then to enlarge on a seemingly more important critic, the dean of the University of Washington Law School. At the time I have in mind, the Canwell committee's House Concurrent Resolution No. 10 was being challenged in the courts for its constitutionality. The complaint was filed by such Communists as Bill Pennock, Phi Beta Kappa from the University of Washington campus, and by a concealed Communist, Russell Fluent, the state treasurer. These people joined with other Communists, I think attorney John Caughlan was one of them, and were attempting to cut off my lifeline, my source of funding for committee operations, which would, of course, have put the committee out of business.

The ACLU shysters would set up a meeting somewhere and would have Dean Alfred Schweppe there and

would ask the sixty-four dollar question as to whether, in his esteemed opinion, the Canwell committee was unconstitutional. He always satisfied them with an affirmative answer. For him to offer a legal opinion when the case was before the Supreme Court was highly unethical and no one but a shyster would have participated in it. However, the dean of the Law School felt free to do this and did so. The interesting part of this story, though, is that when the Washington State Supreme Court brought in its verdict, they held with Canwell, and not with Schweppe or the Communists who were suing. As I think I stated earlier, I don't know what this dean of the Law School thought of the fact that a nonlawyer and nonscholar, a cattle raiser from eastern Washington and first-time legislator, was determined by the court to know more about constitutional law in this instance than did the dean of the University of Washington Law School.

In any event, the state Supreme Court held with Canwell and I believe the verdict of history since and in the future will maintain that position.

When Senator Don Miller was paroled from Medical Lake to rerun for the Senate office, which he won, I did not know at the time of the campaign what became of him during the period of the campaign. He never appeared in public, he gave no interviews, he was just out of sight. It was only later that I learned through a Catholic priest that he had been taken to Mount Saint Michael's Seminary on the north perimeter of Spokane, under heavy medication, and kept there out of sight. It was more than a decade later that the Jesuit in charge of that institution, who had become somewhat of a friend of mine, told me that he knew where he was, because that's where they had him.

After Senator Don Miller's successful rerun for a state Senate seat, as was the custom there, the legislators in the evening after or near dinner time would be standing around the lobby of the Olympian Hotel in little groups discussing their various legislative affairs and whatnot. Don would come up and try to muscle in on these groups but none of them wanted anything to do with him because of his known mental problems, and they would try to fence him out. This was the sort of frustration that Don Miller couldn't tolerate, so he suddenly pulled his zipper, exposed himself, and ran up and down the lobby of the Olympian Hotel, until shortly the man with the butterfly net came and gathered him up and he was returned to the mental institution.

Miller was typical of my critics at the time in what he had to say. The fact that he was committed and others were not seems to me to have just been incidental, and I think I can be forgiven for believing they all belonged where he was placed. Certainly with the condition of the state and the world, anyone who was opposed to countering Communist activity was a little off their rocker. After all, the US Senate has estimated that in the USSR alone, the Communists killed twenty-one million of their

own subjects!

Well, anyway, I did have critics, and could go on and on with the list. They were not all graduates of the “nut house” but I think I could be forgiven for suspecting that there is where most of them belonged. They were all saying the same things; all using the same weak and invalid arguments and I suppose that to bring this into balance, I should also point out what the situation was in Washington State and the nation, and throughout the world, as relates to the Communist menace, so that the charge or implication of those who oppose communism were psychopathic characters just did not stand up. There were great minds and great people who were devoting their lives, fortunes, and energies—everything they had—to try to stop the march of world communism.

The Washington State situation in particular was a national scandal, and particularly at the University of Washington. Such men as Jim Farley, FDR’s handyman, took a trip around the then forty-eight states. When he got back to Washington D.C., he stated in an interview that he had just visited the forty-seven states and the Soviet of Washington. This was not Canwell saying that, or McCarthy, or Nixon, or Ashley Holden; it was the public relations man for the Democrat Party at that time, and for the president of the United States. He was not accused of fantasizing. He wasn’t seeing anything “under the bed.” He had been escorted around the State of Washington by its political leaders, who at that time were all left-wing Democrats. So he was speaking from a sound basis of experience and information.

It should be kept in mind that the criticism of the Canwell committee and its operation developed after the fact. I submit that the best evidence as to what the reaction was to our investigations at the time can be found in the daily press: news stories and editorial comment. It was almost universally supportive; friendly to what we were doing; highly complimentary. The *Christian Science Monitor* stated that our hearings on communism were the best to date.

The critics of the Canwell committee should be stood up alongside the supporters for comparison. Again I submit that in investigating and exposing communism, I was in mighty good company. Such men as J. Edgar Hoover, various key members of the United States Senate and US Congress, the rank-and-file of governors around the country, including the State of Washington; the leaders in education, such as the president of the University of Washington, Dr. Raymond Allen, who was highly supportive and praised our operation without restraint. The majority of the responsible labor leaders at the time, and newsmen of any substance gave their support. There were such men as Ashley Holden of the *Spokesman Review*, Ross Cunningham of the *Seattle Times*, Fred Neindorff of the *Seattle P-I*; and across the nation were men such as Walter Trohan of the *Chicago Tribune* and West-

brook Pegler of the Hearst system. Wherever you turned, there was great praise and a friendly reception to me and to what I had done.

It should be pointed out that when I exposed the Alger Hiss case—the perfidy of this concealed spy who operated at the highest level of government with seeming immunity—I proved that the legislative process was adequate to take care of such emergency situations. I brought witnesses to Seattle and put the facts of his treachery in the record. Alger Hiss chose to perjure himself before the US House of Representatives committee, and went to the penitentiary for perjury.

Certainly any partisans of Mr. Hiss or of his ideology became instant critics of my committee. But most of my critics came along after my committee was out of business; after there was no means of subpoenaing them, of placing them under oath and compelling their testimony. That sort of thing is not pointed out by the committee’s critics. The critics who came along then were largely orchestrated by the American Civil Liberties Union and their devious agents, and with no attempt made to get at the truth of the situation, merely to alibi for the Communists’ obvious treachery. And of course there were some uninformed citizens who bought the party line on our Committee.

Now, more than forty years after the fact, I still have critics; I find that books are still being written and pamphlets distributed, and textbooks contain the patent lies of a couple of agents who made a career of lying about Canwell and the Canwell committee. I take it as a high compliment that my activity and the record of it did not die with my committee. Of course, there are those subversives in the world who would destroy our legislative system; our ability to utilize the legislative process to compel testimony, to make public findings, to pass legislation to meet whatever emergencies arise. These things are part of our democratic system; they are latent powers built into our Constitution and system of government. Of course, there are those who will never rest easy as long as that system functions. The ACLU and its associated body, the National Lawyers Guild, an impressive Communist device, have devoted the last thirty or forty years to destroying the legislative capabilities of the American people. They have destroyed the congressional House Committee on Un-American Activities. They have destroyed the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and all the state legislative committees probing subversive or Communist activities. So, yes, I have critics, and will so long as this nation survives, because its enemies are very active and still today are very much with us.

It seemed that if I could win the Senate race at all, and I was not convinced that I could, mine was an overwhelmingly Democrat district and had quite a bit of radical representation. But I felt that the Senate was just as easy, or maybe easier to win than the House and I

doubted very much that I could win either because of the opposition that I knew was developing.

The reason I ran for the Senate instead of running for a national office, or governorship, for instance, was that I had more or less assured responsible people who had supported me that I wouldn't use them as a political steppingstone or ladder. Because of the tremendous amount of publicity I had and name familiarity I probably would have won the governorship quite handily. I didn't wish to be governor. And I didn't wish to in effect betray the people who had been assured that this was not a political gambit on my part. But I did decide to run for the state Senate and did so.

Probably the most amazing campaign ever carried out in a local district took place in my little district, very quietly. But day after day, and step by step, efforts were made to see to it that I did not win and could not win.

Senator Don Miller, the one that I said was in the insane asylum, was bailed out or gotten out of the institution down there at Eastern State Hospital at Medical Lake by the chairman of the Democratic Party, who signed for his release, and another character. Then he was concealed. He was taken completely out of sight. He never appeared anywhere, never was talked to by a reporter. No one knew what became of him. And I didn't know for some years afterward where he had been confined.

Then they took another Don Miller, there happened to be two of them, and this one was a state senator from Wenatchee. He masqueraded, I believe, as a Republican, but I think he was always identified as a Democrat. Louie Wasmer, a local radio station owner here, put Senator Don Miller from Wenatchee on the air on his station, on approximately half-hour intervals. This Don Miller would come on to give some little news blurb. He would say, "This is Senator Don Miller," without identifying the fact that he was not from the Spokane area.

Then they had a crew contacting residents out in the Fifth District and people would often say, "I can't vote for Miller, he's insane." Then the person would say, "That's not the same one, the one who is running is the one you hear on the radio station." And that was very effectively done.

Then numerous other house-to-house campaigns were carried out. Hugh DeLacy, a top Communist, had a pamphlet printed up in Ohio. I think he was stationed there at the time and working with the Methodist Federation for Social Action, another Communist religious front. They put together a little document, I have one of them here: *Methodist bishops unanimously protest un-American practices of our government*, attacking the Canwell committee. This was distributed to every house in my district, with follow-ups of people who knew church memberships and others. They would assure the district's voters that the opposing candidate who was running was a fine Christian and I was a no good bum. That was done and

whatever was necessary to tell people was done. It was a fabulous campaign with nobody knowing what was happening, except the instigators!

Not less theatrical was a shocking story that I had heard at the Friday night penny ante poker game at the Press Club. One of our players, Paul Jones of the Spokane *Daily Chronicle*, related that he had a news item about Don Miller quashed. Jones came to the game displaying his big headline: "STUDENT NURSE DATES WEREWOLF." All he needed was some safe fill-in for his story, he had said; there had been no police report. The story in this news item was that Senator Don Miller had been involved in a highly sensational and vicious sexual activity that should have been a police matter.

According to the informant, someone at Democrat headquarters had arranged a date for the senator with a student nurse. The senator and the nurse were not previously acquainted. Shortly after the introductions and before a destination had been reached, the senator pulled his car to the side of the road and began an instant and violent assault on the nurse's breasts. The terrified girl leaped out of the car and ran back to the nurses' home. The injuries to her breasts were so serious that they required corrective surgery.

Then a blanket of silence settled down over the story. According to the informant, the girl was sedated and quieted down by the nuns at the nurses' home. A trusted doctor was called and performed the necessary surgery. The nurse's parents, who lived somewhere down in the wheat country, were pacified, possibly because they wished no publicity. No police report was ever filed. The story was kicked about that some money had been made available from local fat cat Democrats, and the story got nowhere. By the time of my state senatorial campaign, Don Miller was at the happy farm.

In my Republican Party they raised almost no money for me at all. I think \$150 and they didn't give it to me. They ran around saying, "You're such a cinch you don't need any money." So anybody that wanted to contribute was channeled into supporting somebody else or something else.

When it went to election night, of course, I was knocked out by a nut who was later returned to the asylum. I said then that I didn't resent it particularly. I said in answer to questions about it that I felt the people had a right to support and elect their own kind. And I didn't make a big thing of it. But had I gone to the Senate I would have led out in the re-creation of the committee. That was a result not desired by very potent powers. That's about what I could say about that campaign. I had no money to spend. The Republican Party did not provide decent support for me and so I could not put out any great amount of printing or distribute it, or buy radio time to counteract this. And I don't think it would have worked anyway. I think they had me.

It was a very clever, very astute piece of work and it was done to take out somebody who was a potential danger to them all along the line. So they put their effort and their money where it would pay off.

Mount Saint Michael's, where Miller, the "Silent Candidate" spent the interim, was a Jesuit Seminary. And so Miller never said a word, never made a speech, never gave a press interview, and nobody knew where he was throughout the Senate campaign.

Mr. Frederick: Who was the Republican chairman in the Spokane area at that time?

Mr. Canwell: Seems to me it was Bill Howe. And Bill Howe was not a Communist. He was an amoral politician and a person who used the county chairmanship for every possible way of making a buck. And was one of those responsible for the Republican Party helping steal some eight, ten, or eleven thousand dollars from my campaign fund in one of my congressional campaigns. An actual theft. Misappropriation of the money. I held him in great contempt, but was somewhat restrained from punching him in the nose because I knew his wife was a lovely person and my family knew her. So that was part of the picture.

I don't think that anything could have changed the picture because they had it too well-organized in a Democratic district. One of the things they did was to obtain lists of church people and so they'd tell these people that I was an alcoholic and a drunk and things like that. Then they'd find somebody who ran a beer parlor and they'd say that I was a bluenose dry who was going to put them all out of business. Whatever was necessary they told. It was just an amazing thing. Nobody realizing what was happening.

Mr. Frederick: What issues did you run on during that campaign?

Mr. Canwell: Any press releases I gave probably centered on my activities, my committee activities. And that I would continue that work. So they elected me once and I don't think it was a factor one way or another in this campaign. I think people were just thoroughly and totally confused and deliberately made so.

Mr. Frederick: Did you have an election committee?

Mr. Canwell: Did I have? No, I don't believe so. I had an informal group of followers. People who were very enthusiastically for me and probably would be in the Women's Republican Club. Those people were very active supporters of mine, but there wasn't much they could do except invite me to a meeting or something like that.

Then I received enormous resistance and endeavor on

that side from the Cheney school area where the Cheney Normal was, where they should have been a hundred percent for me. Professors and others out there were working day and night to get people not to vote for me. Actually they became a university because of a bill that I helped put through there and forced through over the objections of Pearl Wanamaker, and I should have had their wholehearted support.

During that time there were all kinds of demonstrations on the campus, and literature distributed and you name it, it was done. So that took care of a good section of my district that normally would have and should have supported me. It was not necessarily Democratic, since it had voted me in previously. And there was a handful of supporters of mine on the faculty at the school but they were much in the minority and didn't dare speak out very much.

I think the president at that time was Walter Isle. And he did write me a letter apologizing for some the stuff that was done. He wanted to assure me that it wasn't done through or by the school. Interesting things happened there. We had coverage on the Communist cell operating there at the school. I made a talk down there and it was reported then through the Communist press, and I was totally misquoted but put in quotes. The story was used by, as I mentioned the other day, the *American Scholar*. It went to every so-called scholar in America. Most prestigious publication on the educational level. It had an article by one of the Lynds there quoting this speech at Cheney and having me saying something that nothing but an idiot would say. And putting it in quotes.

It's interesting that while that went to every scholar in America, only one professor had the integrity to contact me and ask me if I had said such a foolish thing. So those were the things that were moving early in the "Get Canwell" area.

Mr. Frederick: Who were your financial supporters during that campaign?

Mr. Canwell: I remember one friend of mine, Charlie Hebbard. At that time he owned the Spokane Hotel and the Tull & Gibbs furniture store. He was a well-known, well-liked local businessman, a firm conservative. And he asked me how much support I was getting.

I told him that I was getting none at all. And he said, "Would you mind if I raised a little money for you?" I think he did raise a thousand or so for me. That's the only financial support that I had at that time that I can think of.

There was a great endeavor made in areas where businessmen met, like the Spokane City Club and other places, to get over the idea that I was just loaded financially, the family had lots of money and that I was getting all kinds of support. Of course, none of it was true. We had very limited funds and I wasn't getting any help from

outside. I'm speaking now of the Senate campaign here in Spokane. The picture changed somewhat in the congressional statewide races.

Mr. Frederick: Did you have a campaign staff?

Mr. Canwell: No, I couldn't afford anything like that. I had people who were very much for me, newspapermen and others. That's better than having a staff running around. But I didn't have anybody out soliciting campaign support other than volunteers like Charlie Hebbard, and he was the best you could get. I think I would have had lots of support had they had any idea what I was up against. But how do you convey that information?

Ashley Holden gave me very good support in the *Review* and he'd referred to this phantom candidate, Miller, and raised a question.

I had no objection to the support that I was getting. It was just a legislative race. The Republican Party as such should have provided me more funds, but I'm sure that many responsible people within the central committee felt that with the tremendous publicity that I had I'd have no trouble being elected anywhere. And so they didn't do anything.

Mr. Frederick: Did the Central Committee and/or you conduct any surveying, any polling?

Mr. Canwell: No, to my knowledge nothing like that was done. There wasn't the reliance on polls in those days that we seem to have developed in recent years. And there wasn't much comment. They were just surprised when it was over. I think I was probably one of the those who was not surprised. But the community in general, I think, was very surprised with my defeat by this crazy man.

Mr. Frederick: Were there party repercussions with regard to him during that session?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, they were quite strong. There were people in the Legislature who wanted him removed and wanted me to move into that place. That included Democrats such as Rod Lindsay and Davie Cowen.

And had it not been for the quiet resistance of John Happy, I think I would have been appointed. There would have been a vacancy declared and I would have been appointed to the seat. But what they did is just let it ride. He remained a member of the Senate while he was in the happy farm!

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I'm struck by what you say with regard to potential lack of campaign staff and funding.

Mr. Canwell: I think that was quite usual then. You

realize that the legislative seats were not salaried positions in those days. And no great concern was generated about who went to the Legislature. I think a great indifference prevailed.

There were no funds available to set up committees, to rent office space and all that sort of thing which is done now. They talk in hundreds of thousands of dollars now. I was talking in hundreds, a few dollars.

Mr. Frederick: What were the differences between the first time you ran for the Legislature in 1946 and the second time you ran for the Legislature in 1948 with regard to your activity?

Mr. Canwell: In the first race I was fortunate enough to be teamed up with Jim Blodgett, who had served a term there. I described how he was willing to do a lot of foot work, and printed up stacks and stacks of yard signs and got them placed and that sort of thing. He was an enormous help in getting me elected. And we ran as a team.

In the Senate race I was just running against this nut. And nobody thought that I would have any trouble winning. So I would say the difference there was that I had Jim Blodgett doing a lot of footwork and in addition to that nobody knew me. Locally I knew a few business and professional people. Outside of that there were people who knew me maybe because I had arrested them or processed them in the law enforcement area. But in general nobody knew me. The Canwell name was known but it was not a politically significant name.

Mr. Frederick: Considering your industry and considering your ambition, why didn't you tap out-of-state funds? Particularly so, if you were going to be a one-issue candidate with a very identifiable constituency out there?

Mr. Canwell: I think that had I been able to develop a mailing enterprise and selected a proper list of names, I probably could have raised some funds. But you realize that from the time of filing to election time is a very brief period.

I was, of course, busy with other things, too. I did not attempt to raise outside money. I never did. I've never been a very good fund-raiser. That's probably one of my weaknesses, but I just don't like to be cast in the role. Later, many people did ask me, "Why didn't you let me know that you needed money?"

[End of Tape 45, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Albert, again considering that you were a one-issue candidate and a man of ambition. You are intense with regard to the issue, your issue—anti-Communism and/or subversive activities—has a very

identifiable constituency nationally. I just don't understand why you didn't tap into that money with regard to a political career.

Mr. Canwell: I suppose that it takes a better understanding of my personality. I've said here several times, and I've always said it, that I was never a very good fundraiser. I can't do my job and run around with my hand out. I don't operate that way and can't. And I suppose had I made some sort of a national appeal I would have gotten some funds. But that in itself takes money and endeavor and time. I think most of my friends thought that I didn't need any financial support. So that any race went very underfinanced, underfunded.

I do not believe that it could have been changed with funds. I think that the die was cast when it was determined on top levels of the Communist apparatus to go after me. They did it in a thousand ways. The party knew that one of my weaknesses or my problems was funds and every effort was made to cut those sources off and make them unavailable. And make it appear that I was rolling in money and didn't need it.

So confining it to the thinking of that time, that is the only way I could answer it. I did not make any statewide appeals or any national appeals for funds. I don't know whether I would have gotten them had I done so.

Had I contacted people like Alfred Kohlberg and US Senator Styles Bridges and others who were and became very strong supporters of mine I suppose I would have gotten financial help from that area. I didn't do so. I never have been able to devote enough time to thinking about financing my endeavors. It's always been a job to get the work done and remain solvent. It isn't easy.

I remember Dr. J.B. Matthews in New York one time telling me, "Your problem is you're ten years ahead of your time and you'll starve to death. Nobody is going to understand what you're talking about or what you're thinking is and therefore you'll have no funding." And that was true.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, you couldn't say that with regard to 1948 and 1949.

Mr. Canwell: No, it was shortly after that. After Matthews had been a witness, we became quite well-acquainted and usually when I'd be in New York or that area I would call on him. So somewhere along the line we had this discussion. How are you going to go about financing your endeavors? He knew what I was trying to do. And he had some of the same problems. But he solved them by finding some support within the Hearst organization and other areas.

Mr. Frederick: What did you learn from that campaign?

Mr. Canwell: I don't know that I learned anything that I didn't know before.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, what I'm asking you is a political question as regard to campaigning.

Mr. Canwell: In the first place I never intended to make a career of politics. The endeavors that I made in that direction were a byproduct of the task that I saw before me. Politics as a career did not appeal to me and that was not a goal in itself. I only wanted to go in on my terms. That would still be true. It would be true of all of my activities. Whatever benefits might flow to me, they have to be on my terms. They cannot involve a compromise of my beliefs, or faith, or determination. And it's just me. It's not a virtue; maybe it's a fault.

Mr. Frederick: I hear what you say. It was not your intent to make a career out of running for office or seeking office. But if I'm not mistaken, subsequent to this 1948 campaign you ran three more times.

Mr. Canwell: I ran a number of times. My reason for that was that I had determined that any solution to the problem was on the legislative level, and therefore to me it seemed that the Congress was the place for me. In 1950 I ran for the United States Senate because I felt that Magnuson was very vulnerable and I had so much on him that I felt he could be easily beaten. I filed for the United States Senate nomination. In that I had some formidable opposition: George Kinnear and Janet Tourtelott, very well-known Seattle people; and Walter Williams, who was a figurehead in the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, he's very well known and an able speaker. And I was running against those three powerhouses and I almost got the nomination.

So then pointing in that direction this statewide seat in the Congress opened up.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, let's take these campaigns one at a time. Moving from 1948 into 1950.

Just as backdrop between 1948 and 1950, what did you do with regard to issues of employment?

Mr. Canwell: For one thing we had a farm. It was an operating cattle ranch. There never was a time that I couldn't have busied myself twenty-four hours a day there. So that was an answer to what might be involved in employment. But at the same time I had become involved on rather significant levels in the security field. So I was very busy although not profitably so, usually.

Mr. Frederick: So when you left the Legislature in the first part of 1949 there would be some committee-related issues that would present themselves periodically. What

you are saying then is that you began to do consultive work at that point in time.

Mr. Canwell: Well, I wouldn't know how best to describe it so it would be understood. But I busied myself in the internal security field, and it grew into levels beyond anything I anticipated. There were many issues boiling at that time that were a product or a by-product of the Canwell committee.

The questions of records, for instance, what became of them and so on. That was a boiling turmoil all of the time. There were agitators who naturally felt that it was a way of getting at me. They just didn't know how well-prepared I was to meet that issue.

Charlie Hodde swooped down on committee headquarters with the State Patrol in trucks and took our filing cabinets and my personal safe and other things down to Olympia. Reaction, of course, immediately set in because there were people that didn't want any monkey business carried out in that area. So friends of mine in the Senate moved that these files and records be impounded and kept under lock and key, only accessible to the Speaker of the House and the president pro tem of the Senate, together. They were locked in a committee room at the Legislature.

So there was a great deal of agitation always in that area. I suppose somewhere along the line we ought to go into that as a special issue to discuss, but I could pursue it here.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I hear what you say. You have discussed the Charles Hodde issue with regard to requesting those committee files. When did that take place?

Mr. Canwell: It took place in the intervening months after the close of my committee. We kept on operating because we were winding up our affairs. That's why we needed a supplemental appropriation. You couldn't stop a tremendous operation like that just overnight and say "that's it."

So we were trying to gather up the loose ends. There were things like records that had to be returned to sources. Men like Aaron Coleman were going to other employment, he was going back to the United States Department of State. He stored a great amount of our material and records in his garage with the responsibility of returning them. That had been true of a couple of the other people. All of that stuff had to be taken care of, and it was taken care of in general and to most intents and purposes at my expense. I just had to be there. I wasn't salaried, I wasn't on state support. I think that was up until the time of the termination of the committee, but then after the next session, the 31st Legislature's set up. That's when I believe Hodde moved to seize the records.

Mr. Frederick: While we are on the issue of records,

there is an issue that began to surface. That would have begun to surface at least by the fall of 1949. That has to do with the issue of Melvin Rader and the attention the press, the George Hewitt issue, the University of Washington had begun to address the issues with regard to their tenure committee hearings. And there was a question within a portion of the community that there was so much made about the Melvin Rader thing. But there was not an issue of contempt regarding him and those trials. People began to wonder, if this was all the case, why didn't President Raymond Allen do something about it or the board of regents at the university, and he was not addressed there in that issue. Then there was the motion to support dismissal during the extradition hearings in the Bronx, New York City. That would have been March 12, 1949.

Mr. Canwell: Clarify this. You are saying something about the issue of dismissal. You mean of Melvin Rader?

Mr. Frederick: Issue of dismissal with regard to George Hewitt back there.

Then the press statement by Judge Aaron Levy which raised some blood pressure in Washington State regarding his questioning civilization within the state, and implying that the Washington State judiciary may be a little tainted or questionable. Which seems to be a bizarre thing for a fellow jurist to make a comment in the press on something like that.

Mr. Canwell: The case had to be quite extreme for a jurist of his stature to do that. I think that his remarks and replies were very justified. He wasn't the first one to say that we were a bunch of barbarians out here. I have already quoted Farley, a world famous Democrat, a handyman for FDR, who labeled this the Soviet of Washington. That wasn't something too unusual. We had sent crazy people like Marion Zionchek to Congress and others. So I would imagine that a judge of his standing would be aware of the general situation out here.

Mr. Frederick: At the same time, Albert, it's not appropriate during an extradition hearing to grant a motion of habeas corpus. That sitting judge is not there to adjudicate.

Mr. Canwell: Nobody challenged that. Nobody in the legal fraternity or community challenged his right to do that. If that were to be challenged it should be challenged right there where he was hearing the issue. And questioning whether he had the authority to rule on it or not, which he obviously did have. Anyone who thinks that it's unethical or improper, thinks so because they very much desire the opposite to happen.

But I think that he did as anybody else who was

aroused by the indignity of the whole procedure. This whole ploy. You could see through it. I'm surprised that he was as restrained as he was. But anyway I'm very willing to leave it within that jurisdiction.

[End of Tape 46, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: At several of the issues that are reviewed within this life history with Albert Canwell, here is extensive primary, secondary material addressing these various issues. And this is me speaking: The Justice Aaron Levy demeanor and/or response during that hearing is questionable and reflects upon him as a jurist. Particularly so with regard to commenting on fellow jurists whom he did not name, did not know within Washington State, and commented on across-the-board or questioned the extent of civilization in Washington state. It was inappropriate. I say that as a Washingtonian.

Mr. Canwell: As a Washingtonian and aware of the situation, I am of the opinion that what he said was very proper and timely. We sent the damnedest bunch of bums to Congress from the State of Washington that any state ever assembled. And we had a history that was so repulsive and so notorious that Jim Farley called us the Soviet of Washington. And then for a jurist back there who has a bunch of commie crap dumped on his desk to be aroused and speak his mind, I think it's high time that some jurist speak out as he did. And he had the complete authority to do so. And the only people who think it was unethical were those who wish he hadn't.

I can see that pride in your state might make your hackles come up a little bit on this sort of thing, but they should come up about the condition that caused us to be the Soviet of Washington. To send people like Marion Zionchek and others to Congress.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I appreciate that. The issue was that there had been through legal proper channels.

Mr. Canwell: Why didn't the counsel on the other side raise those issues? Why didn't they challenge this judge? They, I'm sure, were convinced that they were getting off pretty easy.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, it took several months just to find out when the hearing was going to be taking place. The response, as I understand it from officials within the court, was not that forthcoming. And this was one of the reasons why, as I understand it, the prosecutor, Carroll, could not afford to play that game. To send someone back there open-endedly.

Albert, within that environment the "officialdom" couldn't even lay a subpoena on Mr. Hewitt, who was running around testifying in the press this, that, and the

other. People out here, officialdom, were aware of the game that was being played back there.

Mr. Canwell: There are two sides to that game. Hewitt was never called or there was never an indictment from a grand jury, which would be normal in a case like that. For anybody to go and make a complaint to some shyster judge on the lowest possible level and get an indictment or warrant, the whole thing was improper and this judge could see that. If this man were guilty of perjury it should have been taken up before a grand jury and he should have been indicted.

You should realize, Timothy, that George Hewitt had never been arrested for anything whatever, was never indicted, no felony warrant had been issued for him, nor was he a fugitive from justice! Further, extradition from the State of New York is an expensive procedure which must be approved by the governor of the state and the costs are paid out of state treasury funds appropriated for that purpose. Even today our government in Olympia will rarely extradite—and then only on the most heinous felonies, usually involving murder—from any except Washington and the three nearest states. This is standard procedure. For protagonists in the Rader incident to make an issue of what happened in the left-wing attempt to extradite Hewitt is simply unrealistic and foolish, and is intended only to garner sympathy from citizens who are not conversant with legal procedure.

Now if you want legal processes you should start with the flaunting of the thing by the local people who were determined to carry out this propaganda ploy and bear down on this poor, ill, broke, black person whom they should have all been sympathetic to. But they weren't. Not when they're anti-Communist. And that's the situation in a nutshell here. Had they ever had a case on Hewitt they would have taken it to a grand jury like they should have. But they didn't. They avoided that like the plague. They went to some justice court judge as they did to get motions against our committee and other things. They didn't go through the proper channels. They went through the sleaziest, easiest way to do it.

Talk about rights—Hewitt had rights, too.

Mr. Frederick: With the Aaron Levy decision regarding the denial of extradition to stand trial in Washington on issues of perjury, the managing editor of the *Seattle Times* was alarmed and, as I understand it, stated that "justice has broken down on this issue." This was considering that Melvin Rader was not cited for contempt. This was considering that the University of Washington was not moving against Melvin Rader. It was not an issue of review.

Mr. Canwell: You should take a fairer look at that. Melvin Rader cooperated, both with the committee and

the president of the university. That's all that was ever required of these professors. The reluctant and the violent ones—

Mr. Frederick: Albert, those people who stated that they were members of the Communist Party, and in one instance an individual, Professor Gundlach, who did not one way or the other state. Those people were summarily dismissed by the board of regents. Melvin Rader was never a party to that review process. That was a determination made by President Raymond Allen.

Mr. Canwell: No, those things were out of my area of jurisdiction. I had nothing to do with the conduct of the regents—

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I am not stating that you did. I'm stating that various people in Washington began to wonder what is going on.

Mr. Canwell: Let's name them. What people were—

Mr. Frederick: The managing editor of the *Times*.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I can understand that. He's the guy that planted that Ed Guthman on us.

Mr. Frederick: This is what I am addressing right now with regard to the—

Mr. Canwell: I think in any of these things when you say many people are doing this, who? And when you find out who, then you know the why. That's very simple. The managing editor—what was his name, McGrath or something—at the *Seattle Times* was a guy that removed Ross Cunningham from covering our hearings and insinuated this commie agent on us. I'm sure he would be worried and concerned about all kinds of phases of this.

Mr. Frederick: This was at the time that Ed Guthman began the process of investigative reporting for the newspaper with regard to the Melvin Rader and the George Hewitt issue.

Mr. Canwell: He started it the day that he went to work there. And the day that he was assigned to our committee he was assigned it to sabotage us. And his managing editor was the one who did it.

Mr. Frederick: At the same time for many months Melvin Rader was gathering evidence with regard to his itinerary associated with 1938 the summer of, 1939 the summer of, 1940 the summer of. Again there is primary and secondary material associated with these issues.

Mr. Canwell: I examined all of that evidence. I listened to Rader's case at my own expense. I went to great lengths to see that he was heard on the defense that he was providing. I never wished to deny him such rights. And as I say, I went to considerable trouble to see that he was able to present his information to both Raymond Allen and myself.

At the same time I know enough about the deviousness of the party on the upper levels to know that they could whisk somebody in and out of town very easily and conceal their tracks. I just left the thing up to Rader. And had he been as diligent under oath and at the committee hearings as he became scrounging around for bits and pieces of evidence to prove his innocence, there never would have been a case.

All he had to do was to shape up right there where the issue was, and at the time that it was. And he didn't. That's why—

Mr. Frederick: What was that issue, Albert?

Mr. Canwell: The issue was whether Hewitt saw him at Briehl's Farm or not. So that—

Mr. Frederick: He testified. Melvin Rader testified that Friday when he was called.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, but he testified as to his innocence in this thing after he refused and his attorney refused and failed to confront Hewitt at an executive hearing.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, if someone is forewarned that they are going to testify, and it was viewed after the fact as an issue of perjury, it seems like it would be a little foolish to extensively, within a subpoenaed hearing agenda— This was an executive session or you've said it was an executive session—

Mr. Canwell: How would you have handled that at the time? Would you have let this guy walk away and not testify after he had made this identification under circumstances that appeared to me impossible to be other than factual?

Mr. Frederick: Ed Henry received the basic story of what this man was going to say. That is hearsay with regard to what he's going to testify to, because he hasn't testified at that point in time.

Mr. Canwell: That's right; so—

Mr. Frederick: So then let's wait and see what the man says under oath in the hearing.

Mr. Canwell: It was unfair to—

Mr. Frederick: And that was that afternoon. And that transpired—

Mr. Canwell: That was unfair to both Rader and Ed Henry. And if you'll read our resolution, I had the authority to make exceptions in cases where my discretion led me to do so. I think I handled it the way I should have handled it. And if either one of them, Rader or Ed Henry, had been honest men and innocent of the thing as charged, they would have pursued it with the opportunity that they had there that was presented to them. I tried to compel this man to confront this accuser of his. I could ask no more. Somebody accuses me of things, I'd like to confront—

Mr. Frederick: Why didn't you do that for other people, Albert. This is the only example that you ever did that during those two hearings.

Mr. Canwell: This was the only case where a witness from out of state made such allegations: identified professors or people here as having attended a Communist school in New York. It was the only case where that happened. Had there been other cases, it probably would have been handled in a similar manner.

You must always remember, too, that this is not a court of law, it's a legislative proceeding where there's great discretion residing in the chairman or people conducting such an investigation and hearing. And you just do not have the time for all the minutia or tidbits of hearsay and scuttlebutt. Here we had the meat and potatoes. You confront it or you deny it. The fact that Hewitt's identification of Gundlach was never questioned or challenged by these same people would convince anyone that Hewitt knew what he was talking about.

Mr. Frederick: Within this period in time there is some question with what was going on. We're talking about the spring, summer, and fall of 1949. What was going on with regard to this George Hewitt thing. And what were the reasons why apparently nothing was going to transpire with regard to Melvin Rader and the perjury issue and the dismissal of the extradition of this man to come back here to address these issues.

It started to raise some issues. It was discovered by Melvin Rader and it was discovered by Ed Guthman, not at the same time, that in the presence of Ida Kirby, this would be Monday, July 26, 1948—this is the Monday following the Friday adjourning of the second hearings—that there was discovered in her presence in the attic of the lodge register. She attests, too, that it was stated, "There it is, Rader, '38." And there was a receipt left with Mr. Grant at that point in time. And that material was taken back to committee headquarters.

Mr. Canwell: First of all, Timothy, it should be understood that the lodge register included nothing of evidentiary value. It was a practice for customers to use the facilities of the lodge, which had somewhat of a reputation of a "hot pillow joint," to come back later and, for a price of, say, \$20 a page, buy any page of the registry which had embarrassing or compromising information on it from the night clerk. Because of that, this register was tainted in respect to its use as evidence, so it was never used in my hearings.

Second, why did all these people, including Guthman and the managing editor of the *Times*, and who else, why did they confine all of their endeavors to the Rader side of the thing and ignore the fact that the man accused with him was Ralph Gundlach? Not a word was ever said about Gundlach. All of their worry had to do with Rader.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, as I understand it, you agreed with your committee members that if a witness was going to present testimony or you were going to call a witness with regard to testifying to alleged Communist Party membership or participation, that there needed to be at least five other witnesses who would be prepared to state that. If that wasn't the case that issue wasn't going to be raised. Now this is my understanding that you had this understanding with the committee. This was one of the operational procedures.

Mr. Canwell: Mr. Frederick, you have mentioned several times that the Canwell committee had a rule of procedure making it mandatory that at least five or six persons should testify about the Communist membership of any suspect person before we subpoenaed them, put them on to testify, or named them as Communists. No such rule ever existed. It would have been ridiculous.

As I mentioned before, there were so many known Communists out at the University of Washington that to set up some arbitrary rule of procedure for such experts as I had working in the investigation of the university professors would ultimately have been ridiculous. My decision was at all times the deciding factor in who would be investigated and what tactics would be applied.

It must be obvious that in the Communist espionage operation, the higher up the scale a Communist culprit is, the fewer tracks are left; the fewer tracks you will find. Had we had such a requirement as you suggest, we could never have laid a hand on Alger Hiss, but we nailed him and we nailed him without having such mundane evidence as party cards and that sort of thing.

People on that level are not vulnerable to that type of exposure; by that I mean persons on the level of Alger Hiss, Melvin Rader or Harry Hopkins are carried along by the party for years and years, and are very valuable assets to the apparatus. They go to great lengths in the Communist operation to meticulously shield such people from

discovery. You have to know what you are doing, and know their connections are determined by what they do, not by what some silly person may say about them. To illustrate what a Communist suspect does is more important than the fact that at some time or another he paid dues to the party and pasted stamps in a book, and had the approval of the district organizer.

I think at the moment of the case of Oppenheimer. I believe he was one of the most dangerous Communists placed in our atomic energy field. The record would show that, sure, he paid dues in the Communist Party; when they wanted money, he gave it to them. He married a Communist. He was sleeping with at least two or three others. So what conclusions do you draw by the fact that he had at one time paid dues in the party? It was what he did during that time and afterward which is important, and he was a very willing Communist participant on the highest levels of our Manhattan project. To expose these people, you need skilled investigators; people who know precisely what they are doing, what they are up against, and have to operate on those levels in a very professional way, or you get nowhere at all.

These comments are part of an answer to the unreliable statement that we set up some arbitrary rule about how many people had to identify a suspect Communist before it was “for real.”

Mr. Frederick: During testimony, a variety of people testified that they were present with Professor Gundlach during what they believed to be exclusive Communist meetings.

Mr. Canwell: I told you before, we never had such proof that I could use on Melvin Rader. We did have it on Gundlach and many of the others—

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I’m answering what you asked. Or responding to what you’ve asked. At the same time portions of the University of Washington Faculty Tenure Committee were displeased with Professor Gundlach’s participation, or lack of participation, and consistently through that process he, the professor, was not deemed to be fully responsive to President Raymond Allen. To the point where the board of regents fired him. He was never reinstated.

Mr. Canwell: The issue here is: Were the two of them at Briehl’s Farm in New York? Either they were there together as Hewitt said or they weren’t. So why is the question of Gundlach being completely ignored, but a great issue made of Rader, who they happen to know had covered his tracks very thoroughly with the help of the party and the ACLU, over the years?

Mr. Frederick: Additionally to that, I was caught off

guard on the Friday testimony of George Hewitt when he was asked for either the second or third time why he left the Communist Party, and he came close to having a nervous breakdown on the witness stand. And I wondered about that, why that would be the case. It appears to be a great confusion or emotional issue with him on that issue.

Mr. Canwell: I wouldn’t know as to that. I think that a person such as George Hewitt is under tremendous emotional strain in his whole life. And breaking with the party is one of the things they all seem to go through. I’ve talked to many of them, Bella Dodd, Barbara Hartle, and many others. They have this emotional reaction because suddenly they are breaking with all of their friends and things that they have been committed to, work they’ve done. And it is an emotional thing.

But if you are implying that Hewitt is an emotional, unstable witness, I don’t think any of his testimony that I’ve ever been able to read would indicate that to be the case. I think that he is a remarkably competent witness judging by the various things I’ve read in immigration papers and others. So I don’t buy the theory of thinking that he might be emotionally unstable. He was in poor health. He eventually dropped dead.

But in these issues I think it was incumbent to place yourself in the spot where you have to make the decisions that I had to make that you questioned. What would you have done in the case, realizing that the legislative process in a legislative hearing is not a judicial procedure? That enormous responsibility is placed on the individual. In the Hewitt/Rader case I had to make a decision: Do we settle for this in executive hearing, and just make it a matter of something that was testified to in executive hearing and not permit it to go on the stand? I wanted it done where the public, and the press, and everybody else could hear it and it would be up to the criticism and evaluation of that type of testimony.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, was there a quorum in that executive session?

Mr. Canwell: I don’t remember who all was there. Didn’t have to be a quorum I could conduct it as an individual.

I did not want the issue settled in executive session, however. I wanted it out in the open where he had to face the public, the press and everybody else and would make these statements. Where Rader could make his denials. I gave him the advantage of pursuing the thing to whatever extent they wished in the executive hearing, but that would not have ended it. I could not stop the things at that point. And I would not have.

My suggestion to a lot of these people who still seem to be so concerned is: Since Rader is dead and Gundlach

was a partner in this thing, why don't they transfer their sympathies and hand-wringing to Gundlach and his career and activity and background and what he did and has done since?

I think that their sympathies are buried with a dead man.

Mr. Frederick: With regard to Professor Gundlach. He was accused by George Hewitt of attending that school in the latter summer of 1938.

Mr. Canwell: They were accused together, the two of them. And—

Mr. Frederick: Correct. Professor Gundlach was teaching at the University of Washington during that period of time.

Mr. Canwell: —there were also things that I know that I've mentioned before that Gundlach, to the best of our knowledge, within the Communist Party was Melvin Rader's control. And by that he was the one who takes the responsibility to see that he carries out his party functions.

Mr. Frederick: Professor Gundlach was very much interested in that hearing.

Mr. Canwell: He was what?

Mr. Frederick: Very much interested in that hearing in The Bronx. Very anxious to have George Hewitt return to Washington State.

Mr. Canwell: Oh, sure, what did Gundlach have to lose? He was doing what the party wanted done.

Mr. Frederick: He was accused of being back there in 1938 when he was teaching at the University of Washington in the latter half of that summer. He was teaching out here.

Mr. Canwell: Why hasn't he been able to generate any support as Rader has?

Mr. Frederick: I'm not in a position to answer that, Albert.

Mr. Canwell: They're the same people involved all across-the-board.

Timothy, I think this is a good point at which to blow the whistle, and call time, as it were. It is quite apparent that as we launch into the Rader phase of these interviews that you come to the sessions very well-briefed and thoroughly indoctrinated in the liberal pro-Rader position

taken by the ACLU and their compatriots. Your entire line of questioning and obvious editorializing are no longer strictly legitimate. Please don't misunderstand me. I do not question your integrity. I merely think you've been had.

Let's begin by identifying the players and, by stating this, I wish to play on a level playing field. I think that it is fair that we first name the players who are involved; whose teams we are up against. So I will attempt to identify the players—some visible on the field and others concealed in the dugout.

As to Melvin Rader, whether or not he was ever at Canyon Creek Lodge, or at Briehl's Farm in New York is not material to the Rader case. What is material is that he thoroughly identified himself as a Communist by fronting for twelve to sixteen major Communist fronts in the Seattle area. It wasn't necessary to concoct any evidence against this character, he convicted himself. He ran around doing the Communist bidding. He put the imprimatur of the University of Washington on Joseph Stalin's policy positions with no hesitancy, no apologies. He just did the job. And all this was occurring at a time when Stalin was proving himself to be history's worst and most monstrous mass murderer. While he was doing that, these people on the ramparts were out singing his song, praising his program, advancing his missions, and that sort of thing. In the Rader case, I could go into many of the fronts that he went to bat for.

I think one of the most significant ones was the Harry Bridges case. Harry Bridges was an alien Communist who had become very important in West Coast shipping, dominating the International Longshoremen's Union of the Pacific, and this miserable, troublemaking Communist was under fire by the immigration authorities. They were trying to get him out of the country, out of our critical areas where he could not sabotage our shipping and ships. They worked at that very hard. What was Melvin doing in Seattle? He was running around raising funds for the Harry Bridges Defense Committee and other fronts for Bridges. Now what does this have to do with academic freedom, academic responsibility, or anything else? Absolutely nothing. It was a prime cause sponsored by the Communists, and Melvin was doing his thing as usual.

It is quite an interesting sidelight that the one giving Melvin his orders, sometimes directly and sometimes routed through others, was a person by the name of Morris Rappaport. "Rap," as he was known in party circles, had a strength over and above what might have been normal. He claimed to be related to Stalin by marriage, and I suppose that was true, because there was no other reason for him being put in charge of this most important Communist enclave in the free world. Their work here was of major importance to the Soviets, and they selected their personnel with great care.

The procedure that you are pursuing here, obviously,

is called by “shrinks” and professional investigators “guilt transfer.” It is a tactic used by rascals and criminal types that is as old as crime and the human race itself. Accuse the accuser. Put the finger on the accuser. A classic case of that, of course, came along later: Senator Joe McCarthy was accused of everything in the world, but no weight was given to the fact that he was uncovering major Communist subversion. As I said, this is a very old technique. In the Hebrew history of the beginnings, the first man, Adam, it seems, was caught with his fig leaf down—or was it up—and what did Adam do? He transferred guilt. He looked around and the only person available to blame was Eve, his wife, so he put the finger on her. “Not me, her” is the way it worked, and that has been the tactic of the guilty forever.

I can remember back in my days with the identification bureau in the Spokane Sheriffs Office where it became my necessary task to fingerprint, photograph—or mug—convicted felons, and I would take brief statements to attach to the record. In the hundreds of them that I examined, I can never remember one saying, “Yes, I was guilty. I was caught in the act.” It was always a bum rap, a frame-up. That’s the nature of criminal activity—accuse the accuser and, of course, that is being carried out to an extreme in the Rader charade. It became necessary for the American Civil Liberties Union to counter the very successful hearings and exposure of the Canwell committee and so they jumped on this issue. I want to go into the various phases of this. Now, Mr. Frederick, among other things, you are very critical of Superior Court Judge Aaron Levy in New York, who heard the pertinent facts on the Melvin Rader/George Hewitt case in the attempts to extradite Hewitt, and you are very critical of this judge who heard the evidence and ruled on it.

You never saw him, you didn’t attend his hearing, but he is a responsible Superior Court judge in the New York jurisdiction. He is not one to be flim-flammed by a bunch of phony commies coming to New York to falsely accuse this Negro boy, who was an important witness, incidentally, for the Justice Department. You are very critical of this judge, but have no criticism of the two-bit shyster justice court justice in Seattle, who, catering to the ACLU liberals, obediently signed a complaint against this repentant Communist, this Negro boy. It strikes me as peculiar, Timothy.

If Canwell were to out-of-hand criticize a Jewish Superior Court judge and condemn a black, repentant ex-Communist boy, the liberal establishment would be all over me, accusing me of being anti-Semitic, racially prejudiced, and sympathetic to the Nazis, or the KKK! I don’t know what your hang-up is, but you like one judge but not the other, who you have never met.

I think we need to know, when identifying the players, that the whole team is made up of American Civil Liberties Union characters. In fact, everyone connected with

the case on the Rader side is an ACLUer. They should, if we are playing on this field, be wearing ACLU jerseys, because that’s who the team is composed of: Lloyd Shorett, prosecuting attorney who helped in this whole phony charade, is an important part of it; he is an ACLUer; Melvin Rader, state board of the ACLU of Washington; Ed Henry, his attorney, on the state board of the ACLU; Paul Coughlin likewise.

Everybody connected with this thing is an ACLUer. Even one of the writers who made a career of falsifying this case, Vern Countryman, an ACLUer. Ed Guthman, I don’t know whether he paid any dues in the ACLU or what he did. He is just a very offensive, questionable character, obviously doing the job that these people wanted done and doing it ruthlessly, dishonestly, and with the full support of the man who planted him on the news group to cover the Canwell committee. I notice that one of the people who you praise or mention as supporting the position that you’re touting is Russell McGrath, I believe is his name, the managing editor of the *Seattle Times*. He was responsible for removing that great newsman, the late Ross Cunningham, removing him from covering these hearings and replacing him with this suspect character, Ed Guthman, who went right to work the first day, in every instance attempting to sabotage our hearings. Timothy, you mention the *Times* managing editor as one of the responsible sources who supported Rader and who was therefore opposed to the Canwell committee.

I feel that I should go over these names and properly identify them. If they are going to play on this team, let us see their team colors.

What are the team colors of the ACLU? Let’s get it out in the open and identify the organization, its founders, sponsors, and participants to a degree, so that we know why it is significant that I call attention to the fact that all of these people are functionaries in the ACLU.

The ACLU was successor to three other entities: The American League to Limit Armaments, the Union Against Militarism, and the Civil Liberties Bureau, which had as their aim the obstruction of the US military efforts against Germany during World War I. The National Civil Liberties Bureau, which formed to handle cases of conscientious objectors, was unnecessary in the postwar period, so the CLU changed its name to the American Civil Liberties Union in March 1920. At that time, many of its founders were identifiable Communists who belonged to the international Communist party before the US branch of the party was officially established. The founders were such people as Chairman Harry F. Ward, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, and William Z. Foster, all of whom later came to leading positions in the Communist Party—USA. Other founders were Scott Nearing, indicted under the 1918 espionage act, the Communist Robert W. Dunn; and Max Eastman, translator of Trotsky, who later dropped his party membership. There were

many others of that type: Jane Addams, identified as a Communist by Maurice Malkin. Addams ran Hull House in Chicago, where Communist records were stored, and was a stockholder with New York Congressman Fiorello LaGuardia and Vladimir Ilyich Lenin in the Russian-American Industrial Corporation. Zona Gale, who assisted in financing the education of David Goronefsky, who wrote an obscene poem, "America," for the Communist *Daily Worker*; the Trotskyite A.J. Muste; Crystal Eastman; Scott Nearing, who was "in and out of the party" for many years. It was then and remains a Communist device.

Never in its history was there a criminal so vicious, foul, or treasonous that the ACLU would not volunteer its services to defend them and protect them from prosecution and the fury of the people in the various communities where terrible sex crimes and murders occurred. To understand what the ACLU is all about, you have to know that this was their background. It was the source of their beginning; it has been true through the years, and is true today.

Timothy, I feel that I cannot overemphasize the fact that the sources that you cling to in your line of questioning on the Rader/Hewitt affair are tainted. They are propaganda, not to be relied on by any sincere person. I can see why you might be deceived by them. That is what these people set out to do: to deceive everybody. Your citing of Russell McGrath as being one of the "responsible sources" who took the position that you are touting is an example. It has to be understood, or should be by the student who researches these matters in the future, that these were *not* reliable or impartial sources. The fountainhead from which this misinformation flows is in most cases Ed Guthman, Vern Countryman, and Melvin Rader himself. It is designed to confuse, to maintain a position that is not factual, justified, or worthy.

Taking a fair look at what we did in selecting the professors at the University of Washington, I believe it is probably time to insert in the record here some of my observations in response to these assertions and why these sources are tainted. First, getting around the accusations and implications that somehow we were framing or smearing honest people, it should be understood that, even if we had been that kind of people, we would not have needed to do that. There were so many Communists on the faculty at the University of Washington, it wasn't a matter of making a case against somebody. It was just a matter of sorting them out and selecting the ones on whom we had time to do a case. We simply selected the noisiest, the most obnoxious, the ones featured most often in the press and the Communist news sources. We had to do that; but there were dozens of them that we had neither the time nor the intention of doing a case on. They were there, they were doing their job, but the noisiest who were most effective had to be brought on the stage, front and

center, and that is what we did.

Lloyd Shorett was well-advised, well-informed that the Justice Department and others were conducting electronic surveillance in the community. He knew that, because of his position as prosecuting attorney, recorded meetings would, of course, surface. So he was the most difficult person to plant a microphone on. The agent who was attempting to do this reported that he was frustrated. He knew what was going on, but Shorett and his comrades would row a boat into Elliott Bay, and you couldn't monitor what they were saying. The rest of the time, anything that Shorett had to say was superclean. You couldn't tag him with anything.

The person who was with Lloyd Shorett, the King County prosecuting attorney, was Morris Rappaport, the head of the Northwest District of the Communist Party. That was the sort of thing that was going on.

These people weren't playing house. They were, and are, vicious people, connected with the worst ongoing crimes in history: the crimes of Stalin and a dozen more dictators. And to help in any part of that out here, manning the ramparts here, backing up their agents in doing their work is just as vicious as it could possibly be and every person who was ever killed by Stalin in his murderous rampages is a silent witness against these people who carried out Stalin's endeavors here in this community and this area. I just cannot restrain myself when people try to justify the activities of these creeps. The fact that you mentioned somewhere that Rader just belonged to "popular fronts"—the popular fronts were only as popular as Stalin's agents could make them, and there wasn't anything to justify them. To carry the ball for this murderous cabal is in itself an evil, an ongoing evil, and I cannot hold still for it.

Both the public press and the Communist press indicate that Melvin Rader was involved in these fronts and has continued his activity parallel to the current Communist agendas since.

Further, if Rader were—

[End of Tape 46, Side 2]

Mr. Canwell: What I was saying I think, when the other tape ended, was that if Rader was falsely accused by Hewitt, so was Ralph Gundlach. So why are none of these crocodile tears shed for Gundlach? He must have been "libeled and a victim of perjured testimony," too. But none of these great supporters of the rights of man, the ACLU attorneys, have shed a tear about Gundlach. The facts are that Gundlach had a very extensive history that they knew they couldn't defend. And Gundlach was a different package. They didn't want to open up that can of worms. But it's all part of the same can.

As to the treatment of Rader, Rader at least conducted himself as a professional man before his interview with

Dr. Allen and on the stand in our hearing and in any conversations that we had with him. He was not one of those violent ones.

Mr. Frederick: During the summer of 1949, UW President Raymond Allen was out of state. Upon his return there were further meetings between him and Melvin Rader and a review of evidence. In October, President Allen issued a statement declaring that the charges against Rader were false and that George Hewitt falsely accused Rader. About this time a *Seattle Times* article called for an investigation to see if the Canwell committee suppressed evidence.

Mr. Canwell: I think that in a fair and aboveboard appraisal of what Dr. Allen did in this case, it's very understandable. Dr. Allen was under tremendous criticism by the liberal community and the education field. Here was a chance where he could do something, and did so. He gave Rader all the support that he was entitled to, and I think more, too. But I had no criticism of Allen's tactics there, what he did. But I understood them, too. Here he could toss the liberal community a fish and not lose anything, and that's what he did.

I think that he would have been very impressed had we been able to lay documentary proof before him as to Rader's membership as we did on some of the others who had denied membership. I found Allen to be a very fair man. He's not a court of law or justice. He's making the determinations that he was entitled to make. And his determinations on Rader were different than mine.

But I also submit that I had information that I had not made available to Allen, and that fortified me in my belief that Melvin Rader was a long-time member of the Communist Party. And a stooge of theirs. But at least he was man enough and sensible enough to cooperate, and not create a scene, or have to be thrown out or the sort of thing that some of the ACLU-sponsored witnesses had happen to themselves.

I would have been delighted had somebody, somebody capable of doing it and who could afford to do it, pursued the thing back in the New York area. Had they gone to the Briehl's Farm, talked to people there. The people who conducted the operation. Talked to Pop Mindel, who was available. No part of that was ever done. Any competent or honest reporter would have done that.

I would not make denials and such attacks on constituted, legislative authority without pursuing it thoroughly. As a reporter I would not expect to get away with that sort of thing. And it just wasn't pursued; nobody wanted that information, and of course they knew it was there.

Why didn't the *Seattle Times* take that course instead of supporting and financing Ed Guthman and getting a Pulitzer Prize award directed to him? And in Countryman's case, helping get the Rockefeller Foundation to put

up large grants for him. Why didn't they use some of that energy to pursue this thing at Briehl's Farm? They didn't. They didn't want that information. And it probably was there. I would certainly have done so had I had their resources.

Mr. Frederick: We've got George Hewitt, who, in my opinion, perjured himself, lied through his teeth. We've got Manning Johnson who did likewise, said that he saw Melvin Rader in New York City, lying through his teeth. And we've got George Peters doing the same thing. And you're suggesting that potentially these types of people should be pursued and investigated back there when they focused out here on Melvin Rader's schedule.

Now Melvin Rader moved through this environment within an extraordinary production—

Mr. Canwell: You are in a strange position here of an advocate for this side. Now you disapprove of Hewitt's testimony, you say he's lying. You disapprove of Manning Johnson. You disapprove of Peters. You don't like Judge Levy. No part of that is acceptable to you. You just do not like the legislative process, either. You don't like what I was doing or the way I did it. So you and I are adversaries, we're in confrontation.

I submit that I did the right thing in the Rader case. I did everything that I possibly could. I tried to give him the fairest break that anybody could ask for. And it was rejected. His attorneys rejected it. His attorney, I don't know what Coughlin was doing, I think he was consulted by Ed Henry and probably Paul Coughlin talked to John Caughlan and they determined on a course of action. All after Hewitt was well out of the state. I think their course of action was determined in a little cell meeting where they decided: "We have something here and let's exploit it." So they waited until he was out of the state and then they raised their hue and cry. There isn't an honest man in that group.

I was always open to conviction that Hewitt could either be mistaken or was lying. I never just automatically trust somebody because they happen to be saying what I want to approve of. I don't operate that way and I never have. I'd have been delighted if positive proof that was valid appeared that would have proved that Hewitt was lying. But there wasn't anything whatever there that would justify even the suspicion of it, because of the process of the thing. He picked these people out of the crowd and named them. He couldn't have known them otherwise. He could not have been briefed on it. There was no way.

Mr. Frederick: You're saying he couldn't be briefed. Why not? Why not?

Mr. Canwell: Because he would have had to be briefed

on who these people were and their background and everything else and then—

Mr. Frederick: That's not a potential? That couldn't have happened?

Mr. Canwell: No, not in this case. It was not a potential and would not have been done. There was no reason for doing it. Nobody gave a damn one way or another whether these professors could defend themselves or not. They just wanted the facts laid out. And there was just no possibility that I could fathom where Hewitt could have been briefed on this. There is just no way. It takes certain mechanics to do that. He'd have to know these names. He'd have to know their backgrounds. When he saw them, he'd have to know they were professors at the University of Washington and not some member of our committee or some spectator. That just wasn't in the cards.

Mr. Frederick: Albert! He said he was back there in New York City and the record's replete with regard to Melvin Rader's itinerary. He was all over the map out here. And when Melvin Rader traveled it was something to behold. Because he didn't own his own vehicle, so it was almost a community, an extended family operation to get from point A to point B.

Mr. Canwell: He traveled a whole lot. He spent a term either teaching or as a student at the University of Chicago. He was out of town a great deal. He wasn't just the farm boy who was from Walla Walla; he also was sophisticated. He had been around.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, what I'm saying is, that when he traveled and not owning an automobile, it was almost an extended family, friend operation. He had to be yarded from point A to point B repeatedly. There were a variety of people.

Mr. Canwell: So when he went someplace somebody paid for it. And if he went someplace for the Communist Party they paid for it. That's pretty simple.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, late in April 1950, Washington State Attorney General Smith Troy issued a report with regard to his investigation. The report addresses issues that Aaron R. Coleman signed a receipt for the register. He or his investigators asked all of your staff members, "Do you have any records in your possession?" at the time they were to be turned over to the Legislature. All answered "no" except Ernest Stith, who refused to say yes or no to that question.

He requested that Canwell committee records should be opened with regard to these issues. You came forward

and said that would be a mistake. And that it would be inappropriate to open these records due to the Communist menace and the potential of what they could do with something like that. You said you had an idea, one, that they weren't there and the sequestered records which had maybe an idea where they were. And you would present those to King County Prosecutor Carroll, which you subsequently did. And it was one of those instances where Ernest Stith, as I assume, was to return that material to the Canyon Creek Lodge.

Mr. Canwell: I thought it was Coleman but it could have been Stith. I still think it was Coleman.

Mr. Frederick: Coleman picked up the records.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, and I think that he took the responsibility for returning them. And he had a heck of a lot of such responsibilities and he had a lot of this material in his garage elsewhere. He was in the process of returning to the Department of State for employment and overlooked some of it. When such a furor developed around the thing, then he remembered that they were there. He wasn't a man that would enter into any type of deception. He didn't need to. He was a brilliant investigator, a trained agent. He was a person who just wouldn't do this.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, Albert, I appreciate that. At the same time Washington State Attorney General Smith Troy goes on to state in his report that Melvin Rader was at the Canyon Creek Lodge for one session. That was in 1938. And he further states that there could not be much credence put into the testimony of George Hewitt and Manning Johnson or George Peters. Why would Washington State Attorney General Smith Troy say something like that—

Mr. Canwell: Did you know Smith Troy?

Mr. Frederick: Well, Albert, at the same time he made expressions that he felt that this was unfortunate and it shouldn't defame—

Mr. Canwell: He made the statement I think he probably should have made under the circumstances. I knew Smith Troy well. I kept him pretty well-informed on what we were doing. And there were things that he didn't know.

But Smith Troy could have had a different attitude had I been able to unload certain information into his hands. But I wasn't. I knew Smith Troy, got along well with him. He approved our committee in a very forthright statement to the press. He liked what we did and how we did it. In narrowing it down to the Rader/Hewitt thing, he was into something over his head, so he handled it the way he should, I suppose.

He didn't have complete information. But he responded the best he could. I have no quarrel with it, any statement that he might have made.

[End of Tape 47, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: How did the campaign of 1950 come about?

Mr. Canwell: I determined, and had determined, that if there was to be a solution to the Communist menace as it confronted the world and the United States that the solution or opposition would come about through the legislative potential of the Congress and of the individual states. Therefore, I felt that my future effectiveness could be expanded or best directed in that direction. At that time, Warren Magnuson was very vulnerable, could have been easily beaten.

His partisans built up a big fiction about the great Maggie. But he was less than that. I won't go into an attempt to defame him. He defamed himself. But he was vulnerable. At that time the issue was communism, the penetration of the Department of State, and so on. They were my issues and they were the ones that I talked on and that developed a following.

In that campaign three other people filed for the nomination. They were George Kinnear, a member of the House, and Janet Tourtelott whose brother, George Powell, served in the Legislature with me. But she was very prominent in Republican politics.

Mr. Frederick: Where was she from?

Mr. Canwell: She was from Seattle. George Kinnear was from Seattle and my other opponent, Walter Williams, was from Seattle. They were all Seattle people and that's where the votes were. That's where the battle had to center, on the west side. I felt that I probably would get a fair shake on the east side of the state because of my committee activities. I was very well-known at that time. I suppose nobody in the State of Washington ever had as much favorable publicity as I had. And so I felt reasonably certain that I could beat Magnuson, if I could get the nomination.

There again I entered this fray with very limited funds. Nobody was pushing me to do it. I decided on my own that this was a course of action that I should take and one that I could win.

Mr. Frederick: Did you have an election campaign committee?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I had a committee and a staff. I had headquarters in Seattle, a very prominent headquarters. It seemed to me that the several times that I ran I always had

downtown headquarters and prominent spots, where I got the maximum exposure from both foot and automobile travel. That's one of the ways I felt for very little money I could get reasonable support.

Most of my activity involved replying to invitations to make appearances or speak. In general the procedure of the Republicans around the state was to invite the four candidates to one meeting. Let them each be heard. And that was done pretty well. I was forever on the road. About all I did was to go from meeting to meeting and work through my headquarters and staff.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, could you explain and describe staff. Who they were and your staff operations?

Mr. Canwell: In general I had people who contacted me or responded to me because they liked what I had been doing. They were people who were active in the Republican Party and interested in my activities. So from those people I had a great many volunteers. People who would do stenographic work, man the office, attend little meetings for me and things like that. I always had somebody to keep my books and try to keep track of my limited finances. So that's about what it amounted to. We'd man an office, tried to equip it with attractive furniture and lots of signs. They were more or less inexpensive. Anyway, we had attractive headquarters and centrally located in each one of these campaigns.

Mr. Frederick: Where were they located?

Mr. Canwell: One was on 5th and Union. At that time it was right across from I Magnin. A block up the street was the Olympic Hotel, it was the heart of the city. 5th and Union, 4th and Union, 3rd and Union were the very centers of Seattle.

Mr. Frederick: Who stood out in your mind with regard to staff during that campaign? Did you have a fundraiser?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I had some fund raising. I had one Seattle industrialist, I think it was in the Senate campaign that he sort of joined my support. He was one of the heavyweights in Seattle, Jim Clise. He and his family owned about half of downtown Seattle. At one time they developed the Denny Regrade and all of that area. A very substantial person financially, and a good guy. He liked me, he liked what I was doing and he was one of those who put his money where his conversation was. He didn't hesitate to spend a thousand dollars now and then. But he was one who stands out in my mind as a strong supporter in that campaign and through the years, through the congressman at large campaigns. He was always in my corner and usually providing office help and rental

space if I needed it.

Mr. Frederick: Did you have in essence a kitchen cabinet or a set of senior advisers? People you respected and admired who advised you?

Mr. Canwell: I had some. One of the principal people whom I worked with, who was a close adviser and confident, was the chief of corporate security for the Boeing Company, Stan Leith. He was one of those very close to me.

Then it seems at that time I also had people in the Immigration Department and other agencies who I knew who were helpful to me. I don't remember who all I had in my strategy board. I had Ted Crosby, he's Bing Crosby's brother, he was my campaign manager as I recall. He stayed more or less to the east side of the state. I had a pressman and photographer who was constantly attached to my campaign.

So there were so many of these it's kind of hard to separate them now. I ran for the Senate nomination once. I ran for congressman at large and got the nomination and then ran in the general and lost. Then the next two years I ran for congress at large again, got the nomination and again lost. So there were five statewide campaigns there, and that involved an enormous amount of political activity and traveling and a bit of doing with very limited funds.

Mr. Frederick: In the 1950 campaign did you resort to campaign funds solicitation outside of the state?

Mr. Canwell: No, in fact I never solicited funds outside of the state. The only incident of that I think I told you the other day. Senator Joe McCarthy asked me how I came out in the campaign and I told him I ended up with a deficit. And he sent a letter out to followers of his. I did get some funds in that way. But otherwise, there was never any solicitation of funds by me or for me outside of the State of Washington. And I could have. During these periods of time I was invited to national conventions, the DAR or another one of the women's political groups. I spoke in places like Texas and Oklahoma City and Detroit and other places; Minneapolis, as a national speaker. But I never did then take advantage of that to get funding from that source. Probably a weakness in my program, but I just didn't do it.

Mr. Frederick: Could you get funding, let's say from Mr. Henry Day?

Mr. Canwell: I don't recall that I obtained any funding in the Senate race from Mr. Day. And I don't recall that I ever did in political campaigns. My association with him was strictly on a business basis. I delivered what I was

capable of delivering, and I never solicited any funds from Day or others up there for political campaigns.

Mr. Frederick: Again, what was your campaign based on? What was the platform that you ran on?

Mr. Canwell: Before I answer that question I should put an addendum on this fund-raising thing.

I think I did one time attend a meeting at Kellogg, Idaho, where one of the key people in the Hecla Mine invited me up to a dinner to talk and tell what my problems were, with the offer that they would try to solicit some money for me.

Now what was the question?

Mr. Frederick: Albert, what was your platform? What did you run on?

Mr. Canwell: In general, I ran regarding the Communist menace; the failures and betrayals within the Department of State and within the government to meet and solve the problem, and largely it had to do with that. I talked about things like the Alger Hiss case and penetration of the government on that level. I was very well-informed on it and I found excellent response. People were fascinated. They were hearing things that they've never heard before. From that standpoint I would have picked up all the marbles. But I was limited in my appearances and traveling. I didn't have funds to advertise statewide on TV and newspapers, and so I had to depend on my personal appearances. And I talked in general about those subjects.

I think there were talks and discussions about this situation at the University of Washington. Always when I talked it was opened to a question and answer period. I would probably talk for about twenty minutes and then open it up to questions. Usually the questions would get around, among others, to the University of Washington.

I remember in the Senate race, I think in one of the congressional races where Janet Tourtelott was trying to make quite a thing of the fact that she was the only woman in the race. She had a basket loaded with groceries. And she would indicate that she was a housewife who did the shopping and she knew the problems. We'd make light of her traipsing around with this basket of groceries, sometimes using a plant that I had in the audience. I don't know if she'd ever made a cup of coffee in her life. She'd been coddled and spoiled.

But that's the sort of thing we did. Usually I saw to it that I wasn't outflanked in the audience. I'd have some of my people there, too. Bill Spiedel was handling Janet Tourtelott's campaign and he was a tricky, dishonest character so I always had to be on the alert to what he was up to.

We'd be appearing someplace, we'll say Bellingham or Everett or wherever it might be. He would run over to

the newspaper and give them a long statement about Janet Tourtelott's appearance. You'd think that the only person at the meeting was Janet Tourtelott. Unfortunately for Spiedel, I knew most of these newspeople and they'd let me come in and sit down and write my own story in most cases. So I caught Spiedel in that a time or two and dumped the load on him. That didn't add to the friendly feeling between Spiedel and myself and his patron.

But they were rough-and-tumble campaigns. We were out to win. We knew what the odds were and how limited the funds were. If I was going to win it was strictly on my own personality and presentation. And you know, of course, that I was very limited there. I was up against pretty glamorous guys such as George Kinnear. Do you know him?

Mr. Frederick: Was there any consideration given to expanding issues? That is to mount a campaign to move you off of a single-issue candidate?

Mr. Canwell: It wasn't a single-issue thing but these were for national offices so the problems were national and international that we were discussing. Of course, I discussed Magnuson's Communist front record, his aid to Yugoslavia that he lied about and many things like that. There was plenty to talk about. And there were always questions in these areas asked by informed people who wanted answers. And I was pretty well-prepared to give them. So that was the play.

Kinnear was not qualified to talk in those areas. He didn't attempt to. He maybe talked about taxes and local legislation and things like that. But I don't recall that he attacked the senator or made any rough and tumble motions. Janet didn't either. She didn't know what she was talking about, and wasn't very persuasive. Walter Williams was considerable of an orator but he, too, did not get the audiences. But he and his pressman sat there and listened. Finally toward the end of the campaign he spent a fortune putting an ad in every paper in the state saying exactly what I had been saying that got the audience response. He was a pretty smart guy. I always wondered who financed him, he wouldn't spend his own money. He and his wife went to California on a vacation during the general campaign. So he never really put up a campaign against Magnuson. And I was out of the picture.

I toured the state incidentally. I had a Jeep I used out on my farm. We put a sign on the front of that: "Canwell for the United States Senate." Went quite a number of places. I drove around in this Jeep. Then over on this side of the state Crosby would use it, or Marsinah once in awhile would take a trip somewhere with the kids. She got so that—timid as she was—she got to giving talks for me.

One time I was delayed in a flight from Coeur d'Alene to Wenatchee and it got dark. This was the flight where

my plane got in and they had turned the floodlights off, so the pilot was circling around and around trying to figure out how to land. I was due to appear at this meeting with the other candidates. So Marsinah was called upon. It was the first time she had ever done anything like that. She was wearing, as she often did, a tremendous attractive hat and she took that and threw it down in a seat and went up and gave one hell of a talk. Everybody connected with it told me to let her do all of my talking after that. And I should have.

But these were things that happened in the campaign. You try to make do without funds and it isn't easy. I see people running for the United States Senate nomination now, we're talking in terms of hundreds of thousands of dollars and millions, not for peanuts. For \$25,000 I could have won that race. But I didn't have it.

Mr. Frederick: How did you place in the primary?

Mr. Canwell: I was just barely aced out by Walter Williams, I was second.

There was deep suspicion that there was a theft of votes over in Pierce County, Tacoma. Not by Williams but by people who didn't want me to win.

Mr. Frederick: You lost by something like 2,500 votes?

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember, something like that. It wasn't very many. But enough votes that they could have been stolen in Pierce County and probably were. The same thing happened a time or two after that.

Mr. Frederick: What kind of a reputation does Pierce County have with regard to electoral politics?

Mr. Canwell: It was pretty sleazy. Now it appears quite respectable. The only one I remember from there is Rasmussen. He was there the time that I served. We didn't rate him very high. I don't know how they rate him now but he may have learned a little. But at that time he knew nothing. He had a big mouth and that was all. But he did have labor support and liberal support. They had some pretty sleazy campaign politics going on over there.

One of the ex-Communists who worked on one of my campaigns told how they went down there and helped preset the voting machines. Sometimes there were more votes from a precinct than there were citizens in the thing. They'd all be for a candidate they wished to support, of course.

Mr. Frederick: From that campaign in your travels could you give an overview with regard to what you saw geographically?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I became acquainted with a great

many people in every area of the state and in general they're darn good people. I don't care which party they're in. Many of them are farmers, some of them are small-business people. But in general they are just darn good people. I made pretty good hay with that type of people. They liked what I was doing, they liked me. I met and became acquainted with a great many people throughout the state who remained friends and supporters of mine in subsequent campaigns.

Mr. Frederick: Could you detect philosophy associated with various regions within the state? Is someone from the Palouse in any manner in terms of philosophy different than someone from, say, Pacific County or Wahkiakum County?

Mr. Canwell: Not particularly. I think people are very much alike—that is, responsible family people are very much alike. Their political persuasions may differ but they're moral, good people and they do not engage in the dirty tricks and skullduggery that you will find in the urban centers, particularly where there's a strong union and Communist growth or infestation. And I say union advisedly. I'm not anti-union, I believe in unionization of workers. But the unions themselves have acknowledged that radicals do work through those vehicles.

The place I think I've found the most firm opposition, left-wing opposition, was down in Vancouver and on up the coast to the lumber, fishing villages. There was a lot of left-wing strength there. Therefore, a lot of antipathy to Canwell.

Mr. Frederick: Regarding your occupational interest and your investigative consultative work, et cetera, et cetera, legislative career, et cetera, was that area with regard to Communist activity, did that stand out? Was that identified?

Mr. Canwell: I would say yes. Down in the Hoquiam and some of those areas I think there was greater Communist strength. It centered in union activity. Some unions were pretty clean. But other places, the radicals would gain a foothold or control and it was pretty much felt on the union level that you should oppose a Republican per se, and Canwell doubly so. The Communists had circulated the falsehood very widely that I was anti-union. I never was. It wasn't native to my thinking. But that permeated such union groups. They would have resolutions at union meetings condemning Canwell and supporting "Joe Doaks."

[End of Tape 47, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Albert, by about 1950 and concerning again your experience and your field experience. Where,

in your opinion, were the centers of power within Washington State?

Mr. Canwell: Are you talking about political power? I would say the centers of power centered pretty much in Seattle and western Washington. Eastern Washington was always able to send some very competent legislators to Olympia. They also sent some stinkers. But the power was on the West Coast.

I remember in the session that I served we were able to form a coalition. We controlled the House and we were able to form a coalition in the Senate but largely I'd say it was over this radical issue. And that was why the upturn at the time I was elected when there was a general house-cleaning there across-the-board, eastern and western Washington, particularly in the House. Threw out quite a number of the known Communists and some of the lesser Communists, but radicals. The Republicans took over. Some of them were good, some of them were a little weak. But that's the nature of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Mr. Frederick: Dating from that period of time, 1950, where was the economic power located within the state?

Mr. Canwell: It was mostly in the Seattle area. Along about that time the Columbia River had been harnessed and industries employing power began to develop in central and eastern Washington. But the power still remained, economic power, on the West Coast. The lumbering center was there and the aerospace industry was there, the largest employer, I think in the state.

Washington State was dependent upon agriculture. It was very strong because it produces some strong people. So the strength in eastern Washington was greater than a casual observer might think, because of the type of people that we sent to the Legislature; but there were some clinkers, too.

It is significant that the thing began to shift a little with the harnessing of the Columbia River. It increased the agricultural strength, but also increased the amount of industry in central Washington and eastern Washington. Suddenly we had an abundance of cheap power. That was an important factor. So we began to benefit somewhat in that regard.

We developed a rather large facet of the aluminum industry in Spokane. Henry Kaiser and others moved into aluminum and got extensive government support. They spent some of it over here. But agricultural, aluminum, mining and lumbering industries were always strong in this area, in Spokane and even in some of northern Washington. The Okanogan area had quite a bit of lumbering. And we had probably all we were entitled to but we didn't have that many people.

Mr. Frederick: Can you speculate why Walter Williams apparently didn't actively run the campaign after the primary?

Mr. Canwell: My suspicion, and it's merely suspicion based on what happened, was that there were people and forces that wanted to retain Magnuson in office and they were willing to put up big enough money to get Walter Williams to do what he did. Because he obviously wasn't intending to become a senator, he was intending to get the nomination away from me. And that's what happened.

Who provided those funds I wouldn't know. Could be some west coast industrialists. Magnuson had some support over there. And he had a lot of enemies, too. So I don't know.

The Williams thing has always been an enigma to me. I never cared for the individual. I knew him before this time but I'm not enamored by chamber of commerce types.

Mr. Frederick: What did you do that fall of 1950?

Mr. Canwell: 1950.

Mr. Frederick: What did you do then? You obviously came back to Spokane.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I came to Spokane. I was back and forth to Washington D.C. and New York quite a lot.

Mr. Frederick: Now this is consulting?

Mr. Canwell: Consulting, seeking, researching. I always zeroed in on the New York Public Library, as I still do, in their archives. But I expanded my acquaintance in Washington D.C. And as I think I mentioned before, the fact that I dumped a load on Alger Hiss opened a tremendous number of doors for me. So I found it convenient and advisable to get back there as often as I could.

Mr. Frederick: Did you acquire any work back there? Any clients?

Mr. Canwell: I did not become employed back there.

One thing, I developed a quite effective organization made up in many cases of ex-intelligence agents from the military or government service, and if one of those persons was spotted in a city or area where I needed a job done I was always able to put someone dependable on it.

Quite often I was able to transfer the support of that endeavor to the industry that I might be doing the work for. They then took over the putting of "John Doe" on a payroll for a certain amount of time or paying some of the expenses. So it wasn't something that I had to account for as income.

Mr. Frederick: You would get a retainer for that, wouldn't you?

Mr. Canwell: It was more of a reciprocal thing. There's a reciprocal arrangement in much of this work like for Boeing and others. I obtained knowledge and help and information. That in effect was power as far as I was concerned. It enabled me to be on top of the security situation in almost every area.

Mr. Frederick: Did you receive—let's say, stocks or bonds?

Mr. Canwell: No, I never did. There was no concealment of resources or anything. I needed a lot more than I got, a very frugal person in my travels and endeavors. And I did not receive that type of remuneration. Didn't seek it and would not have accepted it.

Mr. Frederick: But you did state that you were getting some monies.

Mr. Canwell: One way or another I came up with some funds, and it's all accounted for in my income tax. It's evident that there was very little. But any information that I have there I will not disclose because it could only be used negatively.

It's like the time that, at the Goldmark trial, they subpoenaed a whole lot of our financial records. Then the radicals went to work on the contributors and people whose names they uncovered and tried to undermine and destroy the sources of support that we had. So that would be true in this case. I have no intention of disclosing all of the details of how I operated at that time. I should have had more.

Mr. Frederick: Did you have a letterhead at that point?

Mr. Canwell: Two or three times I did. I also conducted a couple of businesses here. I had a small printing facility, a photographic facility at one time.

Mr. Frederick: That would be the early fifties.

Mr. Canwell: That would have been along through that period of time.

In the '60s, I had some benefits that worked two or three ways. For instance, my daughter was employed by the security department of the Boeing Company for eight or ten years. And that was not insignificant to me because she was working for the chief of security and he wanted her and was very helpful to her. But there were benefits in a way like that you couldn't take to the bank.

Mr. Frederick: Where was your print shop located?

Mr. Canwell: At one time it was in the Fox Theater Building. Later, it was here in this building.

Mr. Frederick: What was your shop called?

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember if we gave it a name. We didn't solicit a general printing business. We just took what came to us naturally. Mostly I was developing a printing potential to handle my own publications, pamphlets, and things that I printed and utilized.

I obtained some commercial printing from one of my brothers in the laboratory business. They were one of the larger laboratories. And we probably got almost all of their printing. So we had things like that. But we weren't entering the field as a printing enterprise actually. I obtained it to have a voice if I needed it.

You asked if I had a copy of *The Vigilante*, which we printed. Somewhere along the line I'll see if I can find a copy of it. At least I have some that can be photographed.

Mr. Frederick: Did you have a photography shop?

Mr. Canwell: I did at one time. That was shortly after I left the sheriff's office. I talked the manager of the Davenport Hotel into remodeling a section where I could open a shop there. I had somebody working there part time. We did have a photographic shop. Then I always did a certain amount of commercial photography. During some of these periods of time I got rather extensive jobs that were profitable. I was a pretty skilled photographer, too, and it was useful in my other work. It gave me a very valid cover plus some income.

Mr. Frederick: When was your next campaign?

Mr. Canwell: It was in—let's see, the Congressman at large race. I ran for two of them, two years apart, and the last one must have been 1952, so I suppose it was—

Mr. Frederick: 1952 and 1954?

Mr. Canwell: I was trying to think when the Congressman at large seat came on; after the revision of the census and we gained a new seat in the state. Therefore, it became a statewide Congressman at large race. I believe that was, must have been 1952 because I did run for Congress that time and that was, I think—there were pictures there of Eisenhower and other things. That was 1952 and then 1954 was the final one.

Mr. Frederick: And when you ran in the primary whom did you run against in 1952?

Mr. Canwell: I think it was the same threesome. I think Janet Tourtelott and Kinnear anyway, and not Williams, I

just don't remember right off who the opponents were. Except I know that Janet Tourtelott was one of them and I believe Kinnear was. In 1954 I don't know whether Tourtelott was still in that one or not. I still had opposition over on the Coast but was able to win the nomination.

Mr. Frederick: You won that nomination twice?

Mr. Canwell: Twice, yes.

Mr. Frederick: And in 1952 whom did you run against?

Mr. Canwell: You mean in the general? I believe Don Magnuson. He was an ex-newspaperman who was blessed with the same name as Maggie, and that's all anybody knew about him—that his name was Magnuson and I think that was his strength. In the general it was Magnuson and then I think he won again in 1954.

Mr. Frederick: You ran against him twice then?

Mr. Canwell: Yes.

Mr. Frederick: What was your campaign platform?

Mr. Canwell: In general it was about the same as what I ran for in the Senate. It was on my record and my determination that things should be done on the congressional level or continue to be done.

And I utilized my knowledge and information on the monkeyshines that were occurring in the Department of State in the Far East and other places. I had no trouble developing a following and much the same following as I'd had all along.

My problem was, in general, I just did not have the wholehearted support of the Republican machine and to do so I needed that support to raise funds and develop any enthusiasm for my election.

Mr. Frederick: How did you place in those two campaigns?

Mr. Canwell: In the 1952 one, I think I lost by about half of one percent. It was very narrow. And in 1954 it was wider. I don't remember what it was.

Mr. Frederick: Did you choose to run again after 1954?

Mr. Canwell: Sometime along the line some friends of mine in Seattle wanted Governor Dan Evans to get some opposition and induced me to file and run, and assured me of the funds to do so properly.

I don't think that there was any strong thought that we might beat Evans, but more that we could force him to a more conservative position. Evans was actually a social-

ist and had so identified himself and was not very palatable to the business community.

There were some people who got together and wanted a candidate and they induced me to run on the promise that they could come up with the necessary funds. The major supporter in that had a change of heart at critical moments and it was too late for me to withdraw. So my name went on the ballot in the gubernatorial campaign. But I had no great heart for it. I was willing to give it my best shot and that was about it.

Mr. Frederick: And what year was that?

Mr. Canwell: I'd have to go back and pin that down. It was one of the last years that Evans served as governor, whenever that was.

Mr. Frederick: You're talking about running against him in 1972?

Mr. Canwell: It must have been along about that time. I'd have to go back and see what we did. I still use index cards and here on the back of them it says "Canwell for Governor." What year I've forgotten.

Mr. Frederick: Who backed out on you?

Mr. Canwell: I don't know whether it's wise to name him. It won't hurt one way or another. The big money, the big wheel there was Bill Boeing, and there were other substantial people who were in that thing, one of them being Wells McCurdy and a man over in Bellevue who established Bellevue Square, not his son who served in the Legislature. They were among the three or four, plus the Republican state chairman and he was willing and eager to go along because Bill Boeing was in it. He was catering to Boeing in every way he could.

Mr. Frederick: What were your feelings about that?

Mr. Canwell: I didn't care. I wasn't too anxious in the first place. As I said before, the governorship never appealed to me. It doesn't now.

And so in running then it was more my willingness to force Evans into a more decent position than he occupied. And, of course, knowing that a miracle could happen and I could be elected.

Mr. Frederick: Now if that did take place in 1972, isn't that a bit late within that—

Mr. Canwell: It's pretty late. These men were people that knew me. Knew me well and my activities and my continuing activities over there on the Coast. They thought of me as probably the only name that they could

come up with who might possibly do the job. I wasn't terribly flattered one way or another.

But I didn't like Dan Evans, period. I didn't care for him. I didn't like his way of operation. I never thought he was a Republican. He was one of the people who moved into a vacuum and lucked out and became governor pretty much by accident at a time when people like Rosellini were waning.

But he could carry the liberal support that might normally have gone to a Rosellini or someone like that because he was known in the liberal community as such. He and Joel Pritchard and Slade Gorton were all bed-mates, and they never were Republicans really.

[End of Tape 48, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: Albert, what I meant with regard to "wasn't it a bit late in the day if your name did appear in the primary of 1972," late in the day with regard to the Evans administration. He had already served eight years and what could one expect?

Mr. Canwell: There was an enormous dissatisfaction with Evans but they had no alternative. There were people who went to the polls and voted for him and they wrote off checks. They didn't like him. They didn't like what he represented and stood for. And so knowing that, I knew it could be capitalized on and would have been. There would have been a strong campaign put on had Bill Boeing stayed in the campaign.

An unfortunate thing happened. Bill Boeing got religion, and he suddenly became a recruit to the Catholic Church, and there's nothing as holy as a new recruit, no matter what the persuasion. In this case this happened right about this time and he asked his priest if he should continue in it. Now this is what McCurdy told me. I think he had the inside track. He asked his priest if he should do this, and he said, "No." So Bill backed out.

I never knew Bill Boeing very well. I met him a time or two. I knew his father better. I knew executive people who ran the Boeing Company. But I didn't know the boy. He, like me, served as a deputy sheriff for awhile. He was just a good, decent guy with a billion dollars. Anyway that's part of the reason that the Vatican now controls the Boeing Company, if anybody's interested.

Mrs. Boeing, Bill Boeing's mother, inherited a tremendous block of Boeing stock when Boeing died. And then Bill had some of it willed to him, I believe, so there was control of the Boeing Company within the Boeing family. They were inactive in the company. So I don't know too much about this thing, and never concerned myself with it. It wasn't my business. My concern was in their security department and I had good relations there. That's the way it was.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, share some insight with regard to the House Un-American Activities Committee's work in the state of Washington. I believe that was 1953, 1954.

Mr. Canwell: They held hearings in Seattle I think in 1953 or 1954, it was in that period of time.

Mr. Frederick: Didn't they hold two?

Mr. Canwell: They may have. I believe they did. That's quite a ways back. But I was active in whatever hearings they held. I thought I had a letter, I may have shown you. I'll produce it along the line. A letter from Harold Velde, who was chairman of the committee at that time, thanking me for my aid and assistance.

Mr. Frederick: What did you do? Who did you see?

Mr. Canwell: Principally, I was in charge of security for them. To keep people like Ed Guthman from harassing Barbara Hartle. That's part of it. And to determine how many of the comrades would be seated in their hearing room. They were well aware that I knew how to run a committee hearing without letting the comrades make a show of it.

Mr. Frederick: And who was the chairman now?

Mr. Canwell: The chairman then was Velde.

Mr. Frederick: And where were the hearings held?

Mr. Canwell: They were held in Seattle. It seemed to me that it was in the Federal Building or one of the civic buildings.

Mr. Frederick: Were you would serve as consultant? Or were you under contract to the Congress and the House?

Mr. Canwell: I was under no contract. I always had a very friendly relationship with the House Un-American Activities Committee that dated way back. My earliest contacts were Stripling and others in the committee. I maintained that association over the years. They leaned on me for information when it might be available and I got considerable help from them.

Mr. Frederick: Why were they here at that point in time?

Mr. Canwell: I think I had something to do with suggesting that they hold the hearing here. But I had a very strong friend on the House Committee, Donald Jackson of California. A good guy who's pretty intelligent, pretty

informed, and was concerned on this subject. I believe that he came up and made a speech or two for me in one of my campaigns.

I had not only congressional members on the committee who were friends, I was always well-acquainted with staff. When they would hold a hearing in a district they reach out for all the help and support they can get. I looked like the best support out here. And I volunteered to do anything that I could. They asked me if I'd, among other things, handle security for the hearings, determine that there were no riots or things like had happened in California and other places. So I manned the door. When the doors were opened and the rabble-rousers wanted in I sent them to the end of the line. I'm not a nice guy; I'll play it the way they do when I'm in a position to do it. And they were pretty mad.

Mr. Frederick: And who were the subjects or the targets or the personalities of interest?

Mr. Canwell: At that time they quite largely depended upon my hearing records to select candidates plus ones that I might suggest, or Stan Leith at Boeing might suggest; he had very good connections with them, too.

At that time I was very interested in having Sally Goldmark subpoenaed and testimony taken from her. I had, at the behest of the committee, observed her activities, her goings and comings for eight or nine years and I felt that it was time that she be called to testify and so I suggested it.

They set up an executive hearing in the Olympic Hotel and unfortunately they drew the wrong guy as chairman of that. Jackson had to go back to California on some emergency things and the old guy who chaired it was a little soft in the head really. He shouldn't have been doing it. And he was not a person that we could confide in and pursue what we wanted to delve into with Sally. There was information available there on the highest level. And they had to know it was there and they had to know how to go at it. But, incredibly, the chairman was not familiar with the Perlo-Kramer group! So Sally gave her same old soft line that she had told the House committee or the FBI before, telling them only what they already knew. She was a very skilled operator.

Mr. Frederick: Did you chew several pencils that day?

Mr. Canwell: Did I do what?

Mr. Frederick: Chew several pencils that day?

Mr. Canwell: I was annoyed as hell because we had been frustrated in getting the right chairman for this hearing. And there was nothing I could do about it. I didn't attend the session but I did have a transcript of the

hearing.

Mr. Frederick: Who else was a subject of those inquiries?

Mr. Canwell: There was a loudmouth Spokane Communist, I at the moment have forgotten his name. There were several along that line. Barbara Hartle was an extended witness, a very valuable witness. The principal reason for them coming out here and taking testimony was to take testimony from Hartle on the Communists in the Northwest.

Mr. Frederick: And can you remember anyone else?

Mr. Canwell: I don't. I'd have to go back to the press releases or something. I don't think there was anyone significant, any real significant witness other than Barbara Hartle. And the executive hearing on Sally Goldmark. The Barbara Hartle testimony was very extensive and as I recall it took several days. As to other witnesses, they were just random witnesses. They might have been annoyances like this one person I mentioned and I can't at the moment name.

Mr. Frederick: And what insight was gained through Barbara Hartle?

Mr. Canwell: The almost total identity of membership in the district Communist Party. Even some in the underground and all in the aboveground. And she had a remarkable memory. She had a memory like a fax machine or something. But she testified extensively, naming everybody that she knew in the Communist Party in Spokane, Coeur d'Alene, and then she also testified in their hearings down in Portland and other places, naming the people that she knew in the party. She had been in a key position in the party and then transferred to the underground. A very well-informed person, and one who had been in their complete confidence. A brilliant person, she's one of the Communists who wore a Phi Beta Kappa key. She's no dummy and she was a very valuable witness and never to my knowledge was any of her testimony ever impeached by anybody.

Mr. Frederick: What was the state of the apparatus at that point in time? Who were the key players?

Mr. Canwell: Six of the chief players then or shortly after were named as the six top Communists in the state and were tried in federal court under the Smith Act. She was one of those defendants. She had been convicted. I don't think she appealed; she was held here, probably at the request of the committee, in custody of the United States marshal, and held in that position and then brought

into the hearing room daily by a deputy of the United States marshal.

This deputy who accompanied Hartle was a woman by the name of Dorothy Keil-Hall. The deputy was a person who was well-informed and well-advised as to the dangers to Barbara Hartle; she knew that the party might attempt to kill Hartle.

It was also part of my security assignment to see that she had security. Somewhere along the line Bill Pennock had been taken out of the picture. And there was a chance that she would be, if the opportunity presented itself.

Mr. Frederick: Was the pension union still in operation in 1954?

Mr. Canwell: I think a ragtag end of it; I think Pennock and the party tried to maintain organization there but I think it had pretty well disintegrated and I think that their funds had become almost nil.

Mr. Frederick: What do you attribute that to?

Mr. Canwell: The exposure of what Pennock and the Communists were doing with these old people.

Mr. Frederick: Would it have anything to do with increased Social Security benefits?

Mr. Canwell: With Social Security benefits? Not particularly. Pennock did what such people did. He appealed to needs of these people. Many, many of those people had become disillusioned because they had been mistreated by the party and unmercifully bled for finances. Pennock had no conscience whatever. He would come over to a meeting and tearfully say that he had to beg a ride to get over here and he was so concerned about the old people and their needs that he just felt that he couldn't not come. He probably had come over in a plane. And he would do this and then he'd take up a collection and then he'd talk some more and he'd take up another collection. Then he'd have them all march around the room dropping their pennies and coins in a box or hat. He just bled these people so they had nothing left. And that was a constant operation.

Mr. Frederick: What was John Daschbach's background?

Mr. Canwell: John Daschbach. He came from Spokane. I told you yesterday I remembered him chiefly as playing tennis. A thoroughgoing "nogoodnik," but active and useful to the party. I've forgotten what he worked at, if he ever worked. He didn't work very hard if he did. I have always regarded him as a thoroughly no-good character, and I am always surprised when the party depends

on somebody like that. I think they are getting awfully short-handed when they do.

He was one who collaborated with Vern Countryman in writing his book on the Un-American Activities Committee and the story of the Canwell committee. So I could have written a book on him, too, but he wasn't that important. How they selected him as one of the top six indicated the poverty in the party at that time.

They had two or three quite able people over on the Coast who were drawn into this, subpoenaed. Again I'm getting a little fuzzy, I have to review their names to remember them. This time a significant change had come about in the *Seattle P-I*. Fred Neindorff had been retired and Ed Stone, the city editor, maybe he was managing editor by that time, signed Lucille Cohen to cover the trial of the six top Communists. It was really funny, nothing could happen there on our side that deserved coverage, but she could just bleed all over the place for the comics. One day I walked into the hearing room and Burt Nelson was on the stand. The judge was letting him have his say before sentencing. Nelson turned around and saw me come in the door. He yelled and jumped and said, "I wouldn't be here if it wasn't for Canwell and Joe McCarthy!" Cohen was sitting there in the meeting and covering it and released not a word on this disturbance and display. But that's part of what was happening at that time.

Tracey Griffin was selected to work at that hearing, I think as much by my recommendation as that of anybody else. He was a good man.

Mr. Frederick: Who was Tracey Griffin?

Mr. Canwell: He was a Seattle attorney of considerable stature. One who I had known slightly over the years and have respected as an attorney. I believe that I had suggested that he would be a good man to be special United States attorney there and I probably communicated that thinking to Frank Holman, a former president of the American Bar, and one or two others. I was pretty close to them. And I was close enough to the Justice Department to want to see a fair job done. So I was very pleased to see that Tracey Griffin was selected.

Mr. Frederick: This would be about the time that you secured a contract with a portion of the bureaucracy of the State Department?

Mr. Canwell: I had quite a long association with Senator Styles Bridges, who was a very powerful influence in the United State Senate and an influence in the Department of State. Along about that time, Scott McLeod, who was chief of Security and Consular Affairs and also an acquaintance of mine and of Styles Bridges, was developing a somewhat secret project to take place largely in Europe

and the foreign service area. I think I was asked if I would like to participate in that. And who suggested it first, I don't know whether Scott McLeod did or whether Styles Bridges did, but it was decided that I could be sent over on a committee assignment for the Committee on European Migration.

I went there under that cover but with an understanding in the security department, the State Department, that we would be doing other things. So that was in essence what took place there.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, what did you do?

Mr. Canwell: To start out, I went to Geneva and attended the conferences of this committee. While I was there I was one of a group that went out to the airport and met Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and escorted his party to the embassy and to a meeting. That's one of the things that I did.

For some reason or another he was very interested in what I was doing. I suppose he heard some speculation, but had not been briefed as he felt he should be probably, and at this party at the embassy I spent two hours talking to Dulles. Very unusual, but things like that created an atmosphere around me that I probably didn't justify.

The Swiss have one of the best intelligence systems in the world, and nobody like Canwell would be meeting the secretary of state and having a two-hour discussion with him without their awareness of it. So things like that happened.

At my room, I got there first, so I got the best room. The chief of security came in several days later and had to settle for a much smaller room. So we had our meetings in my room, and, of course, again I'm sure Swiss intelligence had the phones and everything else covered. Here from Canwell's bedroom we were making calls all over the world, and so what would their conclusion be? That I must be important. And I wasn't. But anyway it was an interesting thing.

Then assigned to me as a secretary out of the United Nations meetings was a girl, again that I was sure was acting for Swiss intelligence. Very fine, attractive, interesting person but I'm sure this was what was being done. And it didn't make any difference. I wasn't doing anything at that point that was of any interest or concern to Swiss intelligence or anybody else.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, was your role one of just observing and monitoring, and then report-writing within the bureaucracy?

Mr. Canwell: In the State Department before foreign service, I was given a very extensive list of personnel in the foreign service that I was advised to memorize and destroy. Some of them were underlined or marked so that

they had special emphasis. So I did memorize those names; my memory was better then than it is now, obviously. But then we proceeded there. I had an assignment to go to Rome. An assignment at the Vatican, which I kept. I think that was one of the things that Dulles was very interested in because his brother either was a chief of the CIA then, or was later.

Anyway, his brother, Allen, was very involved in all of this, and so they were interested in anything that was going on at the Vatican and exhibited a great curiosity about why I wanted to go there.

So I told Dulles I just was curious. I said there was information I wanted and one of my earliest ancestors had been a priest in the Catholic Church and had a church in Rome and I wanted to dig out the facts on it.

[End of Tape 48, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Albert, we left off last session, if I remember correctly, with you in Geneva, I believe. Geneva, Switzerland. You were talking about the Swiss Intelligence Service. And you were talking about—potentially a Swiss female agent. Let's pick up there.

Mr. Canwell: There is very little that I could say or add to what I said yesterday. I think I made a brief comment about the efficiency of Swiss intelligence. It is very efficient and very effective. Other than observing them in action in certain cases, I had very little to do with them.

In getting to what I was doing there I think I mentioned that I was a delegate to the International Conference on European Migration. That was my excuse for being in Geneva and Europe. So I did that. I attended the conventions at the United Nations, listened to the delegates. That's about all that amounted to.

Then anything that I was supposed to do, or probably would do, are not matters that I could talk about. First place, it was very limited but what there was I'm prohibited among other things by law from discussing. Maybe I don't know much about it to begin with. But it is not something I'm going to go into.

I could mention that I had interesting travels over there. They were very fast. My appointments were on a tight schedule.

I did get to the Vatican. A very interesting experience and would have liked to have spent more time there, but I did have a conducted tour through the place and an offer to have an interview with the pope, which I rejected because I knew he was ill. I could have, had I wished to. My wife told me I was a fine politician. Any other politician in the world would have kept the appointment with the pope and brought back a lot of mementos that he had blessed. But I didn't operate that way anyway. Never was a very good politician and I wasn't playing politics on this trip.

I might mention that in my travel orders I could have gone anywhere I wished. In Europe all I had to do was to go to a consulate or an embassy and get them amended or issued. I always wanted to go up into the Scandinavian countries because of my family background, but I just didn't have time. Had I wished to do it and proceeded in that direction I could have found something to do in Norway to justify my trip, but I had too many things to do and too little time.

Shortly after that the program we were working on was terminated. So that ended that. I returned to the states.

Mr. Frederick: How long were you over there?

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember, two or three weeks. Not very long.

Mr. Frederick: What was your impression of Dulles?

Mr. Canwell: He was a very able man. I had no reason to be critical of him. I thought he was an able secretary of state. Did a tremendous amount of traveling. Before the meeting in Geneva he flew directly from I think Bandung or somewhere over in Asia and the peninsula area. It seemed like the man never slept. But my impression of him was he was a very interesting, very informed person. In fact I felt that he had a pretty good rundown on me before our visit.

Mr. Frederick: Was he surprised that you were there?

Mr. Canwell: No, I don't think so. I was in the delegation that went out to meet his plane. There were several of us. Of course I was introduced to him. It was the first time that I had met him. I'd been in his office in Washington several times, but not when he was there. He didn't seem surprised. I'm sure that he must have known in advance that I was there with the migration delegation and with the chief of security for the Department of State. He would know those things and be informed of them. I think he had the feeling maybe he hadn't been fully informed, but that was just an impression that I gathered in our visit and conversation.

However, I think something I mentioned yesterday probably was misleading to whoever might have been observing the activities—that Foster Dulles and I spent so much time together. It was just a friendly visit, most of it, but a bit unusual.

Mr. Frederick: You traveled to Geneva and then you traveled to Rome. Did you travel to any other cities?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I went to Frankfurt, Bonn, and Paris, of course, two or three times going and coming to various

cities in Italy: Milan—Milano. I spent a day or two there. While there I did go up and have a little junket to the lake region up on the Swiss–French border, the Italian border, very brief. Went also up along Lake Geneva to the Castle of Chillon and other things like this that all tourists see.

Most of that was done with members of our delegation or their wives. I think a major one was Scott McLeod and his secretary were along.

Mr. Frederick: What were your impressions of Switzerland?

Mr. Canwell: I am very fond of Switzerland. I felt at home there. The Swiss people are informed. They are very polite and moderately friendly. They mind their own business and I think they expect you to do likewise.

Their police and intelligence activity can and does become oppressive. I know of one person who has an apartment in Geneva and the surveillance and the things are oppressive. There is just too much of it. But that's the Swiss—they've remained free and alive for centuries and they know what they are doing.

But I like the Swiss people. As you know there are three different divisions of it. There are the French Swiss and the German and the Italian. And there is quite a difference in those particular areas.

The Swiss are known worldwide for their cooking. It's very good. They teach cooks and chefs from all over the world who go there to the major hotels and learn their ways. I don't know whether I'm answering your question of what my impression of the Swiss people was. I would say in general it was very good.

Mr. Frederick: And what was your impression of northern Italy?

Mr. Canwell: I was surprised at the difference in the people as you get north, as you leave Rome and go up through Florence and on to Milan. There are more blonds and blue-eyed Italians than I expected to see. And there is quite a difference. The Italian people, as you get down toward Sicily and that area, are much darker. I don't know whether it's the sun or ethnics but there is a difference. And the northern Swiss, are, as I mentioned, more inclined to be blond and blue-eyed.

Mr. Frederick: Did you see examples of war activity from World War II in those travels?

Mr. Canwell: It was very evident in Milan. The Italians, unlike the Germans—there is a great difference in the way they took care of the rubble. In Milan you could walk for miles out of there where there were heaps and piles of rubble and they would just work pathways through them. There was great evidence of it. There was a church out in

that area that has the original of Leonardo da Vinci's "*Last Supper*." I went there to observe that. The story that I got at the time was that the bombing there and the acids from it were having a bad effect on this painting. But that was like many things, a very brief stop. We didn't have time for a lot of sightseeing.

Mr. Frederick: And your impressions of Germany?

Mr. Canwell: Germany was quite different. The Germans are, of course, an extremely efficient people, regulated and so on. And I thought the comparison of what they did with the rubble from the bombings was very indicative of the difference in the people themselves. The Germans took this rubble and made it into bricks and blocks and rebuilt their city, Frankfurt and other places that had been heavily bombed.

I particularly remember Frankfurt because the cathedral there had been left intact, the two spires of the big cathedral. A flyer who was in the military told me that the reason that they didn't bomb those was that they used them as sort of a target site coming into bomb Frankfurt. They had no particular desire to bomb a church, except that churches and such places were being used to store munitions. So if such sites were bombed there was usually a reason for it.

I remember one German telling me that they very much resented the fact that the Allies had bombed the Opera House and it was right along almost up to the cathedral. They thought that was a severe act of vandalism. The American flyers were very efficient and did a lot of pinpoint bombing. It was evident in areas like Frankfurt and other places.

Mr. Frederick: Did you see any war damage in Germany?

Mr. Canwell: War damage? Oh, yes. In Frankfurt you could see areas where they practically built a new city from the damage. But there was not much of the bombing and rubble left anywhere.

The Germans are too efficient. They don't do that sort of thing. They could see some blessings in the bombings, which took out a lot of old buildings that were deteriorating and that they prized very highly and would not have destroyed themselves. But they could see benefits in the new Germany to be able to rebuild in areas that had narrow winding streets originally. The war changed a good deal of that.

I didn't have much time to talk to the local German people and, not being too conversant with the language, most of the time I spent in Frankfurt and Bonn was with my contacts in the intelligence field, foreign service, and the military intelligence. Much of my contacts and what I did about it was pretty much optional to me. In carrying

out certain assignments, I could also amuse myself if I wished. Try to gather additional information that was just general, but that I felt was part of my ongoing neglected education.

There were significant things in talking to intelligence people there. They had a problem because the Eisenhower administration had made agreements with the Soviets that were very impractical.

For instance, the American Friends Service Committee had a large installation in Germany and had free access to the border. Their vehicles could go and come as they wished anytime, and it was really a pain in the neck to the intelligence people because it enabled these people to be agents if they wished to be, or were indeed in that category. And they could not lay a hand on them. They couldn't search or stop them or impose the usual restrictions on border crossing.

I remember that particularly because I discussed it with, I believe he was a lieutenant. And it did seem a bit unusual that such an open-door policy should be given to a group highly suspect in this country. They are considered one of the major Communist fronts at least by the people who are working in that field of activity. So that was one of the things that I observed at, I believe Frankfurt or Bonn; I heard the complaints.

Then I would say I discussed my business with the people that I was advised to contact and went on my way.

Mr. Frederick: What form of transportation did you use?

Mr. Canwell: In Germany, more rail, because I wished to. I don't remember how much flying I did. But it seemed that when I left Milan I flew to Zurich and then went by train into Germany through the Black Forest, mostly because I wanted to see the country. I could have gone either way. It would have been a little faster to fly but then I also would have missed seeing a great deal of very interesting country. And along there I did see effects of the bombing.

A Swiss person who sort of attached himself to me on the train trip would point out sights of interest. One of them was the place where the Germans were first developing their atomic knowledge. They were conducting experiments with heavy water. This information was relayed to American command over Germany and they took the thing out in one of these bombing raids. It may have set the Germans back in their research in that field a considerable amount. But this Swiss was very happy that this had been done. He didn't like the Germans.

I never quite figured this passenger out, whether he was assigned to do what he was doing or whether he was just free-lancing. But he did everything he could to annoy Germans who were on this train. I just wondered what bugged him. Anyway, it was interesting. But he was

very complimentary of our American bombing capability. It was very accurate with a great deal of precision bombing. That's pretty early in that type of warfare.

I went by train to Frankfurt and in some places you go along through the Black Forest and you see these castles. There are numerous ones that remain and they are tourist attractions now I suppose, mostly. But it's an interesting trip. I'd recommend it for anybody. I'd redo it if I had the chance.

Mr. Frederick: In your travels in Europe did the people appear to be well-fed?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I saw no indication of extreme poverty. In the farming area in general, these farms might be out in a little cluster, and the ones near a city like Florence or Milan would pack their produce in for sale in the city. Quite often they have an auction that they use for this purpose. I don't remember seeing many horses.

Those people are poor, but partly that is their own fault because the head of the family would load up his produce, chickens, and whatever he had to sell, take it to town and invest it in booze or wine. Then finally go home drunk and beat hell out of his wife. That was a pattern in general as it was related to me. It didn't create a happy situation in these little farms. The children would leave as soon as they could get away. The girls quite often would go to town and get work in hotels or wherever they could. Quite often end up in prostitution. It was not a satisfactory arrangement from our standpoint. But it is just the way the thing worked.

In cities like Florence and two or three of them along there that you go through driving from Rome to Milan, going that way there's no evidence of great poverty but there's no affluence there either. There's not these attractive markets and things that we have. They bring their produce in to a square somewhere in the city and the locals come in there and do their shopping and buying and carry it back to their houses and kitchens. It seems very primitive but it's the way they've always done it. And it works.

In Rome one time I got up early in the morning. Walking around I got to an area where these produce cars came in. This was very early. They were just beginning to arrive. There were two of them. They weren't into a collision but one was obstructing the other. They jumped out of the cars and waved their arms and their clenched fists, and hollered and yelled, and pretty soon that was out of their system. They got back and went their way. You see that in Italy a great deal. The drivers drive like crazy people. It's just unbelievable. I have a son-in-law over there. He drives the same way. But they do that. You'll see these confrontations anyplace. Somebody, a cab-driver will drive up to a hotel and spend too much time on something and another cabby will come up, and again

they go through these violent maneuvers but nobody ever lays a hand on anyone. It's just a way of blowing off steam. Typical of them. Anyway, you observe things like that.

In Rome, of course, between meetings, I'd grab a cab and rush out to see some sight, whether it was the Colosseum or whatever—some of the fountains. Once in awhile some foreign service people or their wives would drive me around to see things. I was quite fascinated with Rome, as everybody is. But there are a lot of things about it that you soon tire of, too.

Then in Florence, of course, it's one of the most interesting historical places in the world, from my standpoint. Very interesting and just almost an unlimited sightseeing city. They had floods after I was there and flooded a great many of their museums and did a great deal of damage, but they pretty well cleaned up and rebuilt, I understand. Students from all over the world volunteered to come in there and work and give their services. Florence and such cities, of course, each have their famous cathedrals so you wish to go take a quick look at them and the art that's retained in them.

[End of Tape 49, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: Did you take your camera?

Mr. Canwell: That is an interesting story in itself. I did not take a camera. And as I was boarding the plane a counterintelligence agent with whom I had worked and who had just done an assignment in Germany had two or three Leica cameras. He just unloaded them on me as I was ready to board the plane. I carried them all over Europe and never took a picture. But foreign service people would say, "You goddamn tourist." I didn't know what to do with these cameras. I couldn't stash them anywhere. I carried them a good many places. But I did not take any pictures. There were maybe a few pictures taken of me, and some I didn't know about.

Everything I saw I was looking at with the intention that soon I would come back on my own. Bring my wife and we would do these things. But I just did not have the time for photography, nor the inclination to do so. Had too many things to do to figure out what to do with some rolls of film.

Mr. Frederick: What was the state of the morale of the Foreign Service in the military that you contacted?

Mr. Canwell: I thought that it was pretty good, with the exception of people who resented things like I mentioned of the open-door policy to the American Friends Service Committee or things like that. Most of them did not like that sort of thing. There was considerable resentment that, when you got into talking confidentially with these

people, Patton had been stopped before getting into Berlin and that the division of Berlin was wrong and never should have happened. Most of the personnel in the military didn't like it because it never should have happened. In the Foreign Service that's a different thing.

I might mention an interesting sidelight on this. One of these intelligence agents who was assigned to the border told me that when he went into the service he had been very sympathetic to the Jewish people who had suffered so much, and that most of the soldiers were of the same feeling. They would share anything they had, they would give their desserts or candy to these people. And one of these assignments was to—I think to Belsen—where there was another large installment of Jewish people who had been liberated.

This man was extremely sympathetic to them. They gave these people anything they had that they could part with. They at first seemed very appreciative. But he said that very soon they were complaining all the time about, "What have you done for me lately?" He said it kind of changed his attitude. He had no specific knowledge on how many had been cremated. He knew that there were some and I remember him saying that if there was one that it was too many.

He was telling how he, in handling these people and being the go-between and catering to their wants and demands, found that they were very hard people to deal with. In his experience they were very unreasonable. So that was an interesting sidelight to me, related by someone who had experience in Germany, who was not a Jew-baiter, but who observed that some of the Jewish people with whom he came into contact had not really assimilated socially.

That interested me because every place you turn in a business like mine you have some joker trying to make a Jew-baiter out of you. And with me it never worked. I never believed or felt that way.

But I did see just a little bit of what had happened in the concentration camps and places like that. I remember this man because he wasn't violent or adamant, or wouldn't have returned them to their unpleasant conditions, but he was disabused of some of his extreme tenderness. A great many Jewish people escaped Germany and came to Miami and New York. With most of them, it was with very limited funds. They might have a shawl wrapped up full of jewelry or trinkets or something that they had stashed away or hidden. Then they had relatives, I suppose, in the states and many of them did come here.

I did always feel that it was media hype with the numbers that were used as to the loss of life among the Jews, because I don't think there were six million of them there. It was a good round figure and they really beat the drums on that. But the Holocaust was a horrible thing. Just can't fathom—can't imagine people being rounded up,

taken, and just run through a mill to destroy them. That is just unbelievable. But there was exaggeration, too. Some of these things I observed and wasn't looking for that information, but it was the sort of thing that you encounter here and there.

Mr. Frederick: Where were you, and by what means were you communicated to with regard to the termination of your assignment?

Mr. Canwell: It had been a general understanding of what my course of travels would be. I had considerable options but also little time. There was a delegation going to Greece. I would have very much liked to have gone there. But I did not go and did not include it in my itinerary. All I had to do when a final decision was made to go somewhere was go to an embassy or consulate and have new orders cut. I had such identification that was possible.

Mr. Frederick: Where were you when you were communicated to with regard to the termination of your assignment?

Mr. Canwell: I believe I was back in Geneva.

Mr. Frederick: What were your instructions?

Mr. Canwell: My instructions were to terminate the assignment as soon as convenient. I still had orders to go to London. So I made that part of my itinerary in returning. I stopped off and spent some time in London, a little bit in Ireland at Shannon. That's about all of Ireland that I saw, other than looking out the plane window. Another place I wanted to go back to. But I did have some business to conduct in London and did so on the way home.

Mr. Frederick: How was that explained to you through your contacts, the termination?

Mr. Canwell: I would suppose in a telephone conversation. I don't recall at this time. It was not written communication.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, with regard to the reasons behind that. What did you hear from your contacts?

Mr. Canwell: The reasons for terminating that? There were no reasons given. That was up to the secretary of state to make such determination, and Scott McLeod, I believe, told me that Dulles had decided that it should not be carried out. Of course, what it was, was an examination of Foreign Service personnel and that was within the jurisdiction of McLeod's Security Department and his boss was Dulles. I don't think there were any fireworks

or anything spectacular; it was just decided to terminate it.

Mr. Frederick: Did McLeod ever communicate to you with regard to the reasoning behind that or his perspective of what was behind that?

Mr. Canwell: I'm certain that we had personal conversations. I would usually see him when I was in Washington. We were—well, I would say, good friends.

Mr. Frederick: Did you return then to the Pacific Northwest on your return from Europe?

Mr. Canwell: I think I stopped over in Washington D.C. for sometime. I don't remember just the precise days that were involved. I got home as soon as I could. I wanted to do that. I had travel that was already paid for. I believe my travel assignment originally was from Spokane to New York. I don't remember. I had to return from Washington to Spokane to conduct some business and then took a plane from Spokane and was given the authority to release the information about my assignment to the Geneva convention, at my discretion. It seemed discreet to release that information about the time I was airborne and going over Montague Point, because I'm sure that efforts would have been made to get to Eisenhower to block anything that was being done for me.

My relations with Eisenhower were satisfactory. We were friendly. I asked very little from him or he from me. But he did appoint me as a delegate to this Geneva convention.

You asked what I discussed with Dulles in Geneva. One of the things I discussed was the migration problem in Italy. It was one of the touchy spots. The Italians had lots of poor people and they had lots of criminals. And it seemed that the ones that they okayed for migration were usually in the criminal element. I had discussed that somewhat with Dulles. I thought that was something that should be corrected. There were many Italian artisans, stonemasons, and bricklayers and that sort of thing who were needed in America as well as other places. But it just seemed to be a trick to unload these undesirables on us and other countries that were taking migrants.

I would say, too, that some of the criminals were not necessarily bad guys. They came to this country and didn't all go into the Mafia. But it was a practice that I felt could justify my assignment in Rome, because the Vatican, in general, handled European migration; that is, Italian migration.

Mr. Frederick: What did you learn when you were in Europe from those experiences?

Mr. Canwell: I don't know. Any such travel enlarges your learning and understanding, and knowledge of cities

and places. I think that it is all beneficial to anybody who goes there for that purpose.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, stepping back for a moment historically, it's time to begin to discuss the oncoming children from your marriage.

Mr. Canwell: I could preface it by saying that at all times from the time that Marsinah and I thought of getting married, discussed that possibility, she always said that she wanted a large family. It was understandable because her family had just been decimated by the death of her father, and then her mother, and she and her sister were alone and had no brothers or anything. She was delighted when she was taken out to meet my mother and father, and members of the family were around. She fitted right in. She loved them, they loved her. But she wanted a large family and I think that facetiously I told her she didn't want one because I came from a large family and you don't know what you're talking about. But we wanted children and we got them.

My brother, John, married Marsinah's sister, Jane. They had three children. In fact, they lost one, they had four. But we wanted children. They came along rapidly.

We did have these children and it was rugged times. War was coming up. I expected to be called into military service and was not.

It was during this beginning war period we bought the farmland out at Montvale, and we all moved into this old farmhouse and tried to remodel it at a time when you couldn't buy anything. You couldn't get plumbing, you couldn't get windows, or fixtures. It was a struggle all of the way. The reason we all moved into this house was that we could not get the rest of the property immediately. The Aubrey Whites were not prepared to move out immediately. I think that Mrs. White began to have a change of mind. But we could not obtain the large house which we eventually did. It's a well-groomed facility. But during this war period it was pretty rugged.

I remember humorous incidents, but I don't know that this is the time to touch on them. We had these children coming along rapidly. Jane and John, I think, moved to St. Louis about this time. He entered medical school at St. Louis University. So they, I believe, were there when their next child was born. The first one did not survive. I think they had one child while they were still in St. Louis. Then they came back and we were all together at the farm again. When we first came out there we also inherited a farm family who worked on the farm. They lived in the little four-room house between the two major houses. We still have it and are in the process of rebuilding it. But some time during this time Marsinah and I moved into this little house, and then shortly after that we obtained the large residence.

All during this time children were coming along.

Seemed like Marsinah was always pregnant. She was a wonderful mother. She just loved children. It couldn't have happened to a better person, because that's what she wanted and she mothered them wonderfully and so it was. They came along over quite a long period of time. The first four were quite soon. Then a fifth one; and then the sixth, a daughter was born in, I think, 1955. So they covered that span of years.

It was rugged. We never had as much money as people thought we did. It just wasn't there. And there was a lot of hard work connected with raising small children. Marsinah did it magnificently, as did Jane.

I probably should have somewhere along the line mentioned that when we acquired the large house, the Whites and the Binkleys, who built it, had developed rather extensive formal gardens, very attractive and at least to me, impossible to maintain. I was not a gardener and we couldn't afford to hire one. So eventually I ran the bulldozer through most of this and plowed it up and pastured cattle in areas that had been very attractive formal gardens.

I'm sure that people thought that I was a vandal but the reason that we acquired the place was that Aubrey White, who was trying to maintain these things, was killing himself off. That's why he decided to sell. He just could not maintain those gardens. I remember his telling me that he had these four daughters and he always felt that when they grew up and acquired boyfriends and husbands, he'd get some help. He said that he found that they were all great lovers, but no workers. So Aubrey White was just falling apart. He was getting along in years. In those days you didn't

have the power mowers and things that we have now. We have one with a five- or six-foot spread that you can operate with a tractor, but we didn't have these then and he didn't have them, and his coming sons-in-law were not very good in running hand mowers.

I have pictures of part of this formal garden arrangement and some that were taken with Marsinah and some of the children out on one of these promenades. But again I haven't been able to put my fingers on them. And I suspect my light-fingered children have liberated them.

DISPOSITION OF THE CANWELL COMMITTEE RECORDS

Mr. Frederick: Before we begin today's session, I would like to give Albert the opportunity to ask a question.

The reader may understand or may speculate that within these five weeks, within this opportunity I've had to spend with Albert, we do an immense amount of visiting before the taping sessions and after the taping sessions, which has been very enjoyable.

Albert this morning asked me a question. It so tickled me that I requested that he ask me that on tape.

Albert?

Mr. Canwell: I asked you, Timothy, whether you are or have been a member of the ACLU. The reason I didn't ask it earlier is that we have such extensive files on the ACLU that I thought that if you were a member it would pop out somewhere. But I think that in a proper understanding of these interviews and the issues involved, in that that has been one of my major areas of conflict, I think that it is proper that I ask Timothy if he is, or has been, a member of the American Civil Liberties Union.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I have never been a member and I am not a member now.

Mr. Canwell: That is fine. And I will try to disabuse any sympathies that you have for them as we proceed, because I have felt now and I have for many years that it is a major front. And that it has a lot of good people in it who haven't the slightest idea of what is going on. But the ACLU attorneys have penetrated and dominated the entire judicial system with a result that has made it almost impossible to have sensible law enforcement or reasonable procedure in court. It becomes a time-wasting enterprise in general.

Therefore I felt it very proper that I ask you whether I'm talking to one of their agents.

Mr. Frederick: I appreciate this, Albert. I am surprised that you haven't asked me if I am a former or current member of the American Friends Service Committee.

Mr. Canwell: I'm not concerned particularly about that. I am concerned about enterprises that I know to be subversive. I'm not one who loosely makes charges or

speculates but I am like some writer said, "To be a good writer or good investigator you need a built-in crap detector." And that I have. I start out believing nothing, and then I put the pieces of the puzzle together and arrive at conclusions that a reasonable man would accept. But that's about it.

This organization that you just mentioned I have no familiarity with it. You might explain to me briefly what it is.

Mr. Frederick: The American Friends Service Committee?

Mr. Canwell: Yes?

Mr. Frederick: I thought that was one of the titles that the Quakers used.

Mr. Canwell: Oh, that. Now I know what you are talking about. I thought you were talking about an official social affairs thing.

The American Friends Service Committee is again, another front. They have been used very widely, and effectively, and dangerously.

In my assignment in Europe I encountered some of their activities. They had arrived at a situation where their agents could come and go across the line from East Germany to West Germany and it created a considerable security problem.

Still there was no way of getting a solution to it because they had enough prestige, and enough people who had been identified with both the Quakers and government that it was pretty hard to pick out a front like this and tag them. Men like—I think Dick Nixon was a Quaker, Herbert Hoover probably was, and various such people unintentionally and through the 'accident of birth' lent a great deal of dignity to the organization that had been taken over, I think, by subversives.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I understand that we are in the decade of the '50s—the 1950s—with regard to this series. What I would like to visit with you about now or next is out of context at this point in time. But there was some delay with regard to accessing a copy of—basically a letter from Representative George Yantis to President Allen, president of the University of Washington.

What sparks my curiosity with regard to this issue is that when you and I had the opportunity to review that period in this history, I was surprised that you were addressing, or potentially addressing, issues of adverse publicity coming from George Yantis. Which I found surprising because he died in December of 1947 and that was obviously before the hearings and whatnot. And I didn't understand that.

Then when I was reading *Cold War on the Campus* by

Jane Sanders there was a passage in there that made reference to a communication from Representative Yantis to President Allen. I'd like to show you that at this point in time and then give you an opportunity to comment about that.

The Law Offices of George F. Yantis,
Olympia, Washington

April 1, 1947.

Dr. Raymond B. Allen, President,
University of Washington,
Seattle, Washington.

Dear Dr. Allen:

I recall your remarks at Olympia in the course of your address at the Episcopal Church regarding the legislative interim committee on un-American activities, etc. Also I have received your letter on the subject.

On the last day of the session the Speaker asked me to serve on that committee. I told him that I preferred not to serve on any legislative committee and in particular wanted to keep off that one. The Speaker said, however, that he was afraid of witch-hunting and would feel much happier about the committee if I were a member; therefore, I agreed to serve.

The chairman of the committee who introduced the bill providing for it is a sort of amateur detective. I am afraid that he plans to be quite active, but he is constantly asserting to me his intention of avoiding anything sensational or in the nature of witch-hunting. I do not know the man well enough to judge what his course may be, but I am not too happy about the prospects. Frankly, I am afraid we are entering upon a period of which we will not be proud a little later on. As much as I dislike having any connection with the committee I do plan to at least try to stay close to it as a matter of public duty.

I greatly enjoyed your address to the Episcopal Men's Club and I hoped to have a word with you at the close of the meeting but many were waiting to speak to you and I knew you had a long drive ahead so I did not wait to take any more of your time.

With kindest regard, I am,
Sincerely yours, George F. Yantis.

The response to that is dated April 3, 1947.

Honorable George F. Yantis
State Representative, Olympia, Washington.

Dear Mr. Yantis:

Thank you for taking the time to write me as you have done. It is always good to see you and to hear from you. The fact that you are on the interim committee on un-American activities, etc. is a source of real satisfaction to me. I have yet to hear from the chairman of the committee.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,
Raymond B. Allen, President.

Mr. Canwell: Regarding the use of letters and statements, usually they're not a matter of verifiable record such as those letters. In regard to Yantis, his attitude and his relationship to the committee and its chairman do not square entirely with Mr. Yantis' letter. He was selected to serve on the committee, or requested that he serve, by me. After that determination was made and I had contacted him and he indicated a willingness to serve, I presumed that Herb Hamblen also contacted him. I'm not aware of that, but I suppose he did.

I was very careful to maintain cordial relations with George Yantis. I felt that it was very important that we have a responsible liberal on our committee. And he certainly fit the picture. He was very liberal and I think reasonably responsible. He did explain to me that he was ill. He didn't know how much time he would be able to devote to it, but was very willing to do so. And I purposely kept in touch with him. I had no conflict with him, no utterances that would support the thinking that he appears to display in this letter to Dr. Allen. And beyond that I know not. I did my best to keep in touch with him.

I did not know how serious or dire his illness was. The fact that he was on the point of death was never communicated to me, if he knew it himself. And for people to try to use George Yantis against the committee after he died, I think is pretty desperate because he didn't indicate any such feeling to me.

He indicated a concern about civil liberties and maintaining them. I assured him that whatever we did would be within the framework of the law. That we were going to do our job and it was an important assignment, but we would proceed on good legal advice.

I don't remember whether I discussed with him, I probably did, the fact that Frank Holman, the former president of the American Bar, who had become an acquaintance of mine, volunteered his legal services in any manner that I might request. And so I felt that I had the very best and most competent legal advice. I proceeded to operate in that way. Then later I had the distinguished lawyer, Ford Q. Elvidge, who I consulted on constitutional matters. Holman told me that Elvidge was probably the ablest constitutional lawyer on the West Coast. He became not only an adviser but a friend of mine.

George Yantis or any legitimate lawyer had nothing to fear from the Canwell committee or its procedure. Because it was being conducted with the greatest care. And it always seemed to me that he appreciated our contacts and conversations. So for people to come up with random statements and quoting Mr. Yantis, I discount them.

Mr. Frederick: I remember, Albert, you talking about that when we covered that time period. And what you

said was that potentially some of that was attributed secondhand via a radio program in Seattle. Did you ever see anything in print in the newspaper with regard to that?

Mr. Canwell: If I did I don't recall, and I'm sure that I would have made note of it. Had the enemies of the investigation of Communist activity had access to any derogatory information they would have used it as widely as possible.

There was one radio personality who was a very poisonous character who conducted a talk show. Some recordings of his statements were made and made available to me. But they were pure poison, purely dishonest, biased. One of the statements he made was that, in answer to someone who called in and quoted the Canwell committee reports, he said, "Didn't you know that every member of the Canwell committee repudiated Mr. Canwell?" Now that was not true, it was a blatant lie. And that was the sort of thing that this man did. So I didn't pay too much attention to it. I felt that he was so irresponsible that responsible people would reject his patter. I don't know how many people listen to these talk shows. I'm not one of them.

You mentioned Sanders' book. I have all of those books here and most of these people seem bent upon arriving at a negative answer to the whole thing and very seldom did they consult the best sources of information, that being the chairman of the committee, or the transcripts of the hearings.

So I found that in general, they're not objective scholars or objective writers, they're propagandists and they are writing for a market. I've had a tremendous flow of that sort of material. I don't respect most of those people because they're biased. They do not care what a reasonable man thinks of the situation. They want to convey their own thinking, their own propaganda line, and they find a vehicle to do it. So I never tried to answer all of that sort of thing. I just didn't have the time or means, and do not now. But for people to quote Yantis, I think most of them are liars because he wasn't talking very much. He was ill, very ill.

Mr. Frederick: Let's take the opportunity to turn to the issue of the committee records, and if I remember correctly there were two issues, in terms of the time frame associated with those records. One is when the then-speaker of the house, Charlie Hodde, directed—I assume one of the chief clerks of the House and I think it was the State Patrol—to access the records in the Armory. And we've talked about that. There was material that was transferred to Olympia in that point in time.

Today we would be focusing on the year 1955 and in the Legislature the issue of those records surfaced in that point in time. The first document that I'll be reading from is in essence a receipt—a "House note" dated February 10,

1955. It's an inventory of the records that were found associated with the committee that were stored in the legislative building in Olympia.*

The next document is a report of special committee with regard to a hearing that was conducted with regard to the whereabouts and/or the issue of the House on Un-American Activities Committee records.†

[End of Tape 50, Side 1]

The third document is Special Committee, House of Representatives, State of Washington.

Members of Legislative Committee: John L. O'Brien, Speaker, Mort Frayn.

Counsel for committee: Don Cary Smith, Martin J. Durkan.

Witness present at executive session: Albert F. Canwell.

Executive Session.

Office of the Speaker February 12, 1955.

This is a transcript of the executive session and in this the reader will have an opportunity to view philosophy expressed by a representative proportion of the Legislature and then Albert is expressing his perspective also within this document.‡

[End of Tape 50, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: A long ways around the block there, Albert, but it looks like that both cases were presented in these documents.

From my opportunity in serving in the State Archives and being involved in various oral history projects and interviewing various people, I have gotten the impression that there were parties within the Legislature who wanted to finally deal with that material upstairs just to be done with it. There were others there going back into 1949 when the committee was finished that wanted to, in essence, separate you from the records. Their rhetoric would be in essence to get them away from you so you wouldn't be fiddling around with them in the future.

I think that there is some of that expressed in these documents that we reviewed today. That feeling. There was also a feeling there were issues of security expressed et cetera, et cetera. That's what I see. Would you please comment?

Mr. Canwell: I was certain, at the time that the subpoena was finally issued for me to come over there, that a person or persons unknown had already accessed the files. I had

* For the text of the House note, see Appendix G, page 391.

† For the text of the report, see Appendix G, page 392.

‡ For the text of the transcript, see Appendix G, page 395.

some reason for believing so. I knew that the committee room where these things were locked up was not secure, because in visiting Mr. Holcomb's office we found that one of our typewriters was being used in his office. It came out of that locked committee room.

To understand what was going on there one should go back a little further in the process. The committee set up to get at me was largely a tool of Ed Guthman of the *Seattle Times*. He was in the wings and pulling the strings. I told them at the time that the purpose of their subpoenaing me and interviewing me was to lay the basis for a charge of contempt of the Legislature. I told them that they didn't know what they were doing, and they should ask somebody who understood such things.

They did a very amateurish job. They didn't ask the proper questions. Had they asked the fundamental question, "Were there any legislative records; were there any records that belonged to the state?" I could have answered it very simply, "No, there were not." I had arrived at an understanding with my committee members that if I were to pursue this project that I would have to assimilate materials that we had gathered with my already extensive files which were made available to the committee and were being used by the committee. It had to be distinctly understood that they were not the property of the state, that I would obtain records from other agencies, federal agencies, that perhaps have no authority to provide such information, and that these records per se were to remain the Canwell files and records. There was only one way to do it, and that was to amalgamate them as we went along.

That was understood by the committee and discussed in executive session and made a condition of whether or not I would pursue the investigations in the case, which as I testified in this hearing, it was at great personal expense. The funds paid to me as expenses by the state covered less than half of my daily routine expenses. So to undertake this I knew what the dimensions of the project would be. I knew it would require a full-time application on my part away from my farm and home and family. I understood those things and I laid them out before the committee and put it up to them squarely, "Do you want me to do this job or don't you? If you do then it has to be done on my terms." And they wholeheartedly agreed. I say wholeheartedly, there was one member who would never attend meetings, that was the printer from Ballard. But all the rest of them wholeheartedly agreed, and he did not verbally dissent.

So it was understood that there were no committee records. They were Canwell records that were being utilized and new material being infused into them with me having total responsibility for records that we received on loan and in other ways.

So the committee in Olympia that subpoenaed me for a night session down there, hoping to do to me what I had done to the Communists, were unsuccessful and they

were amateurish.

When this night session was on and they were trying to grill me, Stan Leith, the chief of security from Boeing, was standing in the back of the room and a friend of ours, a member of the state Senate, Zeke White, was very concerned. He thought that I was in a difficult situation. He said to Mr. Leith, "What can we do to help Canwell?" Stan said, "Oh, hell, don't worry about him. He's too old a tomcat to be screwed by a bunch of kittens." That was about the situation. They were trying to grill me at the behest of Ed Guthman of the *Seattle Times*, who was a very suspect individual. The hearing would never have been called had he not had John O'Brien's ear and Mort Frayn, who should have known better than to participate in it, but he didn't.

Anyway, there were no legislative records. They were my records and they grew and were enlarged, of course, in this process. But it wasn't done for my benefit. It was done for the benefit of the state and the nation. And well done I might add. Of course, people who didn't like it were the people we were after in the first place. Of course, to try to utilize the Legislature to chastise, punish me, was kind of ridiculous because these people were amateurs. They didn't know what they were doing. They didn't know how to lay a basis for a contempt case. It did not particularly concern me. It was just another expensive annoyance. I was over there at my own expense again, and away from my activities. And, of course, amused that six years had gone by before they suddenly became "concerned."

I might throw a little light on the FBI connection. I had discussed this whole problem with Dick Auerbach, the district chief of the FBI I told him what was shaping up, and that I didn't wish these files and records to fall into the hands of an unfriendly Legislature and that I was going to have somebody in the Legislature at the proper time recommend that these files be turned over intact to the FBI. Unfortunately, the week that this happened Dick Auerbach was in Washington D.C. and it was relegated to the two agents in Olympia who knew nothing about it.

Had it worked the way that we had planned, the files in total would have been picked up by the FBI and carted away and it would have been assumed that they were in proper hands. But it was one of the flukes that sometimes happens, that the agent in charge of the district was out of town when it happened.

Of course, it was a bit of amusement in my mind. I knew at all times that the file cabinets were essentially empty. And I think that Guthman and his pals had found out that they were, too. They thought that this was a way to get me. Well, it wasn't.

So the mystery of the committee's records is for the first time laid out right here in precise terms. There weren't any. They were Canwell records and they grew and enlarged, but not for my financial benefit but for the

benefit of the country.

There were some very fine agents in government who were concerned about the laxity of enforcement in the subversive field who contributed substantially to our endeavors in Seattle, but with the understanding that they not be betrayed or chastised for doing a very patriotic thing. And I was not about to jeopardize the standing of such patriots.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, your contact with Dick Auerbach or the scenario that you outlined with him, did that develop, let's say, over the fall of 1948 after the summer hearings? Did you see the elections coming? When did that spark that? Because—this is just me talking—my guess is that an acorn didn't fall out of the sky one day and hit your head and say that "this is something that should be done." It's a very delicate thing. There has to be indicators that you would need to see before you would do that? Or was that your intent from the beginning?

Mr. Canwell: To lay the proper groundwork here: I had a long, continuing friendly relationship with Dick Auerbach. Whenever I felt that it was expedient or desired and we both had the time, we'd have lunch together. Dick was very well-informed on what I was doing and what our committee was doing, what our problems were.

We were very good friends, and I was acquainted with other men who had come through the same process. They were men who had worked for Senator Styles Bridges. They went to the FBI. Not only Dick Auerbach; there was Scott McLeod, and there were various other ones. They were people that I had access to, had early acquaintance with. Fine Americans and experts in the Communist field, they really knew what it was all about. So I had a good and continuing relationship with such people.

[End of Tape 51, Side 1]

Mr. Canwell: That is probably just throwing a little light on a situation. But my acquaintance with Styles Bridges and other men on that level went back to the time that I probed into the Alger Hiss case and took it upon myself to expose the Hiss tragedy and travesty.

Such relationships paid off in time. Dick Auerbach was a typical FBI agent, they take everything and give nothing. But if you have a good working relationship with them it benefits in many ways.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, do you remember when you put that potential transfer scenario together?

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember, but I think it was about the time that the committee came to its conclusion. I knew that some disposition had to be made of the records.

For instance the indices were very valuable, very ex-

tensive. But they were coded and I could provide that code and information to the FBI or any agency that took those over. I purposely left the indices there because I knew there would be people like Hodde and O'Brien and others going through these files and wondering what the heck those symbols meant, when they would find their name and a whole bunch of symbols identifying information about them but not known to them. I had some of that in mind when I left the indices there. I removed everything else of any substance.

So somewhere along the line there I think I discussed with Auerbach and others what we ought to do about it. I could have stored them at the Boeing Company or anywhere else, but they were very extensive and there was very explosive information there.

I had no obligation whatever to turn it over to the state. If you read the resolution (I wrote it), I was merely required to make a report to the succeeding Legislature; not to keep records or turn over files or accumulate information. I was just required to make a report, which I did, and which Mr. Hodde refused to print and distribute. The state got little or no benefit from the report of my committee because it was never made available. I still may, one of these days, print it myself just for fun.

But they bellyache about the expenditures made by the state and what they got for it. They refused to do anything with what they did get. It was because the Legislature fell back into the hands of people like Hodde, who was so emotionally disturbed that he shed tears in his speech on the floor of the House, begging the Legislature not to continue the investigation of the Communists. I have mentioned that before, but those things ought to be known, too.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I don't understand the issue with regard to microfilm.

Mr. Canwell: The microfilm?

Mr. Frederick: Why would there be microfilm in the first place?

Mr. Canwell: To preserve records in case they were destroyed in any way. That's one thing. I have made a practice of microfilming records and storing them in a place or two where they're secure.

I learned a few things from Whittaker Chambers and others. He not only saved his life, but his reputation, by keeping microfilm records. Some of them were dumped in a pumpkin out at his farm.

But it has been a very substantial and successful way for people like me to stay alive. Because there are people who know that information and much information is still preserved. Therefore we keep such records. Right now I'm talking about turning records over to the Archives at

the State of Washington.

In microfilming the records there we had no way of knowing what might happen. You will remember that the Communist Party in Seattle offered a prize or an award for anybody who could get into our files. And that we employed Charlie Neuser, the head of the Red Squad in the Seattle Police Department, to work nights guarding our files in our office. But that's the lifeblood of security, records. You have to have facts and evidence and such material and you have to preserve them. I didn't always assign my agents to doing things like that. I could get a lot of it done voluntarily.

Mr. Frederick: They wouldn't be capable of processing that film.

Mr. Canwell: Some would.

Mr. Frederick: Really!

Mr. Canwell: Yes.

Mr. Frederick: Did they have microfiche in those days?

Mr. Canwell: It wasn't used very much. I think it was just coming into use. We didn't.

Incidentally, in our big fire here, I had many containers of microfilm that were damaged by the fire. But fortunately I had duplicates of most things and I had them elsewhere. But microfilm that I had in containers in my office were damaged by the fire and water. Whoever torched this place knew what they were doing.

Mr. Frederick: Within your microfilm series did you film exhibits? Would there be documentation sort of like pamphlets, handouts, fliers? That type of thing?

Mr. Canwell: We photographed Communist documents. We had a tremendous amount of them. I think that the report here that you read mentioned that I left a copy of Peters' *Manual of Organization* in one of the safes.

Mr. Frederick: That would be invaluable. I don't know if that ever made it to the Washington State Archives. But that would be invaluable. And particularly associated with this story—of your life history.

Mr. Canwell: There were Communist documents that I had obtained that they also microfilmed. Some of them were German Communist Party and other things that were very technical and very important and very revealing to the person exploring this subject. I know that the Communist Party, whoever is behind that, had always done a very effective job of having the people worrying about the bushy-faced Commies with a bomb in their pocket. But

the real thing has been an intellectual thing. They just kept that part of it as window dressing. A thing to fool people.

Mr. Frederick: Were you the one that made the selection with regard to record series?

Mr. Canwell: I made almost all selections and determinations. That was the complaint. It was a one-man operation. It had to be. How could you run a technical operation like that with a group of amateurs who were more interested in being re-elected than doing the job? It just doesn't function that way. And that's why, getting back to your criticism of Mr. Hamblen in making the appointment. He made an inspired selection. Nobody else could have done the job.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, why didn't you have a heart-to-heart with Charlie Hodde on that issue?

Mr. Canwell: Charlie, well, I don't know. I don't know how to describe Charlie Hodde. You know it's funny about a lot of these kooks, I like him.

Mr. Frederick: Would you have the audacity to film dossiers?

Mr. Canwell: I'd film anything.

Mr. Frederick: So you did then?

Mr. Canwell: I did, and I'd bug anybody. I still would if I had the time. There's nothing like going to the best source of evidence and information.

Mr. Frederick: The only "problem"—quote, unquote—the only problem that you ever had was the arson fire with regard to your library. Did any of that material just disappear?

Mr. Canwell: Did any what?

Mr. Frederick: Did any of the material ever disappear? Did anybody every walk off with any of that material unbeknownst to you?

Mr. Canwell: I think that there is material and evidence that had disappeared and that's why you have to be very careful about your personnel, and who their friends are, what they do when you're out of town and all of that. So that's a game. It always is. You have to be reasonably smart to survive in it.

For example, when I was out of town, the John Birch Society official, Don Rueber, came in and stole my bound federal hearings from the House and Senate.

I remember a priest that used to come in here. I think he was assigned to me. He would come in about once a week and he was always trying to create diversions and things. I remember one of these attacks was always on my secretary. I remember this priest said, "Do you trust this woman?" I said, "I don't trust anybody; I don't trust you." So that's the way I operated.

This priest used to come in periodically and he'd always heist something to, I suppose, prove to his superiors that he had been here. So I got so that I would leave something with my stamp or name on it on my desk when I'd leave the room and he'd pocket it. We once caught him going through our vehicle glove box. But there has always been some of that sort of thing.

Very, very few people have my confidence and access. Often there are people who are trustworthy who are not responsible. So you just don't make things available, you don't supply your enemy camp the ammunition to do you in.

Mr. Frederick: What you are saying then is that to the best of your knowledge you do not know of professionals accessing any of your facilities. I'm talking about after-hours, black bag jobs.

Mr. Canwell: I know something about it, yes. But I do not intend at this time to name anybody.

I remember one agent who came when I was out of town. He volunteered the information that he was an ex-Communist from an important Communist family and that he was working with the FBI here. An informed person would have spooked him off. But my secretary was a little taken-in by this. He sat down and made a call to the bureau from the phone in our office. All of those things were so phony and so pat, that after that one incident I'm sure my secretary never would have been taken-in again.

But this person was gaining access and through other sources I found out that he was here and what he was doing. He had been permitted to sleep in a room on the second floor. And so I came in and shoved a .38 in his ribs and thought I'd scare the pants off of him. It didn't scare him a bit. He was pretty professional. But he was working his way in. He was volunteering to commit all kinds of criminal acts and things that would supposedly ingratiate himself to us. Again, whoever sent him was underestimating me. But there is some of that sort of thing.

More often than not people would volunteer to do typing and that sort of thing. You always have so much of that to do. Somebody who is doing that may hope to get into your files and records and things. Quite a bit of that happened, but usually I checked these people out pretty quickly. We never assigned sensitive work to people like that anyway.

But you are vulnerable always because, operating as I have, you have to use a lot of volunteer work, and a lot of

people come to you professing concern and interest about the subject that you're concerned about.

Mr. Frederick: Did you have access to or own a viewer-printer? How did you pull that material back out? If it was on roll film. How could you actually manipulate that?

Mr. Canwell: Well, I had the old one sitting out here, a reader-printer. Most of that stuff, once I had the film I didn't job anything out.

Other than coming up with information for the, we'll say the House Un-American Activities Committee, the Senate Internal Security Committee, if they were on a specific project and needed information on a given individual, they might ask me if I had it. Quite often I would have. And so in a case like that I'd produce the information for the inquiring agency.

Mr. Frederick: Would you send that in the mails?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, usually. I had stacks of pre-addressed envelopes and stamped envelopes of some of the agencies and groups that I worked with. So the regular United States mail was about as dependable for that sort of thing as you could find other than to send it by courier or something. It isn't that important.

The attorney general of New Hampshire contacted me about a certain individual. It just happened that we had made a full field investigation on this person. Then he left our state so other than just filing it, we didn't do anything with it. So I was able to provide them with a whole case file on this man for which they were very appreciative.

But that sort of thing is how you might make use of microfilm or stored records of that sort. In general you are dealing with people. Subversives, they are still people, they have identities and records and backgrounds.

[End of Tape 51, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Albert, let's take a portion of today and begin to explore the, I would say circa mid-fifties, the decade of the mid-1950s up and into, let's say approximately 1960, 1961, outside of your political campaigning, outside of your participation with the Un-American Activities meetings 1954 and 1956 in Seattle and focus on the continuation of your work.

My guess at this point in time, the body of your work with regard to your subversive activity investigations would be centered out of your office within Spokane. Let's begin to talk about that, and let's set the stage with regard to the vehicles that you used in terms of your incorporations. Did you incorporate and let's list those if you did do that?

Mr. Canwell: We incorporated the Freedom Library & Bookstore. That's the only corporation we put together other than a nonprofit one later, a research thing called the Citizens Law & Safety Research Center.

Mr. Frederick: Before we move on. Through that foundation, did you have an opportunity or did you choose to take an opportunity to address issues of local law enforcement, county and/or municipal cooperation?

Mr. Canwell: No, we did not zero in on the local situation. We were more interested in the criminal justice system on a national basis. We were interested in the effects of rampaging drug traffic and what could, or might, be done to curtail that and be effective there.

We were largely seeking information and trying to draw on the total picture to create a better, more effective law enforcement. In that we were well aware, of course, that the ACLU had penetrated the judiciary on almost every level. They had been very effective in doing so. And they had been successful in preventing effective law enforcement.

We did some research in Spokane. There was a dean of the law school at Gonzaga who advised his students not to cooperate with the law enforcement agents. The drug enforcement or any others. He was very explicit and emphatic in that.

Mr. Frederick: In their capacity as students? Or as future professionals?

Mr. Canwell: No, as students they were not to respond to law enforcement attempts to get information from them or be effective in stopping the drug traffic. And this man was a professor of constitutional law at the law school at Gonzaga. His name was Frank or Francis Conklin, a priest incidentally.

We had cases here like the peacenik group down in Davenport that set up an operation that was heavily involved in drugs and in other criminal activities.

Mr. Frederick: Now this has to do with the decade of the 1950s?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I think that was largely in the fifties. Do you remember the Tolstoy Farm, whether that got into the sixties? Probably was.

Now you were trying to confine it to the fifties, so we did not organize this nonprofit corporation in the fifties that was into the seventies, I believe.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, if that's the case then let's address that at another time during another session. Let's focus on the 1950s.

Mr. Frederick: You had the Freedom Library by the mid-later fifties, decade of the fifties.

Mr. Canwell: No, the Freedom Library was not organized until about 1961.

Mr. Frederick: Okay.

Mr. Canwell: It did not start out as an operation of mine.

There was a group of conservatives, anti-Communists who became quite active in the area in conducting and handling study groups. They were largely set up I think on the plan by Fred Schwarz, M.D. They became quite active in the area.

Mr. Frederick: When did they become active?

Mr. Canwell: In the late fifties and early sixties. I know it was along in that period of time. I had rented a space. First place I occupied a space in the building the family owned and then I moved out of that up the street to another building. I needed more room and more space. I had acquired—I bought a printing press somewhere along the line. Wanting to put out my own propaganda. Not have to depend on printers and others to process my material. So I had somewhere along the line bought an A.B. Dick offset press. I wanted space for that and I rented space up the street from where I had been.

About that time some of these people in these study groups heard about me and, knowing what my activities were, wanted to acquire space in the building that I had there. They wanted to set up what they wanted to call the Freedom Library & Bookstore, Inc., which they did. They set it up and incorporated it and operated for a time out of space that I was renting. Shortly it became evident to me that we couldn't get along with these people. They were Birchers really. They were disguising their activity. We didn't get along very well with them so we had a split there.

Somewhere along about this time we took over the corporation and moved our own people into it and continued the corporation that they had set up.

That was the reason for the Freedom Library name. I don't know that we would have selected that but it was an existing corporation and there were some good people in it, I think most of them were. We took that over and eventually we moved from that place in the Kershaw Building on Sprague Avenue to this building here.

This building was for sale. I couldn't at the time buy it and my brother operated clinical laboratories and needed space. So he agreed to buy it and he did. He bought it on a contract and note and when that came due he was unable to meet his balloon payment and so we, through the Freedom Library corporation that we had taken over, assumed the responsibility of buying the building. As a

down payment, we raised the money to pay off the debt that my brother was obligated for and took title to the building. And that's pretty much the rough history of the Freedom Library.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, what was the building called?

Mr. Canwell: This building originally was the Chicago Paint Building. That was because the Chicago Paint Company and American Brick and Lime were doing business together and they operated the building together for awhile. The Chicago Paint Company bought out the other interest and then decided that they didn't want to own the building and that's when it was offered for sale.

Mr. Frederick: What was the issue or issues with regard to you and the originators of the Freedom Library, who you mentioned were potentially John Birchers.

Mr. Canwell: The relationship was not good because I felt they weren't being honest with me. I knew that this group they called the Freedom Fighters was putting out a newsletter and conducting a study group. And because I had access to the Birch publications, I knew that the material that they were using and putting out under the name of Dr. Ghigleri and others was actually Birch Society material. I confronted him with that. I felt that if they were going to be Birchers they'd better be in the open and be honest about it. And we came to a real split there and could not get along. I just didn't buy their approach.

Later on after we bought the building, the open Birch Society asked us to install a display of their literature in our bookstore, and we did. We supplied them the space for that but it was not this Dr. John Ghigleri and the secret Birchers, but another group.

Mr. Frederick: Who was he? Where was he from? What was the motivation to be so secretive?

Mr. Canwell: Dr. John Ghigleri was a dentist. He and his family came from Wallace, Idaho. I think that his pretension to being an anti-Communist was partly real and partly was not. I looked into him pretty thoroughly and felt that he was just not responsible. He had a certain ability and kind of a flair about him, but he lacked the integrity that I would require of anybody associated with me in any intimate level. And so we just split. We had nothing in common; I didn't wish to do business with him and that's the way we left it.

But the Birch Society came along and a state organizer who I knew wanted to establish a book outlet in Spokane and handle anti-Communist books. So we went along with that and we let them display their material in our store here in the building until we found that again they were not operating on the level and we kicked them out

and that was the end of that.

Mr. Frederick: What was the issue there?

Mr. Canwell: The issues were that Robert Welch was not an anti-Communist. He was an opportunist, a world socialist actually, and he was doing a very dishonest job. He would gather some very fine people about him. He was a member of the National Manufacturers Association. So he sold them the idea that he was anti-Communist and that he had this program going and then he got quite a number of them to join his group. But what he was actually doing was getting people who were well identified as anti-Communist and able Americans, he'd get them to go along in his society and then he would smear them, destroy them. And that was what his object was.

Mr. Frederick: Why was he doing that?

Mr. Canwell: Because he was an international socialist. I went to work in looking into his background when I began to have trouble with him. And I found that he had attended the London School of Economics, the top socialist school in the world.

It became very obvious to me that he was able to acquire this leadership position by moving into the anti-Communist movement and pretending to be something that he was not. And then some of his own kind of people helped him do that: Drew Pearson, and others, who all of a sudden were attacking Robert Welch and giving him reams of free publicity. And the so-called Americans or anti-Communists thought, "Well, if Drew Pearson is against him, he must be all right." Actually Pearson and Welch were hand-in-glove.

Another phase of this that I turned up was that Robert Welch was a long-time member of the American Civil Liberties Union, which would and did surprise a lot of people when I released that information. They denied it and he eventually made the statement that he belonged merely to get their publications, but that wasn't the case. There was friction on that level.

Mr. Frederick: If he was a member of the National Manufacturers Association, what was his business interest through his background?

Mr. Canwell: They had the Welch Candy Company. He and his brother had this very profitable company. Eventually he sold out to his brother at a favorable price. There's an interesting thing in the Oswald/Kennedy assassination case. Jack Ruby had Welch's confidential number in his little black book. But there is more to the whole thing than appeared on the surface.

Anyway, during that period of time that the Birchers were in here and I was reasonably getting along with

them, they implored me, Scott Stanley, the managing editor of their magazine, implored me to write for them, which I rejected because I couldn't take the time, I couldn't afford it. But he kept putting the pressure on and I raised the ante a little bit. So we wrote a series of articles for the *American Opinion Magazine*. I never was a member of their organization.

Then they also put great effort into getting me to join their National Speakers Bureau. Again it became obvious to me what they wanted. They wanted my reputation plus they could put my picture in their brochure or their catalogue that they put out. But they would never find any worthwhile speaking engagements for me.

I knew how that worked. They got Westbrook Pegler to write for them for awhile and then they started the damndest smear on him that you could imagine. I could see the pattern and I became acquainted with some of the national members of his board, Dan Draskovich and others, and Welch did the same thing to all of them. He'd get them to identify with the Birch Society either on the speakers bureau or on their board or on the writing level and then he'd circulate information about them, derogatory information that was damaging to them. You talk about a sophisticated espionage operation, that was it. I would say that ninety percent, ninety-five percent of the Birch Society members were just downright good Americans, nothing wrong with them at all.

Mr. Frederick: Was he a head case?

Mr. Canwell: A head case? I don't know. I suspected that he was on drugs, and I say that from having observed him in two or three meetings where he was talking and he'd leave the meeting and take some pills. I don't know what kind or what for but I suspected that might be the case. Are these international socialists psychopathic or what? You know they just aren't pro-Americans. They aren't supportive of our system.

This is all news to you, I imagine. You may think I'm psychotic, but on this I'm not.

I have correspondence. I told him that because of his activity he couldn't get his name in the paper any more and that I was going to put him back on the front page. But I just didn't have time to work on him properly.

Mr. Frederick: I thought that he was a great admirer of J.B. Matthews?

Mr. Canwell: That's another one that he undermined. And undermined the relationship between Matthews and Pegler. And wrote stuff and added to Pegler's material in his magazine that was entirely false. For instance, he had Pegler saying that he never knew Matthews and I knew that was false because I had lunch with Matthews and Pegler in New York. I knew that occasionally Matthews

would write a column for Pegler, and Pegler would edit it very little. But I knew that was false so I called Pegler, who had retired and was down in Arizona. I called him and asked him about that. He was just livid with rage. He wouldn't have anything more to do with them.

But the magazine turned out some good copy, wonderful copy. And had some able people. What they were doing it for was to enhance their own position and then cut the props out from under the pro-American that they were using.

Mr. Frederick: It sounds like potentially that he may have been unbalanced.

Mr. Canwell: I think that he probably was. But crazy like a fox. I don't know whether he was making any money out of all of this or not. He may not have been, or he may have been. There is no way that I can tell. He did have a lot of people on his national council who were darn good people. They were big money with deep pockets.

He had Floyd Paxton down at Yakima who was a millionaire. Gary Allen dedicated his "Rockefeller File" book to Paxton. Paxton was not an educated man but was smart. And, of course, Welch latched onto him and put him on the council and flattered the hell out of him, as they do in those situations. And Paxton went along with it and put an enormous amount of money into the Birch Society. So I don't know how many men like Paxton did the same thing. I suppose Grady and others on the national council did put big money into it because they believed in it.

I first came in contact with Welch when Jim Clise in Seattle, who was a member of the National Manufacturers Association, asked me to review a book that he had. Welch had written a book and he got members of the association to take cases of these books. So Jim Clise in Seattle, who was a good friend and supporter of mine, asked me to review this book before he would distribute it. I think the title of it was *May God Forgive Us*. It was a fairly competent piece of work, quite pedestrian. But I told Clise, "He doesn't really know what he's talking about, but it's probably all right." So I said, "Go ahead." And he did distribute it. But that was my first contact with Welch or his work.

Mr. Frederick: What was his game? Was he involved in, did he have any central files? Was he involved in field investigating?

Mr. Canwell: You mean Welch? I think that Welch became a captive of the socialist forces when he went to Europe and attended the London School of Economics. I think that whatever happened to him was brought into sharp focus there. I don't know how far he had gone

down that road before he went there. But that would be my guess that that's where he became a complete instrument of theirs.

Mr. Frederick: Considering the notoriety the John Birch Society has produced particularly in the late 1950s and in the 1960s there would have been a variety of institutions that would devote resources in attempting to track him and figure out what that movement was about. Have you ever gotten confirmation with regard to any of your theories or your opinions or speculations from central federal authorities?

Mr. Canwell: I don't know that I ever discussed it with federal authorities. I never had occasion to.

[End of Tape 52, Side 1]

Mr. Canwell: My conflict with them really matured after I wrote a number of articles for them. In one of them, they made a major change without asking me about it. They ran a picture and information about a national figure and said that he was the carefully raised son of two well-known Communists. I did not write that and, while I suspected he was a Communist, I could not prove it and did not write it. That was injected into a story that I wrote. And that began to wave a flag as far as I was concerned.

We wrote four or five articles, one on Robert McNamara. I think I have a copy of it here somewhere.

Mr. Frederick: What did you say about him?

Mr. Canwell: It wasn't good. I think I started it out as "Strange is his Middle Name." And it was, it was Robert Strange McNamara. I noticed one of their writers swiped that line later. But I have the article here. But it was very carefully researched and written. The Birch editors took it upon themselves to insert something in there that was strictly libelous and not true. I couldn't prove it. And I never heard anything about it. I did tell them "I didn't write that and don't hold such an opinion." So the managing editor kind of waffled on it, Scott Stanley.

Another of the articles was on Jessica Mitford and the funeral situation.

Mr. Frederick: Her book she published about the funeral industry?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, and she was a Communist and so was her husband, attorney Robert Treuhaft of the National Lawyers Guild.

Mr. Frederick: Was this in support of the funeral industry? Did you rally to the cry there, Albert?

Mr. Canwell: No. I only wanted them to pay for my support. I outlined a program for them and told them what they were up against. And the Commies had a good idea there. They were going to develop these fast-burn operations and take over the industry. It served two purposes to these Commies. The funeral system in general is a religious ceremony in America. So it enables them to bypass that and eventually get the government-run crematorium. So it would destroy a major industry. I have no great burning interest for the industry. But I didn't want to see the Commies win a round either. What was it Mitford wrote—*The American Way of Death*. And certainly there are phony funeral directors, but then that is not an indictment of the system. Most people want an elaborate funeral and, of course, the operators will provide it, whatever they want. And they always like to maintain a pseudo-religious atmosphere and attitude.

At the same time the Communists had a program and they were putting it over very effectively down in the Bay area. They developed these memorial societies that were devoted to fast disposal.

I used to watch them over on the coast. The owner of Bleitz Funeral Home would run around with his truck and pick up bodies like cordwood, and take them up to Bleitz's place and burn them. And some of them, I was told, they'd take out to sea and dump them in the ocean. But anyway, a pretty callous operation. I wouldn't want my family handled that way. I don't care what they do to me. But it really wasn't the sort of thing that I approved of and so I entered into a campaign to try to defeat their program. I think it was quite effective. The article for *American Opinion* was the *Communist Way of Death* in which I exposed pretty much the Jessica Mitford/Robert Treuhaft approach. But they were a couple of top Commies. When they got off of that they put her on the penal program. Working in a different area. But she's a long-time very dedicated Communist. And so is her husband, Bob Treuhaft.

Mr. Frederick: With regard to the mid-fifties, the decade of the fifties and the latter part of the fifties, you've mentioned that the title that you operated within was the Canwell Security?

Mr. Canwell: The Canwell Security Agency is the title that I operated under. It didn't represent all of my activities. I was trying to figure out a way to finance my over-all work. It was not easy to do.

I had no intention of going to work for some agency who could control my activities. I could have gone to work for the Boeing Company at any time in their Security Department. But I would have been confined to precisely what their program might be. And that would have been true in any other organization.

Mr. Frederick: Why didn't you do that to gain access, gain a nest egg, if you will? Work for them for a couple of years.

Mr. Canwell: It didn't seem sufficient. I wasn't interested in plant security or such. For instance, I didn't care how high their fences were and that sort of thing. I was interested in the program that they had carried to keep subversives out of the plant. That would be the only phase of it I would be interested in.

And as the years went on, the security had become less and less possible. It became almost impossible to interrogate a prospect for employment and ask him the necessary questions. Couldn't ask him if he had been a member of the Communist Party. Couldn't ask him if he had been a member of the Young Communist League. Couldn't ask him if he was a homosexual. You couldn't ask any of these questions.

So it got to a place where you might just as well take any joker who came along and wanted to go to work for you. And that wasn't the way Boeing had always operated. They had developed a very effective security system.

Mr. Frederick: I hear you, Albert, but we are talking about the mid and latter decade of the fifties. That didn't apply then.

Mr. Canwell: It was beginning to. But I did not wish to confine myself to such employment. In the first place I had been away from home more than two years, almost constantly during these investigations. We had a farm, a wonderful life there. I wanted to spend some time there.

And I really had no desire to occupy a desk at the Boeing Company. My daughter did, however. I arranged for her to go to work for the security department. She worked there for nine years, I guess.

Mr. Frederick: And your office would be within this building?

Mr. Canwell: After the early sixties it was in this building. And eventually we were utilizing most of it. But part time we rented space to my brother for his laboratories. He had laboratories on the third floor. And he had treatment rooms on the second floor. Then eventually he left that and went to work for a laboratory and we took over the space and enlarged it rapidly. We did some printing here. We had printing equipment. We tried to figure out many ways to legitimately make a buck and do the work that I was trying to do.

I did some work in San Diego; in California. One of the people I interviewed in the Goldmark case from the House at Accokeek was Ralph Desola. He had gone to work for one of the aircraft companies down there and he

was also teaching school on the side. There were people like that who were very active in security but were not too close to the existing forces.

However, there were people down there like Bill Wheeler who was with the House Un-American Activities Committee, their West Coast representative. And he was a member of our law enforcement group. But there are people like that. Most of it was a nebulous thing. It never materialized to a place where it was particularly profitable. There was in San Francisco a long-time operation similar to what I operated. It was Harper Knowles who had an anti-Communist operation. He had tremendous records and files. He also was a member of our Pacific Coast group. He met with us in San Francisco.

We had a working relationship with people who were on or had been on the California Un-American Activities Committee. And there were people in San Diego who were very disturbed at what was not being done. One of them, and he volunteered help, financial help, had been one of the group that took the Commie attorney out in the Mojave Desert and left him to walk home. They were determined people. But I became acquainted with a lot of those people. But it never turned up anything very profitable.

Mr. Frederick: Did you have any contact with the Church League of America, Edgar Bundy?

Mr. Canwell: I had contact with him, that is, I knew Edgar Bundy. But he was a person who was very jealous of his work and his field and afraid that somebody else might muscle in on it or something.

I remember that one of his clients was my principal client up in the mining area. It was very difficult for me not to be a little critical of Ed Bundy because I felt that he was, well, he was an able man but a money grubber. He was out to milk the thing and did so. He solicited substantial funds from people whom I probably could have tapped if I had worked that angle or side of the street. But Henry Day was one of the people who thought that Edgar Bundy was quite all right and he sent me all of Bundy's material that came to him.

Mr. Frederick: Mr. Day was walking a lot of the streets. It sounds like he was an anxious man.

Mr. Canwell: Henry Day was a fine person, a tremendously wealthy man who knew the mining business. He was a trained engineer and other things. But he had come into the mining through his family. I think he inherited all of the Day Mines and a good share of Hecla and others. So he was pretty well-established in the mining industry.

Mr. Frederick: I note that the Mr. Bundy memorialized J.B. Matthews with his memorial library.

Mr. Canwell: He raised some money to buy Matthews' Library or part of it. But they had never paid Ruth Matthews for them, I believe, and she had to recover them. I think she set up at Duke University or someplace. Anyway, the Matthews records didn't remain with Bundy, so far as I know.

Bundy set up an operation and had trouble within the organization. They tried to, as I recall, I'm kind of dim on it now, but somebody tried to take over the organization and there was legal action and other things.

Ruth Matthews was another brilliant researcher. She was Ruth Ingles when she was either a student or teacher at the University of Washington. She came down to our meetings to heckle Matthews. Ended up marrying him.

Mr. Frederick: I've always gained the impression that you were an admirer of J.B. Matthews.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I was. I thought that he was one of the best minds in the business. He narrowed his research down pretty much to the fronts and he collected the big ads and things that had all of the signatures on them. He recorded all of that sort of thing. He had very sensitive files along that line. And he did have, I suppose, all of the available books in the anti-Communist field. He had complete files of the Un-American Activities Committee. At one time he was on their staff.

Mr. Frederick: And that would be the famous—

Mr. Canwell: Dies Committee.

Mr. Frederick: The famous *Appendix IX*?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I think that was along about that time. I have a copy of it.

Mr. Frederick: Did you get one of the first copies?

Mr. Canwell: I think so. I had a bound copy and I have a copy that survived the fire. I don't know where it ranks in the time frame.

Mr. Frederick: Well, as I understand it, there were several thousand printed in 1944 in preparation for the potential demise of the Dies Committee. It was so controversial that the committee suppressed it. But it had leaked out at that point in time. And then there was a—

Mr. Canwell: Well, there was the Fish Report and two or three others like that issued from that area. I don't remember the precise time that Matthews was on the committee.

Mr. Frederick: 1938, 1945.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I suppose it was along in that time.

Then Ben Mandel was also on the committee. He was an ex-Communist and I think another superior mind in the anti-Communist field. I had a very high regard for him, but he had been one of those smart Jews who bought the Commie bait at first and then rejected it.

[End of Tape 52, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Albert, we left off mid-passage last session with a cursory review of J.B. Matthews, and we have him placed in the Dies Committee, 1938 through 1945. As I understand the situation, he was called as a witness in 1938 and subsequently became an investigative member of that committee.

I suppose this is the opportune time to begin this discussion with regard to that. Albert, I fully understand that you are an admirer of J.B. Matthews.

Mr. Canwell: I would say that I am a person of an awareness of his enormous talents. That probably describes my interest in Matthews.

Mr. Frederick: What were his talents as you saw them?

Mr. Canwell: First, he was a scholar of enormous capacity. He had been a person who went through the usual pattern of scholarship. Acceptance of a lot of liberal thinking and going along with it. In fact he was one of the leading liberals at one time. I believe that he coined the phrase "fellow traveler."

He always denied having been a member of the Communist Party, and it may be that he was not formally such. They didn't require such people as that to always identify themselves by membership cards. It was quite often the case. But he broke very thoroughly with them because he could understand the fallacies of Marxism and Communism and what its ends would be.

He had been, I believe, a missionary out in Malaysia and to get an idea of the extent of the scholarship, he translated the New Testament into some of the dialects out there.

He was that sort of a man. I admired him—I admire anybody of that skill and talent with the ability to cut through the confusion and arrive at a sensible conclusion. So many scholars are unable to do that and I think he did. Then he assigned himself a task of organizing information on this level. I think he was the best source of information on Communist fronts in America.

I found him very supportive. Whenever I would seek information that he might have, he was extremely helpful in providing it. He was not a wordy person who wasted a lot of time in conversation. He was employed, I believe, over many of the years by the Hearst organization. When I used to go see him he had an office in the Hearst Build-

ing in New York.

But it was through these contacts within and the general references from intelligence sources that I sought him out and eventually asked him to testify at hearings in Seattle, which he did. That about sums it up. I would place him on a level of friendship.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I appreciate that. The reason I bring this up is that in his testimony during the first series of hearings, I found him extraordinarily glib, very chatty, self-possessed. And one of the few witnesses that alarmed you, and understandably so, as chairman of that committee, when he was rattling off about then-General Eisenhower as President of Columbia University and talking about, I believe, the funding of a Polish chair and fellow travelers on the faculty, and getting pretty close to implying that if the good general wasn't up to something, that he was maybe a little soft in the head.

I understand that you came out of your chair at that point in time. I saw that, I could appreciate that, and at the same time he was slow on the come-about on that. He kind of kept rattling on, and didn't quite get the point that maybe this is not—after you, a friend, after you had said, “We're not here to imply anything with regard to the good general.”

Mr. Canwell: I might say in regard to that, that I just felt it was not necessary nor expedient, although the serious questions that he might have had about General Eisenhower were shared by a great many people. I felt that he was an unfortunate choice to head the military, he made decisions that were beneficial to the Soviets and sacrificed the interests of the United States. But he was an attractive, saleable package.

Mr. Frederick: What decisions did you attribute to Eisenhower that benefited the Soviets?

Mr. Canwell: To not go in and take Berlin; to place Eastern Europe in the possession of the Soviets, it never should have been done. And there were questions about how Patton, who was going into Berlin, was disposed of.

But, in general, it was my feeling that he went along with the British to fight the war to the end of every American troop; to do what a good general would do, as Montgomery did, utilize other bodies rather than their own. But I felt that he was doing the wrong thing, and was the wrong man to be in the position.

He was a very saleable product. He was what my father, a military man, would call a happy soldier. He just didn't make anybody mad. And he went to the top. But we were all aware of the fact that he was promoted over the head of a hundred or more senior officers, and merely because he was very well-acquainted with Anna Roosevelt Boettiger. We were aware of those things. I was

rather critical of him, I had correspondence with him over this Polish incident. But in anything he did, in any of his replies, he never made anybody unhappy. He was a person who just did his job and, as I say, my father would have called him a happy soldier, and he was. So my disagreement with Matthews there was mostly that I felt it was inexpedient to explore that there, it didn't serve our interests, it wasn't the place to do it, so I tried to curtail that.

It might be of interest here to point out that I got along all right with Eisenhower. I went about the state on his train introducing him to town after town, and my followers falling away like—well, I don't know what you'd say—but people whom I had worked with in the Republican Party and who supported Taft for the presidency felt that somehow or another I had sold out.

I was practical enough to know that the die was cast. Eisenhower was our man and we had to elect him. So I approached it from that standpoint, there was nothing to be gained by opposing Ike after the die was cast. He was quite friendly to me and he okayed my appointment, assignment in Europe, and other things.

So bringing that back to our discussion of Matthews, I just felt that we could avoid some unnecessary things. I don't remember what the exact testimony was, but I remember that I tried to slow him down a little.

Mr. Frederick: He didn't appear on the stand to really fully grasp what you were doing.

Mr. Canwell: Probably not, he—

Mr. Frederick: Which gave me some insight into maybe this guy wasn't all that sharp.

Mr. Canwell: I think he was pretty sharp, but he was part of the Eastern establishment, and I was still in his mind, I suppose, an amateur. But I was running the show and determined to do it that way, and I think he came to understand that as we proceeded.

Mr. Frederick: I hear you.

What I find extraordinary is that in 1953 he wrote an article for the *American Mercury*, “The Reds in Our Churches,” and in that article expressed the opinion that “7,000 Protestant churches serve the Kremlin conspiracy.”

Mr. Canwell: There was quite a flap over that. Of course the Left thought they had him. I thought that his statement was well-founded, and he produced supporting information.

Mr. Frederick: Within that article he stated that the largest single group supporting the Communist apparatus

in the United States is composed of Protestant clergymen. As you have intimated the response was such that—which again I find extraordinary—he was, for some eighteen days executive director of Senator McCarthy’s investigative subcommittee, and he got bounced off of that committee.

Mr. Canwell: The pressures were so great and that was the issue taken. That was the sort of thing that the Left was very expert at doing. You find the same sort of thing zeroing in on me over the Rader case. They thought they had something, “so here’s a place to go in for the kill.” And on the Protestant clergy thing, he was a thousand percent right. He had the statistics and facts, and had all of these ministers of the gospel signing and giving their names to Communist front apparatuses, but the public wasn’t prepared to understand that, so I think that was something he just couldn’t win, he nor McCarthy, who intended to battle it out on that level.

But he had the statistics—that’s what he had done effectively. He gathered these ads in the *New York Times* and other places where hundreds of names were used to forward Communist front devices. The majority of them, or the greatest number of them, were Protestant clergy. While I’m a Protestant, I would say that the biggest bunch of meatheads in the world are in the clergy. They’re half-informed and presume on the position to influence people in directions they shouldn’t go. But that’s my own hang-up about these characters.

Mr. Frederick: During our last session you mentioned that you had acquired a copy of his *Appendix IX*. Do you recall when you acquired a copy of that?

Mr. Canwell: No, I don’t. At that time I was adding to and developing my own files. I tried to go to the best sources of material and information, and *Appendix IX* was considered one of the great works at the time. I don’t remember when I obtained a first copy and I salvaged one out of our fire that’s still readable but in pretty bad shape. Somewhere along the line I probably will get another clean copy of it, because it’s geared to a lot of my indexing.

Mr. Frederick: It was republished in 1963 by the California Contemporary Classics of Los Angeles?

Mr. Canwell: I don’t know, perhaps along in that time. Some time, I think it was.

We were discussing—and it’s probably apropos here—we were discussing Robert Welch and the Birchers and the fact that one of Welch’s agents literally stole a tremendous section of my library at a time that I was out of town. And it included things like the Dies Committee First Report and many other things. Bound copies.

Mr. Frederick: Do you think he was operating through suggestions of others, or the guy was just a—

Mr. Canwell: I think he was acting under a general program to damage my operation. The way he did this—he had quite a number of these files and records, and I had an enormous amount of them. He suggested that he would work at organizing mine and having them bound at no expense to me, which he did. Then he came at one time when I was out of town, and told my secretary that he had to take these for some reason or another, and he appropriated them, and I haven’t been able to find them since. I know they’re floating around somewhere, and I just haven’t had the time to run down the places where they might be. He sold them to somebody, I’m sure. It would probably be one of the wealthy members on the Birch Society organization. I’m sure whoever acquired them probably did it in good faith, didn’t know that they were stolen.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, what was the American Security Council?

Mr. Canwell: It was a group set up in Washington. I’d have to go back and brief the thing to name the officers. But it was a good organization. They accumulated a great deal of information and published things and circulated right-wing anti-Communist materials to a great many outlets. Fisher, I believe, was the man—I think he was the one who founded it.

Mr. Frederick: Is it one of the larger operations or more powerful operations?

Mr. Canwell: I think one would have to consider it that. It was large, an important operation. It was dependable. And well enough funded that they were able to do an effective job.

Mr. Frederick: As I understand it there was a strong corporate connection—funding. Some of the intelligence fraternity is associated with that endeavor. The director of the Washington D.C. office surfaced in the Watergate hearings, contacting James McCord to destroy records and whatnot, which ties the American Security Council into potentially something that should really be looked into. It sounds like it has a tremendous reach.

Mr. Canwell: I think that any time a country, a nation such as ours, gets into a hazardous situation, such as presented by the Communist expansion program, their penetration of the country, men like that will surface and use their energies and talents, their abilities and relationships with compatible people to counter such subversive things as the general Communist program. Men like that of

ability do what they can, and I think that they did a very effective job. I never found anything that was in conflict with what I thought was right and proper. So I don't know. I know that anybody like that, or any group like that comes under criticism because their opponents don't like what they're doing and they're hurt by it. But I profess no great knowledge of their operation, I'm out in the outer perimeter and I think benefited by their mailings and research.

Mr. Frederick: Did you correspond with them?

Mr. Canwell: I probably did. That's another thing. Tremendous volumes of my correspondence burned in the arson fire here that hit us. But in any organization like that there would be correspondence to and fro.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, there's been repeated reference to the fire, the arson fire, the major fire. When did that occur?

Mr. Canwell: In the summer of '84.

Mr. Frederick: I know that you've talked at some length about that with me, and to date it's been off-tape. I know within the series that we're jumping forward, but it may be an opportune time this morning to review that and gain your perspective.

Could you share with us what you believe transpired?

Mr. Canwell: It was a matter of public knowledge. It was declared an arson fire. We have photographs where the Fire Department placed signs on the building that it was arson. There's no question in my mind it was aimed at destroying my records. I'm convinced that's what—the plan there, it was very expertly executed. It was the biggest fire that occurred in Spokane in the century, I think.

This building was the epicenter of a series of fires that were set to distribute the forces of the Fire Department up and down the railroad here. There were six or seven fires set and part of a dairy burned, but this was the epicenter of the thing, and the—I think—the target.

I know a great deal about it. I had some knowledge of investigation of arson, I at one time worked closely with the head of the arson squad in the Spokane Police Department while I was in the sheriff's office. Because of my photographic ability and potential, I was called quite often by this investigator to fires, so I knew what the procedure was and the steps that you take. And they were not taken here.

Although it was the third known arson attempt on our premises, nobody ever talked to me about it from the official Fire Department. Never asked me: "Maybe you set it?" You know, you have to go to the proper sources and points to determine an arson fire. They determined that it

was arson, and that's where they stopped. But in the first place you have to find out if some nut is running around starting fires. Secondly, if it's that somebody's mad at somebody. And thirdly, and most important of all, you decide who profited. You check the insurance situation and all that. And none of those things were properly done. It just doesn't seem to me that professionals should be that unprofessional.

I know a lot about the fire now but I don't think this is probably the place to point fingers.

Mr. Frederick: I hear you. I appreciate that. Do you think that it was an insurance scam?

Mr. Canwell: Only in a partial sense. I think it was aimed at destroying the Canwell records. The most extensive records on the most important Communist front in America, the ACLU, were in the possession and developed by one Canwell. And that was known eventually to certain sources, and I think that was the basic reason. Then how it was managed and operated, and manipulated and so on, is the rest of the story.

Mr. Frederick: And you believe that there would be no other group and/or individual that would be interested in destroying those records?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I'm sure. That was the organization that I had built the greatest records on.

[End of Tape 53, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: I meant outside of your opinion or thoughts with regard to the American Civil Liberties Union. Would there be any—is there any other individual and/or groups who may be interested?

Mr. Canwell: No, I would say that within that orbit you would find the brains and the motive power and all of that. At this point I have reasonable knowledge as to whom the professionals were, the professional torches that did the job. I know some of the people who were utilized, maybe with a little knowledge or no general knowledge of the motive behind the thing. But it was a skillful, professional job. There's no question about that. Or questions in my mind why more vigorous effort was not put into putting the fire out, but anyway, I had a little conflict with the battalion chief of the Fire Department. I felt that they weren't doing what should be done to put the fire out that was critical to the protection of my records and things.

Mr. Frederick: Were you here that evening?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I was here. I was called sometime

toward the—I suppose two o'clock in the morning or something. I don't remember who called me, whether it was my son or somebody called me and said that there was a fire and it looked like it was at or near our place. And I came into town.

Mr. Frederick: What did you see when you arrived on the site?

Mr. Canwell: Just a tremendous amount of flames and a Fire Department beginning to position themselves with a cherry picker fire-hose equipment to be able to throw enormous amounts of water and direct it to any given spot. And they were set up pretty well out on Pacific Avenue, and devoting most of their endeavors as I could see, to putting out the fire that had already gone beyond reclaim in the adjoining building, or the garage part of our building.

The flames were just beginning to get at my upper office on the third floor and the area in which much of our records were stored. And at that time I think it could have been put out. At least the effort could have been much more effective. And I had some words with the battalion chief here. He was pretty angry, at first he didn't know who I was. I told him I could have put the damn fire out with a garden hose and wanted to know why they weren't doing it. He threatened to arrest me and I said, "You better do that." Then he asked me who I was and I told him. Whether that was incompetence or deliberate, I don't know, but I know that was what was happening.

We did salvage some things. We had a man with wrecking equipment who was directed by the Fire Department to knock down the walls here, and I got him to pick my desk and a few things out of the thing and set them down on the street, so I salvaged a few things by that means. But the fire should have never gone to the extent that it did.

Mr. Frederick: Did it spread over into—I assume that what you're talking about—the portion that you occupied was on the west—the Washington side of the block.

Mr. Canwell: Yes—well—my offices were on the top floor in the west and the south area of the building. The third floor had about ten or twelve finished offices, that had been done when Potlatch Lumber Company owned the building, this was their national headquarters. They had their executive offices up on that floor. I was using part of them for my offices and then the storage of many records and files, our library, a great deal of it was on that level.

The center of our fire seemed to start in our garage. In my opinion, that was pretty well determined. There was a gasoline explosion and some people concluded that it was a car that was stored in our garage. Again, nobody asked

me. I knew that the tank in that car had been drained. There was nothing there to explode. But it was assumed that would be the conclusion: That the gasoline in the car exploded, but I'm certain that it probably was plastic containers, large containers of gasoline at the proper moment, that created the explosion. And that spread to both sides. But that's my idea of how it happened. The official reports by the arson team stated the fire started in the building next to our garage—owned by the Bozo Estate.

It was done by professionals who knew exactly what they were doing.

Mr. Frederick: Who were the other occupants within the building?

Mr. Canwell: At that time there was one rental occupant and I had permitted veterans' organizations to utilize the meeting hall and make such use of that as they wished.

The second floor had quite a large auditorium, and at times we had used that for meetings and the Disabled American Veterans would meet there. They would have dinners and that sort of thing. Then we rented it to the Ancient Order of United Workingmen lodge that conducted bingo games there for awhile. Then we terminated their connection—we didn't like their operation.

But we didn't have much in the way of tenancy. We didn't try to. We couldn't, we just couldn't adapt that sort of thing to my general operation.

Then my son—to get this picture straight—my son was operating the printing department there at that time. And there was probably \$20,000 or \$30,000 dollars worth of printing equipment that went up.

Mr. Frederick: You owned the building?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, we had ownership of it and I managed the building.

Mr. Frederick: And you owned the lots—

Mr. Canwell: Yes.

Mr. Frederick: —you owned the land that it was on.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, yes. The area encompassed by what we rebuilt here and the parking area. Those are the lots that comprised the building.

Mr. Frederick: Did you ever inquire with regard to, I assume what you have said, that no one came and conducted, filled out an investigative report. No one talked to you. Did you ever inquire?

Mr. Canwell: Nobody ever said one word to me, other than a newspaper reporter.

Mr. Frederick: Well, did you ever ask them?

Mr. Canwell: No, I was curious as to why they didn't. I knew what the procedure should be. And naturally I was curious why they didn't proceed in the way that a professional investigation—arson investigation—should proceed.

Mr. Frederick: I assume that you had the building—was secured through a note? It was—

Mr. Canwell: We had a mortgage on the building at the time. Not a large amount, but it was protected by insurance so we could take care of that.

Mr. Frederick: Were you contacted by representatives from the insurance company?

Mr. Canwell: The agent with whom I dealt naturally came and made the necessary reports and we made a claim for payment of the insurance thing. Which was grossly inadequate, we couldn't afford the kind of insurance that we should have had.

Mr. Frederick: The incident report, whatnot, the Fire Department, fire chief, would be public record. You got a copy of that, you looked at that?

Mr. Canwell: I looked at everything that was pertinent.

Mr. Frederick: And they claim that it was an automobile gas tank explosion?

Mr. Canwell: I don't recall that they made any specific claims as to the explosion of the car.

That was the third fire on our premises. There was one arson fire, this all occurred within about eighteen months. There was one initial arson fire that I think was just a nut, just a firebug. He put some things against a door on Pacific Avenue and lit them. It burned a little and the Fire Department came and put it out.

Then months later in the garage, we had stacked a lot of plywood that we had taken out in remodeling and it was stacked in the garage area. Some of that was taken and put in this car, this almost abandoned car that was stored there. It belonged to my son. And it was ignited but didn't accomplish what they wanted—it went out. There was so much smoke and there wasn't enough air circulation so it didn't continue burning, but whoever was planning the eventual fire, I think was inspired somewhat by these things. The fire that went out I think was done by a person who I could identify.

But that's the status of the thing. There's no financial gain that I could gain from it now. We collected our insurance which was inadequate. And I think the actual torch who conducted that part is in the penitentiary, so

nothing could be gained unless he would talk, and he won't because he wouldn't stay alive if he did.

I know enough about it that I can, I think, disclose a pattern and point the finger at the responsible parties.

Mr. Frederick: The only responsible suspects then, if I understood you correctly, are parties sympathetic to the American Civil Liberties Union?

Mr. Canwell: I would say that there's an intimate relationship with them. I, without—to partially go into this makes it sound incompetent, and still I'm not prepared at the moment to reveal all the information I have. But I have recorded it and put the information where it is safe and secure. So nothing would be gained in that standpoint by just eliminating me. I've taken care of it—part of it. But I will thoroughly pursue it at a later date, just because I think it should be known.

I am a competent investigator, and I deal in evidence. I've testified in court over and over on many phases of this thing, and my record in that direction should indicate that I don't deal in rumors and suppositions. I deal in hard evidence, and that's what needs to be involved in this case.

Mr. Frederick: It's fantastic, Albert.

Mr. Canwell: It is. The general public would have no understanding whatever, why am I important in the picture at all. Here, forty years after our hearings there's a stack of books over there written time after time of people taking after me and my investigation, and what I did and how I did it, and whatnot. No part of their charges would be defensible in a fair confrontation, it's biased propaganda. But why? By this time in my life, I should just be a blip on the screen of time.

But the issue involved is more important. It is the question of the use of the legislative powers of the United States to sustain and support this government, and the kind of government it was intended to be. And that can only be done by the proper actions of the legislative bodies of the United States. So to disparage those, you get this stuff over and over. Hell, no liberal writes a book or makes a speech that he doesn't rattle the bones of McCarthy. Why? McCarthy was doing his job that the United States Senate directed him to. He did it very well. Too well. And that's why they do that.

They constantly took after Nixon and they finally rigged up this phony Watergate thing and shot him out of the saddle. And it was because he used the legislative powers effectively.

That's why they still take after me. I'm of no importance, who would know? A student in any college that's reading a text telling about the horrors of the Canwell committee—what would they know about it? What would

they know about me? But the job is done over and over and over again. It's an attack on the legislative process.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, one of the issues is that the legislative process, and you being one of the prime practitioners of it, was identifying individuals for issues of belief. That's a very sensitive issue within the American tradition. Not that it hasn't happened. Not that it doesn't happen. And there is, has been, is, always will be a very passionate debate with regard to that issue: bringing people in to discuss their beliefs. Within the climate it can be, and was, prejudicial to the individual who was subject to that type of thing.

Mr. Canwell: The legislative department of government has ability to declare war and abrogate every right that the individual has. They pull him into military service that he doesn't like, and it's inconvenient to him, but he can't take the Fifth Amendment or anything else.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, Albert, individuals are not drafted into the United States military based on issues of belief.

Mr. Canwell: They have been—

Mr. Frederick: It's apples and oranges, the comparison.

Mr. Canwell: —the conscientious objector thing has been allowed and permitted and has been a beneficial thing, but, in general, honest people who have taken advantage of it have not refused to participate or give service to their country, they've just refused to bear arms or kill anybody. There are conscientious objectors who have received the Medal of Honor for service under very hazardous situations and medical corpsmen and others have done their job. But there's been, and should be, no blanket right for somebody to say, "I won't participate in the defense of my country," and even sometimes when the proposition is wrong.

But I just cite that to show that the legislative branch has latent powers and concealed powers. Certainly the most important of those is the right to remain, and exist, and continue. You can't let one man—in the exercise of his individual rights—place the whole people in jeopardy, and that's what's involved in this whole thing.

Mr. Frederick: You equate individual rights, the exercise of individual rights, with subversion or with criminal behavior. If that's the case that is to be addressed. But with regard to a good part of your life's work, and I know that you're a very fond believer of the exposé being founded by a legislative investigative committee, and what I'm saying to you is that what is alarming to a proportion, maybe a majority proportion within America is

that these people were targeted, for the most part for belief or ideology.

Mr. Canwell: I think that there has been a deliberate program to confuse the individual on what his rights are and what his responsibilities are. There comes a time when the exercise of an individual's freedom to swing his arms—it ends right where my nose begins. There has to be a rational approach to this thing.

Mr. Frederick: You've mentioned that several times. If that arm fully extends and the wrist and the fist and his right to project that, and that makes contact with you as a personal individual, that's a criminal act.

Mr. Canwell: That is right. That's where these peace-niks who are so often just individuals who are not informed, they're easily influenced on the campus. Somebody says, "We're marching," and so they go out and march. That's the way the thing works. But to understand in general what the citizen's rights are, they have to be side by side with his responsibilities. That's the point that these people who are used disregard. And I say they're used, I don't think these kids who go out and parade and say, "Keep out of Nicaragua," when they couldn't even find it on the map, I don't think that they're vicious, I just think they're being used. They're silly.

I think there is a deliberate design, and this is carried out in the education, in the clergy, in the pulpit, and the speaker's platform, and the liberal domination of the press. There is an attempt to confuse the individual about what is happening and what his responsibilities and what the penalties for all of it may be. That took place, it was enlarged about the time of my hearings and after. The Communist apparatus enlarged their "Department of Disinformation," and made it one of the most important departments in the field of their activity. And they delegated the execution of this to the American Civil Liberties Union in the United States. And that's why they are so adamant in protecting the criminal, the Communist, the dissident and all that sort of thing. It's to confuse the individual on what is actually happening and taking place.

That's why my name, my committee, is important to some Commie writer over in England forty years after I operated for only one term in the Legislature. That's important to some propagandists forty years after the fact, not because I have any importance, it's because what I represented was important and still is. And that's where the battle lines are drawn.

Mr. Frederick: I'm just struck by your amazement at this point in time with regard to the passion that this issue generates. I don't understand that in you. To me it appears to be self-evident. If you and the far right and various agencies of government explore the issues of crimi-

nality—that’s another issue. But with the legislative apparatus that you accessed, you were exploring issues of belief, that’s a different kettle of fish.

Mr. Canwell: Not entirely, because the two blend. Somebody, some rabble-rouser convincing somebody that he’s being abused may not commit a criminal act. He might not throw a rock or a bomb or anything, but to disregard that—not recognize that as a force of revolution—well, it’s amateurish and in many cases, evil. Because they do not recognize, and refuse to recognize, what is going on.

I think one of the Communist Supreme Court justices well pointed up the situation. He said, “The American people just want the right to be let alone.” That’s pretty much true, but you can’t let someone else take advantage of that apathy.

[End of Tape 53, Side 2]

Mr. Canwell: A point I failed to make or complete I think is essential to an understanding of the legislative powers. It has been developed that not only do they have the right to inquire, compel attendance, require testimony, they also have the right to make public their findings. And that informs the people. And the Congress and the legislative bodies are the instrument. They are the most direct instrument and representative of the people.

So by these hearings and investigations they do “trample” on some perceived rights. But their rights and their obligations are paramount in these situations and there may be some abuses—that’s recognized. But the power to do so must remain there. They must be able to make these findings public. And, therefore, we have the free press able to convey this information to the people in general, and then they have to be relied upon to respond and act. And to protect the individual who is compelled to testify and appear. He is thereby surrounded with immunity from prosecution. So the whole package, the whole ball of wax is there but it must be complete. And it must be understood. And because that is important, therefore we have this tremendous pro-Communist program to confuse and make the public think that these hearings are trials. That the people are being abused and their rights abused. And sometimes they are.

Mr. Frederick: What you are saying then is the portion of the American citizenry with regard to these various episodes, these campaigns are mistaken?

Mr. Canwell: No, I am stating that the people’s right to survive, and by that I mean survive in the form of government that they’ve created and adopted, that right is paramount to all others. And that sometimes in preserving those rights mistakes can be made. No legislator is

elected with the presumption that he is all-knowing or has total virtue or anything else. But the principle remains that what these legislators are trying to do is to keep the American citizen free. And this is a device that makes it possible. Without that you have a dictatorship, you have all kinds of derivatives of political confusion. But we have developed a system that is the nearest thing to perfect that history has found or has obtained. And we have a right and a responsibility to preserve that system. And if we have to step on a few toes to do it, so be it.

Mr. Frederick: Legislative hearing as the vehicle identifying individuals with regard to belief is what you are saying, is one of the byproducts of survival for democracy?

Mr. Canwell: Not democracy, representative government. I think there is a great deal of confusion deliberately laid on the people about this word democracy. Democracy is a horrible thing. It’s anarchy and everything else involved. Representative government, a constitutional representative government is not a democracy and should not be confused as one.

The rights enjoyed by people who benefit from that also have to be accompanied with the responsibilities to preserve the system and to make it work and to see that the individual isn’t brought into unfair and unreasonable situations. But if it becomes necessary in the course of events to have a war, or to compel somebody to disclose his activities that have the appearance of being subversive, then I think we have to decide on the side of the right of the whole people. And the security and the rights of the whole people are far more important than the rights of some nut who just—sure, if he doesn’t cause any trouble let him think and say anything he wishes. But when it becomes a part of an organized conspiracy, you’re dealing with something else. And no responsible person wants to curtail the rights of any of these characters to spout off all they want. And they certainly have been permitted to do so. But when it’s organized confusion, and then projected through groups like the irresponsible people in the clergy and in the academic community, then the simple people have not only a right but a responsibility to demand some sort of an accounting. That’s what has been taking place and the irresponsible people in the clergy and in education don’t like it.

You look at that bunch of sheep-killing dogs that we were examining at the University of Washington. Not one of them should have been on the public payroll but they were. And so I think the time comes occasionally when we ought to just stand up and be counted and say, “What’s going on here?” And that’s what was happening at the time that the legislative committee that I presided over was established. The people had just gotten fed up with this nonsense and the State of Washington had be-

come known as the Soviet of Washington and the University of Washington as the mouthpiece for it. Hell, the people were just fed up with it and they wanted something done and I did what I could to satisfy them. And I think I did a good job.

Mr. Frederick: Attack them. Did you attack them?

Mr. Canwell: I didn't attack them. I exposed what was going on. It follows that the people who put up the tax money and support the program are in a position to say, "I don't want any more of this." No legislative committee indicts anybody. There isn't any criminal indictment involved. It isn't a court of law. It's a legislative inquiry. It's entirely proper and can be abused, but you have to accept that fact if you are going to get the job done. You have to realize that there you are dealing with people and they're not perfect and they shouldn't be worshipped as perfect individuals.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, it reminds me of an old saw, "Choose your enemy well for you will eventually mirror him." And I see a parallel there with regard to Leninism, or Marxism, or Communism, and you've mentioned it on several instances with regard to the idea that individual need will be supplied via the collective state to the individual. And your inquiry with regard to that is, "Who makes that decision?" The same thing can be said for a legislative hearing exploring belief associated with personality.

Mr. Canwell: I think you're making a mistake that has been foisted on the general public, that legislative inquiries are aimed at belief. They're not, they're aimed at actions. Of course, actions are the result often of beliefs. And nobody questions the right of anybody to believe any damned thing they want. Nobody responsibly asks the question of what somebody believes. I try to prevent that in my hearings. I think if you will read them you'll see that when my chief investigator would get out of line I'd tried to whip him back in line. It's a natural mistake.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, Albert. As I read those hearing transcripts what I saw is that you had expert witnesses, and in some instances they may be referred to in quotes as "expert witnesses" with regard to the Communist menace, with regard to function, operation, issues of history. And you've spent a great deal of time doing that. They are the J.B. Matthews of the world, the bona fides, these type of individuals were brought in. And then the people who were "targeted." The people who were brought in, in essence who were targeted, were asked—and one of the primary questions that they had the opportunity, that is the people on the committee would ask them, have they ever been a member of the Communist Party or are they now a

member of the Communist Party. With this "expert testimony" with regard to the Communist menace as the backdrop, it's perceived as "Bingo" if they had been or if they are or if they deny. That is "guilt by association" and it is persecution for a belief.

Now if they would bring in people who said that, yes, they are child molesters, white slavery, drug addicts, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, and/or exploring that. That's a different thing.

Mr. Canwell: I think that you are assuming something that either does not occur, or you are presenting a situation that is impossible. Now we were inquiring—

Mr. Frederick: Albert, excuse me for a minute here. I want to finish my thought.

With regard to the Leninists, the Marxists, the Communists, with regard to the state will identify the need. However that is defined with regard to individual and then the collective will supply that. And your question has always been, "Who makes those decisions?" With regard to this type of behavior through legislative identification of individuals who professed a belief or a membership, but who are not there per se for undoubtable criminal activity, child molestation, throwing rocks, shooting people, the litany on that. The issue is: Who makes those decisions within the collective? Who identifies the party line? Who ostracizes? Who makes the decision to ostracize individuals for belief?

I don't think that there is anyone who is going to argue with regard to action or behavior in a criminal capacity. But there are issues of guilt by association.

Mr. Canwell: I think you are assuming something that is out of proportion to the situation. In our legislative inquiry over there, of course, we brought in some recognized experts to present what the problem was. How it existed. Tried to prepare a foundation for our further procedure. Now we were dealing with public employees. People who were using the public funds to advance ideas, their "own" maybe, but they weren't their own, they were under Party discipline and we were asking public employees to answer certain questions.

Mr. Frederick: Commonwealth Federation? Old Age Pension Union?

Mr. Canwell: In the Old Age Pension Union we were asking the leadership such as Bill Pennock whether they were or had been members of the Communist Party. That would give us a proper approach to answer to what they were doing. And then what they were doing, in many cases was criminal. We weren't preparing criminal indictments, but we were showing what was being done with public funds and done to helpless old people. And

done by a conspiratorial apparatus. That is what we were trying to bring out in the open. And I think we did a very good job of it.

Mr. Frederick: The question is that it is a subjective decision within a portion of the body politic that an ideology or a belief is a pariah. It is no different than your complaint with regard to the Leninists, Communists, Marxists with regard to the state or a collective or a portion of the body politic deciding what is the need of the individual and the collective will supply that to the individual who makes that decision.

Mr. Canwell: In the position that you are taking, that the State of Washington has no right to inquire into what is being done with the expenditure of their funds and of their management of education or welfare or anything else, that it is none of their business, that the Communist Party can set up a program and use it as a vehicle for advancing their causes and ends, and that you have no right to ask them what the hell they are doing, I don't buy that at all. It isn't a matter of a right to an opinion, it's a question of what you do with those opinions and whether you project it into action.

In the case of the Pension Union it was projected into that area. They bled these poor old people mercilessly. Sure they wanted to get them more money—so that they could take it. And the people of the state had the right to know exactly what was being done in that area. And the Legislature is the right place to find out.

You can't expect the executive department to come clean on those things. They don't want to. That's where their support is. And they're not going to. The legislative body represents the people. It's the closest contact they have. And they have a right to know and somebody's right to his own opinions exists, he can take them wherever he wants to, but he can't put them into action if it's a hazard to the people as a whole.

There is no question about a person's right to believe what he darn well believes. I have a lot of kooky ideas of my own. And I respect other people's rights to have theirs. But their convictions and persuasions should not be transferred into the injury of the whole people. When it's organized and used for that purpose then the people have a right to demand an accounting and they can only do it through a legislative body.

That's the answer to the whole thing. There isn't any trampling on rights. These people didn't want their rights protected. They didn't want to be heard. They wanted to make speeches and demonstrate and disrupt an official function. They didn't want to talk. You couldn't compel them to talk when you got them on the stand under oath. I think that's demonstrated over and over. These people are great on free speech and free thought and all of that as long as they can rabble-rouse out on the street. But they

won't do it under oath.

Mr. Frederick: What did you do when they didn't talk?

Mr. Canwell: When they didn't talk? Some of them I cited for contempt under the laws of the State of Washington and the United States. Five or six of them I cited for contempt were convicted. And they took it to higher courts and lost. So I would say I was right and they were wrong.

I believe that this brings into proper focus the actual situation. These people make a great many public statements and issue complaints about thought control and academic freedom and their inability to defend themselves or to speak their piece. So I deliberately cited, I think six of them, for contempt of the Legislature. So then in court before a jury of their peers they had every opportunity to be heard and to state their position. The whole lot of them became almost speechless when they were under oath and had an opportunity to say what they were complaining about. They were convicted when it went to the courts as I said.

But I wish to say here or observe that I think that your line of questioning and your questions invoke the traditional liberal line on legislative inquiry. And I think that this is the proper time for me to state some of my thinking along that line.

I've always felt—in the first place, I think I am the ultimate believer in free speech and free thinking. I think I exemplified that in everything I've done. But I am of the opinion that the clergy and the academics and the professional liberals should in general make their stomachs as free as their minds. Now if they want a soap box, I think they should buy it. I don't think that we should provide it at taxpayers' expense. I think we have, and the people not only have a right but they have a responsibility or obligation to look into obvious welfare rackets. It will not be done through an executive department usually, because the whole liberal constituency forms a constituency of one of the major parties and, to a certain extent, the other.

I am all for people being able to speak freely. But when they are placed under oath I think that they should give some sound and forthright and vocal answers and explanations for their activities. I do not think, in general, that thought police, or mind control, or an abridgment of academic freedom is involved in this situation. The people under oath are entirely free to voice their complaints and objections. But I explained to the ACLU lawyers prior to our hearings that there would be no platform for speeches and rabble-rousing provided at our hearings.

The committee was doing what it was not only charged with doing, but had an obligation to do and a legal right to do. The committee brought people forth, put them under oath, and requested answers, and they had every legal right to do so and there were ample legal

precedents in this area.

So we weren't embarking on any new course or breaking any new trails. We were doing what the Congress and the states had been permitted to do and were obligated to do. We were just doing it a little more efficiently than some had done it. We were not providing a platform for oratory or for rabble-rousing, shouting, and screaming. And again I say, no thought control, no probing into somebody's private thinking, occurred there. It never does. It isn't necessary.

The complaint is that these people are not permitted to take over a public function and make it ridiculous as they have in several cases. They did in San Francisco at the House committee and other places. I was just determined that would not be done. These people could not do that in a court of law. They're always complaining that legal procedures are not followed. They could not do that sort of thing; they couldn't make speeches in a court of law. They couldn't do the things that they expect to do. But they try to convince the public that they're being deprived of rights when they are not permitted to do such things. They just cannot be permitted to do that sort of thing. The system will not work if you permit it. It's not the proper place for it. And so I did not permit it. When they insisted on speech-making and rabble-rousing and argumentative procedures, I rapped them down. If they didn't cease and desist, we had them removed. And, boy, did we have to remove some of them!

But that's the way the system works and the way it should work. If you are going to have any formal application of government, and government that the people require, then you're not going to permit rabble-rousers to take the thing over and make it ridiculous. And it's in these areas that the public is deliberately confused.

I think that is about it.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, in continuation of today's session in backdropping a bit of the professional background peer group that you operated amongst in the 1950s and potentially in the 1960s, I'd like to ask you who was George Wackenhutt?

Mr. Canwell: I don't at the moment recall the name. What is the context?

Mr. Frederick: George was very active in the antisubversive field.

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember him.

Mr. Frederick: Karl Barslaag?

Mr. Canwell: Barslaag. Yes, I knew Karl Barslaag.

Mr. Frederick: What was he about?

Mr. Canwell: First he had a tendency to be self-serving. He was informed. He did, I think, come up through the American Legion anti-Communist probe. He worked for the US House committee at one time. But he, in my thinking, lacked integrity and honesty.

[End of Tape 54, Side 1]

Mr. Canwell: When he worked for the US House committee he illegally took a great many committee records that were in storage, and then later went out and offered them for sale. He did that sort of thing. And those of us in the business learned that you just have to do business with people who have integrity, who are reliable; say something, they do it, and keep their word. That was not the case with Karl. He was going around the country offering for sale sets of the committee reports that he had illegally appropriated from the congressional storage areas, and actually was trapped in it by some of our people. They set up a meeting for him in San Francisco to talk about buying a set of these, and while he was in there they broke into his car and took the several sets he had taken and removed them. And he never knew what happened.

But Karl Barslaag had some good connections. He had great talent and ability but he lacked something, and that was it. We had acquired the mailing list of the West Coast Communist newspaper. It was a very important and very valuable list. We tried to confine it to responsible agencies, the Immigration Service, and various other places where it would be significant and of importance. He contacted one of our people, a good girl who was not discreet enough to know what he was doing. He asked if he couldn't take the list home one night to read; that he was in a hurry. He took it and copied it and offered it for sale. We quickly figured that out because we had planted dummy names in it. So we knew where these lists went and who was using them.

That is a little more information on Karl Barslaag than you want. But it gives you some idea that we, or I, have always been careful in our use of such material and in our endeavors. In general the basic thing is not only knowledge and ability but integrity. If they lack that then they, in the pinches, will give you trouble.

Karl Barslaag died not too long ago, I understand.

Mr. Frederick: With regard to the mid, latter decade of the 1950s and potentially up into the 1960s, what was the center of your study or your activity? Who were you investigating? I do know from my reading that you had a running commentary with regard to Senator Magnuson.

Mr. Canwell: There were people like Senator Magnuson who—well, I would say Maggie was a sociopath. He was a man with no conscience. He rose to the position he had with the aid and assistance of the Communist Party in

Seattle and the vicinity. And therefore he had an obligation to them and was very responsive to their requests. As to his political association, whether he was ever a member of the Communist Party, I don't know. I do and did know a lot about him.

He was married to a nurse whose income he used to gamble and whatnot. And when he finally was elected to Congress and got where he wanted to go, he dumped her. He was perhaps, in my thinking, the most worthless man we ever exported to Washington D.C., and we sent some dandies.

But we accumulated an enormous amount of material on Magnuson. It should have been enough, properly used, any time to defeat him but there is a certain magnetism to a Scandinavian name in the State of Washington and he benefited by that. I felt then and I feel now that he was just a nogoodnik. And, of course, he got money spent or devoted to our state, and maybe out-of-proportion amounts and that is always appreciated. But it shouldn't be, because it's coming out of the public funds. You're picking the citizen's pockets to give him back a little of it. And he was a master of that sort of thing.

Mr. Frederick: Who else got your attention in that period?

Mr. Canwell: In personalities, he was one of the foremost ones. Probably all through this period of time I was doing extensive research and investigations into the activities of the American Civil Liberties Union.

But during that period of time I suppose Harry Bridges was one of the important figures. He dominated the waterfront and the West Coast and therefore was in a position to do considerable violence to our shipping if it became necessary to the Communist apparatus. And he was a type of person again who was totally worthless and totally ruthless. He, of course, was under my constant observation or awareness.

I'm sure there are others. Of course, Ben Kizer in Spokane was always underfoot. Every rock you'd turn over you'd find Ben Kizer. He had become a very important figure in the world Communist apparatus. Very active in the Institute of Pacific Relations, Amerasia spy case. He was on the National Board of the Lawyers Guild, which was identified as a legal bulwark of the Communist Party. He was on the national level of the ACLU. He was a patron saint of the liberals locally and exerted enormous influence in the local community.

But he also was a focus of interest of mine. So in much of my work it was quite the usual thing if a new agent in one of the agencies came to town and was a little lacking or needed information in the subversive field, he was one of the people that I would call their attention to and put under their observation.

So he was a constant focal point. I told you the other

day, I think off the record, that if you've read Sherlock Holmes' mystery stories the villain in the case was always Dr. Moriarity. That's about the way here. Anytime you turn over a rock you'd find Ben Kizer or his activities.

I remember Barbara Hartle, whom I knew or was aware of long before she ever heard of Canwell. I used to observe her activities here. She and another Communist were advised to undergo arrest. They were to violate a city ordinance about street gatherings or something like that. So they did and they were arrested and thrown into the bucket. Early in the morning, without their requesting it, Ben Kizer appears to get them out. Post bond for them or whatever was necessary. But that's the sort of thing he was always doing.

It was only late in his career that he became kind of soft in the head. He got to a place where he was believing his own hype. The party eventually was willing to sacrifice him because of some pressures I was putting on and making that practically a condition.

Of course, there was John Goldmark who came under my surveillance. The House Un-American Activities Committee, that's the federal one with whom I had always worked quite closely, advised me at a given time that perhaps I would be interested in following, observing his activities since he and his wife had moved to Washington State.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, was that in 1956?

Mr. Canwell: Let's see. I would say that it was in the fifties. I would have to go back to my notes to know precisely when they turned my attention to John Goldmark.

Of course, as the years went on John Goldmark became more important. He rose in Washington State politics. Became a considerable power in the Legislature and as the years went on he and his wife became more and more active in liberal and left-wing things. So my interest in him never decreased. I knew that other agencies were observing him. Sometimes they contacted me to see what I knew. Or if I knew anything new. But he was under my almost constant surveillance.

Mr. Frederick: You've mentioned before, Justice William O. Douglas?

Mr. Canwell: Yes. He was another one that I was always interested in because I knew something about him. I had been on the newspaper at Yakima and the famous Colonel Robertson was an avowed enemy of every liberal. Of course, he had them all over in the Democratic camp, as far as I know. But I had remembered that Douglas had been involved in Yakima in some morals offense. And I did not have definitive information on it. It hadn't become important to me until he obtained a position on the Supreme Court and then a congressional

committee set up with the determination of having the Congress impeach him. At that time I began to devote more attention to Douglas. But he was always in the liberal, far liberal left camp. I think that you will find that time after time he interceded in behalf of criminal types, political and other. It became a part of our knowledge that he was on the payroll of some of the criminal operations in the country.

So he was always of interest to me. He was like Kizer. He was our boy and our responsibility to that degree. I was always interested in the judiciary of the Supreme Court and did considerable research in that area and had experience with some of the members ... Murphy from Michigan. I had contact and ability to observe him during the sit-down strikes way back in 1936. So I had an interest in the Supreme Court as every citizen should.

There was the first Communist book store set up in Washington D.C., The Washington Book Shop. It was established and founded by the wife of Louis Brandeis of the Supreme Court. Then there were Frankfurter and all of these people who were on the professional Left, who arrived on the Supreme Court. So I had a continuing interest in those people and their doings.

But particularly you're confining it to people in Washington State. I did have an interest in Douglas, an interest in Goldmark, an interest in Magnuson and such types.

Mr. Frederick: Anyone else you can think of?

Mr. Canwell: Not in a major sense. While there were people that I did not agree with, and sometimes censored them particularly in my own thinking, men like Senator Jackson, at the same time I allowed for a lot of leeway there. We have two political parties and we need two and they're bound to separate on ideas and thinking and legislation. So I never made a particular assessment of Jackson. Although there were those who thought I was doing it. They thought that I was doing as much to know about his activities as I was Magnuson. But that was not the case. I felt that he was just a person who needed watching; that was about it.

I lost some of my respect for him at the Army-McCarthy hearings where he obviously was in league with the lefties in the visual press and he would do a lot of what I thought was almost childish performances and antics before the camera. The cameramen knew when to throw it on him and he complied and did their job. So I lost respect that I had for him otherwise.

But there were probably others. Of course, there was Lewis Schwellenbach, who became a federal judge here. I had knowledge about him. About his beginnings. He had been very active in the Communist apparatus in Seattle. In fact, as a lawyer he had helped the union that was organizing the cleaning establishments. I forget what the

union was called. But he was organizing for that, and he was the one who was credited with advocating and adopting the practice of going into a cleaning shop and, if they didn't sign up or join, the union organizer would spray the customers' clothes with acids. The Communist Party called him "Lewie the Laundry Man." Eventually he became secretary of labor, I believe, and was federal judge here in Spokane.

There are people like that and we had an overabundance of trash on the political level. I don't think that every state was so burdened, not to the degree that we were.

There were riffraff that came here, like another character that I kept under observation, Jerry O'Connell. A Communist and former member of Congress from Montana who came to Washington State and was made executive secretary of the Democratic Party. And I could go on thinking of a lot of them. I know I was kept busy. And the information on these people of course flowed across my desk from many directions.

THE GOLDMARK TRIAL

Mr. Frederick: Let's begin the process of exploring the John and Sally Goldmark episode. You've already stated that you had received information through the US House.

Mr. Canwell: House Un-American Activities Committee.

Mr. Frederick: And potentially that was in 1954, maybe 1956.

Mr. Canwell: It was along in that period of time.

Whenever in Washington D.C., I was in and out of the House committee because they had lots of records that I needed to tap. And the same was true of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. So I was in and out of those places. I knew the personnel well and they quite often would contact me for information pertinent to somebody of interest to them in this area. So it was just the usual thing. What it added up to was a very desirable, reciprocal operation.

So during one of these visits to Washington, the research director of the House Committee had suggested that it might be of interest to me to see what John and Sally Goldmark were up to and inform them if there was anything unusual.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, who was that?

Mr. Canwell: Just right off the top of my head, I would say his name was Beale, but I could be inaccurate with that. I knew them all. It wasn't a member of the congressional staff or level. It was the working force that I had most of my contacts with. I didn't make any attempt to waste the time or impose my presence on the congressional members. I was well aware of how busy they were and it meant nothing to me. I didn't need any ego build-ups or anything. I didn't feel that I did. But my day-to-day contacts and my mail communications or telephone communications were usually with the staff.

In the Senate committee there was Ben Mandel, who had originally been on the Dies committee, I think at the same time J. B. Matthews was there. But he was for long years with the House committee and then the Senate enticed him away to be research director for the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate.

Mr. Frederick: And the nature of that information that was passed on to you?

Mr. Canwell: Usually it had to do with—more often than not it would be a request on their part for information from me. But are you alluding to John Goldmark information?

At that time I began to become very interested in the activities of the spy group that Sally Goldmark was connected with. Originally her name meant nothing to me, but the names of Perlo and Kramer, and many of those, Silvermaster and others, were very familiar and very important to me. Her significance, of course, became much more important to me after she became active in politics and community affairs in Washington State. And that information, of course, grew. The more I probed the more amazed I was at what I had found.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I think what you are saying is that Sally—she went by Sally Ringe—was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. Canwell: Irma Ringe was a member of the Communist Party. And I never was convinced that she ever left, in spite of her testimony.

Mr. Frederick: Okay. So we are talking potentially. As I understand she joined in 1935 and she left the party sometime in 1942, 1943. And it's understood that you dispute that. Is this what the contact on the House Un-American Activities staffer, if I understand it correctly, told you?

Mr. Canwell: No, I probably told him more than he told me. Once I was on this thing and I realized the significance of it, if anybody provided information it was information from me to the committee. But usually I was looking for records or information that bore on the subject. It is pretty hard for me to separate the steps in an ongoing investigation of the spy activity occurring at that time. I was a pretty intimate part of some of it.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I hear you, but as I understand it, you received information from the committee that she was a former member of the Communist Party.

Mr. Canwell: I don't know precisely where I obtained that information. At this time I'd have to do some thinking about where I became aware of that. I'm sure it had to do with the information surrounding Longview, the famous or infamous house of Accokeek, Maryland. Which was a spy nest and was operated as a sort of boot camp for the placing of Communists and radicals into the burgeoning New Deal government.

So my education grew from a constant probing of in-

formation in that area. So I don't know where each step of it occurred. I know where some of the primary points were.

Mr. Frederick: Now you referred to Kramer?

Mr. Canwell: The Perlo-Kramer spy group.

Mr. Frederick: Okay. You referred to it as a spy group. I've heard others refer to it as a Communist Party study group.

Mr. Canwell: The people that you may have heard refer to it—I think that would be from Sally Goldmark's testimony. I never heard of anybody else calling it a study group. And I've talked to several members of the thing. But it strictly was not that. Perlo/Kramer were the top lieutenants of Harold Ware, who was the top one, that is the top one known in that spy apparatus. I've learned since then who really controlled it.

Mr. Frederick: Why did this, within the local region, begin to emerge within the early sixties? You had this information that she was a former member—that's my language—of the Communist Party.

Mr. Canwell: I would say that the importance of the Pacific Northwest increased rapidly. They had an early penetration and establishment of their operatives in this area very early. Even at that time it was considered important because of its shipping and industry and so on. And due to the limited population they were very able to be effective in their recruitment. Much more so than in the urban aggregations like New York and Chicago.

Out here they had political and geographical objectives, and then suddenly it all exploded with the building and the harnessing of the Columbia River, Coulee Dam, making it possible to produce aluminum for the Boeing planes, establish the nuclear base at Hanford to produce the A-bomb, and all of this suddenly made this the most important defense area in the world; certainly in the free world. And the Communist apparatus was very well-established here.

[End of Tape 54, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I'm not following you. Let me repeat my question. You had knowledge that Sally Goldmark was a former member of the Communist Party. You either potentially learned that in the early '50s, mid-'50s, no later than 1956 and nothing was done about that. All of a sudden there was a campaign mounted within the early '60s. How did that get started? Why then?

Mr. Canwell: Sally and John Goldmark were under ob-

servation. My mind was reasonably open on the subject. I knew that she had been a very important member of the most important spy level in Washington. According to her testimony, she had broken with the party. And that was given not as Sally and John indicated—by her “going to the FBI and the House committee.” They went to her.

It was very apparent to the experts in the field that she only told what they already knew, an old Communist trick. They'd be very frank and open and tearful, and tell you what you already know but nothing else. Well, these things grew and unfolded as we went along.

Somewhere along the line I thought it was time that she be called to account, to testify and to get the story on the record. And I suggested to the House committee that they subpoena her. They did at my suggestion. They questioned her quite extensively and she evaded and confused and lied in this executive testimony. And I think probably like such—

Mr. Frederick: Did you have an access to the transcript?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I did. Whether I should have or not. But I was working closely enough with the committee that was possible. In fact, she wouldn't have been subpoenaed if I hadn't recommended it.

Mr. Frederick: So I understand it, there was one individual, one representative there?

Mr. Canwell: At the hearing, yes. It was, I believe his name was Clyde Doyle of California. Sometimes these things slip up a little bit. It hadn't been planned that Doyle would be the chairman of the subcommittee at that time, handling this very important case. But he was. Donald Jackson, who we had hoped would be the one to handle it, for some reason had an emergency elsewhere and was not able to do this. So Doyle handled it and the House committee staff were there, and they did what they could.

Mr. Frederick: You say he handled this important case. Albert, what was she doing? She was up there in Okanogan County!

Mr. Canwell: That's what we didn't know, what she was doing. And that's what everyone was concerned about. What were they doing out here? You don't take people like that and just plunk 'em down somewhere and say, “Be good girls or good boys.” The apparatus doesn't work that way. Her activities indicated that she had not broken with the party. And their day-to-day, week-to-week activity up in the Okanogan country and around the state indicated that she hadn't broken clean. So I thought it was a—

Mr. Frederick: In what way?

Mr. Canwell: In every way. She would tout the party line, the party project. She would foster them. They had a House committee report that was being circulated. One of them was *Communism on the Map* and one of them—

Mr. Frederick: Now that was from Harding College? Out of, what was it, Missouri?

Mr. Canwell: No, I don't think so. I think the work I'm talking about were reports of the House committee. One of them on the San Francisco riots and hearings there.

The party, of course, immediately jumped in and tried to squelch the showing and viewing of that film. The other one, *Communism on the Map*, may have been produced at the Harding College, I don't remember.

We did—

Mr. Frederick: She was opposed to showing those. She was opposed to showing those in schools, wasn't she?

Mr. Canwell: Opposed to showing them anywhere. But schools were the places that she was most critically concerned about. She had a friend up there, and I've forgotten her name, who was very active in the school circuit.

So they did their thing. They did what they could. The people were talking about free speech, the right-to-know, and academic freedom shouldn't be opposed. People seeing a report of the House Un-American Activities Committee—you should, again, grant them the ability to make a judgment on their own. At least they have a right to see it. The people of the country paid for it, it was their representatives who produced it, it was a violent activity conducted by the Communist Party. I think the people had a right to see that. And she didn't.

Mr. Frederick: This is with the fire-hosing of protesters on the steps of the hearing down there?

Mr. Canwell: They eventually had to wash them down off the steps. They were all over the place like a bunch of vermin. And they were vermin. These are something—the Communist Party was in there active. I don't need to at this point, but I could give you their names. They were there marshaling the disturbance. And the fact that they finally had to wash the steps down to get this crap off of it, is nothing that offends me.

Mr. Frederick: What else did she do?

Mr. Canwell: That was in general the sort of thing they did.

John advocated a pretty strong tax situation in the Legislature. I've forgotten all the details. But she went

around to various meetings and espoused what was recognized pretty thoroughly as the party line. She did it very effectively, very well.

John, not so vocal. He's, I think, a kind of a reluctant dragon. I think that if John had been left to his own, he'd have been an honest man. But so often the effective agent in the family combination is the woman.

Mr. Frederick: Let's mention then at this time that John was a Naval officer in the Naval Reserve. Had served in World War II in the Navy as an officer and that he had a security clearance. That process is in review and it's renewable.

Mr. Canwell: That's a subject, a position that has been so often taken. It was taken in the Goldmark trial and other places, that John could not have been a Communist because he obtained a clearance in the Navy. But I produced testimony, and I have it here where the chief of naval operations, the chief of security, testified—he was under considerable criticism for having accepted Communists in the Navy and he explained why. He said there was no prohibition at that time, you could not deny a man a commission in the Navy because of Communist membership.

Mr. Frederick: I'm talking about in the '50s, Albert.

Mr. Canwell: All right, we're getting into the Reserve. To understand why he was—

Mr. Frederick: They were aware of Sally Goldmark's background—

Mr. Canwell: Yes, yes, because they were Communists, and that was no bar to Navy activity. An officer of the Navy testified on this. He said that they couldn't keep them out of the Navy, but they could place them in hazardous situations, or places where they could do the least harm.

And that's what they did with John Goldmark. They didn't put him in the judge advocate's division, where a top graduate of Harvard Law School should have gone and would be most useful. They put him out deactivating bombs in the South Pacific where he'd probably get his head blown off. That's the concern they have about his being a Communist and they're forced to take him. And it wasn't only Goldmark, it was others.

That is no valid clearance for Goldmark because the Navy had no way of getting at a person in that position at that time. In the Reserves it carried over. I can show you some documents here—I went to the Office of Naval Intelligence in Seattle to see what they had in their files. Having a little difficulty getting it, I went to an admiral and he then ordered up Goldmark's file. We explored

this, how this person with these Communist connections could have a Navy clearance. Of course, it was possible, and did happen.

Here's a notation:

On the sixth of March, 1964, a memo regarding Commander W. M. Bliss, District Intelligence Officer, the Office of Naval Intelligence, Naval Air Station, Seattle.

An interview with Commander Bliss regarding Goldmark case.

Now this happened in 1964, and because Commander Bliss was a little reluctant to let a civilian have access to his records, I had to go through an admiral—Admiral Bledsoe. And did get at Goldmark's file. It had nothing damaging in it, nothing had been placed in there. Nobody had worked on it!

The FBI had the Goldmarks under surveillance from the time they arrived in Okanogan, but their farmhome was ten miles from the entrance gate. They had no legal access. You can't in a federal case, violate any trespass laws or anything else to get evidence.

Mr. Frederick: Now what were they doing up there, Albert?

Mr. Canwell: They were trying to figure out what was going on, who was going and coming.

Mr. Frederick: I meant the Goldmarks. What were they doing up there?

Mr. Canwell: That's what everybody was concerned about. Here's this Harvard Law School—

Mr. Frederick: Watering cows?

Mr. Canwell: Well, he didn't know one end of a cow from another when he went up there. He got himself a big hat and some boots and took on sort of a native drawl and became a cowboy. And I think he liked the life.

The FBI and other agencies were watching them, they were keeping track of the planes going and coming almost ceaselessly into his place. And there was a heck of a lot going on. Of course, people working on it, and knowing that I had some connection with it, the federal agents would contact me, see if I knew anything they could use.

So it wasn't done in the dark. But we couldn't get in and bug his house or phone. I would liked to have!

Mr. Frederick: Now going back to the original question: Why was this campaign—my language, in terms of “campaign”—why was this campaign mounted in the early sixties?

Mr. Canwell: Because John Goldmark and Sally had become more and more important. The direction he was

going, he would end up governor or United States senator, or something else, and it was time to call the shots on him. Time to let him explain why he had kept secret the Communist connections of his wife, or the fact that when he left Harvard he went down and took up residence in the spy cell.

Mr. Frederick: John?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, he moved to the house at Accokeek. That's in spite of what somebody testified to in the Goldmark case, that he only went out there after he became ill. That isn't true. He commuted from Longview or the house at Accokeek to his job in Washington D.C. daily, about 30 miles.

Mr. Frederick: Now Sally at that time was employed at the National Youth Administration?

Mr. Canwell: No, Sally at that time was running the—she and Helen Winner and Lenora Thomas were running the house at Accokeek, which was a boot camp for the training and distributing of agents sent there from Harvard and other places for final selection. And an agent of the man who arranged for the house at Accokeek had Jacob Baker as top agent out there observing this and selecting people from this sort of boot camp, and placing them in positions in the burgeoning New Deal government. And John was just one of those. But he was one of the prize persons that I think were being carried along because of the importance of his background and connections, and he had brilliant legal training and everything about him would indicate that he was due for success and to rise in life.

I am of the opinion that he would not have, well, I've written before that the marriage of Sally and John was a complete mystery, and such things can happen, it can be love in bloom, and it can be damned convenient, because two of them connected with the top spy cell could be required to testify against each other, or involving each other, if they were not married. And once married, that closed that door. So I'm not one of those who circulated that story, but it was very evident to me.

Sally, I don't know whether you knew her or not, you were around Olympia, you should have seen her. She was a sweet gal, she sure was unattractive and she was ten years older than John, who was a very attractive man. But that was a marriage that may have been made in heaven, but I think it was made at party headquarters!

Mr. Frederick: So there was a campaign. He was elected to the House of Representatives when Web Hallauer moved from the House into the Senate. That would be 1956, he was re-elected in 1958 and re-elected in 1960 and in the, I assume, 1960 session he assumed the chairmanship of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Canwell: An interesting sidelight, or a light on the situation was that in the legislative campaign prior to the one that John lost his seat, his opponent was Ashley Holden, who I knew well, and who wanted information on John Goldmark, or anything he could use in the campaign. He wanted to know what I knew about Sally, and I did not give him any information because I still was leaving my mind open as to how clean they were, or were not, and I didn't feel that Ashley would handle it properly anyway. So I didn't give him any information that might have, at that time, defeated John.

But I feel that I was exceedingly fair to both of them. The record will bear that out.

Mr. Frederick: I hear you, and the campaign that we speak of today, in the broad sense, Ashley Holden was a player, and associated with you. How did he accept that, when he found out potentially that you two going way back into the thirties, that Albert didn't give him all the information that he requested in 1960.

Mr. Canwell: If you know Ashley as I know him, and I knew him very well, I think he's a firm patriot but a little indiscreet. Sort of a loose cannon. I couldn't, nor did I wish to control him, but I could withhold information discreetly and when it became, I think, proper to do it or time to do it, I released the information.

Mr. Frederick: What was Ashley's response when he first learned of that?

Mr. Canwell: You mean of Sally's connection, or the fact that I—

Mr. Frederick: Well, well, the second one there.

Mr. Canwell: The fact that I had withheld the information from him? No reaction at all. That isn't Ashley, he rolls with the punches.

I was always master of my own ship. I never feel obligated to jeopardize situations because of friendship.

Mr. Frederick: Did you—okay—your perspective, your opinion: With regard to Ashley Holden, running against John Goldmark in 1960, that would be comparable to Ashley attempting to construct in his backyard, a pair of wings and flying to New York City. Did you, do you share that opinion, one. And did you ever visit with him about some type of Don Quixote campaign like that?

Mr. Canwell: No, there was never any discussion in the sense that you're talking about. I was constantly bombarded by questions from all over the state as to John Goldmark's political affiliations or setup. Everybody of any substance around the state was a little concerned

about him. It was a very usual thing. People would ask me, "Is John Goldmark a communist?" I didn't say, didn't answer it.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I appreciate that. What I'm saying is that your friend, your associate of Ashley Holden, did you ever have any conversations with him with regard to—I'm using my words now—this Don Quixote quest of his to run against John Goldmark in 1960. It's almost ludicrous.

Mr. Canwell: No, I had no discussion with him. I was so busy I didn't get up in the Okanogan very often. When I did I would see Ashley because he was a long-time friend. But he was also busily putting out a newspaper, and if you have ever spent any time around a country newspaper, it was a one-man operation almost. They don't have much time to visit. And because I didn't either, I'd drop in and say hello, that was it.

But he did not discuss with me the—at first—the fact that he was going to run against Goldmark. When he had filed he wanted information of use to him. He did request such information and I did not provide it.

Mr. Frederick: There was a campaign mounted against him in 1960 and that was unsuccessful. Did you contact those people up there or did they contact you? Who was the first contact, and who initiated the campaign?

Mr. Canwell: There were people who contacted me from that area. One of them was a woman, very active in the Republican Party, who lived at Coulee Dam. Her husband ran a big restaurant there. I remember that several times when she'd come to town she would call me and ask me about the Goldmarks, that was a hot issue up there, politically. And—

Mr. Frederick: Albert, and her name?

Mr. Canwell: Newland, I think. N-E-W-L-A-N-D and I've forgotten her first name. But that was one of the first ones. And there were a couple of attorneys in Okanogan or Omak who, when they came to town came in to see me. Again, generally looking for information. First they'd come in wanting anti-Communist literature, it was a cover for them coming to see me, and they'd ask about John Goldmark. I never gave any of those people, at that time, any information. Like Sally, I would just say what I knew that they knew and leave it at that.

I don't remember, I don't think Loris Gillespie came in, he may have. He had a friend out in Spokane Valley, so he was quite often a visitor to Spokane, and I suppose if I were in town he might stop in and say hello.

Mr. Frederick: When did you first meet him?

Mr. Canwell: I would say it was during the times that I was running for Congress or United States Senate, along in that time. He was a publisher of a newspaper in Okanogan or Omak, naturally I'd go see him.

Mr. Frederick: We're talking about Loris Gillespie?

Mr. Canwell: Loris Gillespie, yes.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, now I understand that he had an orchard up there, he was an orchardist—

Mr. Canwell: He was that, too, yes. He also had cattle. He had a string of theaters. He was a real operator.

Mr. Frederick: And he was a newspaper publisher?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, yes, he published the local paper in Okanogan, at least when I first met him. He was the publisher of that paper.

Mr. Frederick: The name of it?

Mr. Canwell: I think it was the *Okanogan Independent*, but I could be inaccurate on that. But it was the major paper in Okanogan and none of them up in those cow towns were very big.

Mr. Frederick: Potentially then you were saying that potentially Stanley Pennington bought that paper from Gillespie?

Mr. Canwell: I don't know whether that's the way it worked. It could be. Somebody did, and it might have been Pennington.

Mr. Frederick: Gillespie was—tell me a little bit about him.

Mr. Canwell: Loris Gillespie was the first white boy born in the Okanogan country. His family were very early pioneers there. And they grew up there and earned their way. They didn't get anything easy. But he was a real hard-working, rather brainy individual who could see a dollar around a corner. I always suspected he had a little Jewish blood in him because he just had that instinct for making money, but he also spent it. He enjoyed a good life and nice home. Drove good cars and that sort of thing. He made money. He made money in orchards because I imagine he bought them in a depressed situation and operated them efficiently, and that's good orchard country.

He raised cattle because they go along with the orcharding and the meadow lands and so on. And they—I think like all the other cattle people, would run these cattle

in national forest land in the summer. But anyway he was a cattleman, he was an orchardist. He had this string of theaters. He set up some sort of a—I think it was a telephone system up in Alaska. And he was founder of Consolidated Edison, which he sold. But whatever he did, he made money doing.

I was only marginally acquainted with him over the years. He was very active in the Legion and among the legionnaires, always trying to get me to come there to talk to their groups.

[End of Tape 55, Side 1]

Mr. Canwell: I might add that the only reason that he was brought into the Goldmark case was that he was a millionaire. They could not have made a case against him alone, they had to contrive this phony conspiracy concept. He was brought into the thing strictly because he had an awful lot of money and he was a little loud in his talking. A little indiscreet, but no more than a great many people.

Mr. Frederick: And he had served as a county Republican chairman?

Mr. Canwell: He probably did. I don't remember precisely what the situation was there. All I know is that I would hit the Okanogan country in these political campaigns, tours, and he would be one of the people who was very much in evidence.

Mr. Frederick: As I understand it also, he was a member of the John Birch Society.

Mr. Canwell: I think he was. I think he joined the Birchers, it was the sort of thing he would do.

Mr. Frederick: He was the chairman of the local American Legion Anti-Subversives?

Mr. Canwell: That's the Legion antisubversive group. They have a structural thing there where they have committees and a chairman of it and so on in the Legion. It functions pretty well through their national organization and publications. I know that he was connected with that.

Mr. Frederick: As I understand it, in February 1961, he was one of the founding fathers of the Okanogan County Anti-Communist League.

Mr. Canwell: I don't know much about that. I know that they did have such organizations. They were developing and burgeoning around the country.

There was a priest up there, a Jesuit priest who was stationed in Tonasket, I think, and was the priest at the hospital there. Funny, it was a Protestant hospital.

Mr. Frederick: We should talk about that for a minute.

I flashed on that Jesuit priest, Father Emmett Buckley. He was the chaplain at the local hospital in Tonasket. Very active, conducted anti-Communist study groups.

Mr. Canwell: He was a—

Mr. Frederick: I'd like to ask one question: Isn't that a bit of the "end of the line" for a Jesuit priest to end up in Tonasket in a Protestant hospital as a chaplain?

Mr. Canwell: Probably a matter of discipline. He was one of these Jesuits who believed his oath. He felt that one of the oaths was not only to be obedient to his superiors, but he also believed that the pope was superior to his superiors. The pope at that time had made some strong pronouncements on Communism and how you should have nothing to do with it. He was a very energetic person and looking for things to do, well, as Ashley Holden said, "He was looking for the devil, and he found him in John Goldmark." He was a wild hair. I think he finally left the Jesuit order, from what I hear.

He was instructed to have no communication with me, so he started sending recordings and things to my sister-in-law, because she had talked to him at some time or another and was a devout Catholic. So to avoid his—to remain faithful to his orders, he had no communication with me, but he did other things. He was a character.

Mr. Frederick: So potentially Loris Gillespie contacted you—would he be the first contact?

Mr. Canwell: I have no idea at this point of time. I would say that the Newland woman was one who contacted me very early. She set up a meeting at Coulee Dam, invited me to attend and this priest was there, and I don't remember who else. But she thought she was doing a big thing to get me down there, so I responded and went down there. That's where they set up, eventually set up, a meeting over at Brewster that they invited me to.

Mr. Frederick: Who was at that meeting at Brewster?

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember. There were, I suppose, eight or ten people and I wouldn't—I remember that this priest, Buckley, was there. There were names that I would recognize if they were read off to me. They were not people that I knew well.

Mr. Frederick: When did Joe Haussler enter the picture? Was he there at Brewster or Coulee?

Mr. Canwell: Not that I know of. I don't remember any meetings with him at all. Oh, I met him, but I don't remember any—there were no meetings or plottings, or that

sort of thing; in most cases these people were just trying to get me down there as an expert at a time that they were all hyper on the subject of anti-Communism. Of course, I was the best they could do, locally.

Mr. Frederick: This was after 1960?

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember what the precise dates were there.

The thing moved along during that period of time, but without going back to notes I don't know what the dates were.

Mr. Frederick: The reason I bring that up is that Joe Haussler, either on his own accord or suggestion through friends, through groups, was going to take on John Goldmark and see if he could knock him out of his House seat in the 1962 election.

Mr. Canwell: I believe that he is the one who did it. And that'll give you an idea of how remote most of that stuff was from me and my general activities. If I hit the area it was on a fast trip in and out. I just had too much to do, to be doing that.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, now I appreciate that! But this was a major campaign that led up to the libel trial—

Mr. Canwell: I took care of John Goldmark and the publication of the information about Sally, Irma Ringe, I took care of the situation. He would have been defeated without any plotting or planning there. Many of these people talked when they should have been listening. He was dead duck when this information hit the street.

Mr. Frederick: I hear what you're saying, but this "information" didn't fall out of the sky! What we're doing here is talking about a list of players with regard to that campaign, or who were associated with the campaign.

Mr. Canwell: There was never any organized campaign to get John Goldmark, to which I was a party. Now they undoubtedly did have meetings and discussions to decide how we can get rid of this guy, as always happens in political situations. But I was not a party to that. Other than they would call on me for information which I was reluctant to give, and when I was ready to give it, I published it.

There was no conspiracy as Goldmark and his shysters put together. It just never occurred.

Mr. Frederick: There was a jury up there who thought differently about it!

Mr. Canwell: Oh, God. They were by and large friends

and neighbors of the Goldmarks and the Goldmarks were in a position, in the selection of the jury and advising Bill Dwyer on the jury selection, to know every lefty in the district. We'd bring in an attorney there who didn't know anybody there. So it was an open-and-shut case—

Mr. Frederick: Albert, that sounds like sour grapes to me.

Mr. Canwell: No, no, it's just a practical observation. Why do you suppose they filed this suit in Okanogan? Because they had this advantage.

Mr. Frederick: It's kind of like in their neighborhood, isn't it?

Mr. Canwell: Sure! They had everything going for them. A judge that was in their pocket. They knew everybody that would be on the jury panel. Unfortunately, I had to be in California getting some late evidence and material put together. I came in after the jury was selected. My God! There were people on there that I wouldn't even let in the courthouse! There was one social worker that was a pal of Sally's.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I hear what you're saying. Let's save that for a later discussion. What I would like to do is to begin to identify a variety of players associated with this. Attorney descriptions and attorney selections would be a little bit down the road here from where we are right now.

What you're telling me is that you don't remember, or you don't know, how Joe Haussler became the one to run against John Goldmark.

Mr. Canwell: No, I would know nothing about that. I suppose it's the usual process where there are always some people who feel that they are especially endowed and they should serve in the Legislature. I think he had some political activity in office. John Goldmark was—well, he had to have an opponent, he always did. That year it just happened to be Joe Haussler. Also John was due for annihilation. Joe Haussler was the beneficiary. Joe was not—he was a good man, but I could think of a lot of people I'd rather be working with because he was not knowledgeable in this field. What he was, he saw an opportunity, a vacuum, he filed and he won.

Mr. Frederick: He was a Democrat. He was a businessman. He had been the county commissioner. What was his business interest?

Mr. Canwell: I don't know, I just don't remember what it was. I didn't know him that well. In fact, I wouldn't have known Joe Haussler if I'd seen him on the street. He

had a very attractive secretary I might remember.

Mr. Frederick: Ashley Holden surfaces again. As I understand it he retired from the political editorship of the *Spokane Spokesman-Review* and found himself, I think that was his site of nativity, in Okanogan County, up in that area.

Mr. Canwell: He went home and bought a newspaper.

Mr. Frederick: And he was the owner and editor of the *Tonasket Tribune* and that would be in Tonasket.

We've talked about the Jesuit priest, Father Emmett Buckley. Loris Gillespie, and there was another gentleman there, Stanley Pennington.

Mr. Canwell: Stan Pennington, I just remember the name. He's another person I wouldn't know if I saw him, but I remember that he was there.

There are quite a number of these people that Don Caron brought into study groups, into these anti-Communist study groups that he was involved in, and that the Birchers were in. I really know nothing about it.

Mr. Frederick: Stanley was the publisher of the weekly *Okanogan Independent*?

Mr. Canwell: I think he may have bought Gillespie out, that's probably the way it happened, but I don't know that.

Mr. Frederick: And you've already mentioned, and it's time now to talk about him, Don Caron.

Mr. Canwell: Don Caron was a Forest Service employee who became very active in anti-Communist study groups and activity and it was eventually revealed that he was in the John Birch Society. I think when he left the Forest Service he became a coordinator or something for them.

Mr. Frederick: Those would be the key individuals.

Something or someone got the ball rolling; you were contacted several times at a meeting at Coulee and had one at—

Mr. Canwell: Brewster.

Mr. Frederick: Brewster.

I would assume, and Albert this is my words, that you signed on. You thought that maybe this would be the time to take John Goldmark out?

Mr. Canwell: I wouldn't put it that way. I didn't know precisely what they were up to when they asked me to come to this meeting at Brewster. I should have sus-

pected that there was skullduggery abroad with the priest, Emmett Buckley, involved in it.

But they weren't completely honest with me either. They asked to make a transcription, or a recording. This was just an informal interview, question and answer thing. It was very late at night; I was dead tired and hardly able to keep my eyes open. But I'd committed myself to this and I did it, I went down there.

Then I found out later that they had taken this transcript and were planning to publish it.

Mr. Frederick: This is the Brewster meeting. They asked you if they could record that—

Mr. Canwell: They asked if they could record it and I told them at the conclusion that I should edit it, before it was used anywhere, because being tired and not having my notes with me I could be inaccurate. I did make one mistake. I made a mistake about what time Sally allegedly left the party; it wasn't intentional.

But I had told them that I should edit this copy before it was used. And in fairness, it should have been. But Emmett Buckley and Ashley Holden, who was to benefit by the printing of it, they took money that they were supposed to pay me, and used it to pay for the publication of this transcript. It was the sort of hanky-panky I didn't like.

Mr. Frederick: So in Brewster the famous Al Canwell interview was taped that night then in that meeting!

Mr. Canwell: Yes.

Mr. Frederick: Who asked the questions?

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember now. There was a fella there I think who was connected with the paper, maybe at Waterville or something like that. It was a fairly competent job, but in fairness to me I should have been able to edit it. I told them, "You don't need to do this, I'll dictate a tape for you." But Buckley was one of these impetuous characters, he just grabbed the ball and ran. Ashley Holden lacks judgment in such things.

Mr. Frederick: Were you paid for that?

Mr. Canwell: No, I told them at the time that I would come down there. But it cost me, and it was suggested that they raise some funds of some kind. I don't remember whether I was supposed to get all that they raised, and I think they raised—might have been \$500, but they never gave it to me.

But that's the way the thing came about, and they should not have taken this transcript and published it without it being edited by me. There's no willful or de-

liberate mistakes in the thing, but talking without notes and without materials and late at night to just a random group was not a good thing to do. I probably should have refused to do it. But Buckley grabbed the tape and went to see Ashley and they started setting up this *Interview with Al Canwell* to distribute.

Mr. Frederick: Ashley wasn't there that night?

Mr. Canwell: I don't think he was, but by that I wouldn't know for sure.

It was not the way that I usually operated but there was no subversive or improper intent involved in the thing on my part. I think Buckley is a sneaky Jesuit who would cut such corners. I wouldn't. At the time they called me about that I told them over the phone that it had to be edited, and I think I may have mentioned several things that should have been excised. They went right ahead and printed it. That was thoroughly explored in the Goldmark trial.

But there wasn't anything big in the thing. Just a matter of answering the routine questions that anybody might ask at that time about the Communist apparatus.

Mr. Frederick: Do you have a copy of that?

Mr. Canwell: I may have. If I do I could look for it, but I just don't know at the moment whether I do. I'll ask Mary if she has that—she probably has filed it.

Mr. Frederick: It'd be nice to be able to have a copy of that to review. As I understand it you talked about the American Civil Liberties Union and Communist conspiracy?

Mr. Canwell: Probably. It was in general a pretty innocuous thing. And at the time I felt it was an unreasonable imposition on me and my time, but at the same time I tried to place myself in their position and I went along with it. I did an awful lot of that sort of thing. People picked my brain for whatever it was worth. Then they'd go back to their groups and sound smart, but never give me any credit for it.

Mr. Frederick: Well, this is an oral history and it's a discussion. It's a form of communication back and forth.

Albert, what strikes me at this point in time is that you're a very cautious, resourceful player. You are a very heavy street player. I would term you as that, a heavy street player in your calling. It sounds like you were pretty close to lying that night with regard to—couldn't you tell a little bit from Father Emmett Buckley that—did you know him that well? Was that the first time you met him?

Mr. Canwell: No, I think I may have met him up at Tonasket, or he may have come to the office. He had asked for copies of our committee reports, as I recall. I think that I provided them, either to him or to Ashley Holden, or maybe Ashley Holden gave them to him in the first place. But he read them and he took off running.

I didn't know Buckley. I know enough to be suspicious of any Jesuit. They're a pretty questionable lot when you get around to want to depend on what they say. It depends on what they want you to know or hear. And Buckley was very much that way. He tried to stay in line as far as his Jesuit discipline went, but he was a constant problem to them, I understand. And to me.

Mr. Frederick: It just occurred to me: At this point in time, and potentially, did he have a drinking problem?

Mr. Canwell: Did Buckley? Not that I'm aware of.

Mr. Frederick: The reason—one of the reasons why I asked that is that from what reading I have done, he appears to be a bit of a bizarre personality, to be charitable. Then he was a Jesuit priest, a Catholic serving as a chaplain in Tonasket at a Protestant hospital, and that really sounds like, kind of the “end of the line,” for that fellow.

Mr. Canwell: I never knew why he was stationed up there, but it goes with the territory that when some priest is assigned to “Podunk,” he's being disciplined. As I told one of them who used to come in and see me all the time. I said, “You keep in contact with me and you'll end up on an Indian reservation.” That's the way the thing worked. It was no mystery to me.

I did not know Buckley well. Whatever recommendation he came with was from Ashley Holden, who probably saw more of him than most other people did.

Mr. Frederick: It probably gets lonely up there in Tonasket.

Mr. Canwell: It's a cow town and cowboys come to town on Saturday nights, that's about it.

[End of Tape 55, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: It sounds like that through obligation, however you would like to define that, once that recording was made it was fairly well out of your hands and/or you didn't have an opportunity to review that transcript before it went on its merry way.

Mr. Canwell: This transcript and other things were used very widely and very energetically by a group of people in Okanogan who I didn't necessarily even know. Emmett Buckley and Ashley Holden I did know. Of

course, Gillespie had nothing to do with that as far as I recall. I don't think he was at the meeting. I don't remember even talking to him about such things.

But the pot was really boiling up in the Okanogan. They were after the hide of John Goldmark. And it's the sort of thing that happens in heated political situations. It should not be surprising. There was no basis, no valid basis for the libel action. They had no case really. The judge's final determination supports that.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I appreciate that, but we're not even there yet. Let's get the background first.

May I assume that this meeting at Brewster took place sometime in early 1961?

Mr. Canwell: I suppose. I could probably pinpoint the date. But it must have been in that period of time.

Mr. Frederick: Do you remember if that transcript was dated? Did they date that?

Mr. Canwell: I don't know, but it probably was.

Mr. Frederick: As I understand the situation, and again I would assume some time in the early part of 1961, Joe Haussler and his campaign manager met with you here in Spokane, and this had to do with your capacity for furnishing research. I would assume the issue would be John Goldmark. Do you recall who Haussler's campaign manager was?

Mr. Canwell: No, I haven't the slightest idea. I know merely from the record, because I don't recall when Joe Haussler came to my office—that they did come to me, as many people did, wanting information. They wanted information that they could use. I was not in the business of supplying that just as a matter of convenience to people, and I'm sure that one of the things that they wanted was damaging information on John Goldmark. I am certain that I provided nothing that they could use. I didn't have anything to hand out in a situation like that.

Mr. Frederick: Was it John Goldmark or were they talking about Sally Goldmark?

Mr. Canwell: John Goldmark and Sally Goldmark were one and the same thing. You could separate them in your mind if you wish, but Sally Goldmark was the agent and John Goldmark was, well, he was the “Trilby.”

Mr. Frederick: It's fully understood that we are talking perspective, and we're talking your opportunity with regard to perspective, but to say that two individuals are one and the same thing, that certainly isn't a legal definition.

Mr. Canwell: It's not a legal definition but it's a factual one.

Mr. Frederick: It's not a spiritual definition.

Mr. Canwell: It's a factual thing. People like that operate as one unit. One may dominate the other and I think that's the case there.

John certainly did not dominate Sally. She wasn't about to be dominated by anybody. So I would say that whatever information they wanted was anything that involved the Goldmarks per se.

Mr. Frederick: I understand that at that meeting you received from Haussler and his campaign manager \$100 apiece for a total of \$200 for the services that you provided.

Mr. Canwell: At this point I wouldn't know. I knew that I received piddling amounts like that from various sources, and I was very happy to get it. But usually it was turned over to the Freedom Library to offset its general expenses.

Mr. Frederick: In July of that year, 1961, Loris Gillespie gave \$200 of American Legion money to Ashley Holden to contribute to the expenses of Ashley Holden and your travels to Washington D.C.

Mr. Canwell: I remember that was the testimony and it never was communicated to me at the time. If Ashley raised any money, Ashley is not a guy to part with any of it. Whatever came his way he sat on.

I remember providing the—I think I provided the transportation funds. I know I did of my own to Washington. And I met Ashley in Washington D.C., I think. I just don't remember. There is so much of that sort of thing. And so many investigations that I was involved in and conducted, that I can't at this point just pinpoint small matters in the thing.

Mr. Frederick: What was the purpose of the trip? Why would you go back there with regard to—if it was the case, explain issues of Sally Goldmark in 1961?

Mr. Canwell: It seems to me because of my recollection of what I did back there, that would have to do with pinning down the information on the Goldmarks; to do investigations that I felt necessary before releasing information to irresponsible people. It's just not the sort of thing I did. There were tag ends of this thing that I needed to investigate and pin down or people I needed to talk to. So I told them before I would proceed beyond the point that I had that I would have to do that. And it cost money. I don't recall that, you know, what the hell, \$200

somebody put up would just take care of your living expenses there one day. But I remember that some funds allegedly were made available, but not to me. Nobody came around and said, "Here's some money to help you do your job."

Mr. Frederick: Did you learn anything new on that trip?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I pinned down some things. I don't remember whether that was the time, but I talked to Ralph de Toledano, for instance, with whom I had considerable contact in the Hiss case and others along that line. I told him what we needed information on. It may have been then or at some other time that Ralph suggested that I might find valuable information out at Accokeek by probing the situation there.

That was part of what I wanted to do. I don't remember when I went out and took pictures of Longview, the house at Accokeek. I did go out there. I did a lot of basic research and questioning.

By that time I believe that I had analyzed the testimony of Sally before the US House committee, and there were things that somewhere there I had to check out as to where this house was. I went out there and I checked the address that she gave, which I'm sure she knew was inaccurate. It was for a vacant lot on which no house had ever existed. Step by step I proceeded to pin down the fact that Sally hadn't broken with the Party. She wasn't telling the truth.

I do remember when Ashley was there. I took him with me for a couple of interviews and one of them was with so-called ex-Communists who had been part of the Perlo/Kramer group. I took him with me to this man's apartment while I interrogated him and his wife. I may have taken Ashley another place. But that's about what our association in Washington D.C. was. I had work to do and you can't do it with some amateur asking questions and fumbling around.

Mr. Frederick: I was going to ask you, was he relatively well-behaved when you had work to do?

Mr. Canwell: Yes. Ashley is an able, a sound reporter. He knows you have to get information. You have to tie it down, and it has to be accurate and so on. But he was, as he always was, just bubbling with excitement. This was an important project and something new to him.

We also attended, seemed to me that we attended a meeting of *Human Events* at that time. I think it was one of their big, annual meetings. It seems to me that was the time that we were back there together.

Mr. Frederick: Now what would that be about? What is the *Human Events*?

Mr. Canwell: *Human Events* is a right-wing publication that is published in Washington D.C. It is a very effective, very powerful publication. Small but potent.

Mr. Frederick: Who's behind that?

Mr. Canwell: At that time—I don't remember the person who founded it—but the one that I was better acquainted with was Tom Winter. He and the news editor were both longtime friends of the family. My daughter went to Washington originally and went to work for *Human Events*. And they had a student program where they trained young people who were interested in newspaper, right-wing newspaper work. She worked for them.

Tom Winter was probably the financial genius who kept the thing going. He got dabbling in real estate and made quite a lot of money. I think he used part of his money to help *Human Events* along. But I think it's probably self-supporting in subscriptions. I could show you a copy if it's here.

Alan Ryskind is the news editor. His father was Morrie Ryskind, who was involved in the hearings in California. He was always a right-wing anti-Communist. He's a humorist. And after his testimony for the US House committee, he found it almost impossible to get work or assignments, like all such people do. But Alan Ryskind is still the news editor and Tom Winter I think is kind of a godfather to the thing. I don't know that he's around there. But that is the publication that put on these seminars and annual meetings. They were very active in supporting the Young Americans for Freedom and such groups.

But it seemed to me that was one of the reasons that we wished to be in Washington at that time. I usually tried to combine things, as I did there with the continuing investigation of the Goldmark situation.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, as I understand in the fall of 1961, Loris Gillespie, Joe Haussler, Stanley Pennington and Loris Gillespie's lawyer met with you here in Spokane.

Mr. Canwell: They came to Spokane as I recall basically on a shopping trip. The Gillespies were providing the transportation, and I think were principally interested in doing some shopping. And this Gillespie did so and at that time someone, I suppose Gillespie, called me to see if I was available for a meeting of these people that he brought with him. I think it was Pennington and Haussler.

Mr. Frederick: That would be a continuation of the previous meetings?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, I wouldn't say it was a continuation of

anything. It was just part of what the action was at that time. These people were all interested in anti-Communist activities. They were mostly also interested in politics. And to forge their interest, I was a prime focal point. So they took every opportunity or advantage they could to exploit their connection with me. That's understandable. They're good people, too. I have no criticism of any of them. I think they're just good run-of-the-mill citizens that took their responsibilities as citizens seriously.

Mr. Frederick: As we have mentioned previously, Joe Haussler was a Democrat and he was staging himself with a support group to run in a Democratic Party primary for, I would assume, the seat of John Goldmark, his House seat. As I understand it, Ashley Holden, through his Tonasket newspaper print shop, printed some 15,000 copies of your *American Intelligence Service* handout. Was that the one that contained the interview?

Mr. Canwell: I believe so. I think they called me about the printing or publication of this, and I think asked if they could put the *American Intelligence Service* head on it. I think at that time I agreed, with certain qualifications that these corrections be made and be a responsible piece of work. I felt that they sort of crossed me up in their enthusiasm. They did things that I knew better than to do. It wasn't done at my behest.

Mr. Frederick: Interestingly, that was paid for by Luke Williams, Spokane Republican Party chair. So now we've got Democrats working at a Democratic campaign. Now we've got Republicans saying that that's not a bad idea. We've got Democrats and Republicans on John Goldmark's case.

Mr. Canwell: That was nothing that I had to do with. I rejected any help from Luke Williams. He volunteered in the Goldmark trial and other places to be helpful and offer assistance and I rejected it out of hand. But whatever—

Mr. Frederick: Who was Luke Williams?

Mr. Canwell: Luke Williams was a local industrialist. He and his brother operated the American Sign and Indicator Company. They're the people that made these reader-board clocks and all that sort of thing, sold them all over the Americas. It was a very successful enterprise. And I think it was founded originally as Williams Brothers Signs by his father, who was just a sign painter. Eric Johnson, a name you may recognize, I think, was involved in it and his Columbia Lighting probably supplying the electronic end of it. But it was a big and successful operation.

Luke volunteered his help. I always want to know when somebody's volunteering whether it's going to help

me or them. I think that any funds that were raised from Luke Williams were raised by Ashley Holden and not by me, nothing that I had anything to do with.

Mr. Frederick: As I understand it, Luke Williams financed the *Citizens Committee Letter*.

Mr. Canwell: The Citizens Committee for what?

Mr. Frederick: The *Citizens Committee*. It was a letter. It was a handout.

Mr. Canwell: Luke sponsored and financed a publication that he hoped would duplicate and phase out my *Vigilante*. To do what the *Vigilante* was so successfully doing with no effort, he wanted to do with might, main, and money. It can't be done that way. But he did put out a publication. He raised money all around the state to do that. But basically it was something that was aimed at duplicating what I did in my spare time, of putting out the *Vigilante*.

Mr. Frederick: And the essence of that handout, *Citizens Committee Letter*, was addressing John Goldmark's tax record with issues of un-Americanism.

Mr. Canwell: I think it's effectiveness was nil, but then that may be a biased opinion. I know that they did raise money all over the state to do this. And I had inquiries about the outfit from Stan Leith at Boeing and other places, whether it was something that I approved of or sponsored. I had to say, no, I had nothing to do with. It seemed to me it was a diversion of business funds that were often raised to be used politically, but were more often used to help the Democrats on the left than it was on the right. And so I was always pretty cool to it.

Mr. Frederick: It sounds like, because I've heard you mention it several times now, that Stan Leith was a nerve center.

Mr. Canwell: He is a power in the security field. I would say he was one of the great men of our time. He worked quietly, but very effectively and efficiently. I think if there is any one person more responsible for making the Boeing Company dominate the skies of the world it was Stan Leith who kept the comrades and the radicals out of the Boeing operation. He did a very nice job of it.

So we worked closely together always. He had queried me about the membership of the League of Americans, I believe that's the group you're talking about. They put out some publication. They called themselves the League of Americans.

But, anyway, whenever somebody or group were

raising funds for supposedly patriotic purposes and tapping the business community, Stan Leith would very likely contact me to ask me what I knew about it. And since that was originating in Spokane, I was a natural.

Mr. Frederick: As the campaign gets underway, as I understand it, January 1962 your *Vigilante*, your publication had an article, "Irma Ringe and the Washington State Legislature." And you were talking about the Victor Perlo study group, and queried rhetorically, and mentioned that her husband favored the admission of Red China into the United Nations, which was parallel to a portion of the Communist Party line.

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember all the particulars about that sort of thing. I know that the issue arose. I was on the side of Free China and the Committee of One Million. That's what the photograph there of Margaret Hurley and Ted Crosby and myself has to do with—the Free China thing, a Committee of One Million. There was a lot of promotion in the right wing at that time to save China and Formosa from the Communists.

Mr. Frederick: Did you liaison with them with regard to the publication, with the *Vigilante*? If I am not mistaken this was the first time in your publications that you have gone public with the Irma Ringe issues.

Mr. Canwell: I think so. I think that the first information published about Irma Ringe was what was titled "An Open Letter to Irma Ringe." And I still think it was a masterpiece.

But, anyway, that was one of the things, the points on which they sued in the Goldmark case. This great Harvard lawyer was asked word by word, and sentence by sentence, and paragraph by paragraph, to point out what was libelous in it. He could not find one point. And then he exploded, "But he's a genius of innuendo!" I felt that was a compliment, too.

But, anyway, that was the first time that I went public and I didn't tell anybody anything prior to that, that I recall. There might have been some little bit of information distributed, but more than likely confidential conversations with somebody might have been then parlayed into a larger field of reception. But not at my intent.

[End of Tape 56, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: Well, Albert, it's kind of difficult to believe that one day an acorn, in January 1962, fell out of the sky and hit you on the head and said, "Gee, maybe I should write something about Irma Ringe today."

Mr. Canwell: No, a combination of circumstances led me to believe that this was the time to dump the load.

I had been very cautious, very careful, and very fair in my treatment of the Goldmarks. Now I had been queried by FBI agents and all kinds of people, Immigration and others who were concerned about the case. So it wasn't just suddenly out of the blue. It was just that I had come to the conclusion that this was the time to fish or cut bait.

Mr. Frederick: Within the scenario that I'm outlining, it may or may not be related, but in March 1962 Herbert Philbrick found himself in Omak at the Omak Legion Hall as a paid speaker by the local American Legion. The gist of his talk was the Communist infiltration, and he took a couple of shots at the American Civil Liberties Union. I think that at that point in time he made his famous, it may have been for the first time, I don't know, but made his famous comment about, "American Liberties Union is not just Red but a dirty Red."

Mr. Canwell: He had over a period of years made similar statements. He was a capable publicist, an advertising man. He understood propaganda. And he understood the ACLU because of his experience inside of the Communist apparatus.

Mr. Frederick: In following these two events then there was the publication release of a second *Vigilante* and the gist of that was that Irma Ringe is a real flesh and blood person and is married to a leading member of the Washington State Legislature. It would be nice some time this week to identify and review those *Vigilantes*.

Mr. Canwell: I think if you analyze those releases of publications you'll find that it was a very expert job and a very fair one. I'd like to be treated as fairly by the people who are after my hide!

Anyway the "Open Letter to Irma Ringe" was, in my opinion, and still is, a masterpiece. And it invited her to come clean without identifying her.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I may be mistaken but I think that was later on within the series.

Mr. Canwell: No, I think the first, I believe the first publication I made about that was the "Irma Ringe and the Washington State Legislature" in the *Vigilante* of January 1962. And then there was a following one that then named her. But in the first publication the only name used was Irma Ringe, which Sally Goldmark knew to be her identification, but nobody else knew.

Mr. Frederick: This is an issue that you and I will have an opportunity to explore, and again I think that we will be in a position to verify this through review of extended copies of the *Vigilante*.

Mr. Canwell: I'd have to go back now and read it, but I believe that it was the way I said, because nobody knew who Irma Ringe was until later in August when I connected it up with Mrs. Goldmark.

Mr. Frederick: The first two *Vigilantes* referred to her as "Irma Ringe," and, as I view it, a subsequent attempt to—the third *Vigilante*, the "Open Letter To Irma Ringe Goldmark," was the first use of "Goldmark."

Mr. Canwell: I'd have to go back and look at it. It was, I thought, handled expeditiously. It gave her an opportunity to know that this information was known, and had been withheld from the public, and that I was in a position to release it anytime I wished. So the ball was in their court. All they had to do was to come forth and say, "Sure, I was in the Communist Party and I got out." But at first they denied it. Then when they were forced to, they began to admit it and alibi and say that she had told all.

Mr. Frederick: In July 1962 John Goldmark announced that he was going to run for re-election and there would be several people running for the two—well, there was only one open seat in the House.

Mr. Canwell: I think so.

Mr. Frederick: So we had John Goldmark, Horace Bozarth—

Mr. Canwell: Bozarth, yes.

Mr. Frederick: Joe Haussler, and there appears to be another individual who was in there.

Mr. Canwell: I don't know. There probably was a Senate seat open at the same time and a House seat. I don't recall. That could be the situation.

Mr. Frederick: And in response to that announcement, Ashley Holden prints on the front page of his *Tonasket Tribune* a response to John Goldmark. With Albert's consent what I would like to do is read several passages from the Dwyer book.

Mr. Canwell: Dwyer's Book is a dishonest piece of work and I would be reluctant to have it quoted any more than I would Vern Countryman, because it gives validity to a bunch of damned lies. And while the part you might be reading might be legitimate, there are too many things in it that are not. So I would not be in favor of that.

I don't want to lend to the respectability of characters like Vern Countryman or Bill Dwyer because they are not entitled to it. So that's just the way the ball bounces.

Mr. Frederick: Within the exhibits that you inherited from that case, do you have a copy of the *Tonasket Tribune*?

Mr. Canwell: Probably.

I should state at this point and for the record that I had absolutely no control over Ashley Holden. I felt at this time that I was completely capable of removing John Goldmark from the Legislature by making public the truth as I knew it. I didn't need this boat-rocking and stuff that got me sued. And so it should be definitely understood that there was never any conspiratorial activity as such.

Mr. Frederick: If this is in reference to a quote from Dwyer's book in reference to Ashley Holden, in particular just what you have said, I don't understand why would you object to that.

Mr. Canwell: I would say that I would have no objection to reading a direct quotation from Ashley Holden's newspaper or wherever it came from. But I would not give any credence or any vehicle for recognition or respectability to Bill Dwyer. Now that's just cold turkey. He's another ACLU agent who volunteered his services for pornographers and others, and should never have gone to the court position that he's in, but he did. But if you want to read from the *Tonasket Tribune* or quotation there, fine, I'll comment on it. But I will not bring Bill Dwyer into this until we get into the Goldmark trial. Then I'll nail his hide to the wall.

[Conversation with tape off.]

Mr. Canwell: Now you want this on tape? Well, on your request to read from Bill Dwyer's book quoting comments, I believe, on Ashley Holden's editorials which were the basis of the plaintiff's complaint against Holden, I see no reason for doing other than going to the best evidence. And the best evidence would be the copy itself, the editorial copy itself or the transcript of the testimony at the trial. It was thoroughly covered.

But Bill Dwyer, twenty years later, is funded to go to Spain and write a book on the Goldmark trial. And this was after the plaintiffs, the Goldmarks, had lost their case and there's court records to support that available to anybody who wants to go to the proper source to get it. So I have no willingness to retry, or enter, or let Bill Dwyer enter complaints about Ashley Holden or Canwell or whatever else he may do in his book. It's an irresponsible piece of work that was written by a lawyer who was trying to win in the court of opinion a case he couldn't win and didn't win in court.

So like my objection to quoting from Vern Countryman, I do not wish to lend respectability in any sense to either one of these people by quoting from their writings.

Whatever validity there might be to a paragraph here and there in their writings, in general they're false. And I do not wish to be a party to or victim of that sort of maneuver.

Bill Dwyer is, as I said, just another ACLU shyster. And the fact is that he was aided and abetted in gaining a seat on the federal bench, again by an ACLUer, Republican Slade Gorton, who would not submit a name of anyone else to the president for consideration. I just don't want to aid and abet that sort of monkey business.

It's the sort of thing that has penetrated the judicial system disastrously. Ordinarily, had these complaints against Holden, had they been something stated in a Communist publication and the publication was sued for libel, the entire ACLU would be out there defending their right to say these things—claiming their constitutional right to free speech and to a free press, and all of that sort of thing. Suddenly the whole ACLU device is out in a legal terrorist campaign to get at anti-Communists such as Holden and Canwell and others. And that's what it is. It's legal terrorism applied by these people. And they had been corrupting the judicial system by placing their people over and over in court positions, state and federal and even on the Supreme Court.

So if we are going to go into that at all, I want to go into it on the factual basis of disclosing what they're doing and what I think about it, not what they think of the thing after they lost a very expensive trial in which they put the defendants to enormous expense and inconvenience to defend themselves against frivolous charges that never should have gotten into court. It was tried in their county where they knew everybody and in selecting a jury they could get a no-lose jury. And they started out with the same type of judge.

So I'm not going to be a party in any way to lending respectability to Bill Dwyer or his utterances.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I appreciate that. What I don't understand is, if Bill Dwyer was quoted, how do *you* lend respectability when you would have an opportunity to comment on what he said?

Mr. Canwell: In what is understood essentially to be an interview of Canwell, I see no reason for quoting from publications written by his avowed enemy. And that includes such men as Vern Countryman and Bill Dwyer. It indicates—if I answer their charges in our interview here, it lends an amount of respectability to people who are not entitled to it. And I do not wish them to carry this thing on using me as a vehicle for trying to recover their losses.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, as I understand the situation at this point in time, what we are attempting to determine is the essence of what Ashley wrote.

Mr. Canwell: I don't think that it is proper that we go into that here. That was very thoroughly handled in court. There was extensive testimony taken, and the court held in the final decision that what he said was constitutionally protected.

And if it was unduly vigorous or robust, I don't think that is something that we should try to decide here in this interview. I said yesterday, I don't know whether we were on tape, that his manner of handling such things and mine are different. It doesn't make him wrong.

I approached the Goldmark thing in a different way. With facts and evidence and their own testimony and that sort of thing. I didn't make any blanket charges. But I do not deny the right of a newspaper editor to do so. Then if called to account, the court and the jury must decide whether that person was constitutionally within bounds or not. And in this case the court held that he was. So I don't see any reason for reading Bill Dwyer's whining and his complaints after he lost the case.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, at this point in time with regard to what Ashley Holden said in his newspaper when John Goldmark announced that he was going to run for re-election, do you recall if Ashley wrote that John was running on a Democratic Party platform that wanted to abolish or repeal the McCarran Act, which was an act that required the registration of Communists?

Mr. Canwell: I don't recall. I recall the highlights of some of the things that were bandied about in the plaintiffs' complaint. There were minor errors that obviously were not deliberate and didn't make any difference, such as stating that Reed College was the only college that invited Gus Hall to speak. It proved to be a mistake. It didn't make any difference one way or another. But the fact is that Reed College did bring Gus Hall there to speak to the students and that was the meat of the thing.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, in what context was Reed College raised in that article?

Mr. Canwell: Reed College has a long and consistent history of left-wing activity. I am not prepared, without going back into my notes and files on Reed College, to pinpoint everything that they did. But in general it has always supported the Communist left wing, far left position. Ben Kizer was on their board. But there were people like that. The man who eventually or at one time owned the *Portland Oregonian* again carried such policies. But Reed College is and has been always far on the left.

Mr. Frederick: I hear what you say. But John Goldmark attended schools on the East Coast. He didn't attend schools on the West Coast.

Mr. Canwell: I think the import of Ashley Holden's statement was that he was trying to indicate the thinking or the general activity of John Goldmark, and the fact that he sent his son to Reed College was just another thing that Ashley felt indicated that his sympathies were on the far left. Other than that, I don't know what significance it has.

But as I said before, I'm not going to retry the Goldmark case. They lost it and other than commenting on it or what they were doing, I do not intend to let Bill Dwyer retry the case in the court of public opinion. They had their opportunities to retry the case and they decided not to. They paid up and got out.

I'm not going to go to great lengths to defend Ashley Holden. He's a very able newsman, one of the best known and most capable newsmen in the State of Washington and a very able man. He knows his business. And I'm not about to condemn the way he conducts it. My saying that his manner of handling of some news items and mine are different doesn't make me right and him wrong. And I don't in any way intend to demean or criticize Ashley Holden; he's a great American. And he has done a courageous job. He was one of those who wasn't afraid to take after this Goldmark situation. I know a lot of people who were questioning John Goldmark's activities and coming to me asking about it but they didn't have the courage to do what Ashley Holden did.

Mr. Frederick: We're still focusing on mid-summer 1962 and as I understand the situation, sometime during that summer, mid-summer, your taped interview was being passed around through various homes within the community. Were you aware of that?

Mr. Canwell: No, I had no knowledge of the extent to which this tape was used. I had no way of knowing what the priest Emmett Buckley was doing. But he was one of those who took it around and made it possible for people to hear the tape recording. But I had no knowledge at all of the extent that was being done. I wouldn't have objected had I known.

Mr. Frederick: Do you know if Loris Gillespie was also passing that tape around?

Mr. Canwell: I don't believe he was. Loris was just a person who was enormously busy in his various business enterprises, and if he did so I have no knowledge of it, and I don't think anything appeared in testimony in the trial that he had done so.

Mr. Frederick: At approximately—at that time, that summer, there was a copy of your *American Intelligence Service* flier broadsheet that was circulating. And as I understand it there was a review of the American Civil

Liberties Union, some of Goldmark's past and the world Communist apparatus.

Mr. Canwell: I'm not aware of anything that was distributed under the title of *The American Intelligence Service*. However, I did distribute some copies of the *Vigilante* and there may have been material such as you're thinking about there. I don't know just what you are alluding to.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I believe that what you're referring to was a second edition that appeared in August. Appeared in that fall which would have the transcript of the interview.

Mr. Canwell: Again the best evidence in this would be the actual copies of the *Vigilante* which I think I could come up with. I don't know that at this precise moment I can supply them. But I think that what was written and distributed using the *Vigilante* as the vehicle, the *Vigilante* would be the best evidence. And I think it is available.

[End of Tape 56, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Albert, as I understand it, on August 23, 1962, in Okanogan County, at an American Legion Hall, there was a gathering. Could you background that for us?

Mr. Canwell: This was, as I remember it, an official Legion meeting—a district meeting of some kind of the American Legion and their various clubs in the area. I had been invited to address that meeting, or convention, whatever it might be. Probably in the introduction here of the various people, they would tell what it is. But in my recollection it was just a regional meeting of the American Legion and their officers and members.

Mr. Frederick: Who was in attendance of note?

Mr. Canwell: I would say that they were Legionnaires. There may have been some members of the press, the radio, or that sort of thing. But as to who all were in attendance, I don't know. John Goldmark and Web Hallauer had been invited to rebut the speech. But it had been made quite clear to them that it would not be a matter of a political harangue.

I remember John Goldmark being there and addressing the group. Then Web Hallauer. John Goldmark gave, I thought, a very presentable talk, very brief as it was supposed to be. Web Hallauer attempted to just take the meeting over, and that was his mistake. I think that probably had as much to do with the people in the Okanogan knowing about the whole issue as any other one thing. I think my speech would have come and gone and that would have been all there was to it, but Web tried to

create a disturbance and had to be thrown off the stage. I think there's a news item there to that effect.

Mr. Frederick: The subject of your talk?

Mr. Canwell: The subject of my talk was to be the American Civil Liberties Union.

Mr. Frederick: And why at that point in time would you talk about the American Civil Liberties Union?

Mr. Canwell: I talked about the American Civil Liberties Union wherever I had an opportunity. In this case the Legion had asked me what subject I wished to cover and I suggested that I would speak on the American Civil Liberties Union.

Mr. Frederick: And we can assume that Loris Gillespie organized this gathering?

Mr. Canwell: No, I don't know that he did. To assume that would be something that I think would be inaccurate or presumptuous. I don't know how these Legion people set up their district meetings. I know they have a lot of them, and how they do it; what part Loris Gillespie had in it, I don't know. I'm sure he was an important person in that American Legion general district, because he was, I think, Americanism chairman. I suppose that he was instrumental in persuading them that he could get Canwell as a speaker.

Mr. Frederick: And he did serve as the master of ceremonies, or the official host?

Mr. Canwell: He served in some such capacity. I'm trying to think of whether he was actually the chairman—I don't think he was. I think—it says on the transcript here—"Mr. Morrell," but I think it was Mr. Morrow. I didn't know any of these people real well. I knew Loris Gillespie slightly, and I had at times met some of the others, but I had no intimate acquaintance with them.

Mr. Frederick: This was not a continuation with regard to theme, because in the July 1962 Ashley Holden article in response to John Goldmark's announcement, he did mention that John Goldmark was a member of the American Civil Liberties Union and went on to talk about that it was closely affiliated with the Communist movement.

Ashley was mistaken when he said, and verify this or correct me if I'm incorrect here, that the California Un-American Activities Committee deemed or ruled that the American Civil Liberties Union was a Communist front. I recall that Ashley mentioned that. Wasn't that a misstatement though?

Mr. Canwell: No, that was a factual statement if he made it. I didn't know that he had. But the California Un-American Activities Committee, I believe in their fourth report, made a very definite pronouncement that the American Civil Liberties was a Communist front.

Mr. Frederick: Was that retracted at some point in time?

Mr. Canwell: No, somebody in California did attempt—I'd have to go back and find out who that was, but there was somebody who tried to retract that, or tried to make it appear other than it was. I do have the records of it, but I don't have it at my fingertips. But there was no effective retraction of the California Committee's finding that the American Civil Liberties Union was a Communist front, that the majority of its activities had to do with defending Communists, at least in their jurisdiction.

Mr. Frederick: This morning we're going to have the opportunity to hear in Albert's own words, a transcript of his speech, in terms of him reading that transcript and we'll be going back, in essence, to August 23, 1962.

Mr. Canwell: I was introduced at the Legion meeting by, I believe, Nelson Morrow. That's my best recollection of his name.

I was duly introduced and it was mentioned that I'd come from Spokane accompanied by my oldest son, Marshall.

The chairman said, "It is a privilege and an honor to introduce to you Mr. Canwell from Spokane who will speak to you on the American Civil Liberties Union. I give you Mr. Canwell."^{*}

Mr. Frederick: Albert, as I understand the situation there was an opportunity afforded John Goldmark to speak, which he did, and if I'm not mistaken it was in reference to the American Civil Liberties Union. And someplace along the line Web Hallauer also came to the podium and had an opportunity to speak.

Dispersed within that, was the opportunity—the call for questions from the audience—and there were several individuals who did ask questions. One of them being Ashley Holden, who asked you to comment on his statement that there were some hundred and forty-five members of the Washington State Legislature, and that two of those members were associated with the American Civil Liberties Union, and they were both from Okanogan County.

Now did he ask if they were on the board of directors or advisory councils of the American Civil Liberties Unions?

Mr. Canwell: Part of the question here. It was Mr. Holden and I'm quoting him: "Mr. Chairman, I'm Ashley Holden. I believe there are some hundred and forty-five members of the Washington State Legislature. Can you tell me why the only two members who are on the Washington committee of the ACLU are from Okanogan County?"

I would suppose that he was attempting to emphasize the fact that these two members of the Legislature were from Okanogan County. And, of course, it probably was what he was interested in. My answer was, it's a coincidence, and I don't believe in coincidences, and I don't know. I don't think that answers that any more than why there is a state member on the national board, Mr. Kizer. I don't know how they select their people. That was my answer. And I'm sure that he was trying to bring out anything that he could that would impress on the minds of the audience that these two members of the Legislature are members of the ACLU and they were from Okanogan County.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, as I understand the situation there was a copy of the Washington State American Civil Liberties Union letterhead that was passed out during that gathering.[†] Was that before you spoke? Or during, or after? When did that occur?

Mr. Canwell: I don't know. These people, the Legion group, had a dinner or something. I don't think I attended that. But some of these things were passed out at this dinner, I believe. So I just don't know.

I remember the sheet that had an overprint on it of "Who's who in the ACLU." But it was an official ACLU letterhead showing their officers and whatnot.

Mr. Frederick: I would assume that John Goldmark's name would have appeared on that?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I'm sure it did. And also Web Hallauer's.

I wish I had one of those. I'm sure that somewhere I have one but I wish I could find it. It would be very appropriate at this time.

Mr. Frederick: Was there any other function conducted that night within that hall, before it was adjourned?

Mr. Canwell: They had an official meeting I believe, which is sort of routine and a thing they do.

I don't believe that I attended the dinner. I think that was an official Legion affair. I was not a Legionnaire. I was brought in as a guest speaker. I don't think that they

^{*} At this point in the interview, Mr. Canwell read his speech. That text can be found in Appendix H.

[†] For an example of the ACLU's 1962 letterhead, see Appendix I.

fed me. I may have been on a tight schedule and not arrived in time for dinner or maybe I wasn't invited to it.

Mr. Frederick: As I understand the situation Loris Gillespie in the closing of the meeting reminded the gathered that there would be an election soon and that they should do their duty. He included in that a phrase somewhere, to vote, you should vote and vote American or pro-American or something to that effect.

Mr. Canwell: I don't know, I don't recall it. I may have even left by that time.

One should probably remember, and I think I mentioned it in my talk, that the Legion for years and years had tried to get a congressional investigation of the ACLU. This wasn't something that was new to the Legion. But to what degree someone like Gillespie wanted to reap any political benefits I don't know. He firmly stated that the meeting was not political and no political speeches would be made. And I think that was the basis for bouncing Hallauer, he insisted on making it political and stating that's what it was. I think he was entitled to his opinion. There were undoubtedly Legionnaires there who wanted to get rid of Goldmark. But I'm sure that there must have been Legionnaires who were supporters of his. I don't know, I had nothing to do with setting the meeting up. I came there on the invitation to speak to them and an agreement that I would, and that I'd talk on the ACLU.

Incidentally I was not speaking from a script. I was just talking off the cuff there. It sounds like it, of course. I probably should have prepared a written speech, but I didn't. It was another one of these things where I just am too crowded for time to do the kind of job that I should do.

But I had, I mentioned there, I read the letters, pro-ACLU, letters that they were using widely. The ones from Truman, Eisenhower, and others. And I had obtained those from the, I believe, the Washington D.C. office of the ACLU. I went in and conned the girl there into giving me this material. I also told her I was writing, doing some articles on the ACLU and I said I had "lots of pro-ACLU materials, doesn't anybody ever get mad at you?" So she fished around and gave me a whole stack of complaints and denials. For instance, denials from, I think it was Eisenhower, and, I don't know, two or three of them had written in and objected to their use of a statement. And in Eisenhower's case I think somebody wrote this glowing thing and put it in the stack of things for him to sign and he signed it. I don't know that he wouldn't have signed it if he read it but I doubt that he did.

In questions from the audience at the speech at Okanogan, someone made comment about Alger Hiss and then he stated, "Isn't it true that J. Edgar Hoover and

Richard Nixon had made complimentary statements about the ACLU?" Now, failing to have those specific statements, I will not comment on them. There is one point in logic: You can never prove that somebody didn't say something, you can only prove that they did. And if somebody had the precise statement, then I would know whether it was out of context. And if you want to mail it to me, then I'd be glad to give you my opinion on it. I know of no statement by either one.

Mr. Hoover has remained very aloof from endorsing or criticizing organizations which have not been cited and listed by the attorney general. He is very scrupulous in that manner. And I would be very surprised if he made any statement, "clearing," lauding, or criticizing the ACLU. What Dick Nixon may have done I don't know. I've never recalled his having done so. I have followed his history very closely and I know him well, but if you will send me documentary proof of what you state I'll be glad to reply to it. "And thank you, ladies and gentlemen. This has been a very pleasant evening."

And somebody jumped up and asked a question. "I've heard it said that you're employed by the Washington Water Power Company." This gentleman asked the question. And a statement.

I replied, "Well, as I commented earlier the gentleman says he has heard it said that I am employed by the Washington Water Power Company. Well, let me tell you. I've tried to pry money out of that bunch and it just can't be done. I wish they'd put me on their payroll or something or subsidize me in some way. I could use it. But it isn't true. They did send a planeload of hundred-dollar-a-plate diners over to a politician's dinner in Seattle recently, and he wasn't even in my political party. But they haven't given me anything. And I went to them looking for some. So you can set the record straight on that."

And then comes the question from Mr. Holden from the audience. He says, "Mr. Chairman, I am Ashley Holden. I believe there are some one hundred and forty-five members of the Washington State Legislature. Can you tell me why there are only two members on the board in the Legislature who are on the Washington Committee of the ACLU? And that these two are from Okanogan County?"

Mr. Frederick: Albert, as I understand it, sometime during that meeting before, during, or after, copies of your *Vigilante* document were passed out also in that room. Do you recall that?

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember that that was part of what happened. There might have been copies of the *Vigilante* there but I don't think that up to that time I had opened up on the Goldmarks. Perhaps you have the date of the speech at Okanogan. I think it's probably here.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, that was August 23, 1962.

Mr. Canwell: I see. All right, we'll take it for granted that this *Vigilante* might have been available at that meeting at Okanogan. The date of publication on this *Vigilante* was August 1962 and it was Volume 1 and Number 7. However, Volume 1, Number 4, which initiated the expose of Irma Ringe, came out in January 1962, months before primary-election campaigns had begun. And the dates were not always too accurate, because sometimes they went to press and then we went and did something else. But I would say that is approximate and it may have been at the speech in Okanogan.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, would you describe the cover of that document?

Mr. Canwell: On the cover of—the title of this publication is *Vigilante*. And usually we or I devoted the front cover to perhaps a picture of some pertinent character, pertinent to the subject in the publication. It was a small publication. We did not waste a lot of words or space. We didn't have it to use. Anyway, on the cover of this one there is a picture of Ben Kizer of Spokane. The title or headline on the page says "Ben Kizer, Spokane Enigma" and then below that there is a line that says, "Open letter to Irma Ringe Goldmark."

The open letter to Irma Ringe Goldmark followed an invitation to her to come forth and identify herself and tell her story. I ran this open letter to Irma Ringe Goldmark, Okanogan, Washington;

Dear Mrs. Goldmark....

(And I might interject here that this is one of the items that the plaintiffs, the Goldmarks, sued on. I'll read the letter.)

Dear Mrs. Goldmark,

As one of the editors of *Vigilante*, I have taken the responsibility for laying before the people of the First Legislative District some of the facts relating to your one-time membership in the Communist Party.

This I felt to be my duty as a citizen since you and your husband, due to his membership in the Washington State Legislature, are influential in shaping the legislative future of our state and hence can influence both our economic stability and our physical security for good or ill.

Your now-known former membership in the Communist Party was a secret carefully kept from the electorate and hence they had no way of appraising your words and actions in the light of your past. I believe it proper on my part, having knowledge concerning the tactics of the Communist apparatus to ask if the Communist Party, knowing your secret, attempted any pressures to accomplish a left-of-center result in the Washington State legislation in recent years, or solicited your

support for participation in a Communist Party program to oppose the House Committee on Un-American Activities and its official report, *Operation Abolition*.

The public record is bare of any revelation by you as a former member of an important Communist group in the nation's capital containing such notorious Communists as Victor Perlo and Charles Kramer, which might conceivably guide others in avoiding the pitfalls prepared for us by the Communists both inside and outside of government.

Repentant Communists such as Whittaker Chambers and Elizabeth Bentley made full and complete public disclosures under oath before committees of the Congress. Disclosures which undoubtedly helped to set back the Soviet timetable for takeover of the United States.

Could you not in the light of your experience in the Communist Party be a compelling witness before the people of your state and district concerning the danger from within posed by penetration of government service by agents of the Kremlin?

The story is being circulated, I hope not at your instigation, that you were an undercover agent of the FBI while you were in the Communist Party. From information in my possession I am forced to the belief that you were not acting for, nor in cooperation with the FBI, while you were a member of the Communist Party. If my information is inaccurate I feel that you should publicly set the record straight.

Another suggestion that I feel impelled to make is that you request that the House Un-American Activities Committee make public the testimony which you gave in executive session before a subcommittee of that committee. I am certain that no information was divulged which by this disclosure might in any manner benefit the Communist Party. In fact, I am reasonably certain that no pertinent information was divulged to the committee regarding the Perlo Group which was not already known to the House committee and to the Justice Department. If I am in error in this matter I shall appreciate any facts and particulars which have thus far escaped me in the examination of the case histories of the Ware and Perlo Groups.

The life and death struggle between free men and Communism continues. The time available to us is obviously short. Why not make common cause with the outspoken anti-Communists in their fight to keep America safe and free?

Sincerely,
A.F. Canwell

[End of Tape 58, Side 1]

Mr. Canwell: It might be of interest for me to again comment here on the fact that this open letter to Irma Ringe was one of the matters sued on by the plaintiffs, the Goldmarks. In an examination of John Goldmark on the stand under oath in the Goldmark trial, Mr. Harmon, counsel for the defendants, read the entire "Letter to Irma Ringe Goldmark," to John Goldmark, who was the prin-

cial plaintiff in the libel action. He read the letter line by line and sentence by sentence and paragraph by paragraph, after each sentence asking John Goldmark, the brilliant Harvard lawyer who had sued on this piece of publication, asked him what therein was something libelous. He asked him line by line and paragraph by paragraph to point out anything libelous in that letter. Mr. Goldmark was unable to do so. In fact he exploded at the end of the thing and said, "Well! No there was nothing libelous," but that I was a master of innuendo.

The reader and listener may judge for himself whether this is a matter of innuendo or whether it's a forthright invitation to someone who is a member of a high-level Communist spy ring to come clean and tell their story. And I still stand on that. I think it was a pretty good piece of work. Pretty fair, too.

I could have identified her as a member of the Perlo/Kramer group very early. I knew that for years but did not do so. I gave her every chance to come out and tell her story. But she didn't do it, like Bentley and Whittaker Chambers and many, many others who broke with the party and aided and helped their government as best they could. She was not one of those.

Mr. Frederick: Following the August 23 Legion Hall meeting, Ashley Holden published in his *Tonasket Tribune* a story titled "Commie Front Exposed by Al Canwell in Legion Talk." And within that same issue Ashley wrote an editorial entitled, "Catching Up With John," which, Albert, if I'm not mistaken, was one of the centerpieces with regard to the plaintiffs' filing libel.

Mr. Canwell: It was one of the items sued upon. It was a means of bringing Ashley Holden into the libel action. I should state at this point at no time and no place was I in collaboration with Ashley Holden on such material. That was entirely within his legitimate field of activity, and done according to his own discretion. It was not something that I advised on or was asked about, or anything else. He used the meeting, the Legion meeting in Okanogan as the basis for a story. Any reporter could and would do that. And then his editorializing was a matter of editorial opinion, which again is constitutionally protected—the court so held in reversing the verdict of the jury that the things sued upon were constitutionally protected. I had nothing whatever to do with that other than being a speaker at a meeting that Ashley Holden attended. I think he was an enthusiastic listener.

Mr. Frederick: To paraphrase, it was fairly strong language that he used, in that he accused him of a left-wing voting record that was socializing this area, which contributed to the movement of turning it into a welfare state.

Mr. Canwell: That matter was thoroughly probed in the

Goldmark trial; Dwyer and Mansfield, I think, both dug into that. And I think Holden properly answered the thing. He stood by his statements and professed, of course, the right to such opinions and to the stating of such opinions. Again I had nothing to do with that. The rigging up of a conspiracy was a flimsy, fraudulent thing to enable them to get into court in an area where they were reasonably certain they could find a friendly judge and a friendly jury. But what Holden wrote or said was of his own doing and subsequently the court upheld his right to do it. So I don't know what the issue at this point might be.

Mr. Frederick: To continue to paraphrase within that editorial, he mentioned that he believed that John Goldmark deceived the people by concealing his true political philosophies, and he was a tool of a monstrous conspiracy to remake America into a totalitarian state which would throttle freedom and crush individual initiative. That's pretty strong language, Albert.

Mr. Canwell: It is strong language. He's that sort of a person. He's a sort of "Sagebrush Tom Paine." He expressed vigorous opinions. Expressed them vigorously. He's that sort of a writer and thinker. I had nothing to do with his thought processes. That was his problem, and it was used as a vehicle to bring him into a libel action that was designed to punish and silence people like Holden and Canwell, and anybody who opposed the Communist device. So I have no criticism of Holden's strong language. It isn't the way I'd write it, but I'm not Holden. And I wasn't the publisher of the paper there either.

Mr. Frederick: Are you sympathetic with that type of rhetoric that Ashley used with regard to John Goldmark?

Mr. Canwell: Am I sympathetic to it?

Mr. Frederick: "A tool of a monstrous conspiracy."

Mr. Canwell: I think that is a penetrating analysis of what the guy was doing up there. He left Harvard University. Went down to the spy nest in Accokeek, Maryland. Took up residence there and then eventually came out to the Pacific Northwest.

The fact that he was an explosives expert, settled down next door to the Coulee Dam, was disconcerting to some people. Didn't bother me. I didn't think that was what they had in mind. But anyway, I can see where an editor in the heart of that country with this man and his wife penetrating the area and propagandizing for the Left in general, and his legislative actions being such that anyone, at least any conservative, would oppose his tax program, I have no quarrel with Ashley's vigorous and dynamic opposition to this. It took courage to write some-

thing like that. And you ask if I'm in sympathy, I can't say that I'm in sympathy or not in sympathy. It just isn't the way I write my material.

If you were listening to this "Open Letter to Irma Ringe," I don't get very bombastic there but I got my message over. Ashley Holden is a more bombastic character. He followed the line of people of that editorial bent. Westbrook Pegler and others didn't pull their punches on these things. So it's not a question of lacking sympathy for him. It's probably lacking courage on my part to do that sort of thing.

Mr. Frederick: One of the next issues that was also cited within that case, the Goldmark case, was the Don Caron article in the *Okanogan Independent*, where several days before the election he wrote a book review entitled "And Not a Shot Was Fired," which claims that the Communists took over Czechoslovakia by infiltrating their parliament. And that we as American citizens have to be very much aware of parties or influences who may be—

Mr. Canwell: I remember that, now that you mentioned it, that happened. It wasn't serious enough, I guess, to have them carry it through in the libel action. I think they dropped Don Caron from the suit. I don't think that there was much meat and potatoes in what he wrote. It was just a good anti-Communist line and he had taken that up. And I think he was voicing mostly his church position on Communism at that time. But I did not know.

I did not know Don Caron at that time. I think that he had come into the, or his wife or somebody had come into the Freedom Library. I just don't know. I don't think that I had personally met him at that time. If I had it was just some casual thing. I had no close relationship with him. I think somebody gave his wife a bunch of our publications to distribute. And I think maybe she did distribute some of them. But it's too vague in my memory at this time to factually comment on it.

But Don Caron was not an intimate of mine or my operation. He probably sought information or material from that source but that is all that I know about it.

Mr. Frederick: He mentioned that, with regard to the potential of Communists within the state Legislature, one method to take over is to send agents into rural areas to seek election.

Mr. Canwell: I think that probably is a very restrained statement. I don't know how much information he had, but the year before I went to the Legislature there were at least twenty known members of the Communist Party in the Washington State Legislature. So I'd say that it's a subject that a person might dwell on a little and wonder what they're doing there. And if you look at what they did it's self-explanatory. So if he saw them creeping into

legislative bodies in Czechoslovakia, I don't know. At this point I don't know what I knew about it then. But he didn't get his information from me.

Mr. Frederick: Then the last item of issue was the passing out via unmarked envelopes, the copies of the *American Intelligence Service* with the interview with Canwell. And if I'm not mistaken that was also cited within the—

Mr. Canwell: If such a thing happened, it's nothing I remember. Nothing that I was a party to. As I stated before I did not print up the interview with Al Canwell that was distributed by Father Emmett Buckley and others.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, as I understand it the Goldmarks filed charges in September 1962. When did you first hear of those charges?

Mr. Canwell: Probably within that same week. The reason I think I knew about it, I had been invited to speak to the, either the Pro America or Women's Republican Club or some such women's organization at Tacoma. And the appointment had been firmed up and then the news broke that I was being sued for libel. And these gals, of course, were very nervous. They didn't want me to come to their meeting and get them in a libel suit. It was kind of humorous.

At that point I was supposed to talk about Senator Magnuson, he was the subject of my talk. So it must have been the Women's Republican Club. Whatever it was, they invited me and these good old gals were really afraid that I was going to say something that they could be sued on. I facetiously told them that "it would be impossible to libel Warren Magnuson. You know there is nothing you could say that is as bad as the truth." But I said I wouldn't say anything libelous. I'd be careful on that. So finally they decided to go ahead with it and I appeared there.

Then I ripped the shingles off of Magnuson. Everything I had, and I had documentary proof. I think by the end of the meeting there wasn't a dry seat in the house. They were really worried!

But I knew then the laws of libel, and I know them now. And I was not saying anything dangerously libelous about Warren Magnuson. As I told them, there wasn't any way to do that. You couldn't say anything about Warren Magnuson that was as bad as the truth.

So that was one of the funny sidelights. And when I heard about the case it must have been about, well, probably several days after the suit was filed.

Mr. Frederick: And those papers were served to you here in Spokane?

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember that. I suppose so. I just don't remember where the process serving occurred. I suppose it was here.

Mr. Frederick: What was your first response? What did you do when you got that paper?

Mr. Canwell: I certainly didn't shake apart. I wasn't concerned. I didn't think they had any libel action or anything to properly sue on. So I wasn't concerned about that. And need not have been. They did not have a valid libel case. You couldn't have gotten into court in a legitimate court, but they had a friendly judge over there who would have done anything for them. And then admitted it to trial. And we had him removed, but too late to stop that phase of the case.

Mr. Frederick: And whom are you referring to?

Mr. Canwell: Trying to think of the judge there. I just don't remember his name. He was a local judge. Not Wicks. The one I think who probably took Judge Wicks' place when he retired.

Mr. Frederick: Did you meet with the co-defendants with regard to the issue of retaining attorneys or did you initiate that on your own? How did that come about?

Mr. Canwell: There was some preliminary discussion and worrying. I think that Holden and Gillespie wanted to employ two local attorneys there in Okanogan or Omak. I've even temporarily forgotten their names. They were good people, but I didn't feel they were competent to defend us in a suit that obviously was being framed up by the ACLU and their attorneys. And so I suggested to the other defendants that we seek to employ Glenn Harmon of the firm of Witherspoon, Kelley, Davenport & Toole. Anyway, Glenn was already a considerable figure in the libel field. And I felt that he was very competent on the law in regard to that. So we proceeded in that direction and Gillespie and Holden agreed that it would be better if we had Harmon than if we had those two local attorneys. I think one of their names was Kelly but I don't remember for sure. They were good people but not competent to go to bat in a big league libel action like this.

Mr. Frederick: Was Glenn Harmon the chief counsel?

Mr. Canwell: Yes.

Mr. Frederick: And who was Ned W. Kimball, and how was he introduced to the defense team?

Mr. Canwell: Ned Kimball, an attorney, I think at Wa-

terville. Quite an able man, but he was employed by the Birch Society who did not wish to be associated in the defense with the other defendants. I believe that he was hired by the Birch Society largely to defend Caron. He was not our problem. He was an able attorney, but we did not select him for that assignment.

Mr. Frederick: Once Don Caron and the John Birch Society were dropped from that suit did attorney Kimball stay on site?

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember that he did. But he may have been there to wind up whatever business he had with the court and whatnot. I just don't know that either. I would not have been opposed to that except that we had more expenses than we could handle as it was. And I believe Welch paid Kimball's fee, but I'm not certain.

Mr. Frederick: How did retired Superior Court Justice Joseph Wicks find himself on that defense team?

Mr. Canwell: I think that there was considerable pressure put on. I won't say pressure, but wish, on the part of Gillespie and Holden to employ Wicks. I think that they mistakenly felt that because he was local and known to everybody that he would be of value to the committee. Which was a mistake. That again was not my doing. But I went along with it or literally had to. I didn't want to start any brawls over something that at that point didn't make any difference to me.

The thing I was trying to figure out is how we got into this suit. I was going to come out with my shirt.

Mr. Frederick: What was your opinion of those three gentlemen as practitioners of law?

Mr. Canwell: You mean on the defense? I would say that Glenn Harmon was a very, very able attorney. He had a fortunate background in that he had been a newspaper reporter, and I believe while he was going to school at Gonzaga Law School he was working for the *Spokane Chronicle*. And so he had a very desirable background but he has a good legal mind. He's a quick learner.

I felt that he knew nothing about Communism per se, and I had to give him a crash course actually. But he was a quick learner and I thought he did a very good job within the framework of what was possible. And libel was his specialty and the law firm of Witherspoon, Kelley, Davenport and so on was on a retainer for the *Spokesman Review & Chronicle* to help them in any libel situation or whatever legal matters they needed along the editorial line. So I didn't think it was a bad selection to have their attorney.

The getting of Harmon and that law firm was strictly of my doing, and the others went along with my logic in

it. I still think that was the right course at the time.

Mr. Frederick: What was your impression of Ned Kimball?

Mr. Canwell: Ned Kimball I felt was a very able man, sincere.

[End of Tape 58, Side 2]

Mr. Canwell: We were discussing attorneys and Ned Kimball in particular. I think you asked my opinion of him.

I thought he was a very fine person, a forthright, decent individual and a quite competent attorney. I believe he also was a Bircher, a member of the Birch Society, and I think that Caron and the Birch Society were instrumental in getting him to represent the Birch Society's position in this lawsuit.

Mr. Frederick: And it appears that they were successful because Don Caron and the Birch Society were dropped from that suit. And that would have to be in the preliminary negotiations and back and forth.

Mr. Canwell: Therein hangs a tale. Unknown to most everybody, but probably well-known to the Birch Society, Robert Welch was a long time member of the American Civil Liberties Union. Therefore, I can see why they, in the initial lawsuit, for window dressing, because it would be impressive, would name the Birch Society and Caron and then drop him, accomplishing their propaganda purpose without in any way injuring Welch and his employee. But that was a thing that was not generally known to the Birch Society and members in general, that Robert Welch was a member of the American Civil Liberties Union. Also the League for Industrial Democracy, which incidentally was another real stenchful organization.

Mr. Frederick: What was your opinion of Joseph Wicks?

Mr. Canwell: He was a person who I had known indifferently over the years, and personally I liked him. But it would not have been my selection to make him a defendants' counsel. And I think that Ashley Holden and Loris Gillespie, because they knew him personally and knew that he was quite a colorful character, favored employing him on our defense counsel. I knew things that maybe they didn't, that during the construction of Coulee Dam a great many people throughout the Okanogan found employment on the dam and many of them are, well, Indians and others, they would end up sometimes in legal problems where they were sued for bills and things, and Wicks

as an attorney had acted more or less as a collection attorney. So he was very thoroughly hated by a lot of people. And that was not known in general to people like Holden and Gillespie.

But the selection of Wicks was finalized, I believe, while I was out of town. I was in California trying to run down some phases of the Goldmark case. I went down there, among other things, to talk to the FBI agent who had been in charge of investigating the Goldmarks in the Okanogan area. He had been transferred to, as I recall, Auburn, California. And while I had met him previously, I wanted to interrogate him. And if he were out of the bureau, get him to testify. But he was still in the bureau and was unable or unwilling to do so.

So during that time I think the placement of Wicks on the legal staff was finalized. In such matters other than getting Harmon, who I felt was competent and necessary for us, I didn't wish to oppose the wishes of Gillespie too much in the thing because we knew that he was the only one of the group who could afford to pay for these characters. So we kind of wanted to let him have his way sometimes.

Mr. Frederick: Would it be appropriate to state that Joseph Wicks with regard to practicing law within a courtroom as an attorney could be referred to as a colorful individual?

Mr. Canwell: I would say he was colorful. And back in the past century he would have been the type of orator who would have been quite acceptable. He was very dramatic and he shouted and jumped a lot. Not my style anyway. But he did his thing in one of the cases there questioning Sally Goldmark, which I felt he overdid.

He was outmaneuvered by these people who were pretty good actors on their own. And his son-in-law also was on our payroll—Thomas, who was in business, at least later, with Mansfield, one of the plaintiffs' attorneys! And he was married to Judge Wicks' daughter. A real complicated thing but I felt we had a fox watching the chicken coop there.

Mr. Frederick: I may be mistaken, Albert, but I believe that also Joseph Wicks participated in defense summation too, or part of it.

Mr. Canwell: He was what?

Mr. Frederick: That Joseph Wicks also participated in defense in the later part of it in the summation part of the trial.

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember that, it may be so, I don't remember that.

Mr. Frederick: Where he was really loud and was hopping around a bit.

Mr. Canwell: Where that occurred—he was, I believe, questioning Sally Goldmark. And I think put on a very emotional performance.

I don't remember his being a party in the summation. He might have been. I wouldn't think that that's likely because the real attorney, the expert was Glenn Harmon. And he knew libel law better than he knew anything else.

Mr. Frederick: Who were the plaintiffs' attorneys?

Mr. Canwell: The plaintiffs' attorneys were—of course, John Goldmark was an attorney and a plaintiff. Bill Dwyer from Seattle, ACLU member, was the chief plaintiffs' attorney. And Mansfield, I have to think of his first name—Reese. Anyway, he was a local Okanogan attorney, and I believe at one time in legal partnership with John Goldmark. But he was associated in the plaintiffs' case with Bill Dwyer. And incidentally he also was an ACLU member.

Mr. Frederick: And what were your opinions of those two as attorneys in the courtroom?

Mr. Canwell: My opinion of Bill Dwyer was that he had considerable talent and he was a real shifty character. I had knowledge of him prior to this time. He had been on the editorial staff of the *University of Washington Daily* during my hearings. But he also, in practicing law in Seattle, had been involved in cases that we had records or information on, one of them being the Id Book Store. They were a couple of real flaky characters who were running this pornographic bookstore. And when they were arrested, Bill Dwyer appeared on the scene and volunteered to act as their attorney.

So I knew something about him in the background. I knew that he was ACLU-connected, and other than that I know that he shared my low opinion of most members of the bar. So I don't know that at this time I should be more definitive except I wouldn't employ him under any circumstances.

Mr. Frederick: And Attorney Mansfield?

Mr. Canwell: Mansfield was more of a country lawyer who had been brought into the ACLU device. He was quite active in Democratic politics, particularly on the Goldmark level. I think he was friends with them. He was very antagonistic to me personally without knowing me. But I appraised him as being very useful to the Goldmark-Dwyer device there and he had some competence. I wouldn't depreciate his legal competence. Mansfield's name was Reese Mansfield and he was a local, an

Okanogan attorney who knew, I suppose, almost everybody there.

Other than that, I don't know except that he was personally antagonistic to me as John Goldmark was. And that was always an indication to me of just where they ranked in things. Sally, who was the real Commie, was quite friendly to me. And that would be true in many such cases. But John Goldmark and Reese Mansfield were people who took the whole thing personally.

Probably I should state that I believe that Reese Mansfield's true name was Resa, but he was known by everybody as Reese Mansfield.

Mr. Frederick: What was your strategy, what did you do in preparing for this, and work with Mr. Harmon?

Mr. Canwell: The first thing I did was try to indoctrinate him as much as possible in what was involved with the ACLU with the power structure behind this whole thing and that in my opinion it was a Communist device. Therefore I felt that Harmon should know something, have sufficient knowledge of the Communist apparatus and their operation and their fronts so he would know what he was getting into.

In addition to that I named the witnesses that I felt that we could get and should get. And again those were people who were acquaintances and friends of mine. And without my knowledge in the thing, there would have been no approach to such witnesses, such defense. People like Herb Philbrick, a longtime acquaintance of mine. And there were many others like that who testified. From Seattle, Ford Elvidge came over at his own expense and testified in my behalf. He was, either later or before that, governor of Guam. A very able man. A most able constitutional lawyer in the area.

Mr. Frederick: So you were locating witnesses?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, and we developed a tremendous battery of competent witnesses, and most of these people were enthusiastic enough about the work that I was doing and had done, to in many cases volunteer to appear. I'm thinking, of course, of people like Herb Philbrick and Congressman Donald Jackson. A very busy and a very competent person but who was willing to come up and testify in the case. And did so. Of course, there were people like Barbara Hartle and, oh, I'd have to go down through the list of witnesses. But they were a very impressive group.

I remember that Robert Morris, who was the president of a college or university in Texas, when I called him he said, "Well, certainly I'll come up, I'll be glad to." And it just happened that on the day that he should have been able to appear we had a blizzard or snowstorm and then he had complications down there and didn't. But that

type of person and people on that level did volunteer and did testify in the case. And did an excellent job.

Some of the few nice things ever said about me were said by these people. I would have to go back and look over the list. But we had quite an impressive list of responsible people.

Mr. Frederick: And your attorneys had filed an affidavit of prejudice against the sitting superior court judge in the Okanogan area. Do you remember, Albert, who that fellow was named?

Mr. Canwell: I just cannot right off remember his name. But the affidavit of prejudice was well-founded. He was a close friend of the Goldmarks, had the reputation for Democratic politics. Whatever his name was, I can't think of it now, we got rid of him.

Mr. Frederick: And then who did they bring in?

Mr. Canwell: Finally, Theodore Turner was selected as the—

Mr. Frederick: And he was from Seattle?

Mr. Canwell: He was from Seattle. He had served in the Legislature with me. And somehow or another it seemed to be agreeable to the plaintiffs, which was quite surprising because he had debated with Paul Coughlin the question of the Canwell committee, its legality and validity and so on, and had supported my position. And this, of course, was known to the plaintiffs. And it makes me wonder at this late date if he had not been a member of the ACLU.

I felt during the trial in general that he was too protective of the ACLU. That is in my opinion. As a reporter I've covered a lot of court proceedings. I've been a featured defendant, or witness, or other things time after time in court so I have a fairly good working knowledge of court procedure and what takes place. I just felt that Turner was too protective of the ACLU. And some of these days I hope to get over to Seattle and take him for lunch and I'm going to ask him the sixty-four dollar question. Whether he is or was ever a member of the ACLU.

He was a very able judge, but did not know nearly as much about libel as Glenn Harmon did. With the result that, at least in Harmon's opinion, he had committed reversible error enough times that there was no question that we could get a reversal of the verdict. I suspect that he realized that, and when he took the thing—our motion for a reversal of the verdict, regardless of the jury verdict, that he took that opportunity to do what he knew that the courts would do later—reverse the case.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, as I understand it when the sitting superior court justice was removed, and in the interim with regard to the selection of an additional superior court judge to come in and hear the case, that the plaintiffs were disappointed in accessing exhibits, possibly depositions, et cetera, et cetera, on the defense side, and filed an action with Judge Turner on that issue. He stated that there was evidence of dilatory tactics on the part of the defense and ordered them to pay approximately \$2,000 in counsel fees. Do you recall that?

Mr. Canwell: No, I don't. And he probably—if he made such a ruling, he probably withdrew it or reversed it or something.

Mr. Frederick: As I understand it, the trial began on November 4, 1963. Did you stay over there during the trial?

Mr. Canwell: Yes. I usually would come home week-ends or if there was a recess permitting that. Otherwise I stayed at the Gillespie home. In fact, Loris Gillespie, who is not overeducated, he's a smart person. And I don't think he knew any Latin, but he said that after I stayed with them for sometime that he knew what that Latin term meant where it said the trial was Goldmark versus Canwell, et al. He said he knew what that meant. He felt that I was a costly contribution that he made to the defense.

But usually I drove home. If we recessed on a Friday and came back into session on Monday, I would go home.

Mr. Frederick: To paraphrase the defense opening statement by attorney Glenn Harmon: Goldmark did not tell voters of his wife's Communist Party history, even though urged to do so by Democratic officials. Goldmark ran for political office knowing that his wife had been a Communist Party member. Goldmark's political positions embroiled him in a political position in which he took a position identical to a position of the Communist Party. That he never deviated from following the Communist Party line and Sally Goldmark never got out of the Communist Party. And John and Sally Goldmark are under Communist Party discipline.

Mr. Canwell: I take it that your notes are made from Bill Dwyer's book.

Mr. Frederick: I was paraphrasing.

Mr. Canwell: What I wish to point out is that Bill Dwyer was redoing the case in his book to make it appear that they won and that if anybody knew that he hadn't won, they'd make them think that they should have won.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, we have here that it appears that

Ashley Holden was one of the first people called to testify.

Mr. Canwell: One of the first witnesses?

Mr. Frederick: Yes.

Mr. Canwell: I don't know. I have copies, a salvage of a good share of the transcripts and I think I had Ashley Holden's testimony. And he may have been the first.

Mr. Frederick: We've got the official language there on that document with regard to the, in essence, the title of the trial. Would you read that Albert?

Mr. Canwell: Yes. "In the Superior Court for the State of Washington for Okanogan County. John Goldmark and Sally Goldmark, his wife, plaintiffs. Versus Albert F. Canwell and Jane Doe Canwell, his wife. Ashley Holden, Sr. and Jane Doe Holden, his wife. Loris Gillespie and Jane Doe Gillespie, his wife. Don Caron and Jane Doe Caron, his wife. Tonasket Publishing Company, a Corporation, Defendants. Messrs. William L. Dwyer and R. E. Mansfield, attorneys for plaintiffs. Messrs. Witherspoon, Kelley, Davenport and Toole, and Glenn Harmon, N. W. Kimball and Wicks, Thomas, and Ellis, attorneys for defendants. Mr. Charles Horowitz *amicus curiae*." I don't know what that's all about.

"The defendants have moved for a judgment and notwithstanding the verdicts in favor of plaintiffs."

And at the end of his statement the judge says, "I conclude that on all the evidence in this case, the state has no constitutional power to enter a judgment for damages for libel by reason of the defendants' exercise of their rights of free speech and press. For this reason the motions for judgment, notwithstanding the verdict, are granted. And order incorporating this ruling and in the alternative granting a new trial may be presented.

"Dated the 17th day of December, 1964."

And in spite of that, and the availability of it, the three major papers in this state have repeatedly stated that John Goldmark was—

[End of Tape 59, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I appreciate that but we have a bit to go before—

Mr. Canwell: We were touching on the subject and I thought so that we wouldn't forget it I'd let you know we have it.

Mr. Frederick: Well, I'm very confident that you're not going to allow me to forget that. But this is at the end of

the trial and we are just starting the trial.

Mr. Canwell: Okay. So proceed.

Mr. Frederick: Ashley Holden was called. You were called. Loris Gillespie was called. And you all had an opportunity to respond to what was printed, and it would be an exploration of what you would be implying.

It appears that when Loris Gillespie had an opportunity, that when he was called as a witness that "much of what he was alleged to have done, he didn't do."

Mr. Canwell: It's quite possible that before you arrive at this stage in the trial, we should mention the fact that extensive pretrial depositions were taken. They were used as a means of trying to get at my personal operation and my source of funds and that sort of thing. Then proceeding to try to interfere with any support we might have from information that was disclosed there. Very unethical and improper thing, but it's what they were doing. They took extensive pretrial depositions and attempted to probe far into my personal files and records here, and of course were, I think, effectively thwarted in some of it.

But they did follow that procedure, took great advantage of their legal access to do so. And that again is something that is a perversion of the law. But witnesses for the defense such as Emmett Buckley, whose interrogated pretrial deposition was taken. And then the information was used to counter his testimony by getting another priest, an ACLU priest, Frank Conklin, to be a witness in the trial. But all of this pretrial deposition maneuver was cleverly used to try to thwart justice and its ultimate application.

It is essential to know that they did take very extensive pretrial depositions, and I think that they took them from Ashley and Loris, as well as from me.

Mr. Frederick: Did the plaintiff attorney team, did they hire a private detective?

Mr. Canwell: I think they said they did. But I don't recall the particulars on that.

Mr. Frederick: I know quite early in that, it might have been the first time that you were on the stand, that attorney Dwyer brought forth you not filing income tax returns for 1956 through 1961. Could he have learned that through deposition or through—

Mr. Canwell: No. No.

Mr. Frederick: How did he get ahold of that?

Mr. Canwell: I don't know where he got that information, but I was not required by law to answer such ques-

tions to begin with.

The income tax filings and your dealings with the director of Internal Revenue are confidential, privileged matters. So I didn't have to answer anything. But I don't know where he got it.

Mr. Frederick: I got the impression that Loris Gillespie, once he finally got on the stand, didn't necessarily cave in but he "didn't do anything."

Mr. Canwell: I think he was, of course, out of his water. That's a pretty stressful situation for a person who is not versed in it and not experienced in it. In my case it doesn't rattle me much. I've spent so much time in court I felt at home there. But Loris I think was a little unsettled. And, of course, in the back of his mind was the fact that somebody might get into his deep pockets. He didn't like the prospect.

Mr. Frederick: I got the impression that he rapidly faded away or caved in. Whereas I don't detect that in Ashley. I don't detect that in you.

Mr. Canwell: I don't think that Loris especially did, except that he has a braggadocio manner and I think he probably realized from their depositions and things that he often talked when he should be listening. And so he wasn't about to do that on the stand.

Mr. Frederick: They had four witnesses testifying with regard to what Loris Gillespie said about the Goldmarks within various means and contacts he had with them. His response to that was: "That just didn't happen." And where you and Ashley with regard to your writings or what you had done, neither of you backed away from anything.

Mr. Canwell: I think the answer to that is that both Ashley and I were well-familiar with court procedures and probably were not as nervous as probably poor Loris was. I think he was into a situation that he didn't understand, and didn't want to be any worse off than he already was.

Mr. Frederick: What was the Reverend Francis Conklin connection, Gonzaga University, as a lawyer there?

Mr. Canwell: He was dean of the law school at Gonzaga. Whether he was at that precise moment, I know he was and had been, and was on the faculty, though, for quite some time. I believe also—I don't know whether he was on the national board of ACLU, but he was officially connected with the organization, and with the National Lawyers Guild.

Mr. Frederick: And he was brought in by the plaintiffs to testify?

Mr. Canwell: He was brought in to offset the testimony and the presence of another Jesuit priest, Emmett Buckley, who they were unable to deport or ship out of the area before we slapped a subpoena on him. So it was inevitable that Buckley would testify, and so the plaintiffs were able to get a "distinguished" priest to come and nullify his presence.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, as I understand it, a defense strategy that was employed by you folks was that in essence the specter of world Communism was an issue. And the American Civil Liberties Union was an issue. And then to a certain extent John Goldmark's voting record in the Legislature or potential bills that he supported and the Democratic Party platforms, the various platforms over the years, were in essence kind of on trial or used by defense as examples, as a backdrop.

Mr. Canwell: I would say that these things came into the trial. Some of them head-on, some of them by the back door.

Goldmark's tax posture was never developed by me, or I don't think I ever wrote anything on it. But it was a subject that Holden treated rather extensively. I don't recall that I ever went into that, because I had not researched it. I wouldn't know just what his legislative votes were nor what his speaking itinerary and whatnot were up in the Okanogan and that area.

Mr. Frederick: To name off some of the defense witnesses, you had Sheriff Russell Will. Loris Gillespie testified again. He basically said that he never said what was alleged to him that he said. What the reference to that is, is that he was alleged to have made contacts with various citizens from the area.

Mr. Canwell: I don't recall what his testimony was all about.

Mr. Frederick: Alleged comments with regard to John and Sally Goldmark.

There was for the defense, there were four individual legislators. There were Representative Dr. Alfred Adams, and Representative Margaret Hurley, and Representatives Elmer Huntley and Richard Morphis. Do you recall any of that, Albert?

Mr. Canwell: I probably listened to their testimony. And I may have been instrumental in getting Margaret Hurley as a witness, at least recommending that she be. The others I don't remember how they were selected other than they were knowledgeable of Goldmark's ac-

tivities and his general reputation.

Dick Morphis I knew from Spokane just slightly. Whether he was a representative at that time, I know he had been. The others, right off I don't remember why and how come.

I had more to do with the national witnesses from out of the area.

Mr. Frederick: And that would be Donald Jackson, former congressman?

Mr. Canwell: Yes. He was one of them.

Mr. Frederick: And Carl Prussian?

Mr. Canwell: Oh, probably it was Prussian. I don't think I got him as a witness.

Mr. Frederick: You contacted Herbert Philbrick?

Mr. Canwell: Herb Philbrick, yes. He testified extensively and I recovered a transcript of his testimony here the last few days.

Mr. Frederick: Were you surprised when Harry P. Cain, former senator, came in as a rebuttal witness?

Mr. Canwell: No, it didn't surprise me that he would be, but it surprised me the lengths that they were going to in bringing these people in. Now he was way down in Florida, I believe.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, just a little bit of background. He was a former US senator?

Mr. Canwell: He was a United States senator. Prior to that he had been a distinguished war veteran and he had been mayor of Tacoma. A very colorful character, an able orator. And probably I had more to do with his being elected to the United States Senate than did any other person.

We were longtime personal friends. Often when in Washington D.C., I stayed at their apartment. It was available to me anytime I wished. His office was open to me and helpful in anything that I wished to do.

But somewhere along the line he was captured by the Left. It's a very intriguing thing. He appeared as a friendly witness for a Communist who had been transferred from Washington State to the Maryland underground. And this Communist had gotten in trouble with the government over falsely signing an affidavit or something.

Anyway, the first time I began to realize that Cain had a problem is that he went down and testified for this man for a couple of hours. He had never met him, he didn't

know him. And the House committee was very concerned because they knew he was a close friend of mine and they were working on a case that involved him and his testimony. Well, that gives you a little background there.

Then he seemed to continue to lean to the Left. In the Rosenberg case, there was a security clearance matter where he took testimony and called in the report and let the adverse witness take it home and edit it, and bring it back and it became the official report of the Senate committee!

I began to encounter this sort of thing. So I knew there was something definitely wrong. Then when he was defeated by Senator Jackson in the Senate race—

Mr. Frederick: In 1952.

Mr. Canwell: I think that was 1952, yes.

Then he went to Florida, I believe, and was installed as vice president of a bank down there.

Mr. Frederick: In 1952 President Eisenhower appointed him to the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Mr. Canwell: That's right. It was after that he went to Florida. But he did serve as chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board which was mandated to examine the attorney general's list and determine who should and should not be on it. And he held hearings in Seattle in which he utilized my committee reports to dredge up witnesses and, up to that date, he was seemingly more or less all right. But time went on and he leaned further to the Left. Eventually he published pamphlets for the ACLU or they published pamphlets that he wrote, and that sort of thing.

So it was not surprising to me that he might be used as a witness. But it was surprising to me that they would spend that kind of money to send for somebody down there that was on the far other corner of the United States. And he had what appeared to be a bodyguard with him or somebody probably assigned to see that he was doing what he was told to do. I'm talking about in Okanogan.

After his testimony, he gave us glowing testimony for the ACLU. At the end of the day's session, this terminated the session, we were walking out, Harry stopped and shook hands. He says, "On what strange battlefields we meet." Some old farmer had been sitting in there in all of the meetings and I couldn't figure him out—whether he was for us or against us. But he had listened to Cain's testimony, he saw us speak. And this old ranger says, "It sure takes a rattlesnake a long time to quit wiggling, don't it?"

Well, that was the reputation, the sort of thing that he enjoyed up there. So that locally I don't think his testimony would have been worth a hill of beans. But nation-

ally it was very important. He was a former US senator, former Republican, former chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board, yet could come up there and testify for the ACLU.

After that I had no occasion to have contact with him. He had over the years, he and Marge, his wife, had been guests at our home and I had many times been their guest in Washington D.C. But it was an unhappy thing. Because I liked the guy. But somehow he was controlled and I don't know how.

He got into some pretty flaky, kookie religious stuff for a time. The "I Am" group or whatever it was called, something like that. So I don't know. I didn't have time, nor the occasion to see very much of him in the intervening years. And so when they introduced him as a witness, that was supposed to be a body blow to me.

Mr. Frederick: As a former ally of you and Ashley Holden, elected to the US Senate, 1946?

Mr. Canwell: I don't know to what degree you might say he is an ally of Ashley. I think Ashley Holden was very much for him. And as a result largely of my endeavors. I went around the state and talked to editors in his behalf while he was still in Europe, before he came home. And Marge, his wife, is a wonderful gal. But she had a little tendency to drink when she shouldn't. And she would talk and do things that were not helpful to him. So I overcame that by going along and meeting editors, and some of them I knew. And touting Cain. He was quite a guy. He was somebody who gave up a desk job in the high command over in Europe and went into Normandy in the first wave of paratroops. He was a gutsy character and likable. I don't know what happened to him.

Mr. Frederick: As I understand it, Albert, when he was on the Subversive Activities Control Board he became disillusioned with the Federal Loyalty Programs and concerned about civil liberties. And to the point where he began to speak out, while he was still a member of that Subversive Activities Control Board, which probably terminated his participation there.

Mr. Canwell: I think that something had happened to him. Something drastic and something that caused that sort of utterances and thinking.

To zero in on that I'll mention this case when Vernon Todd Riley, a local Communist, was transferred from the Spokane Communist apparatus to the underground in Maryland. And I had extensive files and information on him, so when they began investigating him back there they came to me because they knew I did have a lot of information on Vernon Todd Riley. I think it was a labor relations board, one of them had taken testimony from

him and he had perjured himself.

So the House committee became involved in this and they sent an agent out here, and he was reluctant to work with me because he knew of my friendship with Harry Cain. I explained to him that that was no matter in this particular case and what the facts were.

The Communist Riley had gotten a young woman here to go back there and falsely testify, perjure herself. And she became very concerned about that because she knew that she should not have done it, and what she testified to was not true. She was pretty much shaking apart here. When the investigator from the House committee came here I took him to meet her, and we questioned her extensively. She agreed to go back and testify again and tell the truth. And did.

Well, this all involved Harry Cain because he didn't know Vernon Todd Riley. He wouldn't have known him from Adam. And still he went down there to whichever board it was that was taking testimony and testified extensively for this fellow!

So about that time I heard about it, I told him, I said, "I think you are being had, I think that you don't know what you are doing." And he said, "Oh, I don't like to see these people who have foolishly gotten mixed up in the Communist Party in school then harassed and harried."

It wasn't the situation in this Communist case. Riley was going back there to work in a highly sensitive, scientific enterprise, and it was very important that Communists not be taken into that. Well, Harry didn't want to listen to any of this. About the same time they were holding hearings on Anna Rosenberg. I think she was involved in—

[End of Tape 59, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Albert, we left off with a midpassage with regard to a Rosenberg?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, we had been discussing the appearance of Harry Cain as a witness in the Goldmark vs. Canwell libel case, and the effect or impact it may have had on me, in that Harry Cain and I had been longtime good friends and I had been very influential in helping him to be elected to the United States Senate. But, along the line, I found there began to be problems, and I couldn't understand them, but I knew that a problem existed and I had mentioned here before the one case. I was just beginning to mention the Anna Rosenberg case.

Harry was on a Senate committee; I don't remember whether it was Armed Services or what it was, but they were examining the record of Anna Rosenberg. And there had been testimony to the effect that she was a Communist, which she denied.

When the report went to the printers, and the first report went out, it contained some information quite dam-

aging to Anna Rosenberg. Harry Cain, I found out later, called the issue back, let her take it home and edit it, and then the report of that committee and its hearings were reissued. At one time I had both reports. I think probably they were destroyed in the fire.

These are things that began to surface so that I knew that there was something seriously wrong. So the fact that Harry might testify for the ACLU Communists at Okanogan was not as surprising to me as the lengths to which they would go to make their case. It must have involved a tremendous amount of money, and nobody knows how much. But Harry Cain did appear up in Okanogan, and testified favorably regarding the American Civil Liberties Union.

The Anna Rosenberg thing alerted me to the fact that something was drastically wrong, because I was close enough to that and other similar cases to know what was going on. I rather think the McCarthy committee had mentioned Anna unfavorably, but I don't at this moment recall. I do know that there were two reports of that committee hearing on Anna Rosenberg that were issued by the committee, the first one being recalled, and the second one being made official.

Mr. Frederick: Why was the decision made, or was the decision made, to involve Melvin Rader? Melvin Rader was subpoenaed by the defendants.

Mr. Canwell: No, I don't think so. I think that Rader was subpoenaed by the plaintiffs, and Ed Guthman testified falsely, perjured himself under oath, about having interrogated Barbara Hartle about Rader. So in the back-and-forth play of this, Rader testified, and Guthman testified, and Barbara Hartle testified and denied Guthman's statements.

It was quite a dramatic thing in the court, because Harmon bore down on Guthman and asked him when he got the sensational news what he did with it, and whether he wrote a story. Of course, had he ever had such information, it would have been in boxcar type on the front page of the *Seattle Times*, but not a word was written, and, of course, it never happened. I knew that, and that's the first time I knew that Guthman would be willing to perjure himself under oath, but he did, and it was an occasion in which I knew all of the pertinent facts.

But there was an amazing batch of witnesses at the trial up there. Harry Cain, of course, was certainly a surprise and newsworthy. But he was never very well-liked in the Okanogan. I don't think he carried that area, even when he carried other parts of the state.

Mr. Frederick: There were issues explored with regard to the Communist Party function, with regard to party discipline. I recall that the defense stressed that heavily. Their implying that Sally Goldmark may not have left the

party, or would have been subject to influence or pressure from the party in latter years. There were issues of John Goldmark's security clearance and what that meant. And there were issues with regard to what the American Civil Liberties Union stood for on both sides, pro or con. And there were issues of his legislative record. And there were individuals brought in to testify about that, both pro and con. There were issues with regard to the Democratic Party platform and who was responsible for compiling that.

Those were the basic issues, weren't they?

Mr. Canwell: They were issues. The real issue on which we were not permitted to properly present our proof was the fact that the American Civil Liberties was a Communist front.

There were many issues discussed, pro and con, and witnesses queried on many things. I remember party discipline probably was one of them. I think we had a witness, John Lautner. He had testified at least eighty times for the government and the Justice Department. This was the only case where he had ever appeared in a civil action. But he testified, and I believe that he covered questions of party discipline, what a person would be permitted to do and not do, and so on. But there was so much of that. It went on for days, and days, and days.

The number of witnesses they were able to produce was just phenomenal. They must have spent a fortune doing it, or had enough disciplinary control over these people that they would jump when they were told to. I don't know, and nobody would know, other than the people involved in it.

We do know, and this I think was developed in the Lautner testimony, that the plaintiffs' attorneys in New York and Washington had offered, I think, a thousand dollars or whatever it was, to John Lautner to get him to testify for them. And that information was relayed to us because the man who represented the attorneys' firm doing this was a nephew, I think, of Robert Morris of Texas who had been a very important figure in the government anti-Communist scene. So he let us know that this offer had been made and when we talked to Lautner, he confirmed that. He said they had.

So at the Goldmark trial, Bill Dwyer was trying to demean and downgrade Lautner as a paid witness and this sort of thing, and Lautner let it go to a certain point and then he jumped up and pointed his finger in Bill's face and he said, "If I was the kind of person that you're implying that I am, I'd be testifying on your side for a thousand dollars!" It was quite a dramatic moment in the trial. But Lautner, of course, was our witness.

Mr. Frederick: Who was your most effective witness?

Mr. Canwell: Defense witness, most effective? There

were several that were very effective. I would say that Lautner was one of the top ones. Herb Philbrick was a very important witness. Donald Jackson was extremely important. So to say one was the most effective—I don't know how you'd say that.

There were fine people who testified like Margaret Hurley and people like that, just genuinely fine citizens who were there because they were that kind of people. I think that people like Margaret probably asked us to subpoena them so that they could take the position that they had to testify. But I don't recall if that was the case with her or not, but it might have been with some.

Barbara Hartle was a most effective witness. And Hazel Neindorff was very effective. She testified as to the accuracy of *Communism on the Map*, I believe. And she is an excellent researcher, she's one of the best. And she always did usually too definitive or efficient a job. She'd tell you more than you wanted to know. She was very efficient, a very honest, fine person. And I would say she was an important witness because that was at issue in the trial.

Ford Elvidge, a very important witness because of his importance as an individual among other things, and then, of course, I always feel that a man is a very important or effective witness who says nice things about me. But Ford Elvidge, a very able man and incidentally a thirty-third degree Mason and served as governor of Guam. I think Eisenhower appointed him.

To say who was the most valuable witness, I don't know. We had an abundance of fine witnesses. The court was trying to curtail that sort of thing as a timesaving matter. They should have applied it to the other side more than to us. They had unlimited funds and resources to get any kind of testimony they wanted. They brought in such scum as the attorney Sam Fancher from Spokane. They kind of dressed him up and made him look respectable and asked him what my reputation was; and of course it was bad.

They brought in all kinds of witnesses like that. They had this "pothead," Sterling Hayden, the actor. Brought him in from California and he spoke his piece as he always did, any place he went he'd say that he was the only actor who bought a yacht and joined the Communist Party on the same day. It's good propaganda, but a lot of crap. And he was so saturated with pot and marijuana, the day he was up there I thought his eyes would bleed to death.

Mr. Frederick: He was testifying with regard to the existence of party discipline with regard to leaving the American Communist party.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I think something like that.

What does the party care if they can use a national figure like that, an attractive hunk, if he'll say what they want, how they control him, who knows? But he testi-

fied, of course, that there was no discipline, no such thing. He joined the party, and like Sally said, "You just attend study groups and talk nice things."

There were a great many plaintiffs' witnesses up there, drawn from the local area too. Going back and reading some of the testimony, I found that at least some of them were ACLU members, and I don't know that they were always asked if they were. I think maybe that our attorneys were a little remiss in not doing so.

But the court rules and procedures have become a matter of pursuit of trivia. The things they've done to the legal processes are unbelievable, and almost unimaginable. They've made it impossible for a sensible procedure to take place. The selection of a juror, if the person is anything above a moron, he's rejected. If he reads a paper he forms an opinion or anything else, he can be bounced off or challenged. The fact that you need somebody capable of reading and forming an opinion to be an honest and effective juror has been completely obscured and obliterated. I bless the ACLU for most of that, the penetration of the courts, the law, and the judicial system by them has been almost overpowering.

One of the witnesses—I shouldn't forget him—the plaintiffs trotted across the board was Slade Gorton. This was another thing that incensed me. A stipulation had been agreed to that our counsel would not ask him if he was a member of the ACLU!

And that had to come right down from the top of the legal firm, because it had been the most sensible question to ask at the time of his appearance. But they were able to introduce this person as attorney general and other things, so he looks and seems very respectable, but he was a closet ACLUer.

So there were many, many things like that that happened. I was completely incapable of controlling it all, there isn't any way. You can't know everything that's going on. You can see it as it unfolds, and that's about what I could do.

Mr. Frederick: He testified with regard to serving with John Goldmark in the Legislature?

Mr. Canwell: I think so. It was something laudatory. He was a character witness for John Goldmark.

Mr. Frederick: But it needs to be mentioned, too, though, that John was a Democrat and Slade Gorton was a Republican, so he was a telling witness—

Mr. Canwell: Oh, very effective because it'd make good copy. Here's the reporter for the *Wenatchee World* sitting there and just looking for that sort of thing that he could exploit. And did so. Of course, Slade Gorton, Joel Pritchard, Evans, all of these people who wormed their way into the Republican Party were no more Republicans than

I am a Zulu. They were opportunists who moved into a vacuum.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, isn't it a difficult case though, with regard to the defense to establish in front of a jury, the concept of potentially unending Communist Party discipline, with regard to former members or current members?

Mr. Canwell: A very difficult thing?

Mr. Frederick: You had to challenge John Goldmark's Naval officer security clearance. We're talking some pretty heavy timber here you had to be cutting.

Mr. Canwell: Then the unwillingness of the court many times for us to rebut these things. The judge invoked the grounds that he was trying to save time and cut the imposition on the jury and so on. But time after time there were issues like that where we had all the evidence and testimony to take care of it. John Goldmark's security clearance, we could well take care of that.

Mr. Frederick: I don't see that, Albert. There were numerous witnesses with regard to the security clearance.

Mr. Canwell: I don't recall that we had many. The testimony that they could have given on it—

Mr. Frederick: In terms of defense. You're talking about the defense?

Mr. Canwell: The defense. And in the case of the security clearance of John Goldmark, I produced and was prepared to produce testimony where a superior officer was being disciplined for having given a clearance to a certain Navy man who turned out to be a spy, something along that line. There was testimony taken as to what they could do at that time. They could not reject an applicant for a commission on the basis that he was a Communist!

Instead of taking Goldmark, this brilliant young lawyer, and putting him in the judge advocate's department where he would normally belong, they sent him out in the South Pacific to deactivate bombs. Hoping he'd get his head blown off, I'd imagine. But that's the way the thing worked.

But the security clearance meant nothing. I showed you this, where I interviewed Commander Bliss, a district intelligence officer, Office of Navy Intelligence, at the Naval Air Station in Seattle, regarding John Goldmark's case and clearance. And I again found that there was nothing there, no way of keeping a man like that out. And you'd have to capture him with his hand in the cookie jar to do anything. He's sitting on a ranch, out there ten, twelve miles from the front gate, and nobody can come in

and trespass on the thing to get evidence on him. You can't in a federal case trespass on anybody's property to gain evidence for a warrant, that's the law. He was sitting there where you couldn't get the needed evidence, that's if you have the time and funds and facilities to do it. I didn't have.

But when we tried to introduce many of these things, then the court would accept the argument that in congressional testimony or a congressional inquiry that the rules of evidence didn't pertain, therefore you couldn't qualify the evidence as proof. It's a fallacious position.

[End of Tape 60, Side 1]

You can't be an eyewitness, and everybody can't be an eyewitness to every foul deed in history. And that's why the legislative inquiry approach is entitled to reject some of those quibbles that are time-wasters and defeaters of justice in the current system.

Hearsay can be an invalid thing, if it obviously is invalid. But the fact that somebody like Barbara Hartle, who was an official in the Communist Party, and knew every one of these people by their first names and eventually she testifies that she was in meetings with them, then somebody wanting to quote that or use that, or wanting to use it in a trial, to say it's "hearsay,"—she wasn't subjected to cross examination—is absurd. Her testimony was given under oath and never challenged. At her time in the party, she was in Spokane at first, then she was in the underground in Portland and Seattle.

Budenz often would testify that he was advised by his superiors that somebody was a Communist.

Mr. Frederick: It just occurred to me at this point in time. With regard to this major concept/belief of yours, with regard to party discipline, and it's a recurring theme within this milieu or this genre, what happened to the concept of party discipline with regard to Barbara Hartle who was pinched on the Smith Act in, what, 1952, 1953?

Mr. Canwell: Enormous pressures were put on her by the party to force her into line. For that reason we set up security around her to keep them from killing her. So the discipline exists. I've seen it in operation. We'll take the George Hewitt case. When he turned against the party back in New York there was just enormous effort made to destroy the man, to harass him, to turn his neighbors against him, to turn his wife against him. It was party discipline.

Mr. Frederick: At the same time, too, Albert, particularly with the George Hewitt case, in terms of speculation, for all we know he could have been targeted by the Justice Department and subsequent with Watergate and the various disclosures there is documentation that agencies,

federal agencies, have done that. That could have been a federal campaign to flip him.

Mr. Canwell: I don't know where you get such information. There are people like Philip Agee, the ex-FBI agent who testified to all kinds of lying situations. There are others who testified that we engaged in germ warfare in Korea, where it never happened. There's all kinds of that type of testimony, and, of course, there's a great deal of pressure put on people who attempt to leave the party.

I've seen it. In Spokane, one of my informants was breaking, was up very high in the Communist party and she had a truck line. When she began to weaken a little bit, then they began to put pressure on her trucking operation. I have mentioned this before.

Mr. Frederick: Was she in the union—was she unionized?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, at one time she was, but Ed Beck, who at one time was a senator from my district, a member of the Communist Party, was in her cell. She personally provided the money to send him to a Communist school somewhere, for some advanced training. And then he got a job with the Department of Weights and Measures or whoever weighs the trucks. So he got a job with the state doing that, and when she began to weaken, then he began to have her trucks stopped, and harass them. The very person who had built him up in the party, paid for his education and everything else. But when they had that type of operative they had no conscience, they do their job, they do it the way they're told to do it. And usually discipline is accomplished in whatever way is most effective.

In the Building Service Union in Seattle, we had substantial information that when people in the Building Service Union, old people, wouldn't go along with the Communist program, some of these goons would beat hell out of these old people. Kick them downstairs, whatever; they terrorized them. Depends on what level and what phase of the apparatus you're in.

Mr. Frederick: What I don't understand is that, after a year or so of spending time in this area, if a person, and from what I read, if a person wants to quit and leave the Communist Party, and God knows there were zillions of them who did that, I view that operation as a revolving door in terms of membership. Party discipline, if they so desired to quit, was only as effective as the target quitter would allow it to be.

Mr. Canwell: That has so many ramifications and "ifs" about it. It depends on what they're into, who their superiors are, who their associates are, what their tasks in the party were, and a hundred things like that. But experts in

the Communist orbit, ex-members have testified many times very effectively or extensively about party discipline and how it's carried out. I know that they had a general reputation of being very brutal, where it's necessary to be.

Getting back to the Goldmarks, or whether Sally remained under discipline of the party, I would base my surmises on what she was doing, and I don't think she ever left the party. I think she was still carrying out their program when they came out here.

But I think that the truth has never been told by Sally or John as to what their actions and relationships were. And John has never been frank, and he won't be now—he's dead, but he never did frankly say what he was doing out at Longview, the House of Accokeek. He went right to that place from Harvard, and Harry Hopkins' top assistant sat out there and screened these people.

Mr. Frederick: I got the impression that he was courting.

Mr. Canwell: Courting?

Mr. Frederick: Yes.

Mr. Canwell: I think the courting all happened when it became obvious that the lid was going to blow off of the thing. How much—

Mr. Frederick: This would be in the early forties.

Mr. Canwell: Whenever it was that he graduated, I think he graduated from Harvard in 1941.

Mr. Frederick: And I thought that he was—that he had fallen in love.

Mr. Canwell: He ended up, or I might say he started—he went to Longview, the House of Accokeek which was sort of a boot camp for fledgling Communist agents who were being groomed to move into the burgeoning New Deal government. This was a device where it was being accomplished.

He went down there and he took up residence. I don't find any instance that he knew Sally before he went to Accokeek. If he did, then it was at the University of Wisconsin, or something like that. But we never uncovered any such information.

There was a lot of love-making going on at the House of Accokeek, there was all kinds. Some of it was pretty kinky, and anyway these three women were well-known in the apparatus as three lesbians. Two of them were bisexual. One of them, who married Bobby Straus, was just a lesbian who would create a lot of furor when Sally or Helen Winner had some sex relationships with somebody

and she didn't—and anyway it was a battle, a merry-go-round.

I don't get this from just imagination. I went out there and looked into the situation, and then I talked to two of these people who were part of that, one of them being Helen Winner. I interviewed her in New York and a Communist attorney, John Abt, who just died the other day, he interfered with her giving me the information I was after. I interviewed Jacob Baker who was the assistant to Harry Hopkins who sat out there in Longview and screened these people who were sent down there by Frankfurter and others for indoctrination and distribution into government service. Goldmark, I think, went to work for the Agriculture Department, but he didn't go out there as one of the witnesses said, "He just went out there when he became ill and got a room." He took up residence there immediately in this spy cell, and he stayed there.

I never opened up a lot of that stuff that I knew, because I was still on the trail of the whole story.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, would you care to talk about the potential of a leak within the defense team?

Mr. Canwell: You mean in the Goldmark trial? Only to the extent that I knew that information was being siphoned to the plaintiffs and by whom, at the time I was not certain. I did a considerable amount of speculation and I did some research.

But I knew that it was happening. The time that it became very apparent was when they were—our attorney, Harmon, was bearing down on Sally. I believe she was on the stand and he was bearing down on the situation of the House of Accokeek. He was asking questions that she knew were going to lead to some very embarrassing questions. She was very nervous and very upset, and this was toward the end of that day's trial. It was very obvious that it was hitting home, that she was really almost sick.

I made the decision that we would not pursue that, I felt that it was not necessary, I felt that we would win our case. Maybe I was overconfident, but I didn't feel it was necessary to develop that phase of the thing. They had two boys, I'll say fine boys, and I didn't wish for the trial to develop this lesbian story, so I advised our attorney that we should not pursue that the next day. And we didn't. But somehow Sally knew that, when she came into court, came into the courthouse the next day she was just bouncing, happy as a lark. She knew that we were not going to pursue that course of questioning. So then I wondered how she knew.

Mr. Frederick: Did you perceive any other examples of potential leaks?

Mr. Canwell: There were one or two and I, being a suspicious person, naturally I was trying by deduction to figure out where the leak was. I at first thought it might be Don Caron. But I also knew that most of the time he wasn't in our confidence, he would not have known. I felt that there was no possibility that Loris Gillespie would reveal such information or provide any leaks to the enemy. He was too frightened that he might lose. And some of these legal meetings were held at his house where we might make decisions about what course of activity would be. But I did figure out that there was a substantial source of information that the plaintiffs were receiving that was damaging to us. I tried to be cautious from that point on, but there wasn't any great mystery about what we were doing, it would be a question of what witnesses we were going to produce.

We tried to protect that information a little bit so that someone appearing as a witness who had to come in by bus or whatever could not be intercepted. But it wasn't as much a problem. The case where Sally came in relieved and happy highlighted the thing. It was so apparent and I didn't think that one thing made a whole lot of difference one way or another. We didn't have to introduce that testimony, and I was always reluctant to use this sensational stuff—the sex-related things. I don't like to be put in the position that that's part of my defense. I think that those things will usually solve themselves.

In any case that just merely made me aware that there was a leak, and then I had to figure out how that leak could occur.

Mr. Frederick: What was the mechanism of the leak? How did it work?

Mr. Canwell: My opinion was that it was information that went out over the telephone line. And I don't wish to infer by that, that our attorney, Glenn Harmon, was a willing party to any betrayal. I think there were telephone communications that did the job.

Mr. Frederick: Who were the participating parties?

Mr. Canwell: I think I mentioned the other day, and I don't know whether we were on the tape, that we had Emmett Buckley, the Jesuit priest, that we had subpoenaed as a witness, and he couldn't be moved out of state or our jurisdiction after he had been subpoenaed. His testimony could be damaging to the plaintiffs and—

Mr. Frederick: Conversely it could be damaging to the church.

Mr. Canwell: Possibly too. The way it worked out, Father Frank Conklin, dean of the Gonzaga Law School, was subpoenaed as a witness for the plaintiffs and, it was

assumed, to counteract the testimony of Emmett Buckley, who they could not move or intervene with after he'd been subpoenaed. Buckley was willing to testify to anything that he knew, a pretty factual character. Maybe he didn't know as much as he should have. But they brought Conklin in, largely to testify on the ACLU, and he gave a glowing testimony for it. And he is, of course, a member of the ACLU and was a member of the National Lawyers Guild.

Mr. Frederick: What would be the motivation on the defense counsel staff? Who were they and what would be the motivating factor to communicate?

Mr. Canwell: My thinking was that the superior officer in the law firm, Witherspoon, Kelley, Davenport & Toole, supplying Glenn Harmon, the top officer Bill Kelley, felt a deeper obligation to the Holy Land than he did to his clients, and I think that he relayed information to Conklin, whoever. That's my thinking.

Bill Kelley, I may have mentioned before, I don't know whether it's on the tape, was the father of the infamous Kitty Kelley, who writes nasty things about important people.

I think the plaintiffs were pulling all stops to win, no matter what they had to do, and they were in a position to do a lot. I think a careful analysis of the whole case, what they did and how they did it, should frighten thoughtful people because it's a very subversive operation.

Mr. Frederick: How was the morale within the defense team?

Mr. Canwell: I thought it was very good. Nothing in the world frightens or cowers Ashley Holden, if you know him at all. Nothing would do him in. Gillespie didn't manifest any great concern, although I could read it, I knew how concerned he was about a buck, and he had a lot of them, and that's why he was in the case and he knew it. He knew he hadn't really libeled anybody, maybe made some silly remarks at a picnic or something. It wasn't anything to be sued on or to allege a conspiracy. But in general, the defendants were, well, I don't say they were happy, it was a long, extended, grueling trial. You get tired and all that sort of thing. But I think their attitude and demeanor was very acceptable.

I know I wasn't frightened. I thought we'd win the thing hands-down. I've listened to enough court cases and listened to and prepared enough evidence that I just could not see how we could lose. But I failed to realize until later what a friendly jury they had. They were picking their pals, and we had no way of preventing it.

[End of Tape 60, Side 2]

Mr. Frederick: Albert, is there anything that you would like to say in closing with regard to the trial portion? That is, the witness portion.

Mr. Canwell: I think not, except that it was a matter of amazement to me how many people, from all over the country, these people could pull into what was supposed to be a libel case involving an individual. They brought people from all over the United States to testify about the ACLU.

Of course, this whole thing from beginning to end was an ACLU enterprise. The attorneys involved, the witnesses, everything.

So anything that I have to say at this point is that a proper opportunity to present the negative side of the ACLU was blocked by the court. And the court must have realized that this was essentially an ACLU case against Canwell. It was an attempt of the ACLU to clean its skirts and to silence and punish me. The other people were brought into it to make the suit possible. They had no suit against me. There was no way that they could have sued me for libel. I haven't libeled anybody. There was nothing there.

So they had to put together this phony conspiracy. The court should have thrown that, bounced that out the first thing. It had no merit. It was frivolous and vicious and dishonest, and should never have gotten into court. And, of course, I think that Judge Ted Turner began to realize that, the deeper he got into it. And I don't know whether he was or had been a member of the ACLU. But he was unduly concerned in his rulings and decisions about the ACLU. We were prevented from putting the information in that constantly was required because of the witnesses like Harry Cain and many others that they brought from all over the country.

They brought a lesbian woman, a legislator from Oregon, up to testify. Every direction you turn they were able to spend a lot of money bringing witnesses who were biased in favor of the ACLU and testified that way. Still, the court prevented our introducing the valid testimony accumulated by the various committees of Congress and the state legislative inquiries and others. They blocked that information. All the silly arguments of the attorneys that witnesses hadn't been cross-examined. My God, did they cross-examine Moses about the Ten Commandments?

These are things that occurred to me. During the time I felt that we were not given a fair opportunity to present our case because it was always made to appear that this was a libel action defending and clearing John Goldmark. What it was was a libel action waged against right-wing, anti-Communist conservatives by the ACLU. And that's all it was.

So that's the basis on which it should have been fought. And we were not permitted to do that. But we

did ask for a reversal of the thing, obtained it; we won the case.

Mr. Frederick: We're not quite there yet.

Mr. Canwell: Well, that's where it ends. No, it doesn't end there.

Mr. Frederick: As I understand it, on January 17, 1964, the case went to the jury and there were some seventy-five, let's say some seventy pages of typed instruction from Judge Turner to the jury.

Mr. Canwell: There was a lot of it, I know.

Mr. Frederick: And they were out for—

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember.

Mr. Frederick: —five, six days, something like that?

Mr. Canwell: Quite a long time. And thoroughly confused. But I think they went into session with their minds made up anyway. The judges instructions didn't mean much, although I think they were weighted on the side of the plaintiffs.

Mr. Frederick: They were out for a better part of a week.

Mr. Canwell: Yes, I remember it was quite a long time.

Mr. Frederick: And there were several instances where they, the jury, questioned the court with regard to definition and whatnot during that period. What I'm saying is that they didn't disappear for the better part of a week but they surfaced once in awhile with regard to—

Mr. Canwell: They were awake at times.

Mr. Frederick: As I understand it there were twelve members of the jury. It was ten members to two with regard to the vote.

Mr. Canwell: I don't remember. I know it was a verdict for the plaintiffs. And it was almost a cinch. They were able to select one of the Goldmarks' pals for foreman of the jury. It was a heads-I-win, tails-you-lose proposition.

Mr. Frederick: Didn't you have the opportunity to discuss that with Mr. Harmon?

Mr. Canwell: No, not to any extent. You know you can't lock the barn door after the horse runs away. This thing was lost when the jury was selected. That is, it was a foregone conclusion that that jury would bring in a ver-

dict for the plaintiffs—

Mr. Frederick: Did you feel that way at the time?

Mr. Canwell: Yes. Yes, I did. I felt that we couldn't win with that jury. And that's why I favored what Harmon was doing. He had selected the rulings of Judge Turner that he felt were a basis for reversible error. And we were approaching it right from the time it went to the jury, the fact that we would have to appeal it to win. I don't think Harmon ever questioned that the plaintiffs would get a verdict on the thing. Not based on the evidence and testimony but on the fact that it was a no-win situation. And that was very evident.

Mr. Frederick: On one count, Ashley Holden's article announcing the Goldmark's stand for re-election, damages for \$12,000; Ashley Holden's editorial, "Catching Up With John," damages of \$13,000. Albert Canwell's *American Intelligence Service*, which Ashley Holden had printed and Don Caron helped to distribute, \$2,900 jointly against Albert Canwell and Ashley Holden. A hundred dollars against Don Caron. Albert Canwell's taped interview, \$5,000. And then Don Caron's "Pillaging Parliament" article, insufficient evidence. The Legion Hall meeting, \$7,000 against Albert Canwell, Ashley Holden, and Loris Gillespie. And in essence what they found is for a conspiracy issue that John and Sally Goldmark had been damaged.

What was it like? I believe that this was read in an evening, it was at night that this was read, if I'm not mistaken. What was it like to be sitting there and to hear that?

Mr. Canwell: I don't recall.

You're asking me to describe how I felt when the jury returned after this long session? And to be frank, I can't even remember that I was there, or when the jury came back in, what I felt about it or would have felt. It wouldn't have been a matter of surprise, I would say that. I felt that we had a no-win jury there. I felt that we could not win in Okanogan, and so I was not surprised. I may have been surprised that it took so long for them to bring in a verdict for the plaintiffs.

Mr. Frederick: As I understand it, that was an issue that was on both teams. Speculating why they were out for so long and what that meant. That feeling was shared by everyone there.

Mr. Canwell: I suppose the plaintiffs were a little upset because it took so long. I don't know. There is an old saying that an honest legislator is one who will stay bought. I don't know what their attitude was toward their friendly jury. I imagine that they expected them to come

back in with a quick verdict and they didn't, so I don't know what their feeling was. And I don't recall that I was there. I may have gone on home.

Mr. Frederick: What was the response of Ashley Holden? The first response that you perceived. And what was the response of Loris Gillespie? I would assume that you would have been in contact with him at least by the following day, that morning.

Mr. Canwell: I just do not remember. I would imagine that they would have been more surprised with the verdict than I was. And probably more able to survive the situation if it were to stand. I did not have the funds to pay any damage action. I probably could have raised it, I don't know. We did raise defense funds. We had—our legal fees were, I suppose, around a hundred thousand dollars. And we raised money by public subscription to pay the attorney. When I used that figure, I've forgotten just what the total was.

Mr. Frederick: How much did that have to come out of your pocket? How much did you actually have to spend above and beyond time?

Mr. Canwell: I didn't spend a lot of money at the trial. I stayed at the Gillespies'. They were very friendly and willing hosts. And I stayed there, so the living expense at Okanogan was not very great. I had transportation back and forth. I had a family in Spokane. A business that was being neglected and all that sort of thing. So it cost me. But I think that it had been the plan and the wish of the plaintiffs that they'd totally put me out of business. That's what it was all about. I remember I was very concerned because my family would have been concerned.

I felt that we would have to appeal it, and would probably win an appeal. I don't know just when we discussed the question of the motion for reversal. I tried to use the proper legal terms here.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, isn't that an automatic given, that any defense attorney is going to do, *pro forma*, does that in every case.

Mr. Canwell: Not so much in a damage action as it is in a criminal case. But in a damage action, libel action, where you have attorneys who are worrying about whether they are going to get paid, you have to be able to pay them before they'll embark on any big maneuver for an appeal. So I think that was a matter for concern. Naturally we would have to appeal it and had discussed it.

Mr. Frederick: How much money actually came out of your pocket for your attorney? And/or was that paid for through donation? Did you get national money? I would

assume there would be opportunity for national money there.

Mr. Canwell: We had a friendly person, a bookkeeper, auditor over on the coast, who set up a defense committee and circulated mailing lists. I don't know where all he got these lists. But he did raise quite a bit of money. And right along started paying the legal fees, charges. I don't think that I put up any out-of-pocket money to the attorneys. I remember they did have me sign a note. And we have such documents here.

There were local people who contributed to our defense fund who were contributing merely because they were friends or supporters of mine. Among others was the publisher of the *Spokesman-Review*. It's a ridiculous thing that some years later the managing editor of that paper embarks on a campaign of lying about the Canwell trial and so on. But probably one of the biggest contributors to our defense fund was Bill Cowles of the *Spokesman-Review*. He is a longtime friend of mine. I think he was fully favorable to the work that I was doing. So I had supporters like that. I suppose if the damage action verdict had been carried out against me I probably could have raised money. I never was much of a fundraiser.

The law firm, of course, they want money and lots of it. And we set about to try to raise the funds to pay them. I think they were finally paid off.

Mr. Frederick: What type of effect did that have on your family?

Mr. Canwell: I'm sure that they were very unhappy that a negative verdict came in. I don't think that their feeling was a lot different than mine. We discussed the thing as we always had. We'd always been in a series of crises and that sort of thing in my activity. It never was a smooth course. And my loving wife was very patient, and she put up with a lot of absences on my part and other things. But she understood what the problem was and believed in the work I was doing. And so she took it for granted that we would defend ourselves legally with the best means possible.

Mr. Frederick: One of the reasons why I bring that up is that, as of the reading of that verdict, and this is what I believe Albert is referring to repeatedly, although he hasn't pinpointedly referred to it. When that judgment was announced, it almost traveled around the world or at least through North America, almost immediately. And so what was broadcast on the airwaves is that a \$40,000 judgment had been awarded and the libel issue stood, the case was won. That was the news.

Would you like to—

Mr. Canwell: To comment on that? I would.

Mr. Frederick: Would you like to take this time, this opportunity to address this document that has been on this table now for several days, I believe.

Mr. Canwell: Well, yes. The first thing I would like to comment on is what you mentioned. This news went around the world. The *New York Times* featured it. Then when it was reversed and we won the thing, a few days later there was something back in the truss ads, about two inches of space. Nobody ever heard that we won. And that was pretty generally true around the country. The Associated Press is pretty well dominated by the liberal establishment. And that is what took place. But—

Mr. Frederick: To the point that what you are going to read now potentially is not common knowledge.

Mr. Canwell: No, I think that there's almost no knowledge of this. After the verdict came in, our attorneys representing the defendants, and I'll read it here: This is the Superior Court of the State of Washington for Okanogan County. John Goldmark and Sally Goldmark, his wife, plaintiffs, versus Albert F. Canwell, et al. And it tells the attorneys William L. Dwyer and R.A. Mansfield attorneys for the plaintiffs. Witherspoon, Kelley, Davenport and Toole and E. Glenn Harmon, Ned W. Kimball and Wicks, Thomas, and Wills, attorneys for the defendants.

“The defendants have moved for judgment notwithstanding the verdicts in favor of plaintiffs. If there is any substantial evidence to support the verdicts they must stand.” And so on. The judge takes us under advisement and there are thirteen pages to this document. It's available to anybody. In particular any newspaper who wanted the truth could go and get it. But the conclusion of the judge is:

I conclude that on all the evidence in this case the State has no constitutional power to enter a judgment for damages for libel by reason of the defendants' exercise of their rights of free speech and press. For this reason the motions for judgment, notwithstanding the verdict, are granted.

/s/ T. S. Turner, Judge.

And that was dated December 17, 1964.

It's a matter of court record. It's available to anybody who wants it. And in spite of that, over and over the *Seattle Times*, the *Seattle P-I* and the *Spokesman-Review* have printed the libelous falsehood that John Goldmark was libeled and sued, and won his case. And that was not the truth. He not only wasn't libeled, he didn't win his case. And the judge gave a verdict notwithstanding the jury's verdict, which was faulty and had to be reversed, and was reversed by Judge Turner. And the record is

there and available to anybody who wants it.

I tried to provide such information to the managing editor of the *Spokesman-Review*, who was one of those who purveyed that false information during the time of the Goldmark murder case. It was totally rejected, each one of the papers in possession of the information rejected it and went right ahead printing the same lies over and over again.

Talk about being libeled! Nobody was more seriously libeled than I was in the repeating of that falsehood that I had libeled John Goldmark, that he had sued and won. And he hadn't been libeled by me, and he sued and he didn't win. He paid the final court costs as a matter of closing the case; he had to. And that is the sum and substance of the end of the Goldmark versus Canwell trial. The plaintiffs lost it, the defendants won; it's a matter of court record, available to anybody who wants to seek it out.

Mr. Frederick: What is your feeling, what is your speculation with regard to various media outlets?

Mr. Canwell: My speculation as to why they are doing this? The only reasonable answer I can come up with is that they are totally controlled, and they are acting this way because they have to act that way. Not because it's truthful or right, but it's expedient from their standpoint, and I don't know what hazards they face if they were to tell the truth on the matter.

I considered a suit against them, and, of course, made a logical decision that it's silly to sue somebody for libel who buys his ink by the barrel. You can't win. They'd wear me out. So it wasn't worth the effort, and I didn't pursue it.

Mr. Frederick: Did you ever pursue the concept of having your attorneys write a letter to the various editors to get it printed in the newspaper?

Mr. Canwell: No, by that time I handled the thing myself. My attorney, Glenn Harmon, was ill, he was semiretired and other than asking him the advisability of suing these

people, I didn't consult him in the matter. And I was relying on my own judgment. I did have letters written to the local managing editor, which he ignored. I don't recall, I think I had some communication with the *Seattle P-I*. I knew that any such endeavors were a waste of time with the *Seattle Times*. I knew that by that time.

Mr. Frederick: So what you're saying then is, in essence—well, what you're saying is that they are being controlled and/or influenced, and what I see is that, with regard to this issue, Communism, anti-Communism, et cetera, et cetera, that potentially the parade is beginning to pass with regard to that issue.

Mr. Canwell: I would say that the public in general is losing its concern. I think it's probably blunted by the course of present events.

[End of Tape 61, Side 1]

CONCLUSION

Mr. Frederick: Albert, in terms of historical time frame, what I am talking about is circa 1963, that potentially on those various issues, the parade is beginning to pass.

Mr. Canwell: I don't think so, not so much so at that time. Currently, yes. But at that time, no. And the point at which this thing became an issue was when the son and his family, the son of John Goldmark and the son's family, were brutally murdered in Seattle by an insane individual.

Although when he was apprehended, when the culprit was apprehended, he immediately stated that his motive in his assault on the Goldmarks was monetary, he was after money, people over on the coast began to circulate the speculation that this man was anti-Communist; that he killed Charles Goldmark because he thought he was a Communist; none of which was true or justified.

The hearings on the Goldmarks occurred in the Okanogan when the murderer of Charles Goldmark was three or four years old! I haven't made my point here, which is that these papers, knowing the truth, fictionalized the thing, created a situation where over and over they repeated that, in essence, I and other defendants in the Goldmark case were really responsible for this nut murdering these people! That's what it amounted to.

Mr. Frederick: I hear what you say. And David Rice murdered Charles and Anne Goldmark on—

Mr. Canwell: And the children.

Mr. Frederick: —two children, Christmas Eve, 1985.

Albert, as I understand the situation with regard to what I've seen in the news media, that this simple soul was a member of a "local anti-Communist group." And one of the participants of that group, potentially a responsible participant of that group, appeared on television talking about this tragedy. I saw that myself. And my initial response was that—late 1985—this was pathetically tragic. And that the name of Charles Goldmark has to be surfaced someplace. And it was implied, and that gentleman who was interviewed on television did not deny it, that in terms, they thought, they said—he said, it was the farthest thing from their wildest imagination that this simple soul would go out and do something like that.

The point being is that the name of Charles Goldmark was being batted about by certain circles as late as 1985. Which is unfortunate.

Mr. Canwell: That isn't the substance of what was circulated. The story that was circulated was that he was taken to this Duck Club by this lady shrink that he was shackled up with, and that they were essentially anti-Communist. Somewhere along the line then, they brought in the story that John Goldmark was the head of the Communist Party, that was later.

Rice had to look in directories or be sent where he went to even know that Charles Goldmark lived where he did. He went there with handcuffs and various other things and tapes, and didn't expect to find the children there, so he said. But he did say that his reason for breaking in there, forcing his way in there was that he was after money. He took Charles Goldmark's billfold and his bank card and that's the way he was apprehended; he went to a bank to try to withdraw money with Charles Goldmark's bank card.

This theory of fighting a war against Communists was something that was planted in his mind *after* his arrest. In his first statements he did not mention any of those things. He admitted that he broke in and that he needed money. This shrink that he was living with had left town and left him there with no funds, so he was going to get some.

But that's a phase of the thing that nobody ever properly explored—did this woman condition him to do this violence? What was her part in the thing? This phony anti-Communism that they built into the case after the fact was not a valid thing.

So taking that bit of information, and false information, the three major papers in Washington and the AP put it on the wire, that this nut had committed these atrocities because he thought the Goldmarks were Communists. And it never was true; it was not mentioned in his original statements and his arrest.

I think the person that they should have been questioning is this lady shrink. She beds this nut down, knows he has no funds, and eventually with Christmas coming up she takes off and leaves him there in the house. There's a lot of answers there that I'd like to have. Whether he was conditioned to kill these people or what, I don't know. But he certainly, at the point of entry, plotting this assault, was not thinking about killing Communists, he was going with handcuffs and tapes and things to tie people up and get some money. And that's what he did, but he went berserk and bashed their heads in and did a lot of violence. Whether anybody knew that he would do that or was capable of it, I don't know, but I would like to ask a lot of questions of this shrink who was handling this psychopath.

I have pursued the case some, but I just haven't had the time that I need on it. There are a lot of things that

need answering there. For them, then, to try to parlay that into an attack on Canwell and Holden and make them a party in guilt to the murder of these people, this horrible murder, is in itself a vicious, a very vicious thing. Because there was nothing that she could have heard in any of these meetings that would link anybody to the Goldmark trial two decades before. This boy, Rice, was what, three or four years old at that time.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, that was not the point. The point was that these issues live on. And we're not talking about eyewitnesses, we're just talking about those issues that live on.

Mr. Canwell: The Duck Club I knew nothing about, except I have known a lot of those groups. Usually they're made up of good people who may be a little emotional or so on, but always there are a few professional "Jew-baiters," who try to get the idea over to people that all of our problems are due to the Jews and the international bankers, and this, that, and the other thing. So those are always in those groups. Now this woman who was living with this man, she provided the home, knew better than that, I think.

But somebody may have played on it, or parlayed it to a place where it could have made the Goldmarks some of the Jewish establishment, or one way or another try to link them up to all of this hokum that the Jew-baiters dish out. I know that the professional Jew-baiters work in those groups, but in most cases they don't dominate them, they don't organize or control them, and I know nothing about the Duck Club as such, but they sound like the same sort of thing that I encounter many times.

Mr. Frederick: There's some fantastic rhetoric, Albert, that comes from the Right in this country. If I'm not mistaken, within your *Vigilante* you mention that a meeting or example of writing was "the bullet that got John Goldmark." Now I may be misstating that—

Mr. Canwell: No, I said here the other day, "It was the *Vigilante* that shot John Goldmark out of the saddle." It was probably an unfortunate expression at a time when there has been this act of violence against the Goldmark son. And that was just a play on words.

That's another thing: I never, at any time ever mentioned the fact that John Goldmark was a Jew. And then these stories that they ran regarding the murder, they said that John Goldmark had been accused, and this is getting back to the trial, the Canwell/Goldmark trial, that he had been accused of being a Communist and a Jew, neither of which was true. I never accused him of being either a Communist or a Jew. Where'd they get that? Why did they come up with that sort of a line? Somebody is trying to promote that sort of thinking, to make it, somehow or

another, make me a Jew-baiter, and I always beat them at that game because I never was, and I never believed in that line of crap. Somebody wants to make that an issue.

Mr. Frederick: Within that campaign, going back to 1961, as I understand it, that was never an issue within the campaign.

Mr. Canwell: It only became an issue in these repeated false stories in the press, linking the murders to the Goldmark trial.

I don't ever remember that Goldmarks' ethnic identity was ever mentioned by anybody. It wouldn't have been by, we'll say, Gillespie. He's part Jew himself, so it just wasn't the sort of thing that any of those people would be doing, and certainly I never did it.

Mr. Frederick: Well, nothing appeared in print.

Mr. Canwell: Not that I know of, I never heard anything. I never heard any criticism leveled at the Goldmarks on that level at all. It just never occurred, as far as I know.

But it was injected in these stories in the local press. Stories and editorials after the murders.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, you're aware of the immense amount of bitterness with regard to these various issues.

Mr. Canwell: The immense amount of what?

Mr. Frederick: Bitterness.

Mr. Canwell: Bitterness? Say, generated in the Goldmark trial or what? Where?

Mr. Frederick: Surrounding the issue of left-wing politics, right-wing politics, Communist Party or Progressive Party, or New Dealism. This country underwent an ideological cold war, civil war, after World War II. It was an ideological civil war that went on.

Mr. Canwell: I don't believe that there's any time in history where people have been free to express opinions that that sort of situation hasn't pertained. French Revolution, other places, it's the nature of free people to flex their muscles and talk, and sometimes talk too much.

But under our system you can be alarmed at such things, and express opinions on it, and you find people who share them and people who don't, and among both, good people and bad people. So I'm not of the opinion that there was any greater amount of bitterness as such than there was about the Nazis and the Germans.

I can remember the tremendous propaganda against the Germans during the First World War and subsequent.

Many people never got over it, they just hated Germans. They thought they killed babies and all kinds of things because of the stories that were circulated. So there is that type of bitterness and it is a tendency, or the possibility is taken advantage of by propagandists.

A man like Joseph Goebbels was a master of that sort of thing. He and Hitler and many of their followers, they knew how to agitate people to stir them up, get them into action doing what they wanted done.

So that happens under all kinds of systems and it's certainly possible under a free system where people can say what they damn well please. There's some merit to it, there's some demerits. I never was one much to buy propaganda.

But it's the nature of people to succumb to propaganda, and of course it isn't hard to make them see bogeymen and other things. I never was as concerned about the violent phase of the Communist enterprise as I was about the intellectual phase of it. I thought that was where the real war was, and where the real violence and poison was being distributed was in the marketplace of ideas.

Mr. Frederick: How do you deal with that? With that murder, and there are those who partially hold you and Ashley responsible. I've never heard anybody imply that you had anything to do with it, but it has to do with—

Mr. Canwell: Responsible because we—

Mr. Frederick: —the campaign, going back to 1961—

Mr. Canwell: —because we “libeled” John Goldmark and “called him a Communist” and he sued and—

Mr. Frederick: That—

Mr. Canwell: —false story that he “won?”

Mr. Frederick: That's prevalent to this day. That feeling.

Mr. Canwell: I know it. I'm sure that there are those who believe that to be true. So the only way that I can counteract it is to go back to these false statements in major news sources which were the *Seattle Times*, the *Seattle P-I*, the *Spokesman-Review* and the *Associated Press* and show that they deliberately distributed false information to convey that idea. I found no way of doing that. I thought of suing, and then thought better of it.

Mr. Frederick: I'm talking about feelings. I'm talking about feelings.

Mr. Canwell: Feelings? What—

Mr. Frederick: How do you feel about that?

Mr. Canwell: How do I feel about it? It's a fiction. There's no substance to it, no fact, it's a creation of propagandists who want to convey a lie that would be damaging to me and to what I represent.

Mr. Frederick: Oh, Albert! I'm not saying that. I'm not saying that.

Mr. Canwell: Well, you're talking about the people who succumb to this thinking.

Mr. Frederick: Who believe that. They partially hold you and Ashley responsible for those murders.

Mr. Canwell: Of course, that was the result of a very vicious fiction that was published by seemingly responsible sources. So the people have a right to draw such conclusions, I think, as long as they believe those news sources to be accurate. Believe me, I don't know; how to counteract it. How would you counteract it if somebody blamed you directly or indirectly for being responsible for the Goldmark murders? We'll say maybe you picked apples down at White Salmon and didn't like the Goldmarks, so you said something critical about them. So you were accused of murder when an unknown burglar killed them. I don't know, how do you counteract that? You don't. There isn't any way. A lie will usually fall of its own weight, but that's not necessarily true when the media is controlled by people who seem to be wanting to do that. It worked in Germany and Russia. It is working here.

Probably, Timothy, this is the point at which I should make some further exposures. If I am to come out of these interviews with my reputation intact, it seems that, before parting the scene, I must solve the Charles Goldmark murder mystery or share in the guilt which the press has bestowed upon me. Although the murderer has been caught, the political skullduggery that followed makes this case a great all-time whodunit.

I am convinced at this point that David Rice was psychologically programmed to kill Charles Goldmark and his wife on Christmas Eve, 1985. As the total crime unfolded, it became more and more obvious that he had been preprogrammed.

It still remains somewhat of a mystery. However, a number of the pieces of the puzzle are beginning to fall into place. Now as I launch into this disclosure, I will ask a question or two to set the stage.

Have we had any other Christmas Eve murders in the Seattle area?

Yes, and the ACLU is closely identified with it and has used both it and the Rice killings in its propaganda wars.

The murders I am referring to were by Don Anthony White; murders in which the culprit was caught and convicted, and in which the ACLU ballyhooed the murderer, White, as the victim. Alice Ann Jumper, an elderly woman, was raped and mercilessly beaten to death by White on Christmas Eve, 1959, in Seattle. The same night, White stabbed to death a black longshoreman, Willie Leroy Dixon, age forty-nine. White was apprehended and duly convicted in a fair trial and sentenced to hang.

The ACLU made great theater out of the massive campaign to save the murderer's neck. They pulled out all the stops; even had singer Joan Baez prance and whine on the state Capitol steps at Olympia in a successful attempt to save White from going to the hangman.

White had lawyers galore. The brilliant Max Etter of the Spokane ACLU was on line to justify and glorify the unrepentant scoundrel. Even the judge of record in the sentencing (who was later to be the judge in the Goldmark libel trial!) emotionally and tearfully accepted a painting from the murderer, seemingly oblivious to the fact that Don White not only could paint pretty pictures, he could and did brutally rape and murder a helpless sixty-nine-year-old woman on Christmas Eve!

The ACLU, the American Friends Service Committee, and the Spokane Unitarian Church were all involved in the defense and glorification of this criminal. A movie, *A Volcano Named White*, was produced, and shown at the Unitarian Church. Huw Williams of the AFSC and the Tolstoy Farm at Davenport, Washington, organized the Olympia demonstration. Defense of White was provided by the ACLU volunteer attorneys! Later, the ACLU employed White as an inside man in prison demonstrations organized at the Walla Walla State Penitentiary. White thus repaid the favor granted when the ACLU saved him from the noose and glorified him in their propaganda.

On Christmas Eve, 1985, another brutal multiple murder occurred in Seattle. This time the victims were Charles Goldmark, his wife and two children. The perpetrator of these brutal crimes was arrested and sentenced to death. He was David Lewis Rice of Seattle, whose family lived in Richland and Kennewick. After Rice admitted that his motive was robbery, numerous articles appeared in all the large Northwest newspapers supplying a different motive: Rice was an anti-Communist who had murdered Charles Goldmark for the sole reason that he confused Charles with John Goldmark! John, the reports alleged, had been viciously libeled as a member of the Communist Party by Al Canwell and Ashley Holden; that John had sued for libel and won the case. None of these allegations was true, and the charges against Canwell and Holden were criminally libelous!

The how and why of this second multiple murder and of the subsequent propaganda storm must be established to find a motive. The hidden motive to me seems to be a determination of persons operating in the background to

set up a horrible Christmas Eve murder and then adroitly transfer the guilt to one Canwell and others.

This suspicion was fortified by events that followed the horrible crime. The three major newspapers in the area, the *Seattle Times*, *Seattle P-I*, and the Spokane *Spokesman-Review* seemed poised, ready and willing to publish a lie essential to the propaganda success of the plot. The linkage was fragile and tenuous: Twenty years had elapsed since the Goldmark trial. At the time of the Goldmark trial, the murderer was but a small child! But if given a dramatic springboard such as the horrible Christmas Eve slayings and bashings, the traumatized public would be too shocked to notice that.

What the three newspapers and the Associated Press conveyed to the now attentive public was a provable lie. Linking the murders to the Okanogan libel trial and Canwell, it was repeated that John Goldmark had been falsely accused of being a "Communist," thus losing his seat in the state Legislature; that he then sued Canwell and others for libel and won his suit. Neither Canwell nor any of the Okanogan defendants had ever accused John Goldmark of being a Communist, and such was never alleged in the libel complaint!

However, it was well-known to Canwell, but never released, that Goldmark was involved in the Communist apparatus at the House of Accokeek in Maryland at the highest espionage level. And Goldmark did not win his libel suit, a fact well-known to all three newspapers. Claiming ignorance of the facts of the case is invalid, for Dick Larsen, the one-time friend and biographer of Ted Bundy, covered the trial for the *Wenatchee World* and was later to become an editor of the *Seattle Times*. By the murders and the projection of the "big lie," the plotters had the attention of an outraged and sympathetic world.

It seems evident that Rice was programmed to do violence only to Charles Goldmark and his wife, for when he was apprehended and interrogated, Rice readily revealed his motive: money. And he stated that the children were "not supposed to be there." Who told him who was supposed to be there? Who supplied the address and other necessary information to this man who knew nothing about Charles Goldmark?

The plotters, seeking maximum attention by the nature and timing of the crime, really struck gold when the children, too, were fatally bludgeoned. Then a deathwatch was set up by ghouls, who recorded every dying gasp. Tied to the daily news story was a supposed linkage to Okanogan, Canwell, and Holden. This, of course, was to once and for all make the name of Canwell toxic!

Now the question: Am I reaching for a "high one"? Am I demonstrating a kind of paranoia; falsely accusing the guiltless? Let me set forth some of the background information that makes my argument more acceptable to incredulous but reasonable people.

How pure and how free from guilt is the ACLU? Let

me review their history.

They were founded as a front for the international Communist Party centered in Germany prior to World War I. William Z. Foster, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, and many other provable subversives were on the founding list. Now let's dissect them a little and explore their true nature.

Do they mount and maintain libel suits against active patriots?

Yes. The Goldmark v. Canwell libel action conducted in the Okanogan cattle country, where the ACLU spent a fortune calling friendly witnesses from all across the country as far away as Florida to testify for them, is but one of many. It was aimed at silencing and destroying Canwell. They called in their agents to Okanogan with a fabulous outlay of funds and demonstration of power. Their case was frivolous and could not have, under normal legal procedures, found its way into court.

But the ACLU members are very clever, scheming people. One hundred percent of the Goldmark case against Canwell was mounted by members of the ACLU: The plaintiffs, all of them; their attorneys, all of them; their witnesses, ninety-five percent or more ACLU personnel. The sleaziest type of characters were dressed up, brought into court, and presented as critics of Canwell, his character and activities.

Do they support the commission of ruthless murder?

Yes. The ACLU's annual reports are a catalog of instances in which they supported both subversives and violent criminals. Their people led in the public support and domestic propaganda for Stalin's fronts in Seattle. The bank-robber-cum-dictator, Stalin, of course, was history's most notorious mass murderer. The ACLU represented his interests in this outpost of the Kremlin, closest to the coastal areas of the USSR.

Were ACLU contacts responsible for arranging the torching of the Canwell building containing the most extensive files and proof of the perfidy of the ACLU and its agents? I think so.

Did they successfully mount a massive campaign to destroy the congressional House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Senate Internal Security Committee, and the state committees investigating Communism?

They did. They solicited thousands of names and millions of dollars to publish full-page and even double-truck ads in America's mass circulation newspapers, successfully attacking those committees. Those committees, like the Canwell committee, whose funding they successfully petitioned to remove, represented the security interests of all of the people of the United States and were the direct instruments of the people in their representative government.

Such ACLU assaults as the petition to cut the Canwell committee funding, the John Goldmark libel trials, the

arson of our building, the smear following the Charles Goldmark murders, are not really aimed at Canwell the citizen, but at Canwell the legislator, who purposefully and successfully employed the legislative powers to counter political subversion, and also urged others within the Congress and several states to do likewise.

Thus, we have exposed the motive: Make Joe McCarthy, Martin Dies, Al Canwell, and others who employed these remedies, anathema; assassinate their character and you will destroy public confidence in the constitutional system which they were employing so successfully. Yet these are the same legislators who revealed the true allegiance of such men as Alger Hiss, that architect of world politics who accompanied President Roosevelt to Yalta, President Truman to Potsdam, and assisted in San Francisco in setting up the United Nations.

Were ACLU members and friends involved in, or did they benefit from, the smear campaign after the Goldmark murders?

Of course. Not only did they proliferate the lies mentioned heretofore, but they set up private foundations to gather windfall profits from a kindhearted and sympathetic public.

Last, I would suggest that if you can identify those who orchestrated the propaganda in Washington's mass media and caused the libel-sensitive editors of the major papers to publish *in unison* a provable lie, you will have uncovered the who, why, and how of the Goldmark murders.

I now rest my case. If the ACLU is not the culprit, or at least the prime suspect, more than a subject of interest, as the police say, then I'll have to go back to the drawing board.

Prime movers in the ACLU from the beginning have included such plotters as Felix Frankfurter, who trained and conditioned spies and traitors such as Alger Hiss, and sent them down from Harvard to Longview, the "House of Accokeek" in Maryland, an infamous spy cell operated by the Perlo-Kramer group and the Harold Ware cell, under the direction of America's top Soviet spy, Harry Hopkins, and his assistant, Jacob Baker; a house which John Goldmark and his wife, Irma Ringe, a graduate of the infamous Communist Workers School of New York City, called home. From here, pro-Soviet initiatives entered into the burgeoning New Deal government with the intention of taking it over from within.

One of the prize prospects developed by Felix Frankfurter at Harvard and brought along and on graduation sent by their underground device to Accokeek was John Goldmark, a nephew of Louis Brandeis, justice of the Supreme Court.

John was an attractive and intelligent Harvard honor graduate, who they were grooming to be a future "crown prince" of American politics. He was nurtured carefully by that device. When he graduated from law school at

Harvard, he was sent down to Accokeek and took up residence in the spy nest, a large frame house where Irma Ringe (Sally Goldmark), Helen Winner and Lenora Thomas, three lesbian Communists, assisted in managing the spy nest and providing entertainment. John Goldmark, who had taken up residence in this boot camp for spies, eventually married his landlady, Irma Ringe, later known as Sally Goldmark, and took off for the war.

A sharp look needs to be taken at Louis Brandeis, John Goldmark, Felix Frankfurter, and their associates, many of whose antecedents had roots in the secret societies and political intrigues and subversion of the Habsburg Empire in Austria and, in the case of Goldmark, in the political assassination of Latour, the defense minister of Austria. They fled the country after orchestrating the revolution of 1848, and many of them, including Josef Goldmark the physician-turned-bullet-maker, came to the United States, to reap profits from the Civil War of 1865! There is a complicated and shocking story here, one so shocking that the public is unprepared even to comprehend it; we were only scratching the surface as we uncovered the can of worms at Accokeek, Maryland.

It was the fear that these concealed machinations, which were unknown to the public, would be exposed that impelled the ACLU to gamble their vast wealth and power to attempt to destroy me politically and financially, in the hope that the seal on their activities at Longview, Maryland, across the Potomac from the Soviet Embassy, would never be broken or that, if the Pandora's box were finally opened, no one would be receptive to believe the shocking truth.

I don't know how to effectively counter it. First place, the statements made that lead students and others to believe the Goldmark murder connection are based on falsehood. They repeat them over and over, and I have the statements, where they said that Rice was influenced by the trial of John Goldmark and that these murders grew out of that. And that's as vicious as the murders because it isn't true, no part of it is true.

The fact that the Goldmarks lost the libel trial indicates that they were not libeled. Then to say that the murders two decades later resulted from that "libel" is another falsehood, a particularly vicious type of propaganda.

[End of Tape 61, Side 2]

Mr. Canwell: I am glad to take this opportunity to express my concern of questioning that seems to carry on a longtime vendetta against one Ashley Holden.

I want it understood thoroughly that in my opinion Ashley Holden is a fine person. He is, I think, a respectable patriot who has had the courage of his conviction and hasn't hesitated to speak out and to write and state his thinking. And his thinking has usually been very acceptable to me. I think that he is a fine person, a credit to the

state. He is a pioneer and a son of pioneers from the country where he conducted the parts of this Goldmark activity that is at issue. But he, in my opinion, was sort of a "Sagebrush Tom Paine." He's a man of great ability, courage and determination. And, of course, he made enemies, and lots of them.

But it's a little confusing to me to know that there are so many people concerned about destroying Holden and his reputation. I think he's an all-around commendable citizen. I am proud to have known him and to have associated with him. And I want the record to hold and convey that because that's the way it is.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, it's been mentioned that Judge Turner made his ruling due to and/or was influenced by the United States Supreme Court ruling of March 1964 with regard to the case, *Sullivan vs. New York Times*, which it is said made an addition to the libel laws of this country.

Just as a brief background: Mr. Sullivan, L.B. Sullivan, was a city councilman of Montgomery, Alabama, or a commissioner. He happened to be the commissioner for public safety. Was in charge or responsible for the Montgomery, Alabama, Police Department.

There was a paid advertisement within the *New York Times* soliciting funds for Dr. Martin Luther King's work and there were representations and misrepresentations with regard to the Montgomery, Alabama, police response to Dr. Martin Luther King's various campaigns in that area. Mr. Sullivan, being the responsible person for the police department, knew of these errors, misstatement of facts, and sued the *New York Times* for libel. The ruling that came down from the Supreme Court was that these were public issues, public personalities and in the interest of a vigorous press, vigorous free speech; particularly so associated with political debate, political issues, that Mr. Sullivan's libel case was overturned. What is your perspective with regard to the *Sullivan vs. New York Times*?

Mr. Canwell: My running opinion on the thing is that it did not make new law. The Supreme Court justices merely attempted to clarify issues regarding freedom of the press and free speech and so on. The Supreme Court was guilty at times of doing just that. But in the case of *Sullivan vs. the New York Times*, I think they just clarified issues that had always existed. And the only new thing there is they specifically stated that malice had to be an element in addition to truth. And, of course, that was such a flexible, impossible thing to determine. How can a man speak forthrightly and with vigor and so on, about what he considers to be subversion, without personally holding a little malice in his heart against the evildoers or the ones he considers to be.

I have no quarrel with the *Sullivan/New York Times*

case or determination. And I think that Judge Turner found it a very convenient solution to the Goldmark vs. Canwell faulty verdict. I think that Judge Turner was reasonably certain that if this case went through the course of the Supreme Court that it would be overturned. There was so much reversible error committed by the court. And I don't ascribe any evil intent on the part of the court. I think that the judge, Turner, was a very competent, able man, but I do not think he was as informed on the laws of libel as our attorney, Glenn Harmon. So Glenn Harmon could sit there and pick out these cases where the judge had committed reversible error and felt reasonably secure that no matter what verdict came in, that we could eventually win in the upper courts. So I don't know if that's perhaps an extended answer to your question: What do I think of the *New York Times/Sullivan* case? As far as I know, I have no quarrel with it.

I think the court expressed the opinions there in several cases that in political give-and-take, considerable leeway must be granted because it's part of our system to discuss issues and elect or defeat people to represent us in the legislative bodies, and it's recognized that the rhetoric may become pretty severe and hot in such situations and so the court was willing to make a little allowance for that within the operation of our system.

I know that in many political campaigns that I engaged in statewide, there were just unbelievable things that were said about me. Oh, I was an alcoholic, or a wife-beater, a womanizer, everything in the world that you could think of. In one major appearance of mine, they had signs and pickets going up and down that I was anti-Catholic, I was anti-this, that, and the other thing. This happened to be at a Catholic university. That I hated Jews and children and oh, you name it, I was accused of it. And that went on statewide. It was just part of the expected action and that's what happens when a vigorous or determined person is offering his services for legislative office. He's going to be attacked by everybody that doesn't like what he represents. And so a great deal of latitude must be allowed for such irresponsible utterances.

In making those comments I'm not applying it to the case at issue, the Goldmark case. That is just a general comment that I thoroughly believe in freedom of expression even though the expression may be contrary to my beliefs or may be provable error. But I believe in academic freedom. I believe that a teacher has the right to teach what he believes to be true even though it may be in error and then it has to be taken care of in other ways. But I think his right to do so has to exist.

I'm very much more liberal in those areas than any of my enemies think. I'm not about to curtail speech or writing that I don't agree with. I just want the thing not to be done at the public expense. Somebody can provide his own soapbox and preach doctrines that are offensive to me, so be it. But I just don't want to be taxed to support

the joker while he's doing it.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, was that a foundation concept of yours with regard to your formation of the, I believe it was, the National Ban the Bum Committee?

Mr. Canwell: That was sort of a tongue in cheek thing.

Mr. Frederick: When did that come about?

Mr. Canwell: When? There again I'd have to go back and check the record. But I think it was in the 1960s sometime. I just objected to the constant flow of these left-wing propagandists. Particularly across the speaker's stage, and lionizing these characters who were spouting the Communist Party line and making a great to-do about their scholarship and their degrees and so on while they were instruments of a propaganda device that was offensive to me and I think to the majority of people if they understood it.

So just as a tongue in cheek approach to the thing, I put together what we called the Ban the Bum Committee. Not that we wanted to ban these people as much as we just wanted them to be properly identified. If they were to come to the local school or churches or whatever, but particularly the schools, and be featured as great scholars, I felt that it was proper to indicate that they weren't such great scholars. They were phony propagandists.

I thought that was a wonderful vehicle. I should have enlarged it, the Ban the Bum Committee. It reduced these people to really what they actually were. In my concept they were bums.

Mr. Frederick: How did you go about that? What did you do?

Mr. Canwell: I just set up some type and we had a printing press and we put out dodgers and pamphlets, and made them available to students or people who didn't like what was going on either. And we saw that these things were distributed at the appearance of some of these left-wing characters. We were aware and I was aware that many of these people were adequately financed by the Rockefeller Foundation and other large funds. They had ample funds to carry on their propaganda work and there was no opposition to it, so I provided some. I thought it was very good.

Mr. Frederick: Who were some of the people that you, I would assume, protested about? Who were they?

Mr. Canwell: To quickly answer that, I think you might best go through some of these *Vigilante* copies that we had here because they were featured often on the front cover of the *Vigilante*, also, besides fliers or sheets that go

out under the heading of a Ban the Bum Committee. I think I would have to go through it to pick up these names.

There were characters like Abraham J. Muste. Another one who in a speech said that we should destroy the United States. Anyway, these people were featured on the front cover of the *Vigilante*. I think we have some of them here or did have the other day. I would just have to go through the folder and pick some of the names.

Mr. Frederick: I recall, Albert, from that article you showed me. Wasn't there the historian, Commager?

Mr. Canwell: Yes, Henry Steele Commager is one of them. Edgar Snow, I think was brought into the community. Anyway, they had a stable of these people that were circulated around the whole country into the campuses of the major schools. And usually they got a very good press by liberal reporters who believed some of that stuff. But I just felt that it needed some opposition and I gave it some healthy opposition. Whenever we put out a Ban the Bum flier, we gave their Communist front record. Some of them had a great many such connections. So we felt that the student-listener particularly had a right to know both sides of the thing. And obviously the people who siphoned them into the community, into the schools weren't going to put out anything except the favorable line on them. We just filled in the rest of the story.

Mr. Frederick: What campuses did you appear at in that campaign?

Mr. Canwell: Wherever one of these characters was booked for a speaking engagement. But it was not as extensive as I would have liked to have made it. I just had too many other things to do. That was just one of the enterprises that I felt would be effective, so I did what I could on it. And that's one of the reasons I have a printing press. I like to print my own material and not have it censored before issue. So I printed such things myself.

Mr. Frederick: When you came back from Okanogan after that trial what did you do for the rest of that decade? What were you involved in?

Mr. Canwell: That's pretty hard to say right off-the-cuff. I continued my own general activities and keeping track of the Communist apparatus and their devices. I always had undercover people within the Communist Party. I had to keep these contacts up. And I also had a farm and a family, trying to maintain my responsibilities in this farming enterprise and I just did what I had always been doing, which I to a degree still do. I had become obviously a focal point of opposition to the Communist program, and so I had become acquainted with an enormous

number of people and that had grown significantly in statewide political campaigns that I had engaged in and I was essentially talking the same subject in my political campaigns. So I acquired a very wide acquaintance with concerned citizens.

[End of Tape 62, Side 1]

Mr. Frederick: With regard to your Freedom Library. How long was that in operation?

Mr. Canwell: It was in the early sixties that we started the thing and then acquired this building. I don't know just how many years that operated. We ran a conservative bookstore and outlet and let various persuasions obtain their literature through the store. We had the Catholic Kapaun Corner, materials of the Protestant Christian Crusade, and the Birch Society for a time ran their American Opinion bookstore in this building. We ran a print shop and research service.

The Freedom Library was the name of the corporation that we acquired the building under and continued the operation after moving from 610 West Sprague. It was active all through that time.

Mr. Frederick: When did that endeavor come to a close?

Mr. Canwell: I would say that it really came to a close when the building and our facilities were torched in an arson fire in 1984. At least it came to a lull or slowed down the operation, because we were burned out.

Mr. Frederick: You never rebuilt the library after that?

Mr. Canwell: No, not as such.

Mr. Frederick: During this time period, America increasingly became involved in Vietnam. What was your opinion of that endeavor?

Mr. Canwell: About the war in Vietnam? I could say that I've always been opposed in theory, generally opposed to America engaging in foreign wars, particularly in the Far East. I felt that we should not be in a ground war there. But I wasn't out with the protesters and complainers. It was just the sort of thing that I felt was militarily and politically unsound. I don't think we had any sensible reason for placing ground troops in Asia. If we wanted to have any military impact there, we had a powerful Navy and Air Force and they could be used. That was just my personal thinking. I felt that they entered into a ground war in Asia and placed American troops there, where these Asiatics were born faster than you can kill them. I think it's ridiculous. But I was not making those

decisions and I still firmly believe that we should not have been engaged in that manner in that theater.

But once involved or engaged, then I support our government and its military arm. I believe that every citizen has to do that. The time to oppose it is before it occurs.

Mr. Frederick: With regard to the civil unrest of the decade of the 1960s, particularly the mid-latter portion of the decade. Would you please comment on that?

Mr. Canwell: My opinion is that the rabble-rousers and protesters and that sort of thing had to have leadership. It might not be obvious or on the surface, but somebody was calling the shots.

I can remember going down to photograph a demonstration in front of the federal building years and years ago. And before most of the students protesting and marching and carrying banners there could have found Nicaragua on the map they were carrying placards stating: "Get Out of Nicaragua" and that sort of thing. So somebody is directing that kind of propaganda and that sort of demonstration. And somebody is able and there's organization enough that someone says to the students out at Whitworth or Gonzaga or wherever or at the community colleges: "We're marching." So they march.

But my thinking in that regard is that we have a responsibility to know who is directing that sort of thing. Who's pulling the strings. And usually I have some information on it. And again, because I've had undercover people in the general apparatus at all times, I had a pretty good insight into who is pulling the strings.

Mr. Frederick: How would you characterize those people?

Mr. Canwell: I would characterize most of them as being not too bright, misfits on the student level, and others who are able to be reached by people who are trained to get to them. They know their weaknesses and their uncertainties and so on. They take advantage of it and they get those people into this sort of action. The students think they're doing something exciting and worthwhile. And I would say most of them are harmless. They aren't going to throw any rocks. They just get out there and protest and mouth what they're told to mouth.

So I'd say that they're many times the stooges of sometimes faculty, preachers, others who have an ax to grind but that isn't what they tell these students. They're saving the world. So they say, "Let's march," and they march. I wouldn't do anything about it. Just find out who the prime movers are and keep track of them.

Mr. Frederick: With regard to the disclosures that came out of the Watergate era beginning in 1972, 1973. What did you see?

Mr. Canwell: Watergate in general? I saw my friend, Dick Nixon, mousetrapped. He should have known better than to walk into that trap. There were people close to him and around him who were part of a device that always wanted to destroy him. And they knew something that Nixon's followers didn't know, and that is that he talked like a stevedore when he was off the record. And so that device to force his recordings into the open so that his little old ladies in tennis shoes who followed him and a lot of other good people would think, "Why, that horrible man, I didn't know that he talked like that."

It was a thing well-planned, skillfully planned. And it was planned to do exactly what was accomplished. I would say that the "Deep Throat," as they always tried to characterize whoever the undercover guy was—in my opinion, it was always John Dean—they set up this thing with these two reporters and had them on hand to discover the so-called break-in at Watergate and make a big thing of it. And they carried the ball from there.

But I think there were inside people in Nixon's organization as the thing unfolded. I went back to see him, having been through something to a degree similar and knowing in my opinion what should be done about it. I wanted to influence him to take those tapes out on the lawn and burn them, deactivate them. But I was unable to have any effect at that time. I think it was a skillfully planned frame-up; that the man who carried the equipment and was going to bug the thing was, oh, I call him a gung ho meathead. He was a good guy who at long last had an opportunity to do something that he felt was big time. And he carried the tools and the devices, and the reporters were there to photograph the whole works. And they carried it from that point on.

He never should have permitted himself, that is Nixon, never should have permitted himself to be booby-trapped like that. But to begin with he had, I think, sacrificed something in his supporters by accepting or bringing into his operation a group of Rockefeller types who were Republican liberals, I think. These people were not competent to adequately represent Dick Nixon the man, the person who had built himself up to arrive at that point. And I think he suddenly was surrounded by people who were going to change his image.

The whole Watergate thing was a phony. But it accomplished its purpose. It brought down a president of the United States. And he was not too well at that time. I think that he was taking quite a bit of medication and was under enormous stress and they dumped the load on him.

Mr. Frederick: When you went back there did you have an opportunity to have a personal audience with him?

Mr. Canwell: No, I tried to set it up but was unable to do so. And I did talk to his secretary but it could not be arranged at that time. And I couldn't stay there. I couldn't

take the time or afford it. But I would have given him what I thought was pretty sound advice and that was to get rid of those tapes. Because I knew what would be on them. I'd been with him when it was off the record. And he could talk in a very elegant and scholarly manner. He could also talk like a stevedore. And did.

I could illustrate that. One time I was with him in Seattle. We went up to some faculty meeting at the university and he talked to this group and did a very, very scholarly thing and I complimented him afterward. He said, "Oh, I know how to talk to those sons of bitches." Well, that's Dick Nixon. He could be as polished and scholarly as necessary, and he could be just one of the waterfront characters.

But I always had a great admiration for the man. I think I knew him fairly well. He came into the state a couple of times and made a series of talks to aid and abet me in political campaigns.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, is it appropriate to say that, with regard to the arson fire, 1984/1985, was that a transitional period for you in your career?

Mr. Canwell: I would only say that I was getting older every year and my responsibilities always increased and mounted. I don't know to what degree it was transitional. But it had impact because it destroyed an enormous amount of working tools that I had and needed.

Mr. Frederick: What was the percentage of your collection lost?

Mr. Canwell: I would say that it's pretty hard to state that because I had traditionally microfilmed confidential and important documents and I had those things elsewhere. But the convenient files that you just reach out and get a folder or check an index, that sort of thing was decimated. And so it had the intended impact. I think that the goal was accomplished in that it slowed me down. It inhibited my activities.

It was quite interesting. The transcripts of the Goldmark trial had become almost impossible to come by, for whatever reason I won't speculate. But our defendants' copies of the transcripts were in the possession of our attorney in his garage where he had them stored. And his garage was burned down. And destroyed that group or that set of the transcripts of the Goldmark trial, which I still think was a landmark case.

And I think that there were those that did not want that testimony available because it was very damaging to their side, even though it was not everything that I wanted to go into the trial, there was an awful lot in it that was very important. So, anyway, that's when the defendants' transcript disappeared.

The University of Washington, I think, got one and

then sections of that evaporated.

And then along, I suppose it was 1984, the widow of the court reporter, Oren Casey, called me and asked if I wanted the original transcript and notes. She had to do something with them and had been told that I probably wanted them. And she called me and I did. I went over there and took possession of that transcript, the original one, and I brought it back here, and hardly got it installed or put away when the place was torched. I don't know if there was any connection or not. I always assumed that my phone was bugged. I know if I were my opponents I wouldn't sit there without taking every advantage that I could get.

But it was quite significant that that set was installed here and the place was torched. But it wasn't just that which was involved, but it may have been the thing that triggered the time to do it.

I probably had the most extensive antismuggling files outside of the federal government in the United States, particularly on the ACLU. And that was not generally known but it must have been known to some.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, as a senior citizen, how does that change one's life? How does that change one's daily routine? And how is the senior citizen perceived within this culture, this society?

Mr. Canwell: If being a senior citizen has any advantages, I even resent the term. But it maybe gives you some discounts or something—I don't know any other advantage it has, and I am annoyed by the mail I get that must be derived from the state drivers license records. I get a great flood of this mail to senior citizens and it goes of course into the round file. The only thing that I notice is that I naturally slow down a little and I hope that it's not too noticeable.

My friend, Dr. Alfred Adams, who I used to visit with once in awhile, I was telling him that I was writing a general book. And he said, "Well, you'd better get on with it while you can still celebrate." I don't know whether I can still celebrate or not but I think I can.

But anyway I have a busy schedule. I keep busy, and I think I'm therefore in good health. I do work out around my farm. I can't afford to hire people to do a lot of the things that I do. I have a chain saw. I cut my wood and I try to do a little gardening and that sort of thing. And as soon as I begin to get tired I come into town and check my mail and do a little work here.

I don't know, I know that years are creeping up on me but I don't feel that I'm physically or mentally impaired yet. There may be others that do not share that view.

Mr. Frederick: And how many grandchildren do you have now?

Mr. Canwell: I believe it's thirteen or fourteen. I have to take off my shoes and count my fingers and toes. But I think it's fourteen. I have six children and fourteen grandchildren.

My children are all alive and living in various places in the world. Two of them live in the San Diego area with their families. And one lives in Washington D.C., and another one lives in Rome and Geneva. That one, she and her husband, will be here at the end of this month. And then my two sons live here in Spokane. I think you met one of them the other day, Jon, and two is Marshall. They live here. And Jon is not married. But Marshall has several children and he lives with us at the farm at Montvale.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, I want to thank you for sharing with us your life story. And I want to particularly thank you for your patience and your diligence and the work that you've put into it.

Mr. Canwell: I feel that probably I entered this project ill-prepared because of the litter and confusion that is very evident here. I try in general to be an organized person. Particularly in my professional activities. It's very hard to do when you're bringing together salvaged materials from a major fire.

I was a bit surprised when the suggestion was made that I might be a subject of this enterprise. And I, of course, am realistic enough to realize that there's probably nobody really interested in Al Canwell and his history. And the ones who have delved the most energetically were not trying to uncover anything laudatory. There were both in my varied career and activity and there are many people who would order my life in a different manner than I did. So, anyway, that's all behind me. And as I say, I was quite surprised that I might be a subject for this project, as a one-term legislator, but I think in that one term I left some tracks, they know I was there.

So I have no apologies to make. I look back with hindsight; with more experience I would have hit harder in some spots than I did. But it's been an exciting and interesting activity, and way of life. And I know of no way in looking back on it how I would have done it differently.

I am very fortunate in having a wonderful family and the most wonderful woman in the world. I don't know how she ever accepted me to begin with, and has put up with me over the years. But she is a wonderful, naturally gracious person, whom I was most fortunate to be associated with. And I think that is true in the general sense.

There have been two or three remarkable women who have had an influence for good on my life. My mother, of course, being a fine one and one of my teachers, that I try to keep alive. She is as old as Holden, I think. But I tell her I have to keep her alive because she's the only proof I have that I ever went to school. That isn't exactly true but

I've been very fortunate in the people who have been a part of my life. And of course the ones close to me have been very tolerant.

[End of Tape 62, Side 2]

Mr. Canwell: I think I was saying that I've had such a wonderful family and I recognize that I am not, and have not been an easy person to live with. I'm doing too many things, and too many that I couldn't slow down and explain every move that I was making. But I had a very understanding wife and family.

I don't know how many of them you've met. You've met my sister, Pearl, I think. A very wonderful person. And then my brothers, John and Joe are still around. And Carl is not very well, but he's still with us.

But I've had just a wonderful family and if I have let them down by devoting too much time to what became almost an obsession with me, so be it. That's the way it is. And that is the reason, one of the reasons I'm writing a book. I think that maybe nobody would be particularly interested in my forthcoming narrative. But I think my family and grandchildren have a right to know that there is a reason for my activity that had been constantly under attack but it is defensible. And it has not been because I haven't had the time or interest.

But I am devoting such time as I have from here on out to some serious writing and the organizing of my surviving records and materials, and my new-found friend here, Timothy Frederick, has suggested that I put these records in the possession of the state. And I'll attempt to do that. I'll try to sort out the extraneous and sensitive things that have to be protected. The rest of it, if it has any interest I'll be glad to have go into the archives.

I'm sorry that great volumes of my correspondence with some of the interesting and some of the great people of the world burned. Those were things that I would have liked to have preserved. The ones that have survived I will try to make available for the project he is suggesting.

Other than that I'm going to go on doing my thing in the same old way. And in deference to the statement by my old friend, Dr. Alfred Adams, I'm going to try to do all of this while I can still celebrate.

But I find life just as interesting as it ever was. I know the futility of trying to change very much. I feel that each person has the responsibility to himself to do what is committed for him to do. And if he does that to the best of his ability, he has no real apologies to make.

I feel that I live in a grand family tradition. I've never been much of an ancestor worshiper, neither was my father. But we come from pretty good stock: the Mayflower people, and fortunately—it may be accidental—my wife and her family go back to the same roots to the Mayflower Colony, Dr. Marshall, Herman Prince Marshall. The Prince comes from

the Prince family, Noah and Sarah Prince, who were friends of my earliest ancestors in the Plymouth Colony, Dr. Samuel Fuller. I discovered some of those things after we were married—that we had ancestral connections and relationships that were much the same. Maybe it's what makes us the same kind of people.

It's been a wonderful venture, life has to me. And I just hope that I don't leave the world any worse off than it was when I found it. I've tried to carry out my responsibilities as I saw them. And I haven't always been able to justify that to other people. But I'll live by the record. Whatever it is and has been, I'll stand on that. I feel that I did what I was required to do and by my birth and birth-right, my family, my background, my associates, and everything. I would only do it better if I had it to do over.

Mr. Frederick: Albert, again I want to thank you. And thank you for the immense patience that you have shown and the effort that you've extended to go through this series. And again, thank you.

[End of Tape 63, Side 1]

BILLS DISCUSSED IN CHAPTER FIVE

- HB08 Relating to the Western State College fund
- HB11 Relating to the Central State College fund
- HB16 Relating to the Eastern State College fund
- HB24 Relating to college degrees
- HB172 Relating to signatures on initiative petitions
at polling places
- HB276 Authorizing exchange of certain lands near
Mt. Spokane State Park
- HB440 Relating to libel and slander suits
- HB444 Authorizing sale of land at Medical Lake

IN THE HOUSE

By MESSRS. CANWELL and STEVENS

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 10

STATE OF WASHINGTON, THIRTIETH REGULAR SESSION.

Read first time February 26, 1947, ordered printed and referred to Committee
on Military and Naval Affairs.

Providing for investigation of subversive activities.

*Be it Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate Concurring, of
the State of Washington in Legislative Session Assembled:*

WHEREAS, These are times of public danger; subversive persons and groups are endangering our domestic unity, so as to leave us unprepared to meet aggression, and under cover afforded by the Bill of Rights these persons and groups seek to destroy our liberties and our freedom by force, threats and sabotage, and to subject us to domination of foreign powers; and

WHEREAS, Recent announcements by responsible officers of the federal government indicate the seriousness of the problem. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation recently said: "During the past five years American communists have made their deepest inroads upon our national life. Their propaganda, skillfully designed and jointly executed has been projected into practically every phase of our national life. The communist influence has projected itself into some newspapers, books, radio and the screen, some churches, schools, colleges and even fraternal orders have been penetrated, not with the approval of the rank and file, but in spite of them"; and

WHEREAS, State legislation to meet the problems and to assist law enforcement officers can best be based on a thorough and impartial investigation by a competent and active legislative committee;

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, That there is hereby created a Joint Legislative Fact-finding Committee on Un-American Activities in the State of Washington which shall investigate, ascertain, correlate and appraise all facts concerning individuals, groups, or organizations whose activities are such as to indicate a purpose to foment internal strife, discord, dissension; infiltrate and undermine the stability of our American institutions; confuse and mislead the people; and impede the normal progress of our state and nation either in a wartime or peacetime economy; and

Be It Further Resolved, That in addition to other duties imposed upon the committee, the committee shall investigate the activities of groups and organizations whose membership includes persons who are communists, or any other organizations known or suspected to be dominated or controlled by a foreign power, which activities affect the conduct of this state, the functioning of any state agency, unemployment relief and other forms of public assistance, educational institutions of this state supported in whole or in part by state funds, or any political program; and

Be It Further Resolved, That the committee shall consist of four members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker thereof; and three members of the Senate appointed by the president thereof and they shall be subject to confirmation of their respective bodies. The Speaker of the House of Representative shall appoint the chairman of the committee; and

Be It Further Resolved, That the committee hereby created in exercising the powers and performing the functions vested in it by this resolution shall have: (I) All powers conferred upon the legislative committee by Chapter 6, Laws of 1895, and Chapter 33, Laws of 1897; (II) except when inconsistent with this resolution, all the powers conferred upon the committee by the rules of the House of

Representatives, the rules of the Senate, and the joint rules of the Senate and House of Representatives as they are enacted and amended from time to time, and such rules are hereby incorporated herein and made a part thereof the same as if they were set forth in this resolution in full; (III) all powers necessary or convenient to accomplish the objectives and purposes of this resolution including but not limited to the following duties and powers;

(1) To employ and fix the compensation of a secretary and such clerical, legal expert, and technical assistance as it may deem necessary, and to lease, rent, or buy such supplies and facilities as may be required;

(2) The chairman shall have the authority to create subcommittees from its membership, assigning to the subcommittee any study, inquiry, investigation or hearing which the committee itself has authority to undertake or hold, and the subcommittee for the purpose of this assignment shall have, and exercise, all powers conferred upon the committee limited by the express terms in this resolution or resolutions of the latter, defining the powers and duties of the subcommittee, which powers may be withdrawn or terminated at any time by the committee;

(3) To adopt and from time to time amend such rules governing its procedure (including the fixing of its own quorum and number of votes necessary to take action on any matter) as may appear appropriate;

(4) To contract with such other agencies, public or private, as it deems necessary for the rendition and affording of such services, facilities, studies and reports to the committee as will best assist it to carry out the purposes for which it is created;

(5) To hold public hearings at any place in the State of Washington at which hearings the people are to have an opportunity to present their views to the committee;

(6) To make a complete study, survey and investigation of every phase of the subject of this resolution, including but not limited to the operation, effect, administration, enforcement, and needed revision of any and all laws in anywise bearing upon or relating to the subject of this resolution;

(7) To meet at any and all places in this state, in public or executive session;

(8) To act during this session of the Legislature, including any recess hereof, and after final adjournment hereof until commencement of the 31st Legislature;

(9) To file a report with the 31st Legislature;

(10) To summon and subpoena witnesses, require the production of papers, books, accounts, reports, documents, and records of every kind and description; to issue subpoenas and to take all necessary means to compel the attendance of witnesses and procure testimony; to pay fees and traveling expenses of witnesses to ensure their attendance, if necessary; to procure from any court having jurisdiction, upon complaint showing probable cause to believe that pertinent evidence is being concealed or withheld from the committee, a search warrant and cause a search to be made therefor;

(11) To cooperate with and secure the cooperation of city and county and other local enforcement agencies in investigating any matter within the scope of this resolution, and to direct the sheriff of any county to serve subpoenas, orders, and other process issued by the committee; and

(12) To do any and all other things necessary or convenient to enable it fully and adequately to exercise its power, perform its duties, and accomplish the objects and purposes of this resolution; and in case of disobedience on the part of any witness to comply with any subpoena issued by the committee or on the refusal of any person to testify regarding any matter on which he may be lawfully interrogated, the

superior court of any county, or the judge thereof, on application of the committee, shall compel compliance by proceedings for contempt, as in the case of disobedience of the requirements of a subpoena issued from such court or a refusal to testify therein; and

Be It Further Resolved, That the committee, each of its members, and any representative of the committee thereunto authorized by the committee or by its chairman, is authorized and empowered to administer oaths; and

Be It Further Resolved, That every department, commission, board, agency, officer and employee of the state government, including the attorney general, and their subordinates, and of any political subdivision, county, city or public district of or in this state shall furnish the committee and any subcommittee, upon request, any and all such assistance, and information, records and documents as the committee or subcommittee deems proper for the accomplishment of the purposes for which the committee is created; and

Be It Further Resolved, That the Washington State Patrol and all officers and members thereof shall furnish such assistance to the committee as the chairman may direct; and

Be It Further Resolved, That the members appointed to the Joint Legislative Fact-finding Committee on Un-American Activities shall be reimbursed for their expenses incurred while attending sessions of the committee or subcommittee to the extent of fifteen dollars (\$15) per day plus five cents per mile in going to and coming from meetings or hearings of the committee or subcommittee, the same to be paid upon their individual vouchers, approved by the chairman of the committee, from any moneys appropriated for the expense of the 30th Legislature, or from such other funds as may be made available therefor; and that the salaries and expenses of any expert, clerical, and other assistants employed by the committee shall be paid upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee from such funds.

REPORT
of the
JOINT FACT-FINDING COMMITTEE
on
UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
ESTABLISHED BY THE THIRTIETH LEGISLATURE UNDER
HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 10
TO THE THIRTY-FIRST WASHINGTON LEGISLATURE
JANUARY, 1949.

*To the Honorable Members of the
Thirty-first Washington State Legislature*

We submit herewith our report and recommendations on subversive activities in the State of Washington as authorized and directed by House Concurrent Resolution No. 10 passed by the 30th Legislature.

Made a part of this report are the two printed volumes of testimony taken by this Committee at two public hearings, both of which have been made available to each legislator. Respectfully submitted,

(signed) A.F. CANWELL
Representative A.F. Canwell, Chairman

(signed) THOS. H. BIENZ
Senator Thomas H. Bienz, Secretary

(signed) H.G. KIMBALL
Senator Harold G. Kimball

* Senator R.L. Rutter, Jr.

(signed) GRANT SISSON
Representative Grant Sisson

(signed) SYDNEY A. STEVENS
Representative Sydney A. Stevens

** Representative George Yantis

Acting under the instructions and authority of the Thirtieth Legislature's HCR No. 10, in which the dangers of this state and nation from subversive forces were clearly indicated, your Committee has sought to discharge its responsibility to the Washington State Legislature and to the people of this state.

Before embarking on a history of the Washington State Un-American Activities Committee or recording a statement of its findings and recommendations in detail, we feel that a brief general statement regarding our findings should be set forth.

* Resigned.

** Deceased.

Knowing the nature of the world Communist conspiracy against free peoples, and seeing its creeping paralysis spread across great areas of the world, and even now posing a military threat to our state, we have approached our task with a deep sense of personal responsibility. We saw in our assignment an obligation to investigate the extent of this conspiracy in the State of Washington and disclose the identity of as many of its agents as possible.

We have proceeded to do this as rapidly and as effectively as time and a limited staff would permit. We have at the same time taken every precaution to safeguard the civil rights of individuals who became the subjects of our investigations and inquiries, the loud accusations and protests of the Communists and their friends and legal advisers notwithstanding.

The Communists and their apologists have at all times and places attempted to attack the very proper and constitutional conduct of this Committee in its investigation of Communists. They have tried to make it appear that in our conduct and procedure we were in conflict with basic civil rights. Our conflict has never been with civil rights but rather with standard Communist obstruction tactics.

Regardless of our wishes, war may occur between Soviet Russia and the United States; to many informed people it seems inevitable. Only the wishful thinkers and the willfully naive discount the possibility. Our proximity to recently constructed and very elaborate air bases in Siberia, plus our state's importance in the production of war essentials, makes the conclusion obvious that our state would share with Alaska the initial blows of such a war.

Ordinary prudence dictates that we take measures to protect ourselves from the treachery of Communist agents known to be operating within the boundaries of our state. We need but to take cognizance of the oft-stated aims of the leaders of the world Communist Party in their blueprint for world conquest to know that we are a primary target. If we will review the pre-invasion technique of Communist Party members in Romania, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia before their disappearance behind the Iron Curtain, we will see in Washington State the identical pattern of activity in operation.

Recently in Seattle, a responsible Polish refugee aptly described the situation existing in his hometown, Lwow, Poland, prior to the Communist seizure. He said, "At two o'clock in the afternoon, we had no Communists. Three hours later we had 100,000. That many residents of Lwow were on the streets, wearing Communist uniforms or armbands. They took over the city, including the police."

The State of Washington is acrawl with trained and iron-disciplined Communists. They have operated here with seeming immunity. Many of them hold almost impregnable positions of confidence and trust in their communities. They have successfully infiltrated their constant objectives: education, government, labor and municipal services. They effectively operate and manipulate an incredible maze of propaganda outlets known as Communist Front Organizations.

If the Communists are permitted to work unhampered a short time more in American education, the significance of our historic background will be almost completely lost to a generation of Americans. Our endeavors in uncovering Communist activity in education were largely confined to disclosure of evidence showing that Communist agents are being employed by this state in tax-supported institutions.

We did not at this time investigate to any great extent the substance of any teaching. We felt it sufficient to disclose the aims of the Communists in education and point out the rigid discipline and control held by the party over its members. It then becomes obvious that a member of the Communist Party could not possibly shed his communism on entering the classroom. That as a Communist he is dedicated to the overthrow of the system and state employing him. That as a Communist he has subordinated his belief in academic freedom to the will of the Communist Party. By his own consent he is no longer a free agent and when he talks of academic freedom and civil rights it becomes the rankest hypocrisy.

To date, the only effective weapon against the conniving of the Communist conspirators in America has been the legislative investigations conducted by the Congress and the several states. While the purpose of such investigations has always been corrective and preventive legislation, a wholesome by-product has been exposure. This the Communist cannot withstand. When the true nature of his activities and objectives is exposed to the pitiless light of publicity, decent people

will not support him. As always, when a lie is compared with the truth in the market place, it eventually falls of its own weight.

One of the foremost objectives of the Communist Party at the present time in the State of Washington and throughout the United States is a plan to curtail and impair the powers of the people to investigate Communists through their legislative bodies. Legislative investigation is a thoroughly constitutional weapon designed for the self-preservation of a free people and its curtailment at this time can be suicidal.

A clever, consistent and well-financed propaganda to achieve this objective has been carried on in this state for many months.

This Committee believed that an investigation in such a challenging field required the services of experts in the investigation of subversive activities, and so proceeded to employ a staff composed of the most able men available in the various federal agencies. Most of the investigators acquired have had many years of experience investigating Communist and other subversive activities while employed in federal service.

It should be noted that we avoided employing persons who were seeking employment at the time, thus minimizing the possibility of having a questionable person planted on the inside of our organization. Each man was a trained investigator with a thorough knowledge of what constitutes evidence. Two of our staff are members of the bar in addition to having had long years of experience in professional investigation.

This background of experience plus a vast fund of personal knowledge regarding subversive activities and agents in the State of Washington made these men extremely valuable to the Committee. Much of the success accompanying the Committee's investigations can be credited to the fact that the staff was composed of men who were able to avoid the obvious mistakes usually made by well-meaning amateurs who engage in any investigation.

The members of the Committee were at all times determined not to invade the area of individual rights in the slightest degree. With this goal constantly in mind, investigations were instituted only upon the most substantial information.

Communists were so numerous and active on Washington's west coast that it is hardly conceivable that this Committee or any similar committee would wish to stir up trouble for itself by making unfounded and irresponsible charges.

The opposite has invariably been the case. Many times the Committee has declined to pursue certain substantial and important leads because of limitations imposed by time and the size of our staff.

Some of the current "Party line" regarding the Un-American Activities Committee is that we should have had a lawyer on the legislative committee. The facts of the case are that we did have a lawyer-member of the Committee. We had two more on our staff. We had the entire and frequent cooperation of the State Attorney General and his large staff. In addition, we employed as an advisor to the Committee one of the most able constitutional lawyers in the state who successfully defended the numerous nuisance suits brought against the Committee by the Communists. There were also many able and patriotic lawyers who volunteered their services to the Committee. We point this out to enable members of the legislature to more easily scent the Communist propaganda in such indirect attacks on the very proper procedure of this Committee.

Early in our investigations it became apparent that a large and well organized group of disciplined Communists are operating in the State of Washington and have been for many years. These Communists are agents of Soviet Russia through their membership and strict loyalty to the Communist Party. Some are aliens, more are American-born, but all are alike in their undeviating obedience to the dictates of the Kremlin laid down to them in what is known as the party Line.

Every Communist and Communist sympathizer is a potential saboteur and spy and it is the rankest nonsense to finance this program of self-destruction with public funds. An alarming number of Communists are on federal, state and municipal payrolls.

The predatory nature of the world Communist Party is well attested to by many former Communists in the transcripts of our two public hearings which are appended to and made a part of this report. They are identified as "First Report on Un-American Activities in Washington State" and "Second Report on Un-American Activities in Washington State."

In addition to the printed reports of testimony taken at our two public hearings, the Committee has accumulated an index file of approximately 40,000 subjects dealing with Communists, their Front Organizations and activities and related materials. In the case of notorious Communists such as William Pennock, Tom Rabbitt, Hugh DeLacy and Ralph Gundlach, their cards may have scores of individual notations and cross references. We have found a pattern of Communist intrigue and conspiracy of alarming proportions extending over the State of Washington and the Pacific Northwest like a huge spider web. The cables of this web are imbedded deep in federal, state, and municipal government, all levels in education, state welfare programs, labor organizations and religion.

Limited by time we could not make an exhaustive investigation in all of these fields, but did investigate with enough thoroughness to know that a real and present danger exists. Testimony in the transcript of our first hearing will show that an active cell of Communists consisting of members of the Legislature functioned under the capitol dome at Olympia during sessions of the Legislature and that an alien Communist regularly met with the cell and laid down the party line. Confidential information in possession of the Committee also indicates that at least one person active in this cell was known to be in touch with a Soviet spy operating in New York and Washington, D.C. at that time.

In support of the statement that there are Communist agents operating inside the federal government with heretofore seeming immunity, we wish to call to your attention the now famous Hiss-Chambers spy case. This Soviet Communist spy ring was first called to the attention of the American public by this Committee at a public hearing held in Seattle on July 19-23, 1948.

This Committee had specific instructions from the Legislature to investigate the extent of Communist activity in unemployment relief and other forms of public assistance. We were also directed to investigate Communists in the educational institutions of this state, supported in whole or in part by state funds. We devoted the major part of our endeavors to investigating the Communist seizure of the old age pension group and to the Communist activity in higher education.

Our first public hearing was held in Seattle January 27-31, 1948. This hearing centered around the operation of the Washington Old Age Pension Union as a Communist Front Organization. We also disclosed the Communist control of the now defunct publication known as the *New World*, and the now almost defunct Pacific Northwest Labor School as a Communist Front. This latter mentioned school has also been listed by the Attorney General of the United States as a subversive organization.

We also assisted the Building Service Employees Union to rid the Seattle local of its Communist control. Large sums of money were diverted from the funds of this Union to the support of Communist activities and Front Organizations, including the Labor School and the *New World*.

The second public hearing was also held in Seattle July 19-23, 1948, and disclosed evidence of Communist infiltration into the faculty of the University of Washington. Several faculty members willfully placed themselves in contempt of the Legislature by refusing to answer the questions of the Committee. By unanimous action of the Committee they were cited for contempt and their cases are now pending in Superior Court. Included in this group of reluctant witnesses were several non-teachers. One of these is Rachmiel Forschmiedt, an employee of the King County Health Department, who refused to testify and was cited for contempt.

Others included an off-campus theater group doing business as the Repertory Playhouse. The operators, Mrs. Florence Bean James, and her husband, Burton James, as well as an associate, Albert Ottenheimer, placed themselves in contempt of the Legislature rather than give testimony under oath regarding their Communist activities.

Details of these hearings and the problems arising out of them will be dealt with to some length in this report. An actual transcript of testimony taken at both hearings is appended to this report as previously stated.

While engaged in an intensive investigation in these two fields of Communist activity, it became increasingly apparent that all Communist activity in all fields is interrelated. That Communist agents while assigned to different projects are all dedicated to the same objective; the softening up of our people for the eventual violent overthrow of our government. That they work as a team taking their orders from the top, and that they do not deviate in the minutest detail from the party line and Party instructions. This may involve the following out of some minor Party as-

signment in a labor organization, outside speaking engagements for a university professor, or obedience to accepted Party conduct before a legislative hearing. No deviation from Party instructions is permitted—none occurs.

The Washington Old Age Pension Union As a Communist Front Organization

A Communist Front organization may come into being by several methods. It may be and often is organized on direct orders of the Central Committee to meet a specific propaganda need in support of Russian foreign policy. An example might be the propaganda to hurry our troops home from China, organized to support the Communist expansion program in the Far East. When the word comes down from the top these fronts break out like a rash all over the country.

They may seek to prevent the deportation of Harry Bridges or a thousand and one Communist purposes including such committees as those hastily set up to prevent the investigation of Communist activities in education. Many times they are designed to interfere with the operation of our military establishment, such as the Committee to Oppose Peacetime Conscription, so active on the campus of many an American college and university.

Usually these committees or Fronts are composed of a combination of skilled Communists who are pulling the wires, some pseudo-liberals and soft-headed dupes and a sprinkling of honest but confused individuals. But always they serve the sinister purposes of Soviet Russia and work to the detriment of America.

Another effective and often used method is to infiltrate an already established and thoroughly respectable organization. This is accomplished by having trained Communists join the group, work into positions of leadership and trust, eventually seize control and then convert it into an instrument for Communist purposes.

This was cleverly and effectively accomplished by the Communists in the infiltration and seizure of the Washington Old Age Pension Union. The Pension Union was composed of a group of old people bound together by a common interest in old age security. Their chief activity consisted of weekly social gatherings where the subject of discussion was pensions.

The Eagles Lodge and many private citizens had unselfishly aided the oldsters in setting up their organization. Their dues were modest, the members were old people and their objectives were mainly laudable.

Into this group of honest, kindly, and respectable old people, the Communist Party moved one of its cleverest and most promising young agents, twenty-four year old William Pennock. The seizure of the Pension Union was rapid and thorough; non-Communists were eased out of official positions and their places filled with such loyal Party members as William Pennock, Tom Rabbitt, N.P. Atkinson, and many others.

No longer were discussions at Pension Union meetings confined to pension problems. A constant flow of resolutions and press releases supporting Russian foreign policy and the current Party line began to emanate from the state organization of the Pension Union. The proportion of non-pensioner members began to increase, so that a resolution originating in an old age pension meeting or convention often was the product of a Communist member of the Washington Old Age Pension Union who was still in his early twenties.

William Pennock is a brilliant young Communist who has mercilessly exploited the old people of this state for Communist purposes. No doubt this report will serve to increase his stature at the Kremlin, but a careful study of this report and a reading of the transcript of testimony taken at the committee's first hearing should nullify his influence and that of his associates before the Washington State Legislature.

Sworn testimony reveals that Pennock and some of his associates engaged in the most contemptible exploitation of the funeral of an old-age pensioner, Marie Redenbaugh. Testimony shows that the Communist William Pennock offered a profane prayer over the corpse and then proceeded to deliver a typical Communist harangue against the Washington State Legislature. Pennock and his associates deliberately misstated the facts incident to the death of Mrs. Redenbaugh, causing relatives and friends of the deceased to leave the funeral service in disgust.

The Communist-dominated Pension Union became a very vocal instrument in support of Russian foreign policy, current Party line and all Communist enterprises. To keep the oldsters satis-

fied they kept up a running fight to increase state pensions, liberalize requirements for recipients and generally enlarge public welfare expenditures.

This served several sinister purposes for the Communists. It kept the old folks reasonably quiet. It enabled the Communists to constantly bleed the old people for substantial portions of their pensions. Thus, funds voted by the Legislature for old-age assistance were diverted to the support of Communists and to finance Communist propaganda.

Their program also was designed to eventually place an unbearable tax burden on the state. It is a major purpose of the Communist Party everywhere to create a bankrupt state economy, thereby furthering and intensifying public dissatisfaction and enabling the Communists the more easily to develop and spread distrust and hostility toward the American system.

Despite the Committee's thorough exposure of the Communist control of the Pension Union the Communists undoubtedly have achieved their greatest single success in the State of Washington in recent years with the passage of Initiative 172.

It is worthy of note that in King County where the Communist origin and support of Initiative 172 was thoroughly exposed by the newspapers, the initiative was defeated by the voters.

A more widespread dissemination of the information contained in the transcript of the first public hearing of this Committee might have saved the deserving pensioners and the rest of the people of this State the disaster of Initiative 172.

The actual history of Initiatives 170 and 172 is that they were both masterminded by the young Communist, William J. Pennock. The first Initiative, 170, was filed with the Secretary of State January 13, 1948. The accompanying affidavit bore among others, the signature of William Pennock.

This initiative was subsequently found to be faultily drafted and was withdrawn. Initiative 172 was substituted in its place February 26, 1948. The signature of William Pennock was conspicuously absent from the affidavit accompanying the new Initiative measure, although he continued to carry on all negotiations concerning Initiative 172, including the delivery of the final signature sheets. Receipts and correspondence in the Secretary of State's office will support this statement.

It should be remembered that between the filing of the first and second Initiatives, William Pennock's long Communist affiliation and activity came in for a thorough airing before a public hearing of this Committee. At this hearing twenty-one former members of the Communist Party testified under oath to the Communist Party membership of Pennock.

Although repeatedly invited by the committee to take the witness stand and deny under oath the many accusations of Communist affiliation and activity leveled at the leadership of the pension union, neither Pennock nor any of his associates chose to avail themselves of the opportunity.

Pennock chose rather to make his denials where the penalties for perjury could not be imposed. This is typical of Communists. They shout about free speech being curtailed by legislative committees, but can never be induced to speak freely—under oath.

William Pennock was the first person to attempt to disrupt the hearings of the Committee. When the first hearing was called to order, Pennock jumped up in the rear of the room and screamed loudly and unintelligibly at the Committee.

The decision had already been made not to let the Communists take over this function of the Legislature. The Committee determined to maintain the dignity of the Legislature of this state and proceed with the business at hand. The Chairman directed the officers of the State Patrol to escort Pennock from the hearing. Pennock returned later and kicked violently on the door.

It is extremely difficult to conduct an orderly public hearing on Communists because the Communists will not permit it to be done. They are masters in the use of disruptive tactics. Their greatest aim is to make the legislative process seem ridiculous by turning it into another "forum for the revolution."

The Committee was unable to find any visible means of support for Pennock other than the funds he is able to extract from the meager pensions of the old people of this state. A future committee should delve into the financial operations of Pennock and the Pension Union officers.

When the 30th Legislature created this Committee to investigate subversive activities the Communists immediately set in motion an all-out effort to tie its hands. The Front organizations

were whipped up, undercover Communists and fellow travelers issued statements viewing such investigations with alarm. A long series of costly legal steps was initiated, starting with an abortive attempt to refer HCR No. 10.

In the name of the Washington Pension Union, Pennock and other Communists kept the Un-American Activities Committee before the courts for many months. They unsuccessfully argued the Committee's constitutionality before the lower courts, the State Supreme Court, and finally took it to the United States Supreme Court.

The expense of this costly Communist maneuver was largely borne by the old age pensioners, from whose meager funds the legal fees paid to John Caughlan as well as incidental court costs, were siphoned.

Aiding and abetting this travesty was the State Treasurer, Russell Fluent, who supplies the legal peg to hang their suits on by refusing to honor the payroll vouchers of the Committee. The successor committee should investigate the long and intimate relationship existing between Russell Fluent and the Communist Party—should he attempt to continue in public life.

To finance a Communist Front organization by mulcting the aged of their meager funds is certainly a vicious and contemptible practice. Far more vicious is the use of these well-meaning old people as an implement to accomplish the destruction of the one thing they hold most dear, their own country.

This was done in hundreds of cases where the Communist leadership of the Washington Pension Union used that organization as a vehicle for the transmission of every bit of the Communist Party line to an entire state for a period of approximately ten years.

A negligible percentage of the actual pensioners were aware of the manner in which they were being used. Any objections raised by pensioners to any part of this high-handed program were ruthlessly squelched by the Communists who skillfully controlled these meetings.

One elderly lady interested in the pension movement, a Mrs. Marian Knox, was manhandled and beaten at a Pension Union meeting for stating that its speaker, Dr. C.H. Fisher, was not telling the truth in his statements regarding this Committee.

Members of the Pension Union were coerced to subscribe to the Communist publication, *The New World*, in which the press, the government and the entire American system were constantly under attack.

Pensioners were frightened and coerced into compliance with the Communist program by a constant barrage of such scare slogans as "Hunger Act," "Pension Wreckers," and a constant repetition of false and misleading information regarding the Social Security Act of this state.

The Committee prepared a chart illustrating the current Party line at any given time during the history of the Communist control of the Pension Union. The chart will show that the Pension Union invariably supported the party line in conflict with American foreign policy. They followed the party line by countless resolutions and press releases dealing with hundreds of issues having absolutely nothing to do with pensions.

The record will show that the Communists took the Pension Union through all the twists and turns of the party line including the party line switch which occurred following the abrogation of the Hitler-Stalin Pact.

The Legislature should draft legislation designed to protect the legitimate recipients of state pensions and other welfare funds from being victimized by unscrupulous and designing individuals who might wish to exploit them. The fund itself should be safeguarded by clauses which would prevent such characters as William Pennock and Tom Rabbitt from partaking of the fund.

Labor School

There is a network of Communist-created and directed so-called "labor schools" strategically situated throughout the country. These schools are used for dissemination of Communist propaganda, the making and training of Communists and the publicizing of the Communist Party line.

They have been cleverly disguised as schools for the discussion of labor problems, but most, if not all of them, have recently been exposed for what they are.

Seattle has one of them. It is known as the Pacific Northwest Labor School, whose present head is John Daschbach. Daschbach replaced Bert McLeech whose long Communist record and

use of aliases and name changes are fully recorded in the printed transcript of this Committee's first public hearing.

It is unfortunate that some members of the University of Washington appeared with more or less frequency as speakers at this school, thus lending their names and the prestige of the University of Washington to this proven subversive purpose.

Among the members of the University of Washington teaching staff who were speakers and/or teachers at this potent instrument of the Communist Party were the following: Dr. Ralph Gundlach, Dr. Albert Franzke, Professor Harold Eby and Professor H.J. Phillips.

There can be no question that by their appearance as speakers and/or teachers at this school for Communism, the foregoing members of the University of Washington teaching staff aided and abetted the Communist conspiracy in this state.

It should be noted also that the Communist demonstrations conducted to disrupt the public hearings of this legislative Committee formed at this labor school and marched on the State Armory under the direction of such characters as William J. Pennock, Tom Rabbitt and Jerry O'Connell.

It was at one of these demonstrations that Jerry O'Connell and an associate, Forest Crumpley, were arrested by Seattle Police and convicted in justice court of disorderly conduct.

The Pacific Northwest Labor School has been labeled a subversive organization by the Attorney General of the United States.

Building Service Employees Union

Your Committee played an important part in bringing about the public exposure of the Communist domination of the Building Service Employees Union of Seattle.

Your Committee interceded at the specific and insistent request of members of the union who had grown weary of being footfalls for the Communist leadership of William Dobbins, Ward Coley, and Merwin Cole, executive officers of the local.

It was after the legislative Committee brought to public view the facts regarding the subversive character of these men and the subversive purpose to which union dues were diverted that the International with which this local is affiliated ordered the removal of Dobbins, Coley, and Cole.

These three had been largely instrumental in establishing and promoting the Communist Pacific Northwest Labor School and the Building Service local's records revealed that \$3,868 of members' dues had been diverted to the support of this Communist enterprise without the knowledge of the body of the membership. Investigation of the records subsequently disclosed contribution of member dues to at least seventeen other Communist Fronts, and to the Communist Party itself. Many other unions, of course, had no connection whatever with this school, while others, apparently unaware of the fact that it was an instrument for the spread of Soviet Russian propaganda, have since repudiated it and withdrawn their support.

Labor leaders of importance have privately congratulated the Committee for thus assisting labor in helping it in labor's long fight to free itself completely from the tentacles of Russia's fifth column.

Repertory Playhouse

Your Committee's second report proves indisputably that the Repertory Playhouse, which for many years has enjoyed a peculiar prestige as a school for the drama, is one of the most important above-ground Communist Front organizations in the State of Washington.

It is indeed a recruiting school for the Communist Party. Its strategic situation in immediate proximity to the University of Washington has led many to believe it is a part or adjunct of the University, which it is not. It is financed largely by public subscriptions.

But it has employed its proximity to the University of Washington to heavily recruit its pupils from university students and many of them have been subtly indoctrinated with the poison of communism in an attempt to breed contempt for the American system of government.

Testimony shows that besides performing as a recruiting center and training ground for Communism, the Playhouse has been an important cog in fund-raising for the Communist Party. This

institution we regard as even more vicious and inimical to our free institutions than the Pacific Northwest Labor School, which has officially been declared a subversive organization.

Heading the operations of the Repertory Playhouse and guiding its established Communist policy are Burton James, director; Mrs. Florence Bean James, assistant or co-director; and Albert Ottenheimer. Testimony concerning this trio as well as their own conduct toward the legitimate functioning of this Committee will be found in the Committee's second report, which has been made available to every legislator.

Procedure and Civil Rights

Among the many important questions the members of this Committee insisted on having answered to its own satisfaction before proceeding was one we still believe to be most important. Could the undertaking assigned to us be accomplished without at the same time invading the area of civil rights? We agreed to proceed only so far as this could be accomplished.

First, we sought out the available information in this particular field. We studied the reports and records of other investigating committees. We attempted to arm ourselves with a knowledge of the accomplishments and mistakes of others who had pioneered in legislative investigations of subversive activities.

It is the history of legislative committees having conducted investigations into Communist activities that they have exercised remarkable restraint. A knowledge of the sinister nature of Communism plus an insight into the extent of their penetration in America tends to clothe the sincere investigator in this field with a firm resolve to make his every effort count.

We found that legislative investigations have long legal precedent in America, having been known to American law for more than a hundred years. We found also that such procedures were never seriously called in question until they began to concern themselves with the hidden plottings of the Communists. We found no instance where a picket line was thrown around a legislative hearing to protest its operation, except where such committees were taking testimony concerning Communists.

In adopting a plan of procedure, the Committee followed closely the recommendation of the Brookings Institute in their "Suggested Standards for Determining Un-American Activities."

It was the opinion of the committee making the report for the Brookings Institute that:

"It is un-American for any individual to advocate, or to attempt to bring about a change in the form of government in the United States without following the processes prescribed for that purpose by the Constitution of the United States and by the constitutions of the several states."

"It is un-American for any person secretly to conspire by any methods, constitutional or otherwise, to overthrow or attempt to overthrow a government of law and to substitute therefor a government vested with complete discretionary power."

Your legislative Committee is thoroughly convinced that by the above standards the Communist Party and each of its members is un-American. We are convinced that in every instance the American Communist is subservient to the dictates of Moscow and that he is at all times and places conspiring by secret and deceptive means to destroy this government. That his ultimate thinking invariably includes the use of force and violence.

It has long been apparent that the laws on sedition and treason are inadequate to prevent the boring from within tactics of the Communists. Are we to presume that the founders of our Republic contemplated that the Constitution and the Bill of Rights should provide a protective mantle for those engaged in organized treason at the behest of a foreign government? We think not. It seems reasonable and right, that when the exercise of individual rights places the whole people in jeopardy, the primary right of self-preservation asserts itself and beyond that point liberty becomes license.

The Communists are adroitly using our natural reluctance to interfere in the free exercise of individual rights as a weapon with which to destroy us. It seems that we must, if we are to survive, determine at what point the right of the individual ends and the primary right of self-preservation retained at all times by the people asserts itself.

The Communists and their fellow-travelers have long and unconscionably presumed on the fundamental decency of the American people. They have abused the privilege extended to them

in a free society in which they refuse to share the responsibilities that accompany the enjoyment of freedom.

It has been the hope and dream of all Americans that we could always extend to all people, the worthy and unworthy alike, the maximum enjoyment of liberty under law. We believe that even in the present emergency we can maintain our traditional standards of liberty if we but impose a few reasonable responsibilities of citizenship on people in public employ.

It seems to the Committee to be no invasion of civil rights to compel a public employee to state under oath, where the penalties for perjury can be involved, whether or not he owes allegiance to any foreign government. The fact that the Communist Party of the United States and the Communist Parties of every country are extensions of the world Communist Party, operating from the Kremlin is so well established that no reasonable person should at this late date question its truth.

It seems that the loyal citizen could easily dispose of the question of Communist affiliation, with the simple answer of "No" if it were the truth. And it follows that when a person cannot answer in this manner the burden of responsibility shifts to his shoulders and he should not be permitted to hide his actions behind the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights was primarily designed to protect the innocent from oppression; not to pave the way for oppression.

We believe that the security of this country is at all times paramount to a fancied right of privacy regarding affiliation in a known subversive organization such as the Communist Party. It must be obvious that a man's liberty of action ceases at the precise point where his neighbor's injury begins.

The Communists in our midst have long since passed the point where liberty becomes license. We know that there are great and learned arguments extant against the imputing of guilt by association. When association constitutes in truth and in fact, participation in a conspiracy, the "guilt by association" arguments lose validity. Nor are we ready to believe that any precept in law can reverse the truisms that "birds of a feather flock together," and that "a man is known by the company he keeps."

The Committee has used its powers to compel attendance and testimony judiciously. Professors and most other witnesses who were to be subpoenaed by the Committee were approached in advance by the Committee investigators in a discreet and courteous manner. Professors were advised in advance of the substance of the Committee's evidence regarding their alleged connection with the Communist Party, and invited to discuss that evidence with either the investigators or the Chairman of the Committee.

Professors known to the Committee to be members of the Communist Party and under its discipline reacted violently to this approach.

Right of Counsel

Much has been said about the right of reluctant witnesses to have benefit of counsel at legislative hearings. This right has never been questioned by this Committee. However, deliberate falsehoods to the contrary have been circulated by Communists, their friends, apologists and legal advisors.

The Committee quite properly stipulated to witnesses and their attorneys that no time would be devoted to debate or argument concerning the constitutionality of the Committee or its right to require testimony. Witnesses were also advised that the Committee would not through its hearing willingly provide a forum for Communist propaganda speeches.

Because of the nature of legislative hearings, there is little occasion for counsel to do more than advise the client. The procedure of legislative committees, their function and powers are determined by the Legislature and may be challenged in the courts when thought to exceed constitutional limitations.

No useful purpose can be served by arguing these issues before a legislative committee engaged in performing a specific assignment by the whole Legislature. Nothing but delay and obstruction could possibly be accomplished.

The purpose of legislative hearings is to obtain facts on which to base legislation. No findings of guilt are made and no indictments drawn. Witnesses cannot be prosecuted as a result of testi-

mony they may give before a legislative hearing as long as they do not commit perjury or place themselves in contempt.

Witnesses before this Committee were permitted to have their attorneys seated at their immediate right hand during the entire course of their testimony. They were permitted freely to confer with their counsel before answering any question.

The only deviation from this procedure was when the disorderly conduct of some of the witnesses' lawyers created such confusion that it was impossible to proceed in an orderly manner. This was done deliberately.

In the case of Attorney John Caughlan, whose violent and disorderly conduct occasioned his removal from the hearing room, there is no doubt in the minds of the Committee that his clients' interests at the hearing were being subordinated by Mr. Caughlan to those of the Communist Party.

The Committee quite properly refused to accept previously prepared statements of reluctant witnesses in lieu of testimony, or as a condition of compliance with the Committee's authority to compel testimony.

A witness first having lawfully complied with the Committee's summons and freely or otherwise answered its questions to the best of his ability, might then reasonably request the privilege of having a further statement concerning his position considered by the Committee. And if sworn to and germane to the inquiry, it should be, and in our case would be, entered in the record.

No accusations concerning any person were ever seriously considered or acted upon by this Committee unless the witness was first willing to sign a sworn statement to support the same. We took extreme precautions to prevent any witness from making unfounded charges and haphazard reference to names while giving testimony for the record. We never permitted testimony concerning names and events which could not be substantially corroborated.

Some frank questions should be asked those who are fronting for the reluctant witnesses and other Communists. Questions as to why they have such difficulty in answering a few simple questions with which an honest and respectable citizen would have no difficulty at all.

Communists are under instructions and very specific instructions to use every tactic "legal and illegal" to disrupt every hearing or trial in which they appear, or, failing in that, to turn the so-called "capitalist" court or hearing room into a public forum for the spread of Communist Party propaganda. One of their aims is to make such hearings appear ridiculous.

Knowing this, the legislative committee was determined to leave nothing undone to prevent the Communists from sabotaging the hearings, but at the same time it employed every possible bit of self-restraint in dealing with the obvious Communist obstruction tactics.

Actually, the Committee has been under criticism for being too tolerant, rather than intolerant, of Communists' efforts to sabotage the will of the Legislature.

It should be borne in mind that the Communists have nothing but the most cynical contempt for our established legal processes and never overlook an opportunity to obstruct them or make them appear ridiculous in the eyes of the people. The Committee had to be constantly alert to protect the legal sanctity of its procedure as well as legislative dignity itself, against the most ceaseless onslaughts of the Communists and some of their so-called legal representatives.

Members of the Legislature who sat in these very chambers during those sessions when Communist obstruction tactics were something to reckon with will know full well whereof this Committee speaks. And perhaps have a much greater appreciation of the Committee's problem in conducting public hearings, than some legislators who have not encountered the skillful and utterly vicious and unprincipled Communist strategy head-on.

Cross-Examination

Some attorneys asked for and were refused the right to cross-examine witnesses appearing before the Committee. There are several very good reasons why cross-examination is seldom permitted at legislative hearings, and especially hearings having to do with Communists.

Communist attorneys are notoriously skilled in disruption, and a legislative hearing with Communists free to cross-examine and abuse witnesses without the Committee having a corre-

sponding power of summary contempt, would be a farce and of course the Communists and their attorneys know it.

A legislative committee should not have the power of summary contempt. In fact, any attempt to make a legislative hearing a quasi-judicial function would be entirely improper. Any attempts to do this would defeat the entire purpose of legislative hearings.

Again we wish to quote the recommendation of the Brookings Institute in its "Suggested Standards for Determining un-American Activities," in which they say:

"Persons charged with un-American activities should have the right to be represented by counsel when appearing before the Committee and in dealing with the Committee, but neither such persons nor their counsel should have the right to cross-examine witnesses appearing before the Committee nor to be present at any executive session of the Committee whether held for taking testimony or for other purposes. The Committee is conducting an investigation and is not trying persons or putting them in jeopardy. The Committee may, however, in its discretion give such persons or their representatives the privilege of examining witnesses or making presentation to the Committee or any of its members in executive session."

Perhaps the best way to explain the outrageous conduct of some witnesses called to testify before the Committee and that of some of their attorneys is to show that such conduct conforms to specific Communist Party instruction to its members when called before any official agency.

The Communist attitude concerning any inquiry into their conspiracy or membership is graphically summed up by an editorial in the *Daily Worker*, the official Communist organ in the United States, and quoted by the Rapp-Coudert Committee of the New York Legislature:

The *Daily Worker* exhorts as follows:

"It is the duty of the Communists to throw every possible obstacle in the way of a conviction of their fellow Party members in the court, to defend these members by all possible means and absolutely to refuse to give testimony for the state in any form. Testimony of Communists can only be given for the defense of Communists and then it must be based upon uncompromising defense of the party and its program."

Still another Communist instruction to Party members is found in a Communist pamphlet, "The Agent Provocateur in the Labor Department." That pamphlet declares:

"The general and fundamental rule for all Communists is: Make no statement. Of course this does not mean that all questions are simply to be met with the answer, 'I refuse to make a statement.' The tactics to be used under * * * examination must be much more elastic than that. But the fundamental principle remains the same: No statements incriminating any comrade, no names, no addresses, not a single fact which could possibly be used directly or indirectly against the party, its organs or individual members of the organization. No explanations in this respect. Absolute denial even when personally confronted with the persons and despite the evidence given by the police spies and agents provocateurs. Whoever infringes, even but a little, these fundamental rules must instantly and mercilessly be ejected from the party.

"If therefore the police have any evidence against you or if they know that you are a Party member, you must make no further statement. Nor should you let yourself get involved in talks and discussions even about seemingly distant topics, such as views of life, etc. Only should the police not know for certain that you are a Party member, and have no proofs to that effect in their possession—then, since a categorical refusal to make any statement would convict you of being a Communist, you may permit yourself a few short statements calculated to obtain credence, but only with regard to your own person."

These standard Communist instructions to Party members in trouble may shed much light on the conduct of some witnesses at our second hearing who, knowing the Committee had proof of their Party membership, were forced to admit it, but countered that they had quit the party. They could offer no proof that they had beyond their bare statement.

It may also shed light and a special light on their refusal to further answer Committee questions, even to the extent of placing themselves in contempt which carries a lesser penalty than perjury.

Academic Freedom

In this Committee's studies of the reports and investigations of other legislative investigations having to do with the Communist conspiracy we have been able to anticipate many of the counter-moves of the Communist Party.

For instance, we found that whenever a legislative committee turned to probing the Communist activities in education a committee to defend academic freedom was born. This was true in California, New York and other places.

While we did not know what persons would sponsor and promote such a committee in the State of Washington, we were certain that we would have one. We were not disappointed.

It is significant that a committee allegedly interested in defending academic freedom blanketed the State of Washington with its outcries immediately following an announced intention by this Committee to investigate Communism in education.

It is of course obvious to unbiased people that legislative inquiries regarding the conduct of tax-supported institutions is customary and proper. Charges and implications by puppet pressure groups that such inquiries constitute an invasion of academic freedom should be closely scrutinized to determine origin, motives, and intent.

All of the Communist Fronts, their sympathizers, their followers, and their dupes, as well as those in a state of mental confusion are engaging in a concerted effort to convince the people of this state that academic freedom has been imperiled by this Committee's conduct of the University of Washington hearings.

They are in effect challenging the right of the people, through their own Legislature, to question their own employees.

This Committee could go into great detail upholding the sovereign rights of the Legislature, but the absurdity of the "academic freedom" subterfuge should be apparent in light of the forthright statements of Doctor Raymond Allen, President of the University of Washington.

Doctor Allen said of this Committee's hearings in his 'Open Letter to the Friends of the University of Washington on Communism in Education':

"Academic freedom has not been abridged * * * Similarly civil liberties are not abridged by procedures which seek to ascertain facts and which do not result in any action affecting those liberties * * * It is to the credit of this Committee, I think, that it has not attempted to smear liberals with a red brush."

It is the opinion of this Committee that the Legislature should take an uncompromising position opposing the employment of Communists in education. This should also include those undercover Communists who successfully conceal their actual membership in the party but who reveal their true loyalties by their undeviating adherence to the Communist program and Party line.

In the event of administrative failure to properly safeguard the youth in our schools and universities from the subtle treasonable influences of Communist instructors, the Legislature has the final say and can take such action as it deems necessary to effect a remedy.

It is certain that the parents of the state will not long tolerate the expenditure of their tax money to finance the corruption of their children by Communist instructors in the field of public education.

History is replete with disastrous attempts to monitor the mind and define truth. Certainly few, if any, restraints should be placed on the sincere, honest, and capable teacher. Academic freedom is fundamental to progress, nor can it be restrained without imperiling all freedom.

It should not, however, be confused with license, and it should extend to both ends of the classroom. Academic freedom also includes the right of the student, the parent, and the state to dissent from the imposition of alien-inspired propaganda on students by agents of a foreign government masquerading as liberals.

The propagandizing of students becomes particularly objectionable when it is engaged in by those employed by the state, especially when this propaganda is foreign-inspired and designed to destroy the faith of the student in the American system of government and way of life.

It should not be sufficient for the educational administrator to take the position that he will take action only against those Communists who admit Party membership. Most of the more important Communists in education are not card-carrying members and never have been.

Testimony given at the public hearings of this Committee by former high-ranking Communists shows that the Communist Party protects its important members by not requiring conventional Party affiliation.

The best possible information that can be secured as to actual connection with the Communist Party is a history of unbroken adherence to the twisting Party line. When a professor consistently follows the party line and espouses all of their causes, you may be certain that for all intents and

purposes he is a Communist, and could not be doing a better job for them if he were openly on their payroll.

When a professor willfully places himself in this questionable position the burden is not on the state or his immediate superior to prove that he pays his dues in the Communist Party.

No restraint should be attempted on the personal beliefs of the teacher, nor his right to hold them publicly, however faulty his premise or conclusions. His conduct is an entirely different matter. Active and voluntary participation in a conspiracy to work injury to his employer (the State) becomes a matter of dishonesty and treachery and has nothing whatever to do with academic freedom.

One of the most subtle methods used by Communist teachers to sway the mind of the student without incriminating himself is to suggest courses of reading and books which will do the job that the Communist professor or teacher dare not do openly.

There are many Communist-slanted books and pamphlets which take the young student without awareness, even to himself, into the path of Communistic belief. Perhaps at this point the Committee can state that a quiet spot check of some of our public schools disclosed that this type of literature is on the bookshelves in classrooms, and so placed as to be readily accessible to the student.

The Committee has reason to believe that this method of infiltration and the shaping of the young mind is practiced on a scale that makes it mandatory upon the Thirty-first Legislature to provide for the fullest investigation of not only curriculum-approved reading matter but of reading matter which is adroitly introduced into classrooms and does not have official approval.

The Committee invites particular attention to one pamphlet in some Seattle classrooms bearing the title, *The Land of the Soviets*. The subversive character of this pamphlet has been thoroughly established and it is high time that this and similar media of Soviet propaganda are summarily removed from the classrooms of our tax-supported educational system.

Your Committee had planned to make this investigation, but the consistent obstructionist tactics of the Communists during all its public hearings so delayed the Committee in its operations that it could no more than make a cursory check in the brief remaining time. This inquiry should unflinchingly be pursued.

Dr. Raymond B. Allen
President of the University of Washington

The Committee extends its appreciation for the cooperation which Dr. Raymond B. Allen, President of the University, made possible between the Committee and its investigators and the University administration.

The Committee found Dr. Allen cooperative at all times. His cooperation was dignified, courteous and effective. The Committee kept Dr. Allen fully informed of its evidence, its plans, and its objectives, and feels that Dr. Allen, once convinced that Communists had infiltrated into the University, left nothing undone to pave the way for a complete fact-finding investigation.

The relationship between Dr. Allen, the Committee, and its investigators, was mutually cordial. Dr. Allen is undoubtedly the most completely informed person in the University administration as to the methods employed by the Committee in its investigation. His views on the conduct of the Committee and the relationship of its operations on civil rights and academic freedom are quoted in another section of this report. However, Dr. Allen has seen fit to enlarge upon his previous comment in a letter to the Chairman of your Committee dated January 7, 1949. A copy of the letter is transmitted herewith:

University of Washington
Office of the President
Seattle, Washington
January 7, 1949

Dear Mr. Canwell:

I understand that you are preparing the report of the activities of your Committee to the 1949 Legislature. I shall look forward to reading this report. I have long believed that the powers of investigation vested

in our legislative bodies are among the most important functions of a people's government. Doubtless your Committee's experience in conducting investigations of alleged subversive activity in the State of Washington has given you much useful information, and I am sure that the public record of the Committee's proceedings will be of value to the Legislature and the people of the State.

As I have said before, I do not feel that the investigations you conducted of the University of Washington constituted any abridgment of academic freedom or civil rights. A transcript of your hearing was turned over to the University, and, as you know, the University itself has conducted protracted hearings, just recently concluded, to test the validity of the information elicited in these hearings and to determine what action is indicated. This, it seems to me, is as it should be. A legislative committee is a fact-finding agency. When they are made available, its findings should be used by public administrative agencies of government, and voluntary organizations as well, in a manner that will best serve the welfare of the institution or organization itself. This is precisely the course events are taking at the University of Washington.

I appreciated your courtesy the other day in asking me to make the suggestions I did with reference to possible improvements of the procedure by which legislative investigations are conducted. Doubtless the Legislature will have many suggestions before it and will be duly conscious of its obligations to protect the rights of individuals and the security of the State and the welfare of its people and government as well. As experience has shown, not everyone will be pleased with the conduct of any such hearings because they usually embarrass some individuals or organizations. Such, however, is the nature of the democratic process.

One point should be placed somewhere in the record. It is this, that there has been no collusion between the University and your Committee. The University did not invite the Committee to conduct an investigation of its staff. When the Committee presented information to the University indicating that there was a strong possibility that certain members of the University faculty were covert members of the Communist Party and said that it was the Committee's intention to carry the investigation further, the University, through its Board of Regents and President, offered full cooperation. The members of the staff and faculty were urged by the President to be frank and open in providing any information sought by the Committee's investigators. This cooperation, of course, the University was duty-bound to give to a legally constituted agency of the Legislature of the State of Washington.

May I take this opportunity to thank you for your unfailing courtesy and integrity in all of your dealings with the University.

Sincerely yours,
(signed) R. B. Allen
RAYMOND B. ALLEN, President

Melvin Rader

In the case of Melvin Rader, Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of Washington, the Committee's investigating staff and an agency of the Federal Government have produced evidence showing conclusively that Professor Rader did not tell the truth when he testified before the Committee.

Mr. Rader was identified by one George Hewitt, a former member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, as having attended the Briehl school in Communist training in New York State "in the summer of 1938 or 1939."

The precise summer was later established as that of 1938.

Mr. Rader testified that during the period in question he taught at the University of Washington summer school and that he spent a vacation at Canyon Creek Lodge near Granite Falls.

Your Committee's investigators have established that Mr. Rader's first appearance at Canyon Creek Lodge was in August of 1940, and that there was a six-weeks' period when he did not teach summer school at the University in 1938.

The Federal agency heretofore mentioned has in its possession the testimony of two witnesses who corroborate Mr. Hewitt's statement that Professor Rader was in New York in the summer of 1938.

All of this evidence has been made available to the proper state authority and has been made available to the administration of the University of Washington and to the Board of Regents.

The Committee's published report of the second public hearings does not disclose that Professor Rader refused to confront Mr. Hewitt and actually "ran out" on Mr. Hewitt.

When Mr. Hewitt informed your Committee that he recognized Rader as a former attendant of the Briehl school for Communist educators, your Chairman immediately invited Professor Rader to his office.

Professor Rader came into the executive office but as soon as he saw Hewitt, and before a word had been spoken, he turned on his heels and said he refused to have any conversation. As Rader hurriedly left, Mr. Hewitt again identified him positively as the Mr. Rader that attended the Briehl school. Upon leaving the room Rader said he would not talk without his attorney. Your Chairman then courteously invited him to return with his attorney. Shortly thereafter, Attorney Ed Henry, claiming to represent Professor Rader, showed up but Rader was not with him.

Professor Rader would have had every opportunity, had he returned with Henry, to examine and cross-examine Hewitt, as did Henry. Hewitt persisted in his identification but Rader was not there to offer any denial.

Your Committee enters this in its report to the Legislature to contradict and refute the manufactured stories that Professor Rader was not given an opportunity to confront and question his accuser. There is no record of this in the Second Report because events herein related took place in the Committee's executive offices. This is the first time they are publicly disclosed.

Professor Rader is shown by the fully authenticated and documented records of your Committee to have been sponsor for, speaker for, or to have been otherwise directly associated with, twelve organizations which have been officially cited as Communist Fronts and subversive.

Your Committee feels that the perjury charge filed against Mr. Hewitt was not only hasty and unwarranted but of political significance.

Your Committee feels that it would be a proper subject of inquiry for the Thirty-first Legislature to ascertain why the recently appointed Prosecutor of King County, after first admitting the validity of the evidence placed before him and definitely committing himself to seek dismissal of the perjury charge against Mr. Hewitt, later reversed himself and explained that: (1) he was committed to his predecessor, now a member of the Superior Court Bench, not to do so; and (2) that it might cost him 12,000 votes when he runs for election to take such a step.

Ed Henry and Paul Coughlin

Among the most vociferous critics of this Committee have been Paul Coughlin and Ed Henry, law associates, of Seattle.

They appeared during the second public hearing as counsel for Professor Melvin Rader of the University of Washington. The Committee has established that this instructor of our youth has been associated with as sponsor, member, or in other capacities, twelve Communist Front organizations, and that his provable record alone should warrant his dismissal from the teaching staff of our state University.

But it is Coughlin and Henry who have been in the forefront of critics of our Committee procedure and who have stressed what they claim to be the "need" for protection of civil liberties of persons investigated by this legislative Committee.

No member of this Committee believes for a moment that the Committee nor any of its members should be considered above criticism. But when critics publicly raise their voices it is the right of those criticized to inquire whether the criticism be honestly motivated even though conceivably mistaken, or whether the critics are actuated by motives not readily discernible to the uninformed.

It is with this thought in mind that this Committee directs the attention of the Legislature to a discussion of the International Judicial Association in Appendix 9, under the title "Communist Front Organizations," which Appendix is part of the records of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

In this report the congressional investigating committee says of the International Juridical Association:

"Probably the strongest evidence of the Communist character of the International Juridical Association is to be found in the records of the persons who compose the organization's national committee.

"Among those persons we find a substantial nucleus of publicly avowed or provable members of the Communist Party. At the beginning of this study, therefore, we cite a portion of the Communist record of these persons. Subsequently a sketch of the organization's history and policies will add confirming evidence of its Communist character."

The congressional committee then gives the provable Communist records of seven of the national committee members of that period. (See Pages 796, 797, 798.)

The congressional committee report then goes on:

“Up to this point we have named seven members of the national committee of the International Juridical Association concerning whose membership in the Communist Party there is definite proof.

“Even if there were not yet others who belong in the category of Communist sympathizers or fellow travelers, these seven would constitute a very sizable nucleus of Communist Party members on the national committee which numbers 61 members.

“It is rare in recent Communist strategy to find any Communist front organizations with as many as 10 percent provable Communist Party members on its highest governing body...

“In addition to the relatively small nucleus of Communist Party members and the much larger group of Communist sympathizers or fellow travelers, there are always, or usually always, some individuals found in a Communist front organization—even on its highest governing board—who are distinctly not party members or fellow travelers.

“It is a typical Communist device to point out these non-Communists and non-sympathizers as proof that the organization is not Communist-controlled. This is the argument used by those who for one reason or another deny that the International Juridical Association is a Communist organization.

“The seven Communist leaders of the International Juridical Association who have been discussed already do not by any means exhaust the list of those in the organization who have impressive records of Communist affiliations. Other fellow travelers (some of whom may be secret party members) require our consideration.”

The Committee then goes into the records of Pearl Heart, Charles H. Houston, Henry T. Hunt, Abraham J. Isserman and Colston E. Warne, who are also members of the National Committee of the International Juridical Association.

It then briefly goes into the subject of the well-known type of Communist interlocking directorates. It says:

“There is not a single important Communist front organization which does not have a substantial representation from the personnel of the International Juridical Association in its governing body.

“A complete picture of this interlocking directorate would require more space than is necessary to reach the conclusions which it supports.”

The committee cites as examples to sustain its conclusions: the American Peace Mobilization, the International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as proven Communist fronts whose directorates are interlocking with that of the International Juridical Association.

The congressional committee report further asserts that:

“From its inception the International Juridical Association has specialized in the defense of individual Communists or of the Communist Party itself.”

It lists several score Communist cases, many of them now notorious, in which the International Juridical Association has taken a special interest.

Furthermore the congressional committee’s report shows that the International Juridical Association has received monetary support from the Communist-controlled Robert Marshall Foundation of which Jerry O’Connell long has been a trustee.

The committee found that the International Juridical Association “was one of the regular beneficiaries of that fund.”

Members of the national committee of the International Juridical Association representing the State of Washington in 1942 are named by the congressional committee as Paul Coughlin and Ed Henry.

Legislative Investigations and the FBI

Those most vocal in their opposition to legislative investigations of Communists invariably include the argument to support their attack, that the job is already being ably done by the FBI; that we have nothing to fear from Communists because at the first outbreak of hostilities Mr. Hoover and his agents would swoop down on all of the Communists in the United States and confine them forthwith.

We have a high regard for Mr. Hoover and the great organization which he so ably heads but he is limited by law in the steps he may take in safeguarding America from its present enemy.

In fact, the Committee has only the highest praise for the various branches of the Department of Justice. We have worked in utmost harmony with all agencies engaged in the investigation of subversive activities. Our only contention is that the agents of this government are not armed with sufficient weapons to cope with the Communist conspirators effectively.

It is doubtless important to have a secret file on the activities of Communists. It is vastly more important for the American people to know about their evil designs and activities in this country. It is vitally important that they know who they are so that they can appraise more accurately their very clever propaganda. The Communists could not possibly have attained their present strength in America if the people had been adequately informed by agencies in possession of vast amounts of information concerning the underground activities of thousands of foreign-directed agents of the American branch of the World Communist Party.

We believe that Communism is like a disease, as Elizabeth Bentley, self-confessed former Communist Soviet spy has stated, "A disease which corrodes the soul and the mind of man." To attack this disease merely by spying on its agents and storing the findings in one-way secret files is no more conducive to curtailing the spread of Communism than would a similar attack curtail the spread of typhus, diphtheria, or smallpox. The Committee is not speaking of Communism as an economic or political ideology but as a label given the conspiracy and conspirators of a totalitarian foreign government that seeks to destroy the United States.

It is precisely because the Communists have developed a technique to accomplish our destruction which little fears the secret dossiers compiled by the Department of Justice, that legislative investigations seeking information on which to base adequate legislation have become of paramount importance. Certainly it is obvious that Department of Justice files concerning the conspiratorial activities of the Communists have not prevented their rapid and widespread infiltration in labor, education and government.

J. Edgar Hoover is one of the outstanding and most vocal enemies of the Communists and has repeatedly stated that the members of the Communist Party in America are fifth column agents representing a hostile government. Mr. Hoover has also clearly stated the limitations placed by law upon his organization. In a recent interview, in answer to the question, "Does the FBI list organizations ruled to be subversive?" he said:

"The FBI does not make policy, recommendations, conclusions, or rulings, based upon our investigation. It is a fact-finding agency. The facts it gathers are submitted to Department of Justice officials. The Attorney General rules on whether the organization is subversive. The FBI investigates alleged membership in subversive organizations of federal employees after the Attorney General has ruled the organization to be subversive."

In reply to a question regarding the initiation of criminal prosecutions by the FBI in cases where federal employees failed to disclose Communist Party affiliations, Mr. Hoover stated:

"Criminal prosecutions are initiated in proper cases, but not by the FBI. That is a responsibility of the prosecuting officials of the Department of Justice and the various United States attorneys. It's not a simple matter to prove that one is a Communist. In fact, the most dangerous Communists in the nation today are not the open, avowed, card-carrying Party members. They seek to attach themselves to liberal and progressive movements. They conceal their real Communist affiliation, because they know that once exposed they will outlaw themselves in the hearts and minds of loyal Americans. A real Communist supporter can be identified by his acts—he follows his party line, espouses the party's causes and often furthers its aims by his overt acts.

"The Communist Party has long regarded infiltration of the government service as a project carrying highest priority. They have sought to accomplish this under the guise of secrecy. The menace of Communists in government service is a threat to our national security because of (1) opportunity to engage in espionage to the detriment of our national defense; (2) opportunity to influence the formulation and carrying out of governmental policies; (3) opportunity to promote Communist propaganda, creating disruption and undermining public confidence; (4) opportunity to recruit Party members in government service, or soliciting the aid of innocent co-workers in assisting them to carry out Party assignments; and (5) opportunity to place other Communists in government service. One person whose loyalty to the Communist cause exceeds his loyalty to the United States could, if properly placed, do irreparable harm to our security."

Legislative Investigations and the Press

Ours and other legislative committees engaged in the investigation of Communists have been accused of seeking "headlines." To this, the committee cheerfully pleads guilty. We have sought the most complete and accurate news coverage of our every act. We have nothing to hide. We are seeking out traitors to America. When we find them we believe it is public information which concerns the national security and we have made every effort to see that the people were given the facts. Had the facts been made available to the people from other official sources there would have been no need for a committee, nor headlines of this kind.

We have read reams of criticism of the legislative investigating committees by certain columnists and listened to almost daily barrages on the air by self-appointed critics since the Whittaker Chambers disclosures. It is significant, we think, that these critics center their fire on what they claim to be wrong with the investigative committee but have not one word of criticism for those who have so flagrantly betrayed their country to an unfriendly and predatory foreign government. Why?

It is high time that we hold up to public gaze those who are consistently attacking American institutions and their representatives while at the same time stealthily apologizing for everything Russia does and wants.

We believe that the security of this country is at all times paramount to a fancied right of privacy regarding affiliation with a known subversive organization such as the Communist Party. When in the exercise of self-asserted civil rights any individual places the whole people in jeopardy the primary right of self-preservation asserts itself, and the people may properly take such measures as the situation may indicate are justified. Certainly the most proper means available to the people is to call upon their elected representatives, granting them sufficient powers to investigate, inquire, and recommend proper safeguards.

The press and radio are the major if not the only means of quickly and intelligently informing the people of the activities of their elected representatives. It is therefore to the press and radio that the people turn for information. That is why not only your Committee but similar committees throughout the country have held open hearings to which both the press and radio have had free and untrammelled access.

The Legislature may be sure that any attempt to make star chamber sessions out of such hearings would be received by the public with justifiable cynicism and a deserved rebuke.

Recommendations

One of the purposes of such legislative committees as this one is to find an answer in law to the ever-increasing threat imposed by Stalinist Communism in its world-wide conspiracy. Its purpose, too, is to inform the public, whose instrument this Committee is, of the extent and nature of the Communist conspiracy as it affects the State of Washington.

Much effort is being expended to impair the powers of the Legislature to investigate subversives. At this time the only safe course is to strengthen the authority of the Legislature and its investigating Committee in this direction.

The constitutional safeguards which already adequately surround the witness before legislative hearings should be specifically set forth so that misinformation circulated by Communists to confuse and mislead the people will be dispelled.

The Constitution of the United States amply protects the individual in the exercise of his individual rights. These rights are in nowise invaded by the authority granted to your legislative Committee. The individual is not required to give self-incriminating testimony, for the very simple reason that legislative committees have no indicting powers and the individual cannot be criminally prosecuted as a result of testimony he is required to give against himself.

However, it is the opinion of this Committee that specific legislation declaring the immunities enjoyed by a witness before a legislative committee should be set forth in the interest of clarifying a purposely created misconception in the public mind.

The right of the individual to enjoy benefit of counsel when testifying before a legislative body or appearing before such committee in executive session should be clearly set forth. This is

not to imply that counsel before a legislative committee should not be restrained from unethical or unseemly tactics.

The privilege of counsel to cross-question witnesses should at all times remain within the discretion of the legislative committee. The factors of time and energies of the committee members must always be considered. It should be borne in mind, too, that legislative committees do not have and should not have the powers of summary contempt and therefore cannot permit counsel to function without restraint. Such committees at all times function as a fact-finding agency and unlimited argument and debate have no proper place before them and serve no useful purpose.

The facts revealed in the first and second Committee reports indicate beyond any question of doubt that the Communist conspiratorial organization has extended its roots deeply into many branches of our public and civic life and that the pioneer work of this Committee has served only as the beginning of a complete exposure. To end the function of this Committee at this time would prove a fatal blow to the progress that has been made in alerting the people of our state to this danger and would in effect over a period of time nullify the accomplishments already made. Your Committee therefore, in the deepest earnestness, recommends that the Thirty-first Legislature continue to see that the function of this proper and constitutional branch of legislative activity be continued for the public welfare and security.

Your Committee also feels that it is of the utmost importance that a successor committee be adequately financed to effectually deal with the problems it will confront and the important demands that will be made upon it in the public interest. Your Committee has adequately shown, we believe, that the people have received inestimable value for every dollar heretofore appropriated for this work.

Your Committee is of the belief that to curtail the operations of a successor committee by inadequate financing would prove to be a penny-wise and pound-foolish move. Nowhere, we believe, can the expenditure of a state tax dollar bring greater returns in the form of ultimate security to the taxpayers and the citizenry generally. Communists have brought to bear almost unlimited personnel and resources, originating both within and outside the state, to checkmate the effective work of this Committee at every turn. A successor committee cannot have its hands tied by insufficient funds with which to operate.

Your Committee recommends that:

(1) Penalties for contempt and perjury committed before a legislative hearing be made much more severe.

(2) Contempt of the Legislature or legislative committee should be defined to include disorderly conduct which arrests the orderly and dignified procedure of a legislative hearing.

(3) Consideration be given new procedure in cases of legislative contempt, giving the legislative committee recourse to the Attorney General to proceed directly on information provided by a legislative committee, thus averting the possibility of unnecessary delays on the part of lesser public officials.

(4) It may be mandatory for any person, all or part of whose salary or wages are paid from public funds, to respond to a summons by a legislative committee and freely and truthfully answer all lawful questions asked by the committee and that failure to do so automatically constitutes grounds for dismissal from public employment.

(5) That financing of the Communist Party and its activities through tax funds be minimized to the greatest extent possible by:

(a) Requiring any pension or welfare recipient to state under oath that he or she is not a member of the Communist Party.

(b) That the recipient will not use any such funds to aid the Communist conspiracy or any of its officers, representatives, or front organizations.

and by any other provisions in the setting up of the pension and welfare funds that the Legislature may see fit to employ, and further that the penalty for violation shall be permanent suspension from the pension and/or welfare rolls.

(6) That the use of pension and welfare funds for the support of any Communist propaganda organ (such as the late *New World*, and the *Peoples Daily World* of San Francisco, or the *Daily Worker* of New York), for instance, be strictly prohibited on the ground that it is furthering a foreign conspiracy against the peace and well-being of the citizens and taxpayers of this state, and

that the penalty for such a subversive diversion of tax funds shall mean permanent suspension from the pension and/or welfare funds.

(7) The Legislature strengthen the anti-subversive clause contained in the omnibus appropriations of the 1947 session laws, so that it will specifically name membership in, or affiliation with, the Communist Party as a bar to employment on any state or state sub-division payroll. The existing provision fixing a maximum penalty of \$1,000 fine and a year in jail for swearing falsely in connection with a "subversive" organization has proved to be wholly inadequate and ineffective because of legal hair-splitting. For the purpose of this recommendation a Communist should be defined as one holding membership in the Communist Party, the Communist Political Association, or any organization, however defined, having a proven working affiliation with the Communist Party of Soviet Russia. Further, that Party affiliation may properly be imputed where the individual undeviatingly adheres to the Communist Party Line or has proven affiliation with three or more known Communist Front organizations which have been declared subversive by a qualified branch of the State or Federal Government.

(8) No action for slander or libel should lie against an individual for labeling as a Communist a person who can be proved to be a member of three or more Communist Front organizations officially declared subversive. Affiliation with recognized Communist front organizations should place the burden of proof as to loyalty on the individual so affiliated.

(9) In appointing members of the Legislature to serve on the successor to this Committee the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, and the membership of both houses, should exercise the most extreme care to see that such an appointee is neither a Communist nor a Communist sympathizer, nor anyone who might lend himself to the purposeful or unwitting betrayal of the committee to subversive forces, and to name to the successor committee only such members of the Legislature who are wholly in accord with the intent of the 31st Legislature to further expose and arrest the growth of the Communist conspiracy in our State.

(10) The investigating staff of your Committee, as heretofore stated, was chosen for its experience and expert knowledge. At no time was there any political consideration or any consideration of patronage. Your Committee felt that in a work as important as this to the public welfare that only the most capable and proven persons should be employed. No member of the investigating staff at any time was asked concerning his party affiliations; the Committee does not know how many are Democrats and how many are Republicans. It should also be stressed that in every case the Committee sought the man. In nearly every instance the members of the investigating staff resigned other important positions to undertake their work for this Committee. The investigating committee, as constituted, has developed into a highly efficient team and it is the recommendation of your Committee that the investigating staff be held intact and that in the employment of investigators no consideration whatever be given political patronage by either Democratic or Republican members of the Committee.

Your Committee cannot refrain at this point from reminding the Democratic members of the 31st Legislature that the retiring state chairman of the Democratic Party and the Democratic State Attorney General have given their public approval and endorsement of the politically non-partisan attitude and operations of your Committee since its creation by the 30th Legislature. It has at all times been the purpose of your Committee to protect the political integrity of the State against the advances of the foreign-directed Communist conspiracy, and we believe that every act and utterance of the Committee will fully bear out this statement.

(11) To press with all vigor and energy and all its resources the investigation into Communism in our tax-supported schools, both common schools and institutions of higher learning. Communists already have made salutary* inroads into our education system. Testimony, including that of high ex-Communists, in the first and second Committee reports, disclosed the alarming progress that has been made.

In the blueprint for Communist infiltration the Communist objective is summed up in these simple words:

* The word "salutary" is a misprint that appeared in the final, printed version of the report. The intended word, which appeared in the draft copy, was "substantial."

In destroying the capitalist monopoly of the means of production, the working class must also destroy the capitalist monopoly of education; that is, it must take possession of all the schools, from the elementary schools to the universities. (Program of the Communist International, adopted by the Sixth World Congress, Sept. 1, 1928, Moscow. *Blue Print for World Conquest*, page 206.)

As heretofore stated, your Committee had opportunity merely to scratch the surface of Communist infiltration in our tax-supported school system.

(12) The successor committee, or a separate committee, be authorized to fully investigate the manner in which textbooks and all other reading matter in our schools is chosen and approved, and that the Legislature make it mandatory to either delegate existing agencies or create a separate agency with the responsibility of stemming the flow of subversive reading matter that is finding its way into some of the classrooms of our schools.

INVENTORY OF COMMITTEE RECORDS

Mr. Frederick: The first document that I'll be reading from is in essence a receipt—a "House note" dated February 10, 1955. It's an inventory of the records that were found associated with the committee that were stored in the legislative building in Olympia.

Received of S. R. Holcomb, Chief Clerk, the Un-American Activities file material as listed in the attached description. These records were released by the Legislature to the Federal Bureau of Investigation by direction of House Concurrent Resolution No. 5.

This is signed by Steve S. Carter and H. Edward McNulty, Special Agents, F.B.I.

Numerous indices cards, as contained in an 8-drawer index file cabinet. Indices cards were in alphabetical order; each drawer contained two rows of indices cards approximately 15 inches wide and 30 inches deep. There were a total of 8 drawers, each drawer being approximately 3/4 full of capacity.

Safe No. 1, identified as a Herring-Hall Marvin Safe, bearing Underwriters' Laboratories No. 247632, opened with a combination by Charles McKillip, maintenance employee of the State Department of Buildings and Grounds, in the presence of Mr. S. R. Holcomb, Chief Clerk; Mr. John L. O'Brien, Speaker of the House; Mr. Emmett Anderson, President of the Senate; and special agents Steve S. Carter and H. Edward McNulty. The contents of this safe consisted of numerous periodicals and correspondence relating to the Un-American Activities Committee in the State of Washington.

A safe bearing the trade name "Globe", bearing Serial No. 122338, was forced open with drill and punch by Al Clark, locksmith, in the presence of Charles McKillip, maintenance man and special agents Steve S. Carter and H. Edward McNulty, and upon the opening of the safe it was found to be empty.

A safe bearing the name Herring-Hall-Marvin, No. 185531, likewise was forced open with drill and punch by Al Clark, locksmith, in the presence of special agents Steve S. Carter and H. Edward McNulty. This safe was opened for examination in addition to the above-named individuals, those present were Mr. John L. O'Brien, Speaker of the House; and Mr. S. R. Holcomb, Chief Clerk. This safe contained the following items: the transcript of proceedings of hearings held in January and February, 1948, by the Un-American Activities Committee of the State of Washington, Pages 1 through 1418, and transcript of proceedings of the hearing held in July, 1948, by the said committee, consisting of 4 volumes, Pages 1 through 786, and one reprint copy of a pamphlet entitled 'The Communist Party—A Manual on Organization' by J. Peters.

REPORT OF SPECIAL INVESTIGATIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. Frederick: The next document is a report of special committee with regard to a hearing that was conducted with regard to the whereabouts and/or the issue of the House on Un-American Activities Committee records.

To The Honorable The House of Representatives of the State of Washington:

Pursuant to a House resolution adopted by the House of Representatives on the 38th day of the legislative session, dated February 16, 1955, which provided that John L. O'Brien, Speaker of the House, and R. Mort Frayn, Representative from the 43rd District, be appointed a Special Investigative Committee to ascertain the whereabouts of the records of the Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities authorized by House Concurrent Resolution No. 10 of the 30th Regular Session of the Legislature of the State of Washington, which Committee functioned from its origination in 1947 until the termination of its activities by making a final report to the 31st Session of the Legislature in 1949, the members of the Special Committee held a public hearing on February 21, 1955, in the House Chambers. Immediately following this public hearing an executive session was held in the Speaker's office.

Following is a summary, conclusion and recommendation of the Committee:

SUMMARY

Witnesses examined were Albert F. Canwell, former Chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee; Grant C. Sisson, former Committee member; R. L. Rutter, former Committee member; Victor Skinner, former Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives during the 1949 Session; S. R. Holcomb, former and present Chief Clerk of the House; P. J. Stroble, Washington State Patrolman; Dana T. Robinson, former investigator for the Committee; Viola C. Fritchie, former secretary of the Un-American Activities Committee, and Noyes Talcott, one of the owners of safety deposit vaults at Talcott Brothers, Jewelers.

I. Examination of Mr. Canwell disclosed the following facts:

- (1) That he destroyed certain reports, records, documents and papers gathered by the Committee through its investigators.
- (2) That destruction of these reports, records, documents and papers extended through the entire life of the Committee, but that the majority of them were destroyed after Mr. Canwell's term of office had expired, and that many of them were destroyed in the home of Mr. Canwell.
- (3) That microfilm was made of many of these reports, records, papers, and documents, which presently exists today.
- (4) That Mr. Canwell refused under a direct question from Chairman John L. O'Brien to answer as to what disposal had been made of these microfilms and as to where they are presently located.
- (5) That Mr. Canwell refused to answer whether or not he had turned the microfilms over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- (6) That Mr. Canwell claimed he had been given absolute authority to make whatever disposition (including destruction) he felt necessary of the papers, records and documents gathered by the investigators of the Interim Committee on Un-American Activities.
- (7) That Mr. Canwell further testified that the documents and records destroyed were of such a nature that they should not be allowed to fall into strange hands because of the danger to agents of the United States government or danger or harm to innocent persons.
- (8) That as further justification for the withholding and destruction of the papers, files and records, Mr. Canwell admitted that he was motivated by a feeling that the Legislature (1949) was not in sympathy with his 'project' or would carry it out in an inadvisable manner.

II. Examination of Mr. Rutter disclosed the following facts:

- (1) That the Committee had executive meetings and kept records of its activities.
- (2) That he regarded all of the records, reports, documents and papers of the Committee as property of the State of Washington.
- (3) That no authority had been given to the Chairman (Canwell) to destroy the records of the Committee.

III. Examination of Mr. Grant C. Sisson disclosed the following facts:

- (1) That the Committee made a record of its sessions.
- (2) That he regarded the reports, records, documents and papers gathered by the Committee as the prop-

erty of the State of Washington.

(3) That at the origination of the Committee, Mr. Canwell, as Chairman, was granted certain broad authority.

(4) That Mr. Canwell was not given authority to destroy the records.

IV. Examination of Mr. Skinner disclosed the following facts:

(1) That he was Sergeant-at-Arms of the 1949 Session and was delegated to transfer the records of the Committee on Un-American Activities to Olympia for storage by the Legislature from the Committee's office in the New Armory Building at Seattle.

(2) That this operation was carried out with the aid of the Washington State Patrol and that the utmost security was observed.

(3) That so far as he knew, he received all records, documents, papers and property of the Committee for transfer to Olympia, but that the safes and files were locked and it was impossible for him to know whether they were full of records and papers or were empty.

(4) That upon the arrival of the records at Olympia, after storage overnight in the State Patrol Building garage, under State Patrol guard, they were turned over to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Senator Lester Parker, President of the Senate.

V. An examination of P. J. Stroble of the Washington State Patrol disclosed the following facts:

(1) That the Washington State Patrol participated in the movement of the records from the headquarters of the Committee in Seattle to Olympia, and that the utmost security precautions were taken for their protection.

(2) That from the time the records were delivered to Victor Skinner the safes and filing cabinets supposed to contain them were under his constant supervision while on the way from Seattle to Olympia.

VI. An examination of Mr. S. R. Holcomb disclosed:

(1) That he was Chief Clerk of the House in the 1949 Session and is Chief Clerk of the House in the 1955 Session.

(2) That the purported records, papers, documents and property of the Un-American Activities Committee were brought to Olympia pursuant to direction of the House.

(3) That they were stored, unopened, in a locked room in the Capitol Building and that the utmost security was observed in bringing such records and property to Olympia and in storing the same.

(4) That in order to preserve security as to such articles, the key to the door of the room where they were stored and certain keys to files, and safe combinations, were deposited in the safety deposit vaults of Talcott Brothers Jewelry Company in Olympia, Washington, with the direction that such safety deposit box was only to be opened by a representative of the State and a representative of the House, to-wit, the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate; and that they were neither opened nor examined by the Speaker of the House or President of the Senate, Mr. Hodde or Senator Parker, or by their successors, until 1955.

(5) That he had heard Mr. Canwell say, at a discussion of the importance of the records and files of the Committee prior to the storage of the same in Olympia, that they were of extremely explosive character and would affect the state, and that they should be preserved from unauthorized persons.

(6) That so far as he knew, the records, files and property had not been tampered with or opened since their deposit in such room.

(7) That when opened by direction of the 1955 Legislature, such files, cabinets, and safes appeared only to contain a small portion of the Committee records, files and papers as is shown by a receipt from the F.B.I., a copy of which was admitted in evidence at the hearing.

VII. An examination of Viola C. Fritchie disclosed the following facts:

(1) That she, as former secretary to the Un-American Activities committee, was aware of its practices as to the maintenance of reports, records, documents and files.

(2) That the Committee maintained an elaborate card index containing many hundreds of names, which index was keyed to the files of the Committee.

(3) That the records, documents and papers of the Committee were intact as of January 1, 1949.

VIII. An examination of Dana T. Robinson disclosed the following facts:

(1) That he was the accountant for the Committee on Un-American Activities during its existence, and that the Committee maintained extensive and voluminous files.

(2) That he did not see the contents of the files, cabinets and safes the day they were turned over to Mr. Skinner.

(3) That while not aware of the individual items in the files of the Committee, he was of the opinion that the files were maintained in an intact condition until their delivery to Olympia.

(4) That he participated in the surrender of the files to the representatives of the Legislature in 1949.

CONCLUSION

From the foregoing Summary of the testimony taken by your Committee, the following report and recommendations are made:

(1) That the records, files and property of the Un-American Activities Committee which were returned to the Legislature of the 31st Session were returned with the utmost security by the proper officials and stored in the Legislative Building.

(2) That during such return and during such time of storage such records as were returned were not tampered with or molested in any way.

(3) That all of the actual records and files of the Committee were not turned over to the Legislature in compliance with its directive, the portion being transferred to Olympia being but a card index, a transcript of certain public hearings and other matters.

(4) That the larger portion of the underlying files, records and reports had been removed prior to the return of the purported records to Olympia.

(5) That Albert F. Canwell, former Chairman of the Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities, destroyed the greater and most important portions of the files and records of the Committee, without the authority of the Committee.

(6) That with the exception of rough drafts and other writings of like nature, the basic files and records of the Committee were public documents and the property of the State of Washington, assembled pursuant to an investigation which occasioned a public expenditure of about \$140,000 of state funds.

(7) That many of these records and documents were microfilmed, through the expenditure of public funds, and that such microfilm constituted public documents and was the property of the State of Washington.

(8) That when questioned as to the whereabouts of microfilmed copies of the records and files of the Committee, said Albert F. Canwell refused to answer.

(9) That Albert F. Canwell in failing to answer the question was in contempt of the Special Committee created by the 31st Legislature (House Of Representatives).

RECOMMENDATIONS.

It is recommended that the matter of the contempt of the said Albert F. Canwell in refusing to answer as to the whereabouts of the microfilms of the records of the Committee on Un-American Activities and the matter of his admitted destruction of public documents which were property of the State of Washington, to-wit, certain papers, records and files of the Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities be referred to the Attorney General of the State of Washington for appropriate legal action, either civil or criminal as the case warrants.

It is further recommended that the transcripts of the hearing held by the Committee, including both the public and executive hearings, be referred to the Attorney General for his use in connection with the above recommendation.

Respectfully submitted, John L. O'Brien, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SPECIAL INVESTIGATIVE COMMITTEE EXECUTIVE SESSION,
FEBRUARY 12, 1955

Mr. Frederick: The third document is Special Committee, House of Representatives, State of Washington.

Members of Legislative Committee: John L. O'Brien, Speaker, Mort Frayn.
Counsel for committee: Don Cary Smith, Martin J. Durkan.
Witness present at executive session: Albert F. Canwell.
Executive Session.
Office of the Speaker February 12, 1955.

This is a transcript of the executive session and in this the reader will have an opportunity to view philosophy expressed by a representative proportion of the Legislature and then Albert is expressing his perspective also within this document.

Mr. O'Brien: Mr. Canwell, do you have the material that you had out there (at the hearing)?

Mr. Canwell: No, I don't have it now. It was a confidential memorandum on which I was going to make a statement. I was going to quote it.

Mr. O'Brien: Couldn't you quote it now?

Mr. Canwell: I don't think I should. You held a public hearing. I had information I thought had a pertinent bearing on the hearing. There is no reason the whole story shouldn't be given at a public hearing. I have been subjected in the last two weeks to biased and slanted news and statements. It is no mystery to me. The *Seattle Times* - a certain reporter from the *Seattle Times* - is pulling the strings.

Mr. O'Brien: That is not true. Our only purpose was to find out what happened to the records. Other than that we are not interested one way or the other. That is our primary purpose.

Mr. Canwell: You gave the records you had to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. They are out of your jurisdiction. They are not complaining as far as I have heard. The F.B.I. had constant access to my records, they or any other federal agency. This is the purest fiction that doing something here will aid or abet the national security after seven years.

Mr. O'Brien: All we are trying to do is locate apparently missing records. You told us they are destroyed.

Mr. Canwell: I told you that was memoranda I had a right to dispose of.

Mr. O'Brien: We found out further there were documentary files that supported your cross index, your card indices. You had folders you could refer to by code.

Mr. Canwell: That is the memoranda-

Mr. O'Brien: -that you had folders with material, pertinent material.

Mr. Canwell: You understand-whether you understand or not-I do...we were not preparing indictments. We were a fact-finding committee. All we had to do was turn in a report to the Legislature. The memoranda were the means to make the report. It would be highly improper to turn that information over to anybody. That is right. I am certain you would support that opinion. There were a lot of partial investigations, half-done cases, tips, and information; and in addition to that, I doubt there was a file of any significance that didn't have keys to undercover agents in it whose life could be lost if the information were made available. It would be a matter of betraying confidence and trust. Nobody would do that. I wouldn't. I am not obliged to.

Mr. Frayn: I think this, Al. It should be stated in this way, that you feel you were justified in making a statement as to what the disposition of the records was and tell us what you did. Within reason we get down

to the basis they are destroyed. I believe we are some place in the right area there. Also there is the statement which I think is perfectly justified as to the reasoning back of that. The thing is that I think that we are going to have to find out from the Committee's standpoint after listening to your views, whether or not the jurisdiction you feel you had is correct in the eyes of the Legislature and the legislative committee. That is our problem to work out, probably. I think probably what we would like basically to find out first is if you have any other information. I don't quite get your point, quite frankly, if it is confidential information why that type of information should be spilled out in the open hearing.

Mr. Canwell: The form was confidential. It is not anybody's business where I got it.

Mr. Frayn: I don't give a whoop who gave the information. I think if you have information that would be of value, that you should give it to us.

Mr. Canwell: I asked to give it in front of the committee. You refused. You kept your witnesses in the hall outside. That isn't done even in criminal cases very often. I offered you some testimony I think has a bearing.

Mr. Frayn: You said it was highly confidential.

Mr. Canwell: The report itself. You wanted me to turn the report in. I will tell you about it. I intend to tell the press, too.

Mr. O'Brien: Does it have anything to do with the missing records?

Mr. Canwell: I told you that at a high level meeting attended by top Communists they discussed access they had found to some of our records and stated in this meeting they had been obtained; that is, photostats had been obtained of our financial reports from our committee headquarters at the time our place was under twenty-four hour guard. I know who did it.

Mr. O'Brien: This is when the records were in the Seattle office?

Mr. Canwell: In a top Communist meeting, they were discussing photostats they obtained from our office.

Mr. O'Brien: They could have gotten it at the State Auditor's office. The Auditor had those records.

Mr. Canwell: The State Auditor spent the whole summer there.

Mr. O'Brien: That would be a matter of public record. They could have gotten the information there. Was that the extent of the testimony you wanted to give out there?

Mr. Canwell: That is not all. I said before - I started to say that the *Seattle Times* has been using - attempting to use - and with some success, the Washington State Legislature as a cat's paw for the Communist Party since 1949. I will go on and verify it.

Mr. O'Brien: We won't go into that.

Mr. Smith: Would you care to say what meeting that was?

Mr. Canwell: It was a Civil Rights Congress meeting. Top Communists were there including the top seven prosecuted under the Smith Act. They condemned my committee. The *Seattle Times* carried headlines, "Civil Rights Congress Condemns Canwell Actions." They didn't identify the Civil Rights Congress as a Communist front. It was written with the intention of giving the idea that Canwell had done improper things and the Civil Rights Congress were discussing the fact they had illegally obtained documents of the office and that sort of thing. They have played ball with them all along.

House Report No. 1116, the House of Representatives report of investigation of the Civil Rights Congress was originally released September 2, 1947. The Congress was publicly identified as a Communist front at that time, some years before the *Seattle Times* indicates that the best security measures you can take, in spite of them, people will get into your records. As far as turning the confidential records that have to do with the security of people working from the inside, turning them over to people not knowing who would

have them or what would be done to it—

Mr. O'Brien: Don't you think the Legislature should be the judge?

Mr. Canwell: No, sir, I do not. I accumulated it.

Mr. O'Brien: For the State of Washington.

Mr. Canwell: That was only part of it. I obtained information from confidential sources. It was given in confidence. I gave my word not to disclose it. It was to help us in our investigation.

Mr. Frayn: It is a matter of opinion, John. I think you stated your opinion on it, Al, and your reasoning in back of it. I want to get this straight. As far as the reasoning, it seems to stem back to when the records were put in there. Unfortunately the opinion of the people that put the records in, that it was valuable, in that they did retain certain material that might have been of some interest to people. The only reason this has ever come up - I will be honest and tell you, when I took this over in '53, Hodde at that time had stated some concern of the things laying around and it got to the place where the actual mechanics—because there were about three steps you had to go through to get at them—you are well aware of the deal of going to the safety deposit box, getting the keys and so it, that had practically been lost until we wrote to Lester Parker; and, of course, Vic was still here at the time. He was placed in the responsibility of trying to get the mechanics and the reasoning back of it was this. If there was this stuff up there and it had got to the place I doubt if one member in the Legislature knew where the room was, some character might bust into the thing and take the stuff out. It was our intention to—it was the intention of the Legislative Council to dispose of the material. We thought some disposition should be made so that no indiscriminate use of it could come up at a period of eight years, ten years, twelve years from now. You ought to know for your own part of it, it had no bearing on any outside people showing any interest in the disposition of the records.

Mr. Canwell: I know the extent to which Guthman has probed and which he and the *Seattle Times* men - people on the *Seattle Times*, have taken the *Seattle Times* for a ride in a Red wagon. Those who have worked there have taken those who owned it for a ride.

Mr. Frayn: You should realize it stemmed from a very natural reason. You yourself should accept that. You wouldn't want it to sit up there. Something should be done with it.

Mr. Canwell: I created that stuff. I knew what was in it. I had a pretty good idea, I knew there was no security here.

Mr. O'Brien: They took every precautionary measure.

Mr. Canwell: I bet I know somebody that could go into your room, safes, and cabinets in no time. That is done every day, done by the federal agencies. They go into the Communist headquarters and microfilm stuff and go on. Nobody knows it.

Mr. Frayn: Would you be of the opinion, since the stuff was put up there—since the tape recorder was taken out of there, if it was ever put in—would you be of the opinion anybody ever took anything out of there.

Mr. Canwell: I had reason to think they knew what was in them. I was somewhat concerned about the indices. A person could get a lot of information from them.

Mr. O'Brien: Is that why you took them out—the folders?

Mr. Canwell: Sure, that is the basic reason behind it.

Mr. O'Brien: You were similar to an auditor or accountant with working papers. The question arises, whose working papers were they, yours or the State's?

Mr. Canwell: We solved that in our committee. We knew we would have records that would be merely for the guidance of the committee. It was agreed I would be responsible for them and would condense that

information. I worked every day of the week and almost every night. I did that job. It wasn't any committee. They came there once a month and I tried in the few minutes I would have them there to condense all we were doing. It was a tremendous amount of work. I don't know if you appreciate the proportions of it.

Mr. O'Brien: We appreciate the proportion. We also realize there were working papers and underlying material, apparently very valuable material contained in your files. Apparently this Legislature thought so. They locked it very securely and put the keys away and didn't want to go near the room. Mort decided we should do something about it and prepared a resolution and at the beginning of the session we adopted the resolution. For a period of six years the Legislature thought a great deal of important material was gathered there, when we find practically nothing but papers and periodicals plus your indices, which are no good without the supporting data.

Mr. Canwell: The inconsistency that occurs to me—I am not trying to be argumentative—they contained information vital to the security of the state, of the nation, and lie here for six years. That is an indication some people weren't responsible. Half the world could have fallen to the Communists in that time. The United States is acrawl with them.

Mr. Frayn: Those things again are matters of opinion.

Mr. O'Brien: You had a change of administration here during that period of time. You didn't have continuity. Even Mort commented on it last session that the material was up there. It isn't something we have taken lightly. We took it very seriously and found nothing there. What would you do if you were in our position? What would you have done if you thought you had all this material. We were going to turn it over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. Canwell: The F.B.I. had access to our information every day in the week.

Mr. Frayn: The point involved is, we wanted to dispose of the material.

Mr. Canwell: We have accomplished that.

Mr. Frayn: There was no other point involved. It probably should have been done two or four years ago. It wasn't for getting into the material but to dispose of it. I am going to ask about one point. That is this. In your opinion, there is nothing in the material or nothing in the safes and files and the rest of it that would have been taken out of there, that would have been of any particular value?

Mr. Canwell: I would be very concerned if someone had access to those indices, for instance. You had one box of some thousand professors of the University of Washington. In the master file you have the ones we have technical information on.

Mr. O'Brien: Where is the technical information?

Mr. Canwell: It has either been returned to its sources or disposed of.

Mr. O'Brien: By what method?

Mr. Canwell: Various means, many times burned, or other means.

Mr. O'Brien: Did you destroy a lot of that between the time they tell me they were in conversation with you about it?

Mr. Canwell: Who?

Mr. O'Brien: Did Mr. Holcomb talk to you about it?

Mr. Canwell: No.

Mr. Smith: Did Mr. Hodde write you a letter?

Mr. Canwell: No.

Mr. Smith: Did they send you a copy of the resolution?

Mr. Canwell: If they did, it was after the cases were seized.

Mr. O'Brien: They didn't discuss with you at all the fact that they wanted the records?

Mr. Canwell: No.

Mr. O'Brien: Did they tell you...did you tell them you had very valuable material and wanted the committee continued? During the time the session was convened in the 30 days before the resolution was adopted?

Mr. Canwell: We conducted a regular lobby here to get the committee appointed. I tried to keep the investigators. They were the best in the country. One of them now was taken from the committee to head the investigations of the Department of State, another is with the C.I.A. Another is a colonel in the Army Intelligence. Another taught in the War College. I tried to convey that to the next Legislature.

Mr. O'Brien: During that time you had the files intact.

Mr. Canwell: Partially.

Mr. O'Brien: If we had continued the committee, you would have turned over the files of the committee to a committee that would be appointed?

Mr. Canwell: I would have turned them over to a committee that didn't have Communists on it.

Mr. O'Brien: Since the committee wasn't set up, you took the records and destroyed them?

Mr. Canwell: I continued the disposition of them.

Mr. O'Brien: On your own?

Mr. Canwell: As soon as I found the Legislature didn't wish to continue...I knew most of the stuff could be re-created.

Mr. O'Brien: Before the time the Legislature convened, you were willing to turn the records over to a new committee. As soon as you found they weren't going to continue, you disposed of the records?

Mr. Canwell: The rest of it. There was lots of it I knew wouldn't be valuable to them. Maybe we had an undercover man in the Communist Party. We figured out who some of the other agencies' undercover men were. It would have been improper to leave the information there. It is in the minds of two or three investigators and mine.

Mr. O'Brien: Did you ever tell that to the Speaker at that time, that you had highly important records that you felt if the committee wasn't going to be continued you thought it should be destroyed?

Mr. Canwell: No, I had a very difficult time getting his ear on anything. He didn't want to listen to any part of it. You know he didn't. There was a resolution introduced that the Communists carried out all over the country. It had the Communist line laid on it. The civil rights it had in it would make the administration impossible. You couldn't use the methods recommended tonight. It said...first, you said tonight anyone could have counsel but he would have no right to cross-examine. That bill gave everyone right of counsel. It said it had a right to have an hour's testimony printed. It would cost five hundred thousand dollars to conduct an investigation on that basis.

Mr. O'Brien: You then felt they weren't either in sympathy with the project or would carry out the project in a manner inadvisable. Therefore you took the records and disposed of them?

Mr. Canwell: That is right.

Mr. Smith: Ever think of recommending the F.B.I. get the records then, rather than destroy them?

Mr. Canwell: As I said before, it is a very efficient organization in this state. I would say they have probably a hundred people in the Communist Party. They know as of last night what moves they make, what most of them are doing. We turned up new information. We developed informers.

Mr. Smith: They were apparently willing to come down here and pick up all of the material in that room, and I would assume they would have been as willing to have picked up all of those confidential reports that you had, wouldn't they, at that time?

Mr. Canwell: Probably. Look at it this way. Suppose one agency of the Department of Justice—I am giving you a hypothetical example—I will mention a specific case, Gregory Silvermaster, one of the men working from the Department of Justice. Here is a man, one of the top spies in America still at large, working for the federal government and being promoted. Somebody working on his case was very concerned. They made that file available. The man who did it was breaking the law. He was pretty concerned about his country's security. What would I do with that file? If I turned it over to the F.B.I., they would have to trace it back to see how I got it.

Mr. Smith: You didn't have so much of that specific nature. Didn't you ever think of recommending to the Legislature it go to the F.B.I. at that time?

Mr. Canwell: I never got anything from them. No recommendation I made would have been accepted by Mr. Hodde. I am telling you the facts.

Mr. Frayn: I don't think we have anything more on it. I will say this to see if I am correct in my understanding of it. As far as we can gather from what you have got here, there was actually nothing in this safe and the rest of it that was particularly pertinent material that was left, that would be something we would be particularly concerned about, that anything had been taken out from the time it was taken out of the Seattle office until the other day when it was opened up. The reason for the disposition was you felt it was the type of information you didn't feel should be left.

Mr. Canwell: I felt I had done a pretty good job of removing dangerous things from the record.

Mr. Frayn: You appreciate our not knowing it was handled the way it was. You know it would seem reasonable on opening that room men would say, "What about this, Canwell?"

Mr. Canwell: Maybe some people have overlooked the fact that I worked for two years constantly at my expense. What it cost the Legislature didn't cover what it cost me every day. If you ask Mr. Yelle who went over my records, he was rather amazed that what the state paid me covered half the actual expenses there at the Athletic Club where I stayed. I accounted in pretty good faith and served the state pretty well. I was treated in a way I would not treat anyone.

Mr. O'Brien: Don't you think you ended up by deceiving the state?

Mr. Canwell: Nobody asked me whether there was anything in the files or not when they grabbed them. There was somebody that would move in there and grab them. How would anybody know what precautions would be taken.

Mr. Smith: Would you mind telling us, did you remove the files and take them to Spokane at that time?

Mr. Canwell: Some of it was disposed of, returned to the sources from which I got it.

Mr. Smith: How was it sent to Spokane?

Mr. Canwell: I don't recall.

Mr. Smith: In a private car?

Mr. Canwell: Once in awhile, I believe. I may have had some of the stuff shipped there. This stuff didn't assume the proportion to me it seems to be assuming at the moment. I was handling the situation. I hoped it would continue but it had to be liquidated. I handled it according to my best judgment. I don't think anybody here would have wanted some of the records I had made available, even to the Legislature. It wouldn't be proper for the House Un-American Activities Committee files to be turned over to the whole House of Representatives. It wasn't a standing committee, a permanent committee. It wasn't anticipated there was a continuity of record. It wasn't set up with the idea it had to be that way. It was set up with the idea of assimilating a lot of information in a hurry and seeing it didn't fall into improper hands. I know of no other way of handling it. I see nothing wrong with it. Who is a better judge of the records than the person who handled all of it.

Mr. Frayn: I think there is some other stuff you wanted to get to.

Mr. Canwell: I declined to answer about the microfilm. Earlier I said that contained a lot of confidential information.

Mr. O'Brien: You still have the microfilm copies now?

Mr. Canwell: No, I do not have.

Mr. Frayn: That is the type of thing that was in what you called or I called government records.

Mr. Canwell: All the time our records were loaded with undercover information on undercover Communists. They are in the Party now.

Mr. O'Brien: I can't follow your reasoning. That material was valuable and you had very able investigators that gathered it and accumulated it. From that standpoint it had a value. It had a value to the Un-American Activities Committee. It seems too bad to have done all the work and not have anything preserved. This Legislature acted in good faith. They put the files up there and took precautionary measures and sealed the safe and did so as they felt it was valuable material. Probably it could have been acted on sooner. There has been a change in the party and in speakers. It has been felt something should be done. Don't you think from that standpoint they were somewhat deceived?

Mr. Canwell: Who do you think was most aware of the tragedy of the whole thing? I was. My feeling was they should be used. It was my work. I would like to give you a good example. We came in possession of some minutes of a Communist meeting covering a period of years. I won't say how we got them. By going over those and reading them and analyzing them, we found out who the informer was. He is one of the top informers from one of the federal agencies. Because we did figure it out, we were able to get his services. He is still being used. He is a very important person to the security of his country. That man would be dead the next morning if that were known to the Party. We were not playing around; it wasn't the usual legislative inquiry.

Mr. Smith: I can't help looking at it from a lawyer's viewpoint. I was thinking of the possibility of convicting the individuals and things of that nature that have obvious value in a court proceeding later.

Mr. Canwell: A legislative committee has no right to prepare indictments. They have no right to prosecute anyone. I think if that point were properly understood, there wouldn't be all the confusion about the Fifth Amendment. You couldn't use the actual testimony or anything of that nature.

Mr. Smith: You couldn't use the actual testimony, but the documents or exhibits or any matter of that nature underlying it would be valuable.

Mr. Canwell: The only value this has to the people is in the disclosure. The only way is to present this evidence in testimony. I don't think it is fair nor right to hold an executive session and read off a whole bunch of testimony without probably going into a public hearing. You get into the area where it assassinates the character. That is not the purpose of the files. I am suspicious of any situation where you set up a system of files and records of people that will be used to harass them. This information was to guide the people of the State of Washington, in providing a report for the Legislature. I think it was a mistake they didn't pay any attention to what we recommended. We provided the means of breaking the back of the

Communist Party; the suggestions we made on the money being spent in the old age and welfare funds. That is the way the Communist Party is being financed. We suggested a means of cutting it off. We would have saved the State of Washington millions of dollars.

Mr. O'Brien: Is there anything else you want, Mort?

Mr. Frayn: I think it is fine. I don't know whether or not from John's standpoint or my standpoint it is necessary to go any further. Are you going to be over here for a few days?

Mr. Canwell: Unless you want me, I would go back tomorrow. I am willing to stay until you gentlemen are through with me.

I would like to go on and say if this Legislature intended to set up some sort of investigation of Communist activity, I certainly have access to enough material and have enough in my mind and I would be glad to be of considerable help to them. I have never taken any other position. I get a little caustic about the approaches to the problem. I didn't intend to.

Mr. O'Brien: We have no axes to grind. Actually it was a lot of us looking at the thing to see what was best.

Mr. Canwell: The Legislature is not interested in getting at the Communists. They want it so it can no longer be used against the Communists. There are people that would rather silence me and prevent the use of such information than to use it as it should be used at this time. I am not alluding to you gentlemen. There are people that have probed and prodded in this thing.

Mr. Frayn: I want you to be certain of the circumstances back of this, there is only one thing in the minds of this committee. That is to get rid of the stuff up there. It wasn't in there and we wanted to find out what happened to it.

Mr. Canwell: If I had been reasonably approached in 1949, I would have told what the situation was and that would be that. There was no approach.

Mr. O'Brien: Okay. Thank you very much.

Mr. Canwell: Am I released from the subpoena?

Mr. Frayn: As far as I know. Do you mind if we make this executive session part of the record?

Mr. Canwell: As far as I am concerned, I wanted everything to be part of the record.

Mr. Smith: I think he should be released.

Mr. O'Brien: Okay. The hearing is adjourned.

ALBERT CANWELL'S SPEECH AT THE AMERICAN LEGION MEETING,
OKANOGAN, WASHINGTON
AUGUST 23, 1962

Mr. Canwell: I was introduced at the Legion meeting by, I believe, Nelson Morrow. That's my best recollection of his name.

I was duly introduced and it was mentioned that I'd come from Spokane accompanied by my oldest son, Marshall.

The chairman said, "It is a privilege and an honor to introduce to you Mr. Canwell from Spokane who will speak to you on the American Civil Liberties Union. I give you Mr. Canwell."

Gentlemen of the Legion and ladies and gentlemen, it is a distinct pleasure to be here and a considerable surprise to see the large number of people in the audience. I wonder who's keeping the store and feeding the stock? But I'm always happy to return to the Okanogan country. If I could be transplanted to one place and stay there, I can't think of a place that I would rather be than this beautiful valley and the wonderful people whom I have come to know and respect in this area.

I want to say that it is with distinct pleasure and pride that I appear under the auspices of the American Legion, and particularly to discuss the subject at hand.

It may not be a part of your knowledge that for many, many years the American Legion has been demanding that the Committee on Un-American Activities of your Congress investigate the ACLU. They have repeated that request over and over again, and they have sent delegations to Washington. It has been a burning, continuing issue over the years.

It may not be a part of your knowledge either, that the House Un-American Activities Committee is largely the brain-child and the product of the efforts of the American Legion, a great host of American patriots who have fought this country's wars and have fought the Communists at home, and who have fought for good government at all times and in all places and an organization that has been under the constant fire and ridicule and attack by the Communist Party and their stooges and dupes, and those who aid and abet them.

I might say that this House Committee on Un-American Activities represents the most important power of a free people. If we are to remain free and we can defeat Communism in the world, it will be because we intelligently use our legislative powers, and those powers, the powers of the people to remain free, and the power to move the shifting Communist position in the world and defend ourselves depends entirely on how we use our powers in our elected Congress, Congress and Senate.

It is no secret, I guess, that the major target of the Communist Party in America is the House Un-American Activities Committee, and along with that the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. The two committees of Congress engage in the investigation of Communist activities. The two committees of Congress, using the proper powers of the free people in a democratic way in a democratic process to defend freedom for America and for the world against totalitarian Communism.

If we are to remain free, it will be because, as I said before, it will be because we wisely use those powers. And therefore I view with great suspicion any organization or group, or person who devotes his time and talents and energies and efforts and his money to opposing the House Un-American Activities Committee.

I hear a great deal about the offenses of this committee, their invasion of civil rights and their smearing of people, and their unfair tactics. And I can tell you as one who perhaps has as thorough a knowledge of the activities of the committees of Congress and the Senate as anybody outside the membership of those bodies, that the charges made against them are complete, patent lies.

These attacks are made on behalf of the Communist Party. They sometimes are made by fools and dupes. Sometimes there are people who attack the very important function of these committees who think

that somehow or another they are defending freedom and free men. But I know no instance where their attacks have been justified.

The committees of Congress are made up of human beings. They are a part of the system of justice and freedom that we have developed and has evolved in this country. And it is not based on a totalitarian concept. It is based on the understanding that men are human, and that they can make mistakes, and do make mistakes. But the committees of Congress, investigating Communist activities have made very few. The only mistakes that I think they may have made is in not being quite severe enough at times, and not using full powers of Congress, and then the full powers of the free people to protect the rights and the security of free men and our institutions and our laws. And to make them safe against the onslaughts of the Communists and their agents and friends and dupes around the world.

I have seen this campaign against the House committee. I have seen the one against Joe McCarthy and the Senate Committee. I have seen and heard the attacks against the late Pat McCarran, a great Democrat from the State of Nevada. I have followed various ones of these attacks, and somehow every time the person who is investigating Communism is "wrong." He is a villain. He is invading civil rights and he is invading academic freedom. And he is using guilt by association. He is doing all of those horrible things.

I never hear those charges when a committee of Congress is investigating banks or anybody in private industry. Somehow nobody pickets or parades or bleeds for these people. But just lay a hand on the Communists and then suddenly it breaks out like a rash all over the country. You'll see the picket lines around the White House and you'll see the committees of Congress picketed and you'll see them conducting extreme actions within the confines of the legislative hearings in their quarters.

Anybody who has an ounce of sense knows that no one could do, in a federal courtroom for instance, what is done in a hearing room of a committee of Congress. And still the legislative body is of equal importance with the judicial. It is entitled to as much respect and dignity. It is entitled to the same consideration. Actually it's entitled to more, because we have granted the courts the power of summary contempt, because if somebody jumps up in a federal court and calls the judge names, or screams that someone is being railroaded or persecuted, or starts to sing a song, or rattle papers, the judge can put him in jail.

A committee of Congress can't do that, and they shouldn't. They should not have the power of summary contempt, but I think it should probably be extended some to make it a contempt of Congress for anyone to create a disturbance in a legislative hearing or around it, or to interrupt that process of government.

Now I know that the attorneys of the ACLU and many others did not like the way I conducted hearings in Seattle. I didn't expect them to like it, but I was surprised at who some of the people were who complained. When I say I didn't expect them to like it, what I meant was, there were people that I knew would not like the way I handled the hearings, and I stated at the beginning that I was going to uphold the dignity of the Legislature and of the State of Washington. And that no Communist, nor Communist attorney would be permitted to disrupt those hearings. That no Communist, nor his attorney or friend would be permitted to make a speech in those legislative hearings for the obvious reason that no determination would be made there. The facts on the constitutionality of legislative inquiry cannot be determined at such hearings, and the Communists know that. They are there to agitate and create trouble and a disturbance. And at San Francisco that was precisely true.

Now anybody above the moron level who has seen the film *Operation Abolition* and has any degree of integrity and honesty knows that those films accurately depicted what took place at San Francisco. They were newsreels, taken by news photographers, not at the behest of the committee, and perhaps in many cases by photographers who were not particularly friendly to the committee. And those films were subpoenaed and they were edited, of course. You couldn't put the entire films on, it would have taken days to run a string of film like that. They tried to cover a picture as it occurred, and if there was any sequence of it which was out of place, it was unintentional, and it didn't make any difference. They gave a true picture of what the Communist Party was doing at a hearing of your Congress in San Francisco.

The Communist Party was saying, "You cannot hold a legislative investigation of the Communist Party in San Francisco because we're going to stop you." And they organized riots to stop it. What kind of people want to play into the hands of the Communist Party to stop the investigation through the demonstration process of the Communist Party?

Now if we have a weapon against the Communists we have an effective one. And as I said before it is the legislative process. And the Communists know this. They know that the Congress of the United States and our state Legislatures have the power to investigate and to inquire, to compile and hear testimony, to pass laws and make public their findings, to appropriate money and in all those ways counteract the Communist conspiracy to take over the world.

The Communists know that. And they know it is their one greatest threat and so they make that their one major target.

So who helps them? Who helps do this job? Now if the Communist Party did the thing alone, or if they put the story and the plea for the pickets and made all of their speeches and statements through the *People's*

Daily World in San Francisco, everybody would say it was a bunch of Communists. Of course they don't like it, and would appraise it in that light. The Communist Party is not foolish, they have captured almost half of the world by stealth and deception and falsehood and trickery. And they have had a lot of soft-headed people doing the job for them.

So they have organized fronts and groups and got a bunch of students all worked up about peace and invasion of academic rights and freedom and so on. Somehow or another they get them convinced that they have got to go down there and picket. And don't be carried away about how innocent all these students are. Some of them are just dupes. I would say that the majority of them know what they are doing. I have observed them there, in New York, in Washington, and at my own committee hearings. And I would say that the majority of those who participate, particularly on the student level, know precisely what they are doing.

An amazing number of them, unfortunately, come from homes where parents are or have been Communists and defend the Communist position at home, and attack all those who are opposing Communism. And the great tragedy of it all is that their children then go forth to the world, feeling that they have to defend that position and believing that it must be right because their mother or their father, or both, are advocating that position and were or are members of the Communist Party.

What is a Communist front? Now some men will say that I said that everybody who belongs to the ACLU is a Communist. I've never said that. I don't believe it, for the very simple reason that I know what a Communist front is. And I think I am qualified to know what a Communist front is, and as qualified as anybody in this room, unless maybe a member of the Communist Party.

A Communist front is a device created by, or captured by, the Communist Party to use for Communist purposes. Regardless of the fact that it is a front—there are people in it who are not Communists—it nevertheless is a Communist instrument. And if it is effectively controlled by the Communists, it is as deadly as an atom bomb, because it does a job that armaments and bullets cannot do. It invades the area of your mind. It conducts a propaganda war. It captures the student mind. It invades the area of religion and teaching. It does a job that the Communists could not possibly do with a frontal attack.

So they attempt to capture these organizations, or they set them up. In the case of the ACLU, I don't think any reasonable person who has looked into their historic background will question that the Communist Party had a great deal to do in setting up the parent organization.

Among the people in it were such personalities as Dr. Harry Ward. Now if Dr. Harry Ward wants to sue me for calling him a Communist, he may do so. I think he is. I think he always was. And he has been named under sworn testimony by reliable witnesses as being a Communist. He belongs to so many Communist fronts that if he is not a member of the Communist Party, and if he was not, that is a matter between Dr. Ward and the party.

And Elizabeth Gurley Flynn. Now I think most everybody knows Gurley Flynn. And I know the ACLU people say, "Yes, but we've pulled her out. We got baptized. We got rid of the bad people in the ACLU. We got Gurley Flynn, and William Z. Foster and some of those people that flaunted their party membership and we got them out of the ACLU." And they did. How it was handled, I don't know. I know by the time the ACLU became important the presence of people like Gurley Flynn on the board was most revealing and most embarrassing and would obviously detract from the effectiveness of the organization.

If it was to be used as a Communist front, they couldn't leave these prominent well-known Communists on their board. Well, you hear people say, "We got rid of the Communists, and we're clean. And we have endorsements," and so on. Everywhere I go I get these. They read a letter from General Eisenhower, and they read one from Harry Truman and they have a statement from McCloy I think, and two or three others. I usually run into them, and am having to answer them in a question and answer period, or having somebody make a speech from the floor. Usually I try to answer one or two of these matters.

Before I get into that, I'll mention a few more people in the ACLU. A man, Roger Baldwin, now I even have an endorsement here saying that "Good Old Roger" is all right. But if you were to look into the reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, known as the Dies Committee back in those days, and this is *Appendix IX*, in which we have the listing of most of the Communist fronts up to the time that these reports were made, it is a cross-indexing of the people who belonged to Communist fronts.

Now those fronts would include all kinds of organizations, captured, or controlled, or set up, by the Communist Party for propaganda purposes. Some of those fronts were to prevent the deportation of Harry Bridges or were more concealed than that. There were such as American Youth for Democracy. They like these patriotic names and make a specialty of that. There are hundreds of these fronts and the majority of them have good, patriotic, high-sounding names.

Anyway, look Mr. Roger Baldwin up in *Appendix IX* and you'll find that just in *Appendix IX* up into the early '40s, the man had somewhere around some forty citations and Communist front connections. All the worst of them.

In a letter at Harvard University, he sounded off about his socialist-communist thinking and ended up his letter with the statement that "the goal in America is Communism." The man's name is still on their

letterhead. If you have in your possession the Washington State letterhead of the ACLU, you will see that Roger Baldwin is still on the letterhead. Of course, Gurley Flynn is off the thing. She has a different function to perform now.

Well, about the nice things that they say about it, here's a letter from Dwight Eisenhower. Now I will accept for the record that he actually wrote the thing. I suspect perhaps an aide or somebody wrote it for him and he signed it. At any rate he said nice things about the ACLU. That was on April 18, 1960. Now I'm an admirer of General Eisenhower from a little different standpoint. I know him, and I like him as a person. He is pleasant, he's just a nice guy. But I don't think he is a competent authority in the area of Communism, and he didn't indicate that he was during the time he was general of the Army, or during the time that he was president. And I say that with all charity and all kindness.

Just recently he said he was convinced that, "I think Khrushchev really likes children." Now he probably didn't know that he was spouting the party line. They advanced this line on Khrushchev. They are attempting to humanize him. They're going to make him acceptable to us. Sure he likes children, he probably likes them with catsup on them. Nobody in the world, including Herod, has murdered more children than Khrushchev. And so when he says that he likes children, I don't think he is any more responsible in that statement than he is when he says that the ACLU is all right.

And I differed with him far back in the days of Joe McCarthy, a great American who was doing a great job in the proper American way on a committee of the United States Senate. He gave his life doing that job. And Americans owe him a great debt which most of them will never realize.

Anyhow, Eisenhower was wrong on that, and he was wrong on Khrushchev. And he was wrong when he let the Russian armies march into Berlin. And so I am not going to accept a letter in which he makes what I consider an irresponsible statement in favor of the ACLU. I don't think he knew what he was talking about.

Then another one, one they usually use is because this is from the other side of the political fence, Harry Truman. And I should just say that nobody can say that joker came down here and he was political, and I'm not. Sure I'm identified with one of the political parties. I believe in the two-party system, and there are times when I get very political. But when I do, I announce it. And I have mellowed a little in recent years, and recently I think, since he died. I've come to the place where I can even forgive FDR, or I would if he had taken the old girl with him.

Anyhow, on Harry Truman. Harry Truman also wrote nice things about the ACLU and this was done on November 24, 1945. (1946 I believe it is--no it was 1945.) About the same time or a little while after that my committee in the State of Washington was responsible for exposing the master spy, Alger Hiss. Now maybe you didn't know that the first information on Alger Hiss, his treachery to this country, his actions within the Communist Party, were revealed within the State of Washington by your legislative committee in the City of Seattle. And about at that time Harry Truman said, "That Hiss case is all a red herring." Well, he was wrong then and he's wrong now. He was a nice guy, but it doesn't mean he's an authority on the ACLU, he isn't. He isn't an authority on Communism, and he wasn't an authority on Hiss, either.

If I wanted to be unkind to him I would point back to *Appendix IX* where once upon a time as senator he wrote a letter to the publicity director of *The Daily Worker*, the Communist *Daily Worker*. Complimented highly and suggested that he might publish his letter if he wished. So he hasn't known the facts about Communism, and I don't think he knows them now, and I don't think the fact that he was president, and a lot of people loved the man, should be used as an endorsement for an organization today that is trying to beat to death the committee of Congress that is protecting you from Communist takeover.

Then a character here by the name of Tom Dewey. He has problems, and I'm not going to add any more to them.

Lucius Clay, I don't think that I would accept his endorsement for the ACLU as being a competent appraisal of it being either good or bad.

There's one letter here that really throws me, it's from Douglas MacArthur. And how in the heck he was suckered into doing this, I don't know. But anyway, there was a favorable letter from him.

And so I have saved the opposition the trouble of introducing those things, and have covered them rather briefly.

Well, is the ACLU a Communist front?

Do we have to call people on it Communists even if it is a Communist front? I don't think so. I think there are a lot of people involved in the ACLU who are brought into it through racial agitation or some of them feel deeply over the negro problem, the Jewish problem or other things, and so they are brought into the orbit of this activity. Brought under the influence of this organization and used. And so I think there are a lot of people who are acting from good motives.

Another one they pulled on me recently, they said, "We're so fair we defend Communists. We defend Rockwell the Nazi. We defended even the Birch Society. They were going to investigate the Birch Society

and we opposed it.” Well, the simple facts of the case are, the Birch Society asked to be investigated. They requested it, and they promised the committee that if they were investigated that none of them would take the Fifth Amendment.

Now I’d like to ask the sixty-four dollar question of the members of the ACLU, right down the line, and see how many of them would answer the question forthrightly and openly under oath: Are you, or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party? I’ve asked that question of quite a few of them and gotten all kinds of answers, except the freedom of speech they’re always talking about when they aren’t under oath. I’d like to see some of those people who want all those rights exercise those rights. And those rights are not all wrapped up in the Fifth Amendment, nor the First Amendment.

Well, is it a Communist front? I think that you have to look into the history of an organization like that and draw some reasonable conclusions. What has been the nature of their activities? What have they been doing? To what do they devote their time and their money and their efforts? They have testified, and others have testified that fully ninety percent of their activities are devoted to the defense of Communists who run afoul of the law or are in trouble with the government.

Now if anybody could tell me why the well-financed Communist apparatus needs an ACLU to carry the ball for them, then I’ll put in with them. There’s nobody in America better able to defend themselves in court than the Communist Party. They have all the money in the world. We’ve given them currency plates when they didn’t have anything else and we’ve loaned their satellites money, and we’ve taxed the American people to death giving them money to develop their secret police and their spy apparatuses. And we’ve adopted these tax-exempt foundations that are devoted to the advancement of socialism and Communism in America. The money is coming out of your pockets. The Communists have all the money in the world that they want. It’s “we the people” on the other side who don’t. We red baiters who are doing the job, we can’t get the time of day. The Communists have all there is. They don’t need an organization, much less the one called the ACLU to protect them in their treachery. To keep them from being deported and all the things that the ACLU does.

I’ve not seen one valid excuse for the existence of the ACLU, as such. They make some token cases, and I’m aware of that, and they do some jobs for window dressing, they have to. What good would a Communist front be if they didn’t do something to confuse people? If they didn’t try to make them think that somehow they were doing an American job? Time after time when we’ve tried to deport people or we’ve convicted them or we’ve done anything, we’ve had congressional hearings, who do we find out on the firing line opposing us? Who makes the speeches and makes the press releases? Who appears as a friend of the court and all those things? The ACLU more often than anybody else.

If you were to read the Communist *Daily Worker*, and I read it, I read the West Coast Communist newspaper, you’ll find more space devoted to the ACLU perhaps than to any other one organization. Now if they are not their organization, somebody on the ACLU staff ought to tell them so, because they don’t seem to know.

Well, what about the State of Washington? A lot of people on the ACLU here, I don’t know them all, I don’t have the time nor the facilities, a lot of them I’m interested in and would like to probe around a little bit into their activities. I would like to know what they do in their spare time, and what kind of meetings they hold in their basements and other things, and what they contribute to. Just because I think that my freedom and my safety, and that of my family and my kind of people, is wrapped up in knowing what they’re up to.

But I don’t know what they’re all doing. I do know some of them. A state board member was Dr. Melvin Rader of the University of Washington. Now if you want to find out everything that’s bad about Mr. Canwell, you attend one of his classes or one of his meetings. Engage him in conversation when I’m not there and he’ll give you a great deal of information about one Canwell, and how unfair we were to Mr. Rader. I picked him because he’s a bright and shining light, and one of the examples they use in this state about who’s who in the ACLU, and what’s wrong with the opposition.

Mr. Rader claims that he was smeared by the Canwell committee, and that he was pure and white, and not guilty of anything. What he doesn’t tell you is that he belonged to twelve major Communist fronts. Among them, and one of the worst, was the Harry Bridges Committee. If you don’t know it, Harry Bridges is the most dangerous Communist in the Western Hemisphere. And if some day you land up in a concentration camp and you or your family is lined up against the wall to be shot, you may find that Harry Bridges is calling the orders.

Anyway this Dr. Rader was president of the ACLU and he is on their board and he is very vocal in its support and in attacking those, the House Un-American Activities Committee, Canwell and everybody else who is doing my kind of a job.

Well, ask him why he was working so hard for Harry Bridges? So early when anybody with sense enough to come out of the rain knew that Harry Bridges was a Communist. I knew that way back in 1932 or ’34, and I’m certain that people who lived in Seattle must have known it if I knew it.

I did newspaper work there; I was thrown out of Harry Bridges' meeting one time. It gave me great interest in the man with the result that later my committee—I see Mr. Holden, he was there when we introduced the ex-wife of Harry Bridges in our hearing. And she was frightened, scared to death that she would be killed by this monster. And we finally induced her to come and testify against him and the first time in America that Harry Bridges was identified in competent testimony as a member of the Communist Party was done in Seattle at our hearing. But everybody knew that he was a Communist. Everybody on the waterfront, and I think every literate person in Seattle knew it. And knows it now.

I cite that merely to point out to some of these people who are so concerned about civil rights. They are like the characters in the song *Everybody's Talkin' 'bout Heaven Ain't Goin' There*. Anybody talking about civil rights isn't necessarily interested in them. So I'd say that he is one of them.

And until the men like that can explain the great number of Communist fronts that they have participated in, advanced and helped and collaborated with Communists—and known Communists like Hugh Delacy and many others I might name, Tom Rabbitt, I could go on down the list. And if they didn't know that those people were Communists, then heaven help us, then they are certainly not competent to be teaching in a great university.

I think of another one on that list who runs around the state here speaking against the HUAC (that's the House Un-American Activities Committee) speaking against anybody who opposes the Communists. He does it with a very self-righteous and holy way and that is Dr. Giovanni Costigan.

Now back in the days when we were investigating around the University of Washington, we called on this joker. I say that advisedly. I think that best describes him. At that time he had been in, or connected with, two or three Communist fronts including the Seattle Labor School where he had lectured. Now he brushes that all aside lightly. Anybody who didn't know that the Seattle Labor School is a Communist device, I say is not competent to teach. If a person in ten or fifteen years since then hasn't been able to figure it out, he isn't competent to teach history. If he hasn't figured out what the Spanish Brigade Movement and all of that was, if he hasn't figured out that, and that those things were Communist devices, it was twenty years that have elapsed, and I say he shouldn't be drawing public funds and teaching in our schools.

Well, I could go on down the list. I don't know whether all these people are Communists or not, it doesn't make any difference. What I am concerned about is the kind of a job they're doing. I don't give a hang whether they are paying their dues in the Communist Party or whether the Communist Party would have them. The question is, What kind of a job are they doing on the state and national level?

You have a man on the ACLU board, Benjamin H. Kizer. Now I know something about Mr. Kizer because my first professional activity in investigating of Communist activity had to do with probing Russian War Relief in Spokane, and Mr. Kizer was on the national board of that front, and on many other Communist fronts. He is no piker, he doesn't fiddle around in bush leagues. When he gets into a Communist front he is up on the top of the thing. He's way up in the thing. And Mr. Kizer belonged to many of the major Communist fronts. The National Lawyers Guild, which was identified by the committee of Congress as being the legal bulwark of the Communist Party—he was on that, on the national level.

Perhaps the most dangerous and most effective Communist front they ever developed or captured was the Institute of Pacific Relations. It was a vehicle used and devised to sell out China, and if you don't know the history and the program of the Communist Party, they early said that they had first to capture Eastern Europe, and then they had to take China, and then encircle the United States. You know where they are in the program. They have captured China for all intents and purposes. They are ninety miles from our shores. They have heavy concentrations in Mexico and Canada. I'd say they are five minutes to midnight in their program. But the people who did the job for them, who accomplished what had to be done, the takeover in China, were the people in the Institute of Pacific Relations. Mr. Kizer was on the top board of that apparatus, the board of trustees, for many years.

Associated with him on that board, and it's in the printed record, in their brochures and publicity, on that board at the same time were such notorious and dangerous Communists as Alger Hiss, Frederick Vanderbilt Field, and I could go on down the list and name others.

The IPR had an office in New York, I've forgotten, I think it was on the 14th floor of a certain building, and the building right next door on the same floor level and right next to their office, was the office of *Amerasia Magazine*. Now they say there's no connection, but the connection was intimate enough that they cut a hallway through from one building to the other, and the offices were interlocking. The people on the IPR were also on the *Amerasia Magazine*. Your national member of the ACLU, Mr. Benjamin Kizer, was also on the editorial board of *Amerasia Magazine*.

Amerasia Magazine was an espionage device put out of business by the FBI and the OSS when they raided it one day and caught them with their guards down, and they found about seventeen hundred stolen classified documents in their quarters.

Mr. Kizer, who blandly and publicly denied it when accused of that, said it was all a lie and that it was untrue and that he wasn't on the editorial board of *Amerasia Magazine*, in spite of the fact that the Spokane

Public Library has a complete file of *Amerasia Magazines*, and for a year or two his name was on the mast-head as an editorial board member of *Amerasia Magazine*.

Now Louis Budenz, former managing editor of the Communist Party, a repentant Communist who turned against the party and did great service for America, testified before the State Department Employee Loyalty Investigation, under oath, that Mr. Kizer was a member of the Communist Party and he had been so advised by his superiors.

I would say that Mr. Budenz is perhaps as competent a witness as we have been able to find in the subversive field. I think he has been completely reliable, never been discredited, and he has again made the same charges in the IPR hearings before a committee of Pat McCarran. He made the same statement and Mr. Kizer denied it; I don't know that he denied it under oath, but he said it wasn't true. But he also said, when I accused him in 1950 of being on the Lawyers Guild, of being on the IPR, being on the Russian War Relief and being on the editorial board of *Amerasia Magazine* that this was all false, it was untrue.

I looked at a number of these things. He said that my accusations were false all the way down the line. Now am I to believe that when he says Budenz was wrong, because I know he lied about the accusations that I made, because I had the documented evidence in my hand when I released the information. So can we believe a man like that? I don't know whether he pays his dues in the Communist Party or not, but I do know he is a powerful and effective member of some of the most important and effective Communist fronts in the world.

Well, sure you can find people on those lists. I don't know whether they are Communists, or Communist sympathizers. But I have never yet found one that I found to be an outspoken opponent of Communism. Opponent in the sense that he wants to help those of us who are doing the job. An opponent who wants to help the House Committee on Un-American Activities or one who wants to help Joe McCarthy, or Dick Nixon, or Pat McCarran, or Martin Dies, or anybody like that who is devoting their time and energy and talent to doing the job of turning back the tide of Communism in the world.

And when I find some of these people who will be as vocal and vociferous on the side of America and American security interests as they are in defending Communists whom we are trying to jail or deport, then I'll begin to believe that they are on the level.

Until they can show me some of that kind of evidence then I'm going to have to conclude that the burden of proof is on their shoulders; and I am that kind of a person. I don't get bogged down in a lot of legal trivialities. I think that when a person associates with Communists and follows the Communist Party line and passes out their propaganda, does everything the Communist Party wants him to do, then he surrounds himself with suspicion. That the responsibility is not mine to prove him guilty or innocent, the responsibility is transferred to his own shoulders. He has surrounded himself with guilt and suspicion and it's up to him as an American to remove that doubt and suspicion. Until he does so, I certainly am not going to devote my meager facilities to proving that every person who allows his name to be associated with a Communist front be investigated and cleared by me.

This group has such an obnoxious history over such a long period of time that I wonder why they had the crust to advance their particular move in this area. They are operating in the State of Washington. To my notion that's a major Communist front operating in the State of Washington at the present time. They're invading the campus level, they're losing strength on the campus of America and they're working day and night to build up these units of the ACLU to give it a facade acceptable to the loyal student and citizens and appeal to the sympathies and our idea of fair play, and so on. And get him into these operations.

And then you'll have somebody, when they do get into that position, somebody like Dr. Giovanni Costigan, who will lead in a group protesting the showing of a report of a committee of Congress such as *Operation Abolition*. Now that is a report of a committee of your Congress. And why anybody in state, or federal, or public employ should be out joining the book burners to ban the showing of a report of your Congress is beyond me. And how he can get away with it I don't know.

These people talk about the people's right to know. And they talk about people's right to be heard. About academic freedom. About book burning. And the minute someone tries to invade the camp with the little light on the anti-Communist side then these same people go out there and they join the book burners. They want to ban the film. No longer does the student have the right to know, and see, and hear, and to make his own decision.

Well, the thing is so patently phony that I don't know why anybody buys it. Perhaps I'll take you back a ways. I brought a box of books here and I'm not going to read them all and I just want to let you know that there is a great quantity of evidence in this case.

Here's a report of the Massachusetts Legislative Committee, the Massachusetts Senate. This committee took testimony on Communist activities in the State of Massachusetts. They did a very competent job. And back in one of the pages here in this report, page 204, they say that the Communist Party for years has used the International Labor Defense as a sounding board for propaganda and is one of the effective means of pushing Communists' objectives. Here are the suggestions: ILD had inseparable allies: Two other Com-

munist-controlled organizations. They are the American Civil Liberties Union and the Garland Fund, so-called.

Now the Garland Fund as such was a Communist-controlled front set up to aid and abet Communists in their problems. And they worked with the ACLU in conjunction with the ILD. Now this is a Senate Committee for the State of Massachusetts. It isn't Canwell saying that. I could go into the reports of other committees. We have the California report of '43 and 1948.

I'll just briefly touch on some of these. "The ACLU," page 107 of the 1948 report of the California Senate Committee. They say the ACLU may be definitely classified as a Communist front or transmission belt organization. At least ninety percent of its efforts are expended on behalf of Communists who have come into conflict with the law. And while professing to stand for free speech and free press and free assembly, it is quite obvious that its main function is to protect Communists and their activities of force and violence and their program to overthrow the government.

I could go on and on and read you that kind of testimony. I could read you the statements of the American Legion. And time after time they have gone before the committee of Congress and asked and begged and pleaded that the ACLU be investigated, a hearing be held and a report made.

Now they quote Mr. Ahrens on the House committee. I know him and respect him and they quote him out of context. They asked him whether the ACLU had been declared a Communist front or whether the House committee had ever held a hearing on them. Well, the answer is obvious. They have never declared it a Communist front. They never held a hearing on it. But a man who was a chief investigator and researcher for the House committee a few years back planned a report on the ACLU. He did a tremendous research job on it and he planned to call a hearing on the ACLU. And I think that these people carry a rabbit's foot around in their pocket because before they could dispense and dispose of other business, pressing business, the committee control changed and they never held that hearing. That man is Judge Beale. I know him well. He is a man who asked me to look into a certain Communist case in this area. I had many contacts with him. And when he changed jobs he turned the report over to me that he had prepared for the House committee on the American Civil Liberties Union. It's a scholarly, fair, very all-inclusive study.

Had they held a hearing I don't think that there is any question at all about the House committee would have come to the same conclusion that the Massachusetts committee did. Or the California committee did. And I know that somebody is going to jump up here and say that in 1961 the California committee said it wasn't a Communist front. Well, I have the 1961 report here, and if anybody is given that story I suggest they read the many pages on the ACLU which contains the rest of their statements. And it will dispel any allusions about them thinking that the ACLU is not a Communist-serving device.

Well, I could go on and on here and I know that there are those who are nervous to ask me questions. There are some who are antagonistic. It is a position that I am taking. I'm sure that they want to be heard. I'm not one of those fair people. I don't think anybody ever accused me of it. I always feel that you should let the opposition provide their own soapbox. I'm not opposed to fireworks. I like it. If I weren't able to take care of that sort of situation and meet it, I would have been out of business a long, long time ago. And maybe I'd have been better off.

But anyhow I'm going to shortly throw this open to questions, and I'll try to answer them. I don't care what the question is or how you phrase it, whether you like me or whether you don't. The job I'm doing is one I think needs to be done. And it's an unpleasant one at times. It's not the easiest nor most pleasant thing to point the finger at fellow Americans and challenge either their intelligence or their integrity. But if we're going to remain free in this world, and if we're going to live as we have lived as Americans, and if we're going to pass on any kind of future to our posterity then somebody is going to have to stand up and be counted. And we're going to have to quit playing patty-cake in this business and call a spade a spade, and a slob a slob. And I'll turn the meeting now over to Mr. Gillespie and will be with you for awhile.

THE PROGRESSIVE ERA AND WORLD WAR I: 1900-1918

The United States

Population:	1900	76 million
	1918	103 million
Presidents:	1900	William McKinley
	1901	September 14. Theodore Roosevelt
	1909	William Howard Taft
	1913	Woodrow Wilson

Washington State

Population:	1900	518 thousand
	1910	1.1 million
Governors:	1900	John R. Rogers
	1901	Henry McBride
	1905	Albert Mead
	1909	Samuel Cosgrove
	1909	Marion E. Hay
	1913	Ernest Lister

Legislature: Republican majorities.

National Politics: Progressive Legislation

1901	Initiative and referendum adopted by Oregon. Other states followed.
1901	September 6. President McKinley shot by an assassin.
1902-12	Social legislation adopted by states: Workmens compensation, Maryland, 1902; 10-hour industrial workday for women, Oregon, 1903; public assistance for dependent children, Illinois, 1911; minimum wage, Massachusetts, 1912.

State Politics: Farmers and Workers Unite

1909	Womens suffrage.
1911	Workmens compensation.
1912	Initiative, referendum, and recall ratified.

National Economics: Continued Industrialization

1901	US Steel, Ford Motors established.
1903	Wright brothers flight.
1908	General Motors established.
1918	First airmail routes.

State Economics: A Natural Resources Economy

1900	Weyerhaeuser buys 900 thousand acres of Northern Pacific Railroad land.
1909	Seattle hosts Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition.
1911-18	Economy grows after 1907 recession.
1916	First Boeing plane built.
1916-19	Labor unrest.

World Affairs: World War I, 1914-1918

1917	US enters war. Greater recognition of US as global power.
1917	Russian revolution.
1918-19	Influenza epidemic, 20 million died.

Everyday Life: Accessible Entertainment

1903	World Series established.
1906	San Francisco earthquake.
1913	Charlie Chaplin's first movies. Nickelodeons in every neighborhood.
1916	Jazz developed from ragtime.
1917	Bobbed hair: Millions of American women cut their hair in imitation of Irene Castle, - famous dancer.

THE ROARING TWENTIES: 1919-1929

The United States

Population: 1920 118 million
 Presidents: 1921 Warren G. Harding
 1923 Calvin Coolidge
 1929 Herbert Hoover

Washington State

Population: 1920 1.3 million
 Governors: 1919 Louis F. Hart
 1925 Roland H. Hartley
 Legislature: Republican majorities.

National Politics: Assorted Experiments

1919 Soldiers Bonus Act.
 1919 Prohibition.
 1920 Womens suffrage.
 1924 Harding administration scandals: Teapot Dome.

State Politics: Reform and Reaction

1921 Consolidation of state government into ten departments.
 1921 Gas tax: one cent per gallon.
 1925 Tax Commission created to standardize real estate assessment.
 1926 Grange proposes PUDs.

National Economics: Uncertain Prosperity

1919-21 Postwar depression. Agricultural depression continues throughout decade.
 1922 Stock market boom begins.
 1929 US: 34% of world's industrial production.
 1929 October 28. US stock exchange collapses.

State Economics: Problems and Promise

1921 State agricultural prices drop by 50%.
 1920-29 Lumber companies cut best timber, then let land revert to counties.
 1920-29 Markets open up as highways are built.
 1926-29 Property values fall.

World Affairs: Retreat from a Troubled Europe

1920 US refuses to join the League of Nations.
 1921-29 Germany: inflation, economic collapse, increase of Hitler's influence.
 1922 Fascist government established in Italy.

Everyday Life: Boisterous and Troubled Times

1921 First regular radio programs.
 1923 The KKK gains political power: 200 thousand attend a tri-state conference in Indiana.
 1925 Flappers wear cloche hats, short skirts, and dance the Charleston.
 1927 The first talkie: "The Jazz Singer."
 1927 Charles Lindbergh flies the *Spirit of St. Louis* across the Atlantic.

THE GREAT DEPRESSION AND WORLD WAR II: 1930-1945

The United States

Population:	1930	122 million
	1940	132 million. Smallest percent increase since 1790.
	1945	140 million
Presidents:	1933	Franklin D. Roosevelt. Served three full terms. Elected 1944, died April 12, 1945.
	1945	April 12. Harry S. Truman

Washington State

Population:	1930	1.5 million
Governors:	1933	Clarence D. Martin
	1941	Arthur B. Langlie
Legislature:	1929-31	Republican majorities.
	1933-45	Democratic majorities.

National Politics:

Government Functions Redirected

1932-35	New Deal legislation: Agricultural Adjustment Act, Public Works Administration, National Industrial Recovery Act, Social Security.
1933	Prohibition repealed.
1940	Selective Service Act.
1941	Lend-Lease Act.
1943	Emergency Price Control Act: government price-fixing, rent control allowed.

State Politics:

Democrats and the Federal Government

1930	PUDs authorized.
1933	First Democratic Legislature.
1935	Blanket primary adopted.
1938	Department of Unemployment created.
1943	Hanford Atomic Energy plant constructed.

National Economics: Decline and Recovery

1931	US unemployment 15-25%.
1939	Economic boom from European orders for arms and war equipment.
1941-45	Women and blacks replace men in war industry jobs.

State Economics: Relief and Revival

1934	Seattle strike: maritime and timber workers.
1934	600 thousand receive federal relief funds.
1939	Eight thousand working on Bonneville Dam.
1941-45	State receives \$8-10 billion from federal war contracts.
1943-44	Agricultural recovery. Crops worth 500 thousand dollars annually.

World Affairs: World War II

1934	Hitler designated Fuhrer by German plebiscite.
1939	France and England declare war after Germany invades Poland.
1941	December 7. US declares war after Japanese attack Pearl Harbor.
1945	War ends: VE Day, May 8; VJ Day, Aug 14, after US drops atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.
1945	Discovery that five to six million Jews had been killed in concentration camps.

Everyday Life: Doing Without, Together

1930	115 million movie tickets sold every week.
1930	Contract bridge.
1931	<i>The Star Spangled Banner</i> adopted as national anthem.
1940	Penicillin and sulfa, first antibacterial drugs, marketed.

POSTWAR PROSPERITY AND THE COLD WAR: 1946-1963

The United States

Population: 1950 150 million
 1960 180 million
 Presidents: 1949 Harry S. Truman
 1953 Dwight D. Eisenhower
 1961 John F. Kennedy
 1963 November 22. Lyndon B. Johnson

Washington State

Population: 1950 2.3 million
 1960 2.8 million
 Governors: 1945 Mon C. Wallgren
 1949 Arthur B. Langlie
 1957 Albert Rosellini
 Legislature: Democratic majorities, four elections.
 Republican majority, one election. Split,
 two elections.

National Politics: The Search for Stability

1947 GI Bill: one million veterans enroll in colleges.
 1950-54 Senator Joseph McCarthy's investigation of Communist infiltration in government.
 1954 Brown vs. the Board of Education: racially segregated schools illegal.
 1956 Federal Aid Highway Act: provision for construction of interstate highways.
 1963 November 22. President John F. Kennedy assassinated.

State Politics: Growth and Change

1948 Canwell committee investigates Communists.
 1957 The Omnibus Civil Rights Act.
 1958 \$52 million bond issue for school construction.

National Economics: A Consumer Society

1953 US workforce: 30% employed in commerce and industry.
 1954 US: 6% of world's population; 60% automobiles, 58% telephones, 45% radios.
 1960 Television: 85 million in US homes, 1.5 million in 1950.

State Economics: Prosperity and the Suburbs

1952 Irrigation opens 80 thousand acres.
 1954 Boeing 707 line begins.
 1960 Census shows rapid growth of suburbs, slow growth of cities.
 1962 Seattle World's Fair.

World Affairs: Geopolitical Rivalry

1949 Communist People's Republic proclaimed in China under Mao Tse-tung.
 1950-53 Korean War.
 1952-53 Hydrogen bomb. US: 1952. USSR: 1953.
 1957-58 Satellites. *Sputnik I* and *II*: USSR, 1957. *Explorer I*: US, 1958.
 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis.

Everyday Life: Security and Disquiet

1955 Montgomery bus boycott begun by Rosa Parks.
 1956 *Blue Suede Shoes*, Elvis Presley. Beginning of dominance of rock music.
 1956 Polio vaccine.
 1961 Oral contraceptives marketed.
 1963 May. Birmingham, Alabama, march led by Martin Luther King. President Kennedy calls out troops to protect marchers.
 1963 August. March on Washington D.C. Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream" speech.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND VIETNAM: 1964-1975**The United States**

Population: 1966 196 million
 1970 205 million
 Presidents: 1964 Lyndon B. Johnson
 1969 Richard M. Nixon
 1974 August 9. Gerald R. Ford

Washington State

Population: 1970 3.4 million
 Governor: 1965 Daniel J. Evans
 Legislature: Democratic majorities, four elections.
 Split, two elections.

National Politics: Challenge and Scandal

1964 Civil Rights Act: right to vote; equality of education; access to goods, services, facilities and accommodations guaranteed.
 1965 Great Society legislation: Medicare and Medicaid, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Older Americans Act.
 1968 Assassinations: Martin Luther King, April 4; Robert F. Kennedy, June 6.
 1973 Roe vs. Wade: Abortion during the first six months of pregnancy may not be prohibited.
 1972-74 Watergate: five arrested inside of Washington D.C. Democratic headquarters, 1972; House Judiciary recommends impeachment and Nixon resigns, 1974.

State Politics:**Clean Environment, Clean Government**

1965 Evans' "Blueprint for Progress": economic growth, expansion of higher education, equitable taxation, government efficiency.
 1967 22 community colleges and TESC established.
 1970 Ecology Department established.
 1971 Shorelines Management Act.
 1972 Public Disclosure Commission established.

National Economics: Foreign Competition

1966-69 Space Race: moon soft landings, US and USSR, 1966; *Apollo 11* moon landing and moon walk, US, 1969.
 1971 Balance-of-payments crisis. Nixon orders 90-day wage/price freeze.
 1973-75 OPEC oil energy crisis: OPEC embargo results in 100 thousand unemployed in US, 1973; OPEC raises prices 10%, 1975.
 1975 US unemployment 9.2%: highest since 1941.

State Economics: Recession

1970-73 Boeing bust: reduction from 115 thousand to 29 thousand; 39 thousand leave state.
 1974 Spokane "EXPO '74": first environmental fair.
 1975 Value of production \$2 million: up from \$900 thousand in 1970.

World Affairs: The Vietnam War

1964 Escalation of US involvement.
 1968 Worldwide protest.
 1969 US troop withdrawal begins.
 1973 Ineffective January and June cease-fire - agreements signed.
 1975 Communists overrun South Vietnam.

Everyday Life: Protest and Response

1964 Mississippi Summer: Northern college students help blacks register to vote.
 1969 Woodstock: 300 thousand attend rock festival in Bethel, NY.
 1970 May 4, Kent State University: four student war protesters killed by Ohio National Guard. Resulting disturbances close 448 universities and colleges.

BABY BOOMERS AND THE NEW CONSERVATIVES: 1976-1995

The United States

Population:	1977	216 million
	1980	226 million
Presidents:	1977	Jimmy Carter
	1981	Ronald Reagan
	1989	George Bush
	1993	Bill Clinton

Washington State

Population:	1980	4 million
	1990	5 million
Governors:	1977	Dixy Lee Ray
	1981	John Spellman
	1985	Booth Gardner
	1993	Mike Lowry

Legislature: Democratic majorities, six elections.
 Republican majorities, two elections. Split,
 three elections.

National Politics: A Conservative Agenda

1982	Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act: corporate taxes raised; social programs cut.
1985	Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act.
1986	"Irangate": Reagan admits secret arms deal with Iran.

State Politics: Defining Responsibility

1977	Basic Education Act.
1981	Annual legislative sessions.
1983	Bipartisan redistricting commission established.
1985	Comparable worth.

National Economics: Recession and Inflation

1978	US dollar at record low against the Japanese yen and the German mark.
1984	70 US banks fail: largest number since 1937.
1985	US world's largest debtor nation: deficit 130 billion dollars.
1987	October 19, Black Monday: world stock market prices crash; Dow Jones index falls by 23%.

State Economics: Urban Patterns

1981-83	Timber prices fall. State unemployment 13%.
1979-87	Employment along I-5 corridor grows 22%.
1986	\$7 billion military establishment equals 11% of state employment.

World Affairs: A New Order

1978	US and People's Republic of China establish full diplomatic relations.
1987	US and USSR finalize INF treaty: destruction of missiles in Europe.
1988-91	Eastern European states gain independence: Polish government reconciles with noncommunist groups, 1988; Czechoslovakia, first free postwar elections, 1991; USSR recognizes independence of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, 1991.
1991	Gulf War: US and allies liberate Kuwait from Iraq.
1991	December 26: USSR disintegrates, replaced by a commonwealth of republics.

Everyday Life: Diversity and Fragmentation

1976	Discovery that gas from spray cans, air conditioners, refrigerators, and computers depletes ozone layer.
1981	IBM markets PC.
1981	Scientists identify AIDS: 125,000 US fatalities by 1991.
1982	ERA not ratified.
1988	Crack cocaine common in US cities.

INDEX

- Abraham Lincoln Brigade (Battalion), 205
Abraham Lincoln Brigade, Friends of the, 199
Abt, John, 335
Accokeek, Maryland, 190, 286, 301, 322, 324, 335, 346
Ackles family, 50
Adams, Ansel, 104
Adams, Alfred, 184, 329, 351, 352
Addams, Jane, 254
Aerospace Union, 177, 179, 185
Agee, Philip, 334
Air National Guard, 64
Algeo, Herb, 152
Allen, Gary, 284
Allen, Raymond B., 197, 205, 208, 232, 243, 247, 249, 276, 276
Amerasia spy case, 167, 298
American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), 118, 120, 122, 157, 174, 187, 189, 193, 195, 196, 200, 201, 204, 206, 216, 218, 219, 221, 224, 227, 234, 235, 238, 240, 241, 242, 251-254, 275, 282, 283, 290, 292, 294, 297, 298, 309, 314, 315, 317-321, 324, 326, 328, 330, 332, 333, 336, 344, 345, 350; founding, 254
American Friends Service Committee, 269, 270, 275, 344
American Intelligence Service, 312, 317, 322
American Jewish League Against Communism, 230
American Juridical Association, 234
American League to Limit Armaments, 254
American Legion, 108, 150, 157, 163, 188, 297, 306, 314, 317
American Legion Americanism Committee, 162
American Mercury, 167, 289
American Opinion, 284
American Scholar, 220, 244
American Security Council, 289, 290
American Sign and Indicator Company, 313
American Way of Death, The, 285
Ancient Order of United Workingmen, 291
Anderson, Lucile, 228
Angel, Fay, 184
Anthon, Sis, 83
Appendix IX, Dies Committee, 289
Apple Show, 54, 55
Armstrong, H.C. 'Army,' 145, 204
Army-McCarthy hearings, 299
arson fire, 291, 292
Ashley, Fred, 144
Ashley, Paul, 202
Associated Press, 343, 344
Astley, Ted, 198, 204
Athletic Round Table, 117
Atkinson, N.P., 176
Auerbach, Dick, 113, 208, 223, 278, 279

Bachelor family, 45
Baez, Joan, 344
Bailey, Bill, 32
Baker, Jacob, 304, 335, 345
Ball, Howard, 145
Ballard Printing Press, 90
Ballard News, 86, 89
Barslaag, Karl, 297, 298
Beal, Maud, 204
Beaver Creek School, 43
Beck, Ed 124, 136, 334
Beck, Dave, 72, 177, 178
Begun, Isidore, 229
Bentley, Elizabeth, 212, 320
Bienz, Thomas H., 144, 150, 155, 156, 157, 158, 164, 186, 194, 199, 233, 239, 240
Binkley, Judge, 135
Binkleys, 272
Birge, Harvey 'Bull,' 71, 73
Bliss, W. M., 304, 333
Blodgett, James, 136, 137, 143, 245
Blodgett's Grocery and Mercantile Store, 137
Bloor, Ella Reeve 'Mother', 190
Blue, Monty, 53, 54
Boeing Company, 120, 121, 123, 168, 177, 182, 261, 264, 286. *See also* Leith, Stan
Boettiger, Anna Roosevelt, 184
Bolshevik revolution, 123
Bolsheviks, 72
Bone, Homer, 83, 117
Borman, Bill, 79
Boyd, John, 168, 209-211, 224, 225. *See also* Immigration and Naturalization Service
Bozarth, Horace, 314
Bozo Estate, 291
Brandeis, Louis, 346
Brandeis, Mrs. Louis, 190, 299

- Bridges, Agnes, 184, 186
 Bridges, Harry, 73, 90, 91, 119, 121, 172, 184, 186, 192, 213, 252
 Bridges, Styles, 113, 246, 266, 279
 Briehl's Farm, 204, 206, 217, 224, 227, 229, 231, 249, 251
 Brown, Martin J., 225
 Buckley, Father Emmett, 307, 310, 312, 317, 322, 328, 336
 Buckley, Ralph, 105, 106
 Budenz, Louis F., 166, 172, 174, 184-186, 195, 212, 226, 227, 229
 Building Service Employees' International Union (AFL Local #6), 173, 174, 176, 178, 179, 184, 334
 Bullitt, Stimson, 196
 Bundy, Edgar, 286
 Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, 105, 113, 114
 Burnside, Art, 113
 Butterworth, Joseph, 204 232
- Cadle, Wilbert W., 184
 Cain, Harry P., 329, 330, 331
 Cannon, James, 105
 Canwell, Albert Franklyn: 266, 277, 317, 321, 338, 344, 345, family background, 1 ff; education 2 ff; work, 63 ff; political development, 102 ff; Detroit trips, 119; legislative committees, 140-149; files and records, 156 ff; political campaigns, 237 ff; travel abroad, 267 ff; libel trial, 301
 Canwell, Adelbert Lee, 2, 3, 7-15, 35, 36, 37, 38, 74, 75
 Canwell, Bertha Adele, 3
 Canwell, Carl Demeritt, 14, 27, 42, 114-116, 351
 Canwell, Christina. *See* Espelund, Ingeborg
 Canwell, Claude Adelbert, 41, 46, 49
 Canwell, James, 1
 Canwell, James Lee, 41, 46, 73
 Canwell, Jane Marshall, 106, 107, 272
 Canwell, John Mellen, 3, 14, 27, 42, 106, 135, 272, 351
 Canwell, Jon, 351
 Canwell, Joseph, 351
 Canwell, Marshall, 351
 Canwell, Marsinah Marshall, 53, 113, 133, 135, 138, 185, 194, 259, 272, 273
 Canwell, Maybelle, 41
 Canwell, Pearl Adele, 35, 42, 46, 351
 Canwell, Walter Joseph, 14, 27, 42
 Canwell Committee, 135 ff, 184 ff, 250, 275, 293
 Canwell Glacier, 8
 Canwell Security Agency, 132, 286
 Canyon Creek Lodge, 208, 213, 218, 224, 228-231, 252, 256
 Capitol Club, 144, 151-153, 161, 192, 193
 Carnegie Library, 55
- Caron, Don, 308, 322-324, 327, 335, 338
 Carroll, Charles, 225, 226, 248
 Casey, Oren, 350
 Castle of Chillon, Switzerland, 268
 Caughlan, John, 154, 187, 196, 232, 241, 255
 Central Washington College of Education (Ellensburg), 141
 Central State College, 149
 Chambers, Whittaker, 167, 190, 202, 222, 280, 320
 Chaplin, Charlie, 54
 Chiang Kai-shek, 167
Chicago Tribune, The, 94, 221, 242
 Chicago World's Fair, 92, 93, 94
 China Lobby, 167, 230
 Chinatown, San Francisco, 65
Christian Science Monitor, 186, 242
Chronicle. See Spokane Daily Chronicle
 Chrysler Company, 95, 99
 Chrysler, Walter, 96, 97
 Churchill, Walter W., Sr., 184
 Citizens Law & Safety Research Center, 282
 Civil Liberties Bureaus, 254
 Civil Service Commission, 168, 169
 Clark, Irving, 233
 Clark, Thomas Campbell, 226
 Clise, Jim, 259, 284
 Coffin brothers, 88
 Cohen, Joseph, 204, 232
 Cohen, Lucille, 266
 Coleman, Aaron R., 168, 169, 185, 223, 228, 247, 256
 Coleman, Verlin, 79, 81, 82, 83, 86, 88, 92, 99, 109
 Costigan, Howard, 90, 128, 182, 173, 176, 184, 185, 189, 205
 Costigan, Isabel, 173, 190, 205
 Coughlin, Paul, 212-221, 223, 234, 240, 253, 254, 326
 Coulee Dam, 123, 133
 Counter Intelligence Corps, 128, 129
 Countryman, Vernon, 174, 206-208, 220, 253, 254, 266, 315
 Cowen, David 'Davie', 245
 Cowles, William, Sr., 33, 116, 338
 Cowles family, 53, 83
 Crawford, Cora, 54, 116
 Crosby, Bing, 94
 Crosby, Bob, 133
 Crosby, Ted, 113, 131, 133, 143, 258, 313
 Crosetto, Albert, 184
 Crowfoot, Charlie, 32, 33
 Cunningham, Ross, 144, 159, 160, 242, 249, 253
 Cutter, Kirtland, 53
- Daily Worker*, 166, 184, 228
 Dallam, Frank, 101
 Daschbach, John, 266

- Davenport, Louie, 52
Davis, Herbert, 217, 223
Davis, Phil, 204, 240, 241
Day, Henry L., 132, 258, 287
De Julio family, 194
Decker family, 45
DeLacy, Hugh, 124, 176, 184, 243
Democrat Party, Washington State, 78, 151, 237, 299
DeSola, Ralph, 286
Detroit Free Press, 93, 94
Dewey, Thomas E., 226
Diamond, Theodore, 227
Dies, Martin, 123, 345
Dies Committee, 150, 165, 203, 287. *See also*
Appendix IX
Dikes, Drains, and Ditches committee, 146
Dill, Clarence, 38
Dill family, 88
Dilworth, Nelson, 239
Dimeling family, 31
Dirksen, Everett, 102
Dixon, Willie Leroy, 344
Dobbins, Bill, 90, 178
Dodd, Bella, 168, 251
Dodd, Ivy, 184
Dore, Major, 121
Douglas, William O., 299
Doyle, Clyde, 302
Draskovich, Dan 284
Drumheller, Joe, 117, 138
Duck Club 341, 342
Dulles, Allen, 267
Dulles, John Foster, 266-268, 271
Duncan, John, 16
Dunn, Robert W., 254
Durkan, Martin J., 277
Dwyer, William L., 91, 221, 308, 315, 316, 321, 325,
327, 332, 339
- Earp, Wyatt, 52
Eastern State Hospital, Medical Lake, 141, 148
Eastern Washington College of Education (Cheney),
141, 149
Eastern Washington State College, 129
Eastman, Crystal, 254
Eastman, Max, 254
Eby, Edwin Harold, 204, 232
Edwards and Bradford Lumber Company, 31
Eisenhower, Dwight D., 272, 288, 329
Eldredge, Sarah, 184, 188
Elks Club, 158, 211
Elvidge, Ford Q., 154, 159, 217, 276, 332, 326
Engels, Friedrich, 72, 128
Erling, Thomas, 184
- Espelund, Aaron, 6, 11
Espelund, Elizabeth, 6
Espelund, Hannah, 6
Espelund, Ingeborg 'Ida' Christina (Canwell), 3, 4, 8,
14, 17-22, 26-28, 35, 39, 40, 55
Espelund, John Christianson, 8
Espelund, John, Jr., 6
Espelund, Joseph, 6
Espelund, Martha, 6
Ethel, Garland, 204, 232
Evans, Dan, 263, 335
- Far East, 89
Farley, Jim, 242, 247, 248
Farmer, Frances, 147
Federal Bureau of Investigation 102, 109-112, 117, 118,
125, 131, 166, 172, 182, 206, 223, 224
Felts Field, 64
Finucane, Charlie, 117, 138
Fish Report, 165, 287
Fletcher, Jess, 172, 173, 178, 184, 186
Fletcher, Judith, 172
Fluent, Russell, 154, 241
Flynn, Elizabeth Gurley, 56, 121, 254, 345
Fogg, Katherine, 184, 204
Foley, Samuel J., 228, 229
Ford, Henry, 97
Ford, Mildred, 60
Ford Motor Company, 95, 96, 98, 99
Fordham University, 166
Foresman, Kennedy, 84
Forker, George, 33
Forker family, 45
Forschmiiedt, Rachmiel, 204, 232
Fort Walla Walla, 8
Fort Vancouver, 9
Fosseen, Neal, 52
Foster, William Z., 56, 121, 254, 345
Frankfurter, Felix, 191, 299, 335, 345, 346
Frayn, Mort, 89, 145, 277, 278
Freedom Library & Bookstore, Inc., 132, 282, 283, 348
French, Art, 104
French, Bob, 144
French, Bud, 101
Fritsche, Viola, 170
Fuher family, 45
Fuller, Ezekiel, 1, 7
Fuller, Samuel, 352
Fuller, Zipporah, 2
Funk, John, 71, 80, 81
- Gale, Zona, 254
Garten, Art, 192
Geiger Field, 101

- General Motors, 95, 98
 Ghiglieri, John, 283
 Gilbert, John, 220
 Gilbert, Mary, 184
 Gillespie, Loris, 306-312, 317, 318, 323-328, 338, 342
 Glenn, Captain, 9, 10
 Glenn Expedition, 7-10, 12
 Godfrey, Lyla, 60
 Goebbels, Joseph, 343
 Goldmark, Anne, murder case, 341
 Goldmark, Charles, murder case, 341, 343, 344
 Goldmark, Jonathan Edward, 190, 286, 299, 301 ff, 341, 346
 Goldmark, Josef, 346
 Goldmark, Sally (Irma Ringe), 189, 190, 265, 301 ff, 322, 335, 345, 346
 Goldmark libel trial, 60, 125, 189, 220, 301 ff
 Gonzaga Law School, 241, 324
 Gonzaga University, 139
 Goodman, Leo C., 145
 Gordon, Alfred, 184
 Goronefsky, David, 254
 Gorton, Slade, 263, 333
 Graham, John W., 74
 Grand Coulee Dam, 100
 Grange, 122, 132
 Grant, Thomas, 228, 229
 Great Northern Railway, union shops, 72, 121, 122
 Griffin, Tracey, 175, 266
 Griffith, D.W., 54
 Grove, Lefty, 54
 Grunke, Leal, 79, 81, 82, 86, 88, 92
 Grunke, Ruth, 88
 Gundlach, Ralph, 197, 200, 204-210, 216, 222, 232, 249-251
 Guthman, Ed, 158, 160 180, 181, 189, 191, 192, 201, 206, 208, 216, 220, 221, 223, 225, 234, 249, 250, 253, 254, 264, 278, 279
 Gwydir family, 12, 48

 Habsburg Empire, 346
 Haggin, Jim, 124, 136, 177, 178
 Hall, Gus, 316
 Hallauer, Web, 304, 317, 319
 Hamblen, Herbert, 140, 144, 151, 155, 161, 163, 164, 171
 Hamilton, John, 184
 Hamilton, Mrs. John, 184
 Hammer, Cap, 89, 94, 131
 Hammett, Dashiell, 54
 Hanford Nuclear Facility, 123
 Hansen, Ingeborg Larsdatter, 6
 Happy, John, 237, 245
 Harber, George, 105, 110, 111, 113
 Harding College, 303
 Harmon, E. Glenn, 321, 325-327, 336, 337, 339, 340, 347
 Harry Bridges Defense Fund, 199, 172
 Hartle, John, 122
 Hartle, Barbara, 188, 189, 234, 251, 264, 265, 298, 326, 332-334
 Haussler, Joe, 307, 308, 312, 314
 Hayden, Sterling, 332
 Hearst columnists, 93
 Hearst, William Randolph, 65, 105
 Hebbard, Charlie, 138, 243, 244
 Hecla mines, 132
 Henricksen, George, 21, 24, 25, 33, 36, 39, 52
 Henry, Ed, 195, 196, 201, 206, 208, 212, 214-223, 234, 250, 253, 254
 Hewitt, George (pseud. Tim Holmes), 167, 168, 201, 204-230, 233, 234, 247-248, 250-257, 334
 Higher Education Committee, 148
 Hill, Jim, 30, 52, 64
 Hiller, Peter, 184
 Hillyer, Al, 86
 Hine, Louise, 170, 171
 Hiss, Alger, 167, 190, 191, 202, 216, 221-225, 235, 242, 258, 261, 279, 345
 Hitler, Adolf, 343
 Hitler-Stalin Pact, 214
 Hoar, William, 225
 Hodde, Charlie, 132, 140, 144, 145, 216, 235, 237, 247, 277-280
 Hoffa, Jimmy, 72
 Holcomb, 278
 Holden, Ashley, 83, 89-91, 100, 101, 137, 148, 149, 159, 186, 202, 220, 242, 245, 305-310, 315, 320-324, 327, 328, 330, 336, 338, 344-346, 351
 Holman, Frank, 154, 266, 276
 Holmes, Tim. *See* Hewitt, George
 Honig, Erla, 184
 Honig, Nat, 173, 184, 186, 204
 Hood River Dam, 64
 Hoover, J. Edgar, 165, 202, 242, 319
 Hopkins, Harry, 191, 203, 251, 334, 335, 345
 Horan, Walter, 131, 166
 Horowitz, Charles, 327
 Hough, Frank, 184
 Hough, Ruth, 184
 House Committee on Un-American Activities (U.S.), 54, 150, 165, 202, 211, 212, 264, 281, 286, 301
 Houston, William, 138, 158, 169, 209-11, 217, 223, 244
 Hudson department store strike, 95
 Hughes, Glen, 191
 Human Events, 312
 Hungerford, 13
 Huntley, Elmer, 329

- Hurley, Margaret, 313, 329, 332
Huson, Homer, 184
- I.W.W. Free Speech Movement, 72
I.W.W. *See* Industrial Workers of the World
Id Book Store, 325
Immigration and Naturalization Service, 127, 197, 211, 212
Industrial Workers of the World (I.W.W.), 56, 71, 72
Ingles, Ruth. *See* Matthews, Ruth
Institute of Pacific Relations, 166, 167, 230, 298
International Association of Law Enforcement Officials, 160
International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Workers Union 176, 179, 213
International News Service, 92, 93, 94, 102, 108, 131
International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, 132
International Woodworkers of America, 179
- Jack family, 45
Jackson, Donald, 264, 326, 332
Jackson, Henry, 220, 299
Jacobs, Melville, 204, 232
Jaeger, Donelyn, 170, 171
James, Burton, 146, 185, 197, 204, 211
James, Florence Bean, 185, 191, 197, 204, 205, 209, 211, 214, 232
Japanese internment, 118
Jefferson, Thomas, 58
Jessup, Philip C., 167
Jewett, Frederick, 107, 195
Jimmy Durkin Saloon, 53
jitneys, 54
John W. Graham store, 52, 73, 97
John Birch Society, 281, 283, 284, 289, 306, 323, 324
Johnson, Eric, 313
Johnson, Manning, 167, 168, 173, 184-186, 227-230, 255, 257
Joint Committee Against Communism (New York), 230
Joint Legislative Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities. *See* Canwell Committee
Joint Labor Lobby, 146
Jones, Wilder R., 238
Jones, Paul, 243
Judd, Walter, 167
Jumper, Alice Ann, 344
Jung, Harry, 120
- Kaiser, Henry J., 104, 261
Katyn Forest massacre, 214
Kaynor family, 83, 88
Keil-Hall, Dorothy, 265
Keith, Lyle, 152, 153, 193
- Keller, Sarah, 184
Kelley, Bill, 336
Kelley, Kitty, 336
Kellogg, 145
Kimball, Harold, 89, 90, 155-163, 171, 233, 237-239
Kimball, Ned W., 323, 324, 327, 339
King, Martin Luther, 346
Kinnear, George, 143-145, 150, 153, 163, 164, 246, 257, 259, 263
Kipling, Rudyard, 69
Kirby, Ida, 228, 229, 249
Kittelman, Harry F., 145
Kizer, Benjamin Hamilton, 122, 123, 124, 129, 130, 138, 153, 202, 296, 299, 318, 320
Knowles, Harper, 240, 286
Kohlberg, Alfred, 165, 167, 186, 190, 202, 205, 216, 224, 226, 227, 229, 230, 246
Kornfedder, Joe ('Joe Zack'), 98, 173, 184, 185, 199
Kramer, Charles (Charles Krevitsky), 320. *See also* Perlo-Kramer spy group
Ku Klux Klan, 104, 105
Kulaks, 214
- LaGuardia, Fiorello, 254
Lally, Tom, 194
Langlie, Arthur B., 137, 226, 238
Larson, Louis, 185
Latter-Day Saints (Mormons), 75
Lattimore, Owen, 167
Lautner, John, 331, 322
Law, Laura, murder case, 184, 234
Lehman, Fred, 145, 151
Lein, Nave, 150
Leith, Stan, 168, 120, 121, 182, 198, 265, 277, 313
Lenin, Vladimir, 254
Levich, Captain George, 173, 185
Levy, Aaron J., 229, 248, 249, 253
Lewis, John L., 94, 95, 119
Libby, Al, 105, 117
Lincoln, Abraham, 100
Lindsay, Roderick, 142, 238, 245
Logan School, 48, 49
London, Jack, 65
London School of Economics, 283
Loney, Milt, 145
Longfellow School, 50
Longshoreman's Union. *See* International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union
Lussier, Donald J., 116
Luther, Martin, 57
Lyman, Tracy W., 145
Lynd, Staughton, 244
Lynnbloom, Miss (teacher), 49

- Magnuson, Warren G., 246, 257, 258, 269, 298, 299, 323
 Malkin, Maurice, 254
 Mamer, Nick, 64
 Mandel, Ben, 120, 287, 301
 Manhattan Project, 203, 251
 Manhattan Superior Court, 224
 Mansfield, Resa 'Reese,' 321, 325, 327, 339
 Marshall, Edna C., 107
 Marshall, Herman Prince, 107, 352
 Marshall, Jane. *See* Canwell, Jane Marshall
 Marshall, Marsinah. *See* Canwell, Marsinah Marshall
 Martin, Clarence, 38, 137, 138
 Martin, Berwick 'Brick,' 57
 Martin, Frank, 136, 137
 Martin, Robert, 57
 Martin boys, 64, 67
 Marx, Karl, 72, 128
 Mary, Queen of Romania, 64
 Maryhill, 64
 Matthews, J.B., 108, 120, 165, 190, 202-204, 212, 246, 284, 287, 289, 295, 301
 Matthews, Ruth Ingles, 203, 287
 McCannon sisters, 125
 McCarter, W.E., 185
 McCarthy, Joseph, 199, 235, 253, 258, 266, 293, 332, 345
 McClean, Dean, 225, 226
 McCluskey, Jim, 101, 114, 117
 McCord, James, 290
 McCurdy, Wells, 263, 264
 McDowell, John, 225
 McGrath, Russell, 249, 253, 254
 McLaughlan, Benny, 45
 McLeod, Scott, 113, 266, 271, 279
 McMullen, Dale, 238
 McNamara, Robert Strange, 284
 McWethy, Miss, 47
 Metcalf, Cyrus, 3
 Methodist Federation for Social Action, 243
 Metropolitan Tract, 148
 Mildus family, 45
 Miller, Don, 237, 240, 241, 243
 Milton Nursery, 5
 Mindel, Jacob 'Pop,' 206, 207, 216
 Mitford, Jessica (Decca Treuhaft), 285
 Montvale, 106, 135, 139, 351
 Moore, Ray, Jr., 142, 153, 154
 Moore, Ray, Sr., 142
 Mordaunt, Carrie, 185
 Mormons. *See* Latter-Day Saints
 Morning Herald, 81
 Morphis, Richard, 329
 Morris, Robert, 326, 332
 Mount Spokane (Mt. Carlton), 21
 Mount Saint Michael's Seminary, 241, 244
 Mueller, Mrs., 231
 Mueller, Quincy, 228, 229
 Murgatroyd drugstore, 53
 Murphy, Frank, 94, 95, 299
 Muste, A. J., 254
 National Lawyers Guild, 122, 235, 243, 285, 298, 328
 National Civil Liberties Bureau, 254
 National Ban the Bum Committee, 347, 348
 Native Son movement, 65
 Nearing, Scott, 254
 Neff family, 45
 Neindorff, Fred, 83, 89, 144, 155, 158, 159, 180, 192, 202, 225, 226, 242, 266, 332
 Neindorff, Hazel, 180, 188
 Nelson, Burt, 266
 Neuser, Charlie, 280
 New Deal, 83, 99, 120, 304
 New York Philharmonic Orchestra, 53
 New York Public Library, 105
 New York Times, 289, 339, 346
 Newspaper Guild, 176
 Nicolai, Max, 217, 218, 223
 Nixon, Richard, 202, 239, 275, 293, 319, 350
 Northern State Hospital, Sedro Wooley, 148
 O'Brien, John L., 276, 278
 O'Connell, Jerry, 78, 124, 159, 196, 299
 Office of Price Administration (OPA), 133
 Okanogan County Anti-Communist League, 307
Okanogan Independent, 306, 322
 Omdahl, Sverre, 145
 opium, 115
 Oppenheimer, J. Robert, 203, 207, 251
 Orchard Avenue School, 57, 63, 71, 79, 123
 Oregon Trail, 6
 Osborn, Lucy, 185
 Ottenheimer, Albert M., 232
 Pacific Northwest Labor School, 172, 174, 200, 208
 Paine, Thomas, 101
 Palmeroy, Evert, 228
 Parker family, 33
 Patton, George S., 288
 Paxton, Floyd, 284
 Pearson, Drew, 283
 Pegler, Westbrook, 108, 242, 284
 Pellegrini, Angelo, 204
 Pennington, Stanley, 306, 308, 312
 Pennock, William, 146, 153, 154, 159, 172, 184, 185, 189, 196, 241, 265, 296
People's World, The, 90

- Perlo, Victor, 313, 320, 321. *See also* Perlo-Kramer spy group
- Perlo-Kramer spy group, 190, 191, 202, 265, 302, 311, 345
- Peters, Buck, 33
- Peters, George, 227, 229, 230, 255, 257
- Peters, J., 230, 280
- Pettus, Terry, 90, 153
- Philbrick, Herb, 314, 326, 332
- Phillips, Herbert, 197, 198, 200, 204, 232
- Plain Talk*, 167, 230
- Portland Oregonian*, 316
- Potlatch Lumber Company, 195, 291
- Powell, George, 145, 257
- Poyhonen, Warner, 145, 151
- Prince, Noah and Sarah, 352
- Pritchard, Joel, 263, 333
- Prohibition, 70
- Project Workers Union, 175, 176
- Quakers, 275. *See also* American Friends Service Committee
- Rabbitt, Tom, 90, 146, 153, 154
- Rachlin, Carl, 224, 227, 228, 230
- Rader, Melvin, 172, 188, 197, 200, 204-219, 221-225, 228-231, 234, 239, 247-257, 331
- Rader, Virginia, 228, 229, 231
- Rainier Brewing Company, 195
- Rand, Sally, 94, 103
- Rapp-Coudert Committee, 165, 168
- Rappaport, Morris 'Rap,' 200, 253, 254
- Raugust, 144
- Reagan, Ronald, 239
- Red Squad, Seattle Police Department, 172, 181, 190, 210, 280
- Red Squad, Spokane Police Department, 110
- Redenbaugh, Mary Louise, 185
- Reed College, 316
- Reeve, Karl Marx, 190
- Reiseroff, Lillian, 205-207, 213, 214
- Repertory Theatre. *See* Seattle Repertory Playhouse
- Republican Party, Washington State, 257-260
- Republican Party, National, 288
- Riblett Tramway Company, 52
- Rice, David, 341-344
- Riley, Doc, 148, 221
- Riley, Ed 'Saltwater,' 145, 163
- Riley, Harriet, 185
- Riley, Vernon Todd, 129, 330
- Ringe, Irma. *See* Goldmark, Sally
- Roberts, Joe Dana, 205
- Robertson, Colonel, 81-83, 88, 91, 99, 299
- Robeson, Paul, 102
- Robinson, Dana T., 169, 170, 173, 185
- Robinson, Kinsey, 143
- Rockefeller Foundation, 207
- Roen, Brynhild, 3-6
- Rogue River, Oregon, 68, 69
- Roosevelt, Eleanor, 104, 120, 151, 173, 184
- Roosevelt, Franklin Delano, 173, 184, 345
- Rosa Project, 82
- Rosellini, Albert, 194, 263
- Rosenberg, Anna (nee Lederer), 331
- Roup, Howard, 238
- Rowles, Aubrey 'Aub,' 241
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 159
- Ruby, Jack, 284
- Rueber, Don, 281
- Rushmore, Howard, 190, 202, 203
- Russell, Charlie, 25
- Russian War Relief, 122, 125, 129
- Rutter, Robert L., Jr., 155, 158, 163, 233, 237
- Ryan, Wilfred, 75
- Ryskind, Alan, 309
- Ryskind, Morrie, 309
- St. John's Episcopal Cathedral, 195
- San Francisco, California, 65
- San Simeon, 67
- Schumann, 145
- Schwarz, Fred, 281
- Schwellenbach, Lewis Baxter, 83, 299
- Schweppe, Alfred, 200, 241
- Screen Actors Guild, 239
- Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, 83, 91, 104, 144, 159, 266, 343, 344
- Seattle Press Club, 91
- Seattle Repertory Playhouse, 146, 172, 220, 191, 232
- Seattle Six, 188
- Seattle Star*, 89
- Seattle Times*, 91, 125, 144, 159, 160, 242, 249, 253, 343, 344
- Seattle University, 107
- Seck family, 33
- Seeger, Pete, 190
- Service, John S., 167
- Seventh-Day Adventists, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 68, 75, 78, 79
- Shamrock Bar, 88
- Shannon, William D., 145
- Shaw, Osborne 'Ozzie', 61, 66, 80
- Sheridan School, 56, 57, 63
- Shorett, Lloyd, 201, 206, 217-219, 222-225, 232, 253, 254
- Silver Shirts (of William Dudley Pelley), 104
- Simone, Sonia, 185
- Sisson, Grant, 145, 161, 163, 233

- Smith, Howard 'Pig,' 185, 196
 Smith, Don Cary, 277
 Snow, Edgar, 167, 348
 Spanish-American War, 75, 104
 Spencer family, 32
 Spiedel, Bill, 259
 Spokane & Eastern Trust Department, 107
 Spokane City Club, 117
Spokane Daily Chronicle, 103, 148, 243, 324
 Spokane Fire Department, 291, 292
 Spokane Park Department, 16
 Spokane Press Club, 127, 137
 Spokane County Identification Bureau, 105, 110, 111
 Spokane County Sheriffs Department 105, 106, 110, 111
 Spokane Merchant Police, 12, 14, 16, 38
 Spokane Police Department Vice Squad, 114
 Spokane Press Club, 94, 101-103, 117, 131
Spokane Spokesman-Review, 53, 101, 103, 116, 144, 150, 159, 242, 343, 344
 Spokane Unitarian Church, 344
Spokesman-Review. See *Spokane Spokesman-Review*
 Stalin, Joseph, 252, 254, 345
 Stanley, Scott, 284
 Star Clothing Company, 87, 88
 Stevens, Sid, 150, 162, 163
 Stillwell (theater owner), 54
 Stith, Ernest, 168, 169, 198, 185, 228, 256
 Stone, Anne, 185
 Stone, Cliff, 185
 Stone, Edward T., 225
 Straus, Bobby, 335
 Stripling, Bob, 120, 165, 211, 212, 264
 Strong, Anna Louise, 214
 Subversive Activities Control Board, 329, 330
 Sullivan, James, 185
 Sullivan, L.B., 346
 Sullivan v. *New York Times*, 346
 Summers, Lane, 205
 Sunshine Mine, 87, 88
 SunSweet Company, 66
 Swartout (Officer), 112
- Teamsters Union, 72
 Technocrats, 175
 Tenney, Jack, 240
 Thomas, Lenora, 346
 Tibbetts, Earl, 169
Time magazine, 125
 Tolstoy Peace Farm, Davenport, Washington, 282
 Tonasket Publishing Company, 327
Tonasket Tribune, 308, 315
 Tourtelott, Janet, 246, 257, 259, 262
 Townsend Clubs, 175, 176
- Treuhaft, Robert, 285, 286
 Trohan, Walter, 94, 108
 Troy, Smith, 256, 257
 Truax, Arthur, 185
 Truman, Harry, 102, 137, 151, 345
 Turner, Theodore S., 326, 341, 347
- Underwood, Harry, 50, 55
 Unemployed Citizens Leagues (Conference for Progressive Labor Action), 174, 175, 176
 Union Against Militarism, 254
 United Auto Workers Union, 96
 United Nations, 191
 U.S. Department of State, 267, 268
 U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, 281
 U.S.S. Valencia, 10
 University Club, 103
 University of Chicago, 256
 University of Minnesota, 206
 University of Oregon, 125
 University of Washington, 130, 148, 172, 179, 187, 200, 204-207, 232
 Utter Motor Company, 118
- Vane, Z.A., 145
 Veccio (Deputy Sheriff), 112
 Velde, Harold, 264
 Veterans Bonus March, 158
Vigilante, The, 262, 313, 317, 320, 330, 342, 348
 Virgil Warren Advertising Agency, 138
- Wales, Nym, 167
 Wallgren, Mon C., 120, 137, 151
 Wall, Sarah, 185
 Walla Walla College, 5, 8, 61, 78, 79, 81
 Wanamaker, Pearl, 149, 244
Wanderer, The, 167
 Ward, Harry F., 254
 Ware cell, 190, 191, 345
 Ware, Harold, 190, 302, 345
 Warren, Virgil, 138
 Warren, Ward, 173, 184, 185, 205
 Washington, George, 9, 10
 Washington Book Shop, The, (Washington DC), 299
 Washington Commonwealth Federation, 158, 173, 175, 176
 Washington Joint-Legislative Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities. See Canwell Committee
 Washington Old Age Pension Union, 146, 154, 166, 172-176, 184, 185, 197, 211, 296
 Washington State Liquor Control Board, 102, 139, 140, 145, 194
 Washington State Patrol, 109, 152, 196
 Washington State University, 130, 200

- Washington State Weights and Measures, 124
Washington Water Power Company, 47, 131, 142, 143, 319
- Watergate, 291, 350
Webster, Betty, 123, 124, 207
Webster, J. Stanley, 33
Wedekind, Max, 145
Weinstein, Allen, 220
Welch, Robert, 283, 289, 323, 324
Welch Candy Company, 284
Wenatchee World, 344
Western Washington College of Education (Bellingham), 141
Western Washington State Hospital, 147
Wheeler, Bill, 286
Whipple, John, 169, 223, 226, 228, 229
White, Aubrey, 106, 135, 271, 273
White, Don Anthony, 344
White, Zeke, 278
Wicks, Joseph, 323-325, 327
Wielgos, Harriet, 170, 171
Williams, Luke, 312, 313
Williams, Walter, 246, 257, 259, 261
Williams Brothers Signs, 313
Wills, Ellsworth Clayton, 185
Winner, Helen, 336, 346
Winther, Mabel, 205
Winther, Sophus, 205
Wintler, Ella, 145
Wirin, Abraham Lincoln, 286
Witherspoon, Kelley, Davenport & Toole, 323, 327, 336, 339
Wobblies. *See* Industrial Workers of the World
Woodall, Perry, 145, 151, 152, 153
Workers Alliance of America, 175, 176
Workers Defense League, 227
Workers School of New York City, 190, 345
Works Project Administration (WPA), 133, 175
World War I, 50, 31
World War II, 117, 133, 269
World's Fair, 1934, 86
- Yakima Republic*, 81, 88
Yakima Valley Review, 81
Yakima Valley News, 83
Yantis, George, 145, 160, 162, 163, 233, 275-277
Young, John, 114, 115
Young Americans for Freedom, 312
- Zionchek, Marion, 247, 248
Zumwalt, John, 211