Sinkola, and Charles Young, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

H. R. 3064. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Thomas Lucas; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 3065. A bill for the relief of Miguel A. Viera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 3066. A bill for the relief of Lawrence G. McCarthy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHENER (by request):

H. R. 3067. A bill for the relief of E. J. Brennan and Janet Howell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3068. A bill for the relief of Alfred Thomas Freitas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3069. A bill for the relief of Cecil T. May; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 3070. A bill for the relief of Simon Broder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 3071. A bill for the relief of Hong Fort Chew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

328. By Mr. BRAMBLETT: Petition of Eloise Stoltenberg and others, relative to proposed legislation prohibiting liquor advertising in interstate commerce and via radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

329. By Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Petition of Miss Amy M. Henry and others, for the passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

330. By Mr. JONES of Ohio: Petition of Mrs. Ella K. Lowry and 90 other mothers, Christian citizens, and members of a Sunday-school class, of Troy, Ohio, urging the passage of S. 265, which bans liquor advertisements in newspapers, periodicals, news reels, by radio, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

331. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of the citizens of Knox County, Ohio, urging passage of S. 265, the Capper bill, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and to prevent the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

332. By the SPEAKER: Petition of members of the Lake County Townsend Club, Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as H. Res. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

333. Also, petition of members of Boynton Beach Townsend Club, No. 1, Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as H. Res. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

334. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of the One Hundred and Seventy-first Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress to adopt H. R. 724, providing for the conveyance of the Bureau of Animal Industry quarantine station at Clifton, N. J., to the city of Clifton, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 16, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, in the face of life's mysteries and its vast imponderables, give us faith to believe that Thou makest all things to work together for good to them that love Thee. Strengthen our conviction that Thy hand is upon us, to lead us and to use us in working out Thy purposes in the world. Even though we may not see the distant scene, let us be willing to take one step at a time and trust Thee for the rest. Through Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 15, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BROOKS obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. BROOKS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorun..

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hoey	O'Daniel
Ball	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Ives	Pepper
Bridges	Jenner	Reed
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Bushfield	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Knowland	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Langer	Saltonstall
Capper	Lodge	Smith
Connally	Lucas	Sparkman
Cooper	McCarran	Taft
Cordon	McCarthy	Taylor
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McGrath	Thye
Eastland	McKellar	Tobey
Ecton	McMahon	Tydings
Ellender	Malone	Umstead
Flanders	Martin	Vandenberg
Green	Millikin	Watkins
Gurney	Moore	Wherry
Hawkes	Morse	Williams
Hayden	Murray	Wilson
Hickenlooper	Myers	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MEETING OF APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security may hold a meeting this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent for that purpose is granted.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that I may be absent for the rest of the week on important public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee may meet this afternoon to hear a number of witnesses on the antimonopoly bill; and in that connection, inasmuch as I am chairman of the subcommittee, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate this afternoon for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL LANDING CRAFT TO GIRL SCOUT MARINER TROOP, PACIFIC GROVE, CALIF.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Girl Scout Mariner troop at Pacific Grove, Calif., had requested the Navy Department to transfer a personnel landing craft for the use of that organization; to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

SALE OF LIQUOR TO CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit the sale of liquor to Indians outside Indian country (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

ORGANIC ACT OF GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reenact and amend the Organic Act of the United States Geological Survey by incorporating therein substantive provisions confirming the exercise of long-continued duties and functions and by redefining their geographic scope (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

JOURNAL OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF HAWAII LEGISLATURE

A letter from the Acting Director of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copy of the Journal of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1945 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Public Lands.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter in the nature of a memorial signed by sundry members of the Civil Rights Congress, New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of House bill 1884, to prohibit certain un-American activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by 100 citizens of Horton, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

Resolution of the General Court of the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact a fair-employment-practices act

"Whereas the Declaration of Independence states: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness'; and

"Whereas the preamble of the Constitution of the United States declares that the people ordained and established the Constitution in order to establish justice; and

"Whereas during the World War II neither our draft boards nor enemy bullets selected our citizens because of race, color, or creed; and

"Whereas the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has already established a fair-employment-practices act to outlaw discrimination in employment: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to adopt an effective permanent fair-employment-practices act; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the state secretary to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officers of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In house of representatives, adopted, April 1, 1947.

"In senate, adopted, in concurrence, April 8, 1947."

PRICES OF MILK

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a memorial unanimously adopted by both houses of the Vermont Legislature, addressed to the Vermont delegation in the Congress, protesting the action of the Secretary of Agriculture in reducing the price of milk at this time.

I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture, signed by representatives of 14 milk producers' cooperative associations in New England, setting forth the conditions which led to the adoption of the memorial I have just presented.

There being no objection, the memorial and letter were received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, United States Secretary of Agriculture, has ordered that the price of class I milk for May and June 1947, payable to producers in the 201-210-mile zone from Boston shall be reduced 44 cents per hundredweight below April prices, and has ordered similar reductions in prices to be paid to producers shipping milk into New York City and other federally administered milk markets in New England; and

Whereas, by these orders, estimated returns to producers in said 201-210-mile zone will not be over $3.68 per hundredweight during the month of May and $3.50 per hundredweight during the month of June, being sharp declines from returns during these same months in 1946, of $4.06 and $4.17, respectively, while at the same time the index of Vermont farm costs has risen a minimum of 14 percent over the costs of the comparable periods; and being also sharp declines from prices received during the past few months; and

Whereas the Vermont Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service, the College of Agriculture, University of Vermont, and United States Department of Agriculture cooperating, has published its statement that, based upon existing prices of grain and feed, and other present costs, the costs of producing one hundredweight of milk in said 201-210-mile zone is $4.86, using as labor costs a less figure than many dairy farmers pay for labor, being a production cost 33 percent higher than estimated May sales returns per hundredweight and 39 percent higher than estimated June sales returns per hundredweight; and

Whereas such a deliberate action with respect to governmental pricing can only result in disaster to the Vermont dairy farmer, and clearly indicates that the Department of Agriculture has failed to understand, or give any consideration to, the producer needs and production conditions prevailing in this State: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That we formally protest this action on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture for the reasons above stated, and as punitive and unrealistic governmental action that can only result in irreparable damage to the economy of the State of Vermont by breaking down the efficiency of its basic industry, that of dairy farming; and that we respectfully request that the Secretary of Agriculture review and revise his order of April 9, 1947, by giving consideration to the actual conditions in Vermont to the end that class I milk-producer payments in New England federally administered markets and in the New York City market be held at least at April prices; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby authorized and directed to transmit copies of this resolution to Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, and to each Member of the Vermont delegation in Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That this joint resolution be treated as a memorial to the Members of the Vermont congressional delegation that they take affirmative action to advise the Secretary of Agriculture of the needs of the Vermont dairy industry as expressed herein.

Approved APRIL 12, 1947.

ERNEST W. GIBSON,
Governor.

BOSTON, MASS., *April 4, 1947.*

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON, *Secretary,*
United States Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On March 12, 1947, the undersigned cooperative associations representing more than two-thirds of all producers supplying milk in the Greater Boston, Mass., marketing area, submitted to you two petitions relating to suspension of certain provisions of the class I price schedule contained in Federal Milk Marketing Order No. 4.

The first of these petitions related to the month of April 1947 on which affirmative action has already been taken. The second petition requested a similar suspension of the formula pricing provisions of order No. 4 for the months of May and June 1947, so as to hold the class I price to the end of June at the present level of $4.77 per hundredweight. We wish to again call to your attention the latter petition, to submit additional information which has since become available, and to request affirmative action on such petition.

The above-mentioned petition conforms to the proposal with respect to class I price which was submitted jointly by the producers' cooperative associations at a recent hearing in the Boston market on March 14-26, 1947, and supported by lengthy evidence in that hearing. The proposal submitted by the cooperative associations called for elimination of the present butter-powder formula as a basis of establishing the class I price, and for the substitution of a definitely named seasonal schedule of prices to run from now through the next short season. The price schedule proposed provides for maintaining the class I price to the end of June at the present level of $4.77 per hundredweight, an advance to $5.21 in July and to $5.65 in October to carry through the next short season.

The class I price in the Boston market has already been reduced by 44 cents in February and another 44 cents in March, and no further reduction is warranted for April, May, and June in the face of the sharp advance which has occurred in feed prices and continued high levels of production costs. The blended price to producers in March is now estimated by the market administrator at $4.23 per hundredweight for 3.7 percent milk in the 200-mile zone. For March last year the blended price including the subsidy amounted to $4.31. The price to Boston producers in March will be lower than a year ago, and for April, May, and June, the relation will continue to become less favorable compared to last year. In the meantime, feed prices have advanced about 21 percent; farm labor 19 percent; and farm machinery and supplies at least 25 percent above the level of a year ago.

The market administrator for the Boston market regularly compiles and publishes a figure showing the average price of dairy ration per hundredweight based on quotations of eight large feed distributors supplying dairy farmers in the Boston milkshed. These figures are official in character and are the best measure available of the sharp increase in cost of dairy ration which has occurred in the last 6 weeks. A table showing such prices was introduced as a part of Government Exhibit No. 3 at the recent hearing in Boston. The figures below are taken from that exhibit.

Average prices of dairy ration, per hundredweight

March 1946	$3.419
February 1947	3.640
Week beginning:	
Mar. 3, 1947	3.759
Mar. 10	3.965
Mar. 17	4.140

The above figures indicate that by March 17 the average price of dairy ration had advanced to a level 14 percent above February 1947 and 21 percent above the level of March last year.

The price of mixed feed is dependent on the prices of feedstuffs used in preparing such mixtures. During March prices of these ingredients have risen to new high levels and it is probable that not all of the increase in prices of ingredients has yet been reflected in prices of ready-mixed rations. The following table shows average prices of certain feedstuffs as reported in the USDA Weekly Feed Market Review (bagged, per ton, in carlots, sight-draft basis) at Boston, Mass.

	1947		
	January	February	March 25
Wheat bran	$45.70	$48.50	$73.50
Wheat middlings	46.70	51.60	75.50
Linseed meal	90.45	87.45	95.00
Soybean meal	79.00	70.75	91.00
White hominy	54.40	56.25	76.50
Cottonseed meal	83.55	73.50	90.00

Farm wage rates have continued their steady advance. On January 1 in Vermont the reported rates of farm wages per month with board were 19 percent higher than a year ago. Prices of all farm machinery and supplies have increased substantially and are due to remain at much higher levels than in former years.

The national index of prices paid by farmers used in computing the parity prices for Boston milk has advanced every month except one since July 1945. Figures for the last 6 months are: October 218; November 224; December 225; January 227; February 234; and March 243. This is an increase of 7 points in February and 9 points more in March. This steady upward trend causes a similar upward trend in milk parity prices. In view of the continued increase in cost of things that farmers buy, and the additional fact that last year's milk prices failed to encourage production of an adequate supply of milk for Boston, it is a poor time at present to further lower the class I price.

In our petition of March 12, we attempted to make a rough estimate of the seasonal level of blended prices that would result in the event that the class I price were held to the end of June at the present level of $4.77 per hundredweight. Based on a class I price of $4.77 in June, a class II price of $3, and a class I use of 45 percent, the blended price in June would run around $3.77 per hundredweight. This compares with a blended price of $3.62 plus 55 cents subsidy, or a total return of $4.17 for June last year. This means that even if the present class I price were held to the end of June, returns to producers in June will be lower than a year ago by 40 cents per hundredweight in the face of higher costs of feed, of farm labor, and farm machinery and supplies. A June blended price of $3.77 is to be compared with a price of $5.53 which prevailed last November. The reduction is $1.76 and the November price is 47 percent higher than June. The differential is ample to encourage production of relatively more fall milk. We believe that any greater reduction in returns to producers for May and June in the face of continued high levels of production costs would lead to the liquidation of dairy herds and discourage production for the next short season.

On the demand side, consumer income and industrial earnings have remained at a high level in New England, and demand for fluid milk is still close to the all-time high record of last June. The number of wage earners employed in manufacturing establishments in Massachusetts in February 1947 was 16 percent larger than a year ago, average weekly earnings were up 13 percent, and total pay rolls up 32 percent. The number of wage earners in representative establishments in Massachusetts for all classes of employment combined in February 1947 was 12 percent higher than a year ago, and total wages paid showed an increase of 27 percent. These figures are based on statistics compiled and issued by the division of statistics, Massachusetts Department of Labor and Industries.

For the above reasons, we believe that there is no basis either in production or demand conditions to warrant a further reduction in the class I price in the Boston market for May and June 1947.

This petition is submitted jointly by the following producers' cooperative associations.

Very truly yours,

Bellows Falls Cooperative Creamery, Inc.; Bethel Cooperative Creamery, Inc.; Cabot Farmers' Cooperative Creamery Co., Inc. Connecticut Valley Dairy, Inc.; Grand Isle County Cooperative Creamery Association, Inc.; Granite City Cooperative Creamery Association, Inc.; Maine Dairymen's Association; Manchester Dairy System, Inc.; New England Dairies, Inc.; New England Milk Producers' Association; Northern Farms Cooperative, Inc.; St. Albans Cooperative Creamery, Inc.; Shelburne Cooperative Creamery Co.; United Farmers' Cooperative Creamery Association, Inc.; Chester W. Smith, C. W. Swonger, George H. Thompson, chairman, for the committee.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS OF IOWA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD House Concurrent Resolution 14 of the Iowa Legislature, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 14

Whereas the use of alcoholic beverages is rapidly increasing in Iowa; and

Whereas the habit-forming practice of the use of alcoholic beverages in many cases results in lowered physical and mental efficiency, broken homes, juvenile delinquency, increased crime, and general disregard for law and order, all detrimental to the general public welfare; and

Whereas the General Assembly of Iowa does recognize the inherent right and duty of government to protect and safeguard the general public welfare of its people by all proper means; and

Whereas the above habit-forming practice is constantly being stimulated and encouraged by the use of advertising and propaganda, much of which comes from out of the State and which has for its purpose financial profit rather than the general public interest and welfare; and

Whereas there has been introduced in Congress a bill by Senator ARTHUR CAPPER known as S. 265, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, which bill is now in the hands of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which Senator WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr., of Maine, is the chairman: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of Iowa hereby urges its Senators and Representatives in Congress to us their influence and support in behalf of S. 265 to the end that the general welfare of the people, and especially the youth of Iowa and of the United States, be safeguarded and protected.

Furthermore, that a copy of said resolution be sent to the United States Senators from Iowa and the United States Representatives from Iowa, to the Honorable WALLACE H. WHITE, JR., Senator from Maine, and to the Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER, Senator from Kansas.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD Senate Concurrent Resolution 23 adopted by the Legislature of the State of Iowa, relating to the recognition of the Marine Corps.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 23

Whereas there is now pending before Congress a plan calling for the unification of the armed forces of the United States; and

Whereas the said plan in one form does not make adequate specific provision for the recognition of the United States Marine Corps as a distinct unit of the armed forces of the United States; and

Whereas the Marine Corps has established itself over a period of more than a century as one of the greatest fighting organizations in the world and should be continued in its traditional status; and

Whereas the security of the United States requires the continuation of a unit versed through experience and training in the art of amphibious warfare; and

Whereas the United States Marine Corps has, since its organization in 1775, distinguished itself as the greatest and best versed amphibious force in the world: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Iowa (the house of representatives concurring):

1. That the Congress of the United States be memorialized and urged to take immediate favorable action toward specifically establishing the United States Marine Corps and making adequate provision for its continuation in any plan for unification of the armed forces of the United States.

2. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of

Representatives, and to each Iowa Senator and Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD, Senate Concurrent Resolution 22 of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, dealing with tax regulations in connection with community property and other matters.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 22

Whereas the Internal Revenue Code of the United States, as construed and administered by the Internal Revenue Bureau, permits married residents of eight States to split their income for income-tax purposes because of the existence of the community property concept in such States; and

Whereas married residents in all other States are not so permitted to split their income; and

Whereas the use of this legal fiction or rule of law, known as the community-property law, results in discrimination against the married residents of Iowa and all other similar non-community-property States, and requires such residents to bear an unjust proportion of the Federal tax burden; and

Whereas in connection with the adoption of the Revenue Act of 1947, the Congress of the United States is now considering various proposals to eliminate this unjust and unfair discrimination; and

Whereas it is the consensus of opinion of this general assembly and of the people of Iowa that the Internal Revenue Code of the United States should be amended so as to permit a husband and wife residing in non-community-property States, including Iowa, to split their income for income-tax purposes upon the same basis as is employed in community-property States, irrespective of the sources of the income: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring): That the Fifty-second General Assembly of the State of Iowa respectfully represents to the Congress of the United States that it is the opinion of the people of Iowa, as well as the opinion of this assembly, that the Internal Revenue Code of the United States should be revised and amended so as to permit a husband and wife, residents of Iowa or of any of the other non-community-property States, to split their income, and thereby eliminate the unfair and unjust discrimination now existing in favor of the married residents of States having the community-property concept;

That our Senators and Representatives in Congress are requested to exert their efforts to secure such a revision of the Internal Revenue Code;

That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to so revise the Internal Revenue Code of the United States;

That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Iowa Members of the United States Senate and the Iowa Members of the House of Representatives of Congress.

TRANSPORTATION OF ALCOHOLIC-BEVERAGE ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PETITION

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I have received from Mrs. Walter Hall, 8 Oak Street, Salem, N. J., a letter, dated April 11, 1947, the body of which reads as follows:

We are sending petitions signed by 395 voters who ask your support for Capper bill (S. 265).

Please present these petitions to the Senate and have them inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent to present the petition for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD without the signatures attached thereto.

There being no objection, the petition was received, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached thereto, as follows:

To Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES:

We respectfully request that you use your influence and vote for the passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio. The most pernicious effect of this advertising is the constant invitation and enticement to drink. The American people spent $7,770,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1946, as compared with $3,700,000,000 in 1942. During the same period there was a corresponding increase each year in crime. There is every reason why this expenditure should not be increased, but decreased.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 245. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act to provide a secondary market for farm loans made under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 101); and

S. 338. A bill to amend the Plant Quarantine Act, approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding thereto a new section; with amendments (Rept. No. 102).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 1114. A bill to amend section 26, title I, chapter 1, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 321), as amended by the act of May 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 588); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1115. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Vincent Bad Wound; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 1116. A bill to provide a limitation on the construction of family quarters for the Army and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1117. A bill to amend the act of June 22, 1936, so as to permit the construction of public works on the Great Lakes for purposes of flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. McKELLAR introduced Senate bill 1118, to repeal the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 and to provide for the exercise by the War Department of all powers and functions relating to atomic energy, which was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. J. Res. 101. Joint resolution to authorize the Postmaster General to withhold the awarding of star-route contracts for a period of 45 days; to the Committee on Civil Service.

ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to repeal the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 and to provide for the exercise by the War Department of all powers and functions relating to atomic energy.

I now read into the RECORD today an excerpt from the RECORD as it appeared in the House of Monday last. I want the Senators who are present to hear it.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

DAVID LILIENTHAL TO HIRE DAUGHTER

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a brief but important fact. Nancy Lilienthal, an active and sympathetic pro-Communist leader of the United States Workers' Local 10, in the Department of Labor, which local has been actively opposing the President's loyalty program, is about to leave the Department of Labor to work privately on confidential matters with her father, David Lilienthal, the newly appointed head of the Atomic Energy Commission.

In this connection, the following portion of an article which appeared in the February 1947 issue of Plain Talk should be of interest:

"His daughter, Nancy, an employee of the Department of Labor and a member of the United Public Workers, a Communist-dominated union, only recently displayed her strong pro-Soviet attitude. At the beginning of December 1946, at a meeting of her local, a proposal had been made to endorse the resolution of the Atlantic City CIO convention condemning communism. The fight against the endorsement was led, with success, by Nancy Lilienthal. It may be that Nancy's outlook had been conditioned not by her father, but by her mother. For Mrs. Lilienthal is reliably reported to have belonged in the middle thirties to several 'front' organizations."

I sincerely trust for the future security of the United States that President Truman will see that all employees of the Atomic Energy Commission are investigated by a competent board to determine their loyalty.

After all, it is a privilege to be an employee of our Federal Government, and not a right.

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

Mr. BUSBEY. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Cox. I would like to make the observation that the appointment of Mr. Lilienthal to the Atomic Energy Commission is one thing that only God himself can explain.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] has expired.

In the next place I want to read an article by a distinguished writer in this morning's Washington Times-Herald. I want to read it because it is of such ability and importance.

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

Yesterday's issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (p. 3351) reports a significant and penetrating indication of how the world

wags among our lawmakers on Capitol Hill in this atomic age. Representative FRED E. BUSBEY, of Chicago, Republican, and a Regular Army overseas veteran of World War I got the nod from Speaker MARTIN, of Massachusetts, and spoke as follows:

"Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a brief but important fact. Nancy Lilienthal, an active and sympathetic pro-Communist leader of the United States Workers' Local 10, in the Department of Labor, which local has been actively opposing the President's loyalty program, is about to leave the Department of Labor to work privately on confidential matters with her father, David Lilienthal, the newly appointed head of the Atomic Energy Commission.

"In this connection the following portion of an article which appeared in the February 1947 issue of Plain Talk should be of interest:

" 'His daughter, Nancy, an employee of the Department of Labor and a member of the United Public Workers, a Communist-dominated union, only recently displayed her strong pro-Soviet attitude. At the beginning of December 1946, at a meeting of her local, a proposal had been made to indorse the resolution of the Atlantic City CIO convention condemning communism.

" 'The fight against the indorsement was led, with success, by Nancy Lilienthal. It may be that Nancy's outlook had been conditioned not by her father, but by her mother. For Mrs. Lilienthal is reliably reported to have belonged in the middle thirties to several front organizations.'

"I sincerely trust for the future security of the United States that President Truman will see that all employees of the Atomic Energy Commission are investigated by a competent board to determine their loyalty.

"After all, it is a privilege to be an employee of our Federal Government, and not a right.

"Mr. Cox (Democrat, of Georgia). Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

"Mr. BUSBEY. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

"Mr. Cox. I would like to make the observation that the appointment of Mr. Lilienthal to the Atomic Energy Commission is one thing that only God Himself can explain."

The blast in the House, it may be noted, came the week after the Senate, following bitter and savage wrangling, had confirmed Lilienthal's nomination by a vote of 50 to 31. There will be more of these uproars. They will increase in violence as our relations with Moscow worsen.

The net result, damaging of course to the morale of the Nation, is that the confidence of Americans in the one man to whom is entrusted the greatest war secret in the history of the world will be sapped.

Truman, of course, pulled one of the biggest boners when he sent the name of Lilienthal to the Senate. Lilienthal wounded himself and the men who had battled with him for TVA and everything that TVA stood for, when he permitted his name to be considered.

Six months hence, it's an even money shot that Lilienthal will have quit his post or stubbornly, and, to the detriment of national security, will be defending himself against Communist charges even more violent than those already in the record.

And the most devastating, from the standpoint of the Nation, will be the charges that never get into print or never are heard over the air waves.

The national caliber of the Senators who voted against Lilienthal on the grounds that when it came to protecting the atom secret he did not have the confidence of a Nation behind him, was impressive. Party lines were kicked out the window.

Voting against Lilienthal were such Democrats as Byrd, of Virginia, and the veteran McCarran, of Nevada, lining up with Ohio's Republican Bricker, Governor Dewey's running mate in '44, and Ohio's other Presidential aspirant, Taft.

They simply didn't want Lilienthal because they figured the Nation—unjustly perhaps—was worried when it came to the atom bomb secret and had sent out the call, "Put only Americans on guard tonight."

These would have taken, gladly, a military hero—a MacArthur, Nimitz, King, Eisenhower, Bradley; or Marine Corps heroes Vandergrift or Holcomb or Spaatz of the Air Corps, or such civilians as former Senator Bob La Follette, Barney Baruch or New York's Bob Moses—but they didn't want anybody who had even been scented, however innocently, with the aroma of Moscow.

And, writes one acute and observant citizen, after watching the atom bomb hysteria on Capitol Hill:

"Truman is playing a smart game to win in 1948 but a losing game for America, which has few champions. His advisers are of two sorts: the Politburo showing him how to use world politics to win in 1948; professional military experts who lack political, historical and social knowledge or sense.

"The latter do not realize that the American war machine, actual and potential, can only destroy. It can't build. And capitalist America cannot win a war of destruction. The Pentagon crowd are dumb enough, like their German prototypes, to suppose the world's best machine can dictate a world to our liking."

I also read two editorials from the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal of April 14 and 15, 1947:

WHILE MR. LILIENTHAL ESCHEWS ANY CONNECTION WITH POLITICS, POLITICAL PLUMS SHOW STRANGE AFFINITY FOR HIM

Mr. Lilienthal's bid for the chairmanship of the Atomic Energy Commission resulted, naturally, in his qualifications coming under much greater public scrutiny than those of his colleagues.

We were greatly interested, therefore, in the views of the editor of a well-known Iowa newspaper as to the member of the Commission from that State, Mr. William W. Waymack, especially since he was nominated by the President, if not at the suggestion of Mr. Lilienthal, then at least with his consent.

Mr. Waymack has an extended record on a variety of public boards and civic agencies, as listed in Who's Who, but what interested us was the emphasis which this editor from Iowa placed on his pro-Russian bent of mind.

This, our informant asserts, is plainly shown by an almost continuous flow of editorials and articles in the Des Moines Register and Tribune favorable to Russia or in justification of one or another of the Russian attitudes or positions. Mr. Waymack has for many years occupied a powerful position in the editorial councils of the Des Moines newspaper and, presumably, its affiliated publications, one of which is Look. That magazine, some readers will recall, sponsored and of course financed the well-advertised safari of Elliott Roosevelt to the Kremlin, a journey which was productive of a considerable controversy as to the extent to which Elliott had belittled the foreign policies of his own country.

We would not be misunderstood. We do not assert, nor did our informant charge, that Mr. Waymack, as Chairman Lilienthal's colleague, is a Communist or that his essential loyalty to his own country is questioned. What our informant believed, and what will occur to most of us, is that the Commissioner has that soft viewpoint toward Russia and almost necessarily toward communism that was objected to by many Senators in Mr. Lilienthal and is regarded by many of us as a threat to national security when found in men in high places.

In this connection it will also be noted that the selection of Mr. Waymack as a nominee to the Commission marked another of those astute political moves by which Mr. Lilienthal has won to a position of international prominence. (We have asserted repeatedly that with the single exception of the late Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Lilienthal is the greatest politician of our age.)

Mr. Waymack, as noted, is an outstanding Iowan. So, too, by a strange coincidence, is Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, formerly Governor of Iowa and chairman of the Senate Atomic Energy Committee before which the Lilienthal hearings were held. We do not suggest that Senator HICKENLOOPER got his chairmanship as a result of Mr. Waymack's aspirations to the AEC, but it is a definite probability that Mr. Waymack got his nomination on the ground that Senator HICKENLOOPER would almost certainly be friendly to Lilienthal because of his previous association with Waymack back in Iowa.

Nor did Mr. Waymack have to rely on pure friendship or the fact he and the Senator are from the same State. Senator HICKENLOOPER would naturally have been predisposed toward Mr. Waymack, not primarily as the candidate of Mr. Lilienthal but of the Des Moines Register and Tribune, which is a monopolistic newspaper combination in position to be remarkably helpful to any political candidate, including one running for the Senate.

The chain of mutual aid could be outlined, therefore, thus:

If Lilienthal placed Waymack on this important board, Waymack was in position to insure a warm reception from HICKENLOOPER, who in turn could expect to command the cordial support of the Des Moines papers. It's quite a pretty piece of political planning, although, as Mr. Lilienthal says, he will have nothing to do with politics.

These are things that can't be proved. They would be dismissed by Mr. Lilienthal as pure speculation. Nonetheless, the story is there in the pattern of human and political relationships for anyone to read who cares to.

ASSOCIATED PRESS ON SUNDAY OFFERED TYPICAL EXAMPLE OF PROPAGANDA TECHNIQUES OF ALL FEDERAL AGENCIES

On Sunday the Knoxville Journal published a piece of TVA propaganda which provides a typical example of the way in which the agency, with the cooperation of not only the Associated Press but other national press associations, does a continuous selling job on the American people.

The story started out with a recital of observations on TVA operation by the General Accounting Office which were, in themselves, legitimate, though the same press association had carried a straight news story on the GAO report one day last week.

Reading down a few paragraphs, however, it became clear that the design of the piece was twofold, first, to emphasize what the TVA cult believed to be favorable in the report and, second, to hand out some propaganda against several recommendations of the GAO which the same cult believes would reduce TVA's independence of Congress.

In order to accomplish this result, Associated Press editors permitted their writer to introduce that ubiquitous character known as "a Senate friend of TVA—who asked that his name not be used—" and from the moment he entered the story the old propaganda blowgun really got a working out. This technique, in a press service so notoriously insistent upon "seeing the body" before permitting a factual story to be carried on its wires, occurs to anyone who analyzes it as being most remarkable. What it really shows is the efficiency with which the TVA "liberals" and those employed by the AP and other press associations work in selling any program of mutual interest. The Associated

Press would definitely, and properly, decline to carry a story reporting the death of this "Senate friend" unless an authorized authority, such as the police, could be quoted, yet its editors have no hesitancy in feeding through the machines propaganda that might easily contribute to national consequences much more serious, in the eyes of some of us at least, than the death of old "Senate friend."

So much for the technique of propaganda, this example of which is worth the study of anybody interested in this sort of thing. There was one opinion expressed by the "Senate friend" that is good enough, from a standpoint of being 14-carat fallacy, which certainly deserves comment here and preservation in anybody's album of remarkable viewpoints.

The General Accounting Office's report included the recommendation that follows:

That TVA be required to pay 2½ percent interest on the entire Government investment in its power activities.

This would mean an interest charge of ten millions per year on the Authority's allocation for power from the total investment since its establishment. The news story under discussion forecast a total repayment by June 30 of thirty millions since 1933.

What was the attitude of "Senate friend" toward the recommendation that TVA pay interest on its investment? This is one for the book. He is quoted in the second person as follows:

"The Senator commented that the Government—under such arrangement—would be paying interest to itself since TVA is entirely Government-owned and operated."

We submit that no man with little enough understanding to make a statement like that has any right to a seat in the Senate, much less to be quoted anonymously by a great news service such as the Associated Press.

"The Government would be paying interest to itself," he says.

And where does the Government get this money? We didn't know our Government, or any other Government for that matter, had any money. Of course, it can get money, but by only one method—that is taxing the people. When "Senate friend," therefore, or any other advocate of socializing the country talks about the Government's money, you simply have to know that he's talking about the tax money in the taxpayer's pocket.

In the present instance, "Senate friend" is simply ignoring the fact that while TVA is paying no interest to the Government, the Government in turn is paying interest on the more than $700,000,000 borrowed from the people and invested in TVA.

One of the troubles with the country right now is the fact that so many people, including old "Senate friend" subscribe to the fallacy that so long as the Government is spending money nothing really costs anything. This is a favorite New Deal theory, heavily sold by Roosevelt and his associates, that it makes no difference what the Government owes because we simply owe ourselves. It is because so many legislators share "Senate friend's" belief that the President had the nerve to propose a budget of $37,000,000,000, and it is also because of this belief that Americans are paying the highest peacetime taxes in history.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two radio broadcasts on the subject of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal by Fulton Lewis—one April 3 and the other April 4, 1947.

There being no objection, the radio broadcasts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULTON LEWIS' RADIO BROADCAST, THURSDAY, APRIL 3, 1947

The Senate late this afternoon voted down the first open attempt to block the nomination of Mr. David E. Lilienthal by a vote of 52 to 38. It was a motion by Senator BRICKER, of Ohio, to send the Lilienthal nomination back to committee for further consideration, and presumably it was a test of present Senate strength.

Eighteen Republicans voted with 34 Democrats to support Mr. Lilienthal, while 7 Democrats and 31 Republicans voted against him. If the present balance of votes remains intact, it means that the Lilienthal nomination wil be approved by the Senate when the final show-down comes, possibly some time next week.

In the meantime, however, I promised you last night that beginning this evening I would try to present to you some facts about Mr. Lilienthal's career with the Tennessee Valley Authority so that you might have something more than the idle generalities that are current as a basis for making up your own mind on the subject of his desirability for this job; and having so promised, we'll go through with it, in spite of the Senate action this afternoon. And, I might add, because of the nature of this report tonight, it will not be interrupted for any middle announcement.

In the course of this discussion of Mr. Lilienthal's nomination there have been many charges hurled against him and many defenses presented on his side. As I observed to you last night, he has been charged with being a Communist or a Communist sympathizer, on the one hand, and he has been championed as a great and able administrator who has done a wonderful job of running the Tennessee Valley Authority, on the other hand, and, frankly, there has been an abysmal lack of proof or substantiation in support of either declaration.

Mr. Lilienthal has been nominated by President Truman as head of the Atomic Energy Control Commission, a job in which he will hold tremendous power over the future welfare and the future economics and the future safety of the United States. The whole atomic-energy question will be in the hands of that Commission—the military, the commercial, the production, the policy to be followed. That Commission will have complete control, and because of the tremendous future implications, these discussions in Congress over Mr. Lilienthal have taken place. It becomes a matter of real importance what sort of a person he is; what are his philosophies of government, and economics, and society, and politics. It is not merely a matter of his alleged ability as Administrator of the TVA; it also is a matter of how he thinks and what he thinks. Is he a part of the reactionary clique which believes that labor should be exploited like slaves for the enrichment of a few? Is he a middle-of-the-road, normal American, who believes in the profit motive and free enterprise and the American way of doing business as we have always known it as a nation? Or, is he a member of the clique on the left, which believes in Government ownership and paternalism, and the socialization of industry—the group that is opposed to private enterprise and disapproves of the profit of the profit system which we have always had, and would like to change that?

Those are three different points of view, and it's a matter of interest, certainly, just where Mr. Lilienthal stands, as between those points of view, when it comes to his qualifications and his desirability, as the chairman of this Commission for the Control of Atomic Energy, which may revolutionize the world of tomorrow, or may destroy the world of tomorrow. It's a matter of importance just what his philosophies are, along those lines.

As to whether Mr. Lilienthal really did or did not do a great job, as head of the TVA, we can leave that to some other discussion. There is a wide division of opinion on the subject, in the public mind. Mr. Lilienthal was given the job of running a Government hydroelectric power project in Tennessee, which was to produce electricity for the public at a cheaper rate than the private concerns which had been producing that electricity, and it is on that score that the claim is made that he did a great job. There have been reductions in the electric power rates in the area served by TVA, that is true. Whether the savings in those electricity bills is enough to justify the $733,000,000 worth of appropriations and advances which Mr. Lilienthal has gotten from the Federal Treasury, with a total of $22,000,000 paid back into the Treasury by TVA as the Government's return, is a question that hardly can be settled in this broadcast here tonight, and I'm not going to try. That is a net investment of about $711,000,000, and page 1006 of the President's Budget for the present year requests an appropriation of another $27,000,000 to finance the TVA for the coming year.

There are side activities of the TVA however, in which I think you may be interested, and about which I want to report to you tonight. Sentor WILLIAMS, of Delaware, has mentioned some of these activities, and on the strength of what he said, I have done some further investigations; and inasmuch as they are activities about which I'm sure that you the public are totally unaware, they seem to be worth attention.

And everything I tell you from here on—except where I specifically state otherwise—is taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or the President's own budget message to Congress, or official reports of the Comptroller General of the United States, or the official reports of the TVA itself.

In 1934, the records show, Mr. Lilienthal and his two fellow members of the Tennessee Valley Authority board, Mr. Arthur E. Morgan and Mr. Harcourt Morgan, undertook to set up a cooperative known as the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, with a charter under the laws of the State of Tennessee.

President Truman states in his budget message—and it is also stated in others of these documents—that the three individuals acted as private citizens in setting up this organization, although the corporation was listed as belonging to the United States Government. It was financed by a grant of $300,000 in Government relief funds, provided by the old FERA, the Federal Emergency Relief Administration under Mr. Harry Hopkins, $1,000 of which was for capital stock all of which was owned by the Federal Government, and the other $299,000 being listed as capital surplus.

Despite the fact that it was owned by the United States Government, however, the charter provided that Mr. Lilienthal and the two Morgans were to have control over it. In fact, the charter went so far as to state that the board of directors shall exercise all of the powers of the corporation, and shall reappoint themselves or their successors, as directors.

This corporation still is in existence, and President Truman made it the subject of a special mention in his annual budget message to Congress on page 997. In fact, he asked for an appropriation of $2,500 for the coming fiscal year to pay the administrative expenses of it.

The $300,000 of original capital now has dwindled to $186,000 according to the Budget figures.

The charter shows, and it is set forth elsewhere in these documents, that the purpose of the TVAC, thus established by Mr. Lilienthal, was to promote the organization of cooperatives in the Tennessee Valley area; and the charter gives the TVAC the authority to engage in any and every conceivable form of business or business enterprise, and to do business not only in the Tennessee Valley area, or in the United States, but in any other countries of the world.

Senator WILLIAMS told the Senate that TVA itself is sponsoring some 175 cooperatives in that area, and it is a matter of record in various places that the TVAC—this Government-owned cooperative started by Mr. Lilienthal—actually organized at least nine of them, and perhaps many more. These nine are the only ones of which there is any particular record.

The record also shows that when the Comptroller General of the United States attempted to make an audit of the books of the TVAC, he received a letter from the TVAC refusing to permit him to do so. I quote the letter:

"Because of the fact that these funds were granted by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration to the State of Tennessee, and by the State of Tennessee to the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, and because no money has been put into the organization directly by the United States, we feel that this organization is not subject to the usual regulations affecting Government departments."

According to Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan, the records show that Mr. Lilienthal and the Morgans actually initiated the request by the State of Tennessee for the $300,000 of relief money for the purpose of setting up this cooperative and of course the cooperative is a Government-owned corporation, with a budget item requested in appropriation bills, the Treasury Department admitting that it holds the complete stock in this TVAC.

On page 997 of the President annual budget message to Congress, delivered in January, is the following sentence—and remember, this is the President of the United States speaking:

"No act of Congress, or Executive order, or Federal statute specifically authorized the creation of the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc."

The Comptroller General of the United States, in a report last May 1, made the same identical statement in the same words.

Now, to sum up what we have thus far:

We have Mr. Lilienthal and the two Morgans, as private citizens, setting up this Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives financed with $300,000 of Government relief funds, to sponsor the formation of other cooperatives in the Tennessee Valley area, wherein 175 have sprung up which are directly sponsored by the TVA itself or the TVAC; the control of that corporation, although the Government owns it and although Congress is being asked to appropriate money to pay its expenses of operation, is entirely and completely in the control of Mr. Lilienthal and the two Morgans, or those other private individuals to whom, under the charter, they have assigned their powers of control. The Comptroller General is told that he cannot go into the books of the cooperative, although the Government owns it; and both the President of the United States and the Comptroller General say that there is no act of Congress, no statute, and no Executive order that ever specifically authorized the setting up of this Government-owned but privately controlled cooperative.

Now, that is about all we have time for tonight. We'll pick up again tomorrow night, with some information on some of these cooperatives which have been organized under the tender sponsorship of Mr. Lilienthal and his TVA and his TVAC. Of course, the simple fact is that the promoting of cooperatives is not in the slightest objectionable in itself. It all depends on what these cooperatives are, that they have been set up, whether they are good or bad ones; if they're good, that is fine, if they're not, that's something else.

It all depends on how they are operating in competition with private enterprise; what the TVA, under Mr. Lilienthal, was doing with them, in their competition with private enterprise. And these little details, we'll get into tomorrow evening.

FULTON LEWIS' RADIO BROADCAST, FRIDAY, APRIL 4, 1947

Tonight, ladies and gentlemen, I want to pick up where I left off last night, in reporting to you some of the activities and policies of Mr. David E. Lilienthal, in his operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority—the famous TVA.

As I told you last night, in my introduction to these reports, there has been bitter controversy in the Senate, in debate on Mr. Lilienthal's nomination as head of the Atomic Energy Control Commission, as to just what he stands for, and just what his political and social philosophies are. On the one hand he has been called a Communist; on the other, he is acclaimed as having done a great job as TVA Administrator—and no one seems to have produced any supporting evidence on either side of the picture. Therefore, it seems helpful to get a little factual information, and that's the reason for this broadcast.

As I pointed out to you before, the average individual seems to have a conception of TVA as a Government power project designed to give cheaper electricity to the people of the TVA area. Whether it actually has succeeded in doing that is a very controversial question, but what the public does not seem to know is that there are a great many other activities which the TVA and Mr. Lilienthal personally conducted along with the TVA power project which throw some light on the mental and philosophical approach of this very controversial gentleman.

Last night I reported to you on the subject of an organization which Mr. Lilienthal and his two fellow members of the TVA organized with Government money. To recapitulate briefly, this was what we found:

In January 1934, Mr. Lilienthal and his two fellow members of the TVA Board set up a cooperative corporation under the laws of the State of Tennessee, called the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives—the avowed purpose of which was to promote the organization of various localized cooperatives throughout the Tennessee Valley area. It was a sort of master cooperative which could do business in any line of business or industry anywhere in the United States or any country in the world, and which could finance, by gifts or loans, these local cooperatives, after they were organized.

The President of the United States and the Comptroller General and the Attorney General and the legal adviser for the TVA itself are on the record as stating that there is no act of Congress, statute, or Executive order authorizing the setting up of this Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives.

The record shows that the cooperative is 100-percent owned by the United States Government, $300,000 of Federal relief money having been given to it in 1934 to finance it. Despite the fact that it is wholly owned by the United States Government, the charter provided that it was to be permanently controlled by Mr. Lilienthal and the two Morgans as individuals—they being instructed to reappoint themselves to the board of directors, or to reappoint such substitutes as they might see fit.

The record shows that in spite of the fact that the TVAC was wholly owned by the United States Government, it refused to permit its books to be audited by the Comptroller General of the United States until Congressional legislation was enacted, requiring that such audits be made. The present audit, contained in President Truman's budget message to Congress for this year, shows that the $300,000 of original funds now has dwindled to $186,000, and the President's budget requests an appropriation from the Treasury of $2,500 for operating expenses for the coming year.

Now, in addition to this super cooperative, the annual reports of the TVA and other records show that the TVA itself, as such, has also been active in the promotion of cooperatives. In fact, I might read you a line or two from the last annual report of the TVA:

"In the interests of carrying out the broad objectives or resource development, the TVA, through a small staff, has encouraged the activities of cooperating associations. Cooperatives are an important factor in attaining, at a minimum of cost, the application of soil minerals and readjusted farming methods, in order that the broad objectives of land and water conservation may be attained."

As a matter of fact, the Comptroller General's reports show that TVA actually gave to this TVAC—this super cooperative, some $58,000 in just two years—in addition to the original three hundred thousand which that outfit got from relief money. Also, they provided personnel to help operate the TVAC. The record also shows that this Tennessee Valley Authority had so-called farm extension workers all through the areas of the Tennessee Valley watershed, helping in the cooperative movement.

So, to boil it down to a simple proposition, aside from the electricity producing function of TVA, it was busily engaged under Mr. Lilienthal in the promotion of Cooperatives—not only directly, but also through the super-cooperative, the TVAC, which Mr. Lilienthal and his two companions had set up.

The fact is that this same report by the TVA itself boasts that many of the cooperative groups which it spawned, have incorporated as cooperatives, and "have expanded into other activities as needed." It then goes on to say that as of last year, an incomplete survey showed that TVA has relationships with some 175 of these organizations.

Now, in and of itself, the promoting and sponsoring of 175 or more cooperatives in a given area is not in the silghtest objectionable; in fact, it may be a very commendable accomplishment. There is nothing wrong with cooperatives, as such, as I've called to your attention over this microphone before. The question is, what sort of cooperatives they were—whether they were good ones or bad ones—whether they have an unfair advantage over the private enterprise that exists in that particular area and is paying the taxes which provide the appropriations by Congress, to keep Mr. Lilienthal's TVA in operation. This year, TVA is requesting an appropriation of 27 million dollars.

Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, told the Senate a week ago that he had personally investigated four of them, picked at random, without the slightest advance knowledge of any details about any of the four. He told the Senate that he found that in three cases of the four, the incorporators were not backward farmers in the Tennessee Valley area, but actually were employees of the TVA drawing regular salaries from the TVA.

But go back to the TVA's own annual report for this year. By way of giving an example of what has been done in this field of organizing cooperatives, the report has the subtitle, "Example in Virginia," and it explains that the name of this organization is the Southwest Virginia Cooperative, which is a federation of local county cooperatives.

The report says that the cooperative handled certain quantities of fertilizer, and that at the close of the first year, it is "laying plans to extend its activities to the handling of feed and is considering other possible activities for the benefit of its members."

Now, in the course of trying to get to the grass roots of Mr. Lilienthal's cooperatives, and what sort of cooperatives they are and how they function, I wanted to trace down a few individual cases, and inasmuch as this is the example that the TVA itself offers as its prize exhibit, I thought the fairest and simplest thing to do was to look into this one. Therefore I called the head of the Southwest Virginia Cooperative, the headquarters of which are at Lebanon, Va.—his name is Bryce Connally—and I interviewed him. I have a verbatim record of that interview; so we'll let him tell the story.

He said that he is a sort of wholesale cooperative; he has 11 members, each of them a local county cooperative in southwest Virginia, and they are the sole stockholders, each having put in $1,000 capital.

He said that he buys fertilizer from the TVA and from other sources, and he sells it to the 11 local cooperatives which are his members, and they, in turn, sell it to the farmers.

He said that his cooperative made a little money last year—that the difference between what he paid for the fertilizer and the amount he received for it from the local distributors, less, of course, his expenses of operation—amounted to about $7,800. Please remember that figure—$7,800.

Now, Mr. Connally revealed that in addition to that regular business as a sort of wholesaler of fertilizer, his cooperative also receives free fertilizer from the TVA, which it passes along to the local member cooperatives, which they in turn pass along to the farmers. Mr. Connally's organization gets 50 cents for each ton of fertilizer so handled, and the local distributing cooperatives get an additional dollar. The farmer gets the fertilizer for $1.50, plus shipping costs from TVA's fertilizer plant, which stands the farmer a total of approximately $5 to $6 a ton. The same grade of fertilizer, commercially, costs the farmer $54 a ton, delivered.

I asked Mr. Connally how much of this free fertilizer he has handled from TVA as compared with the fertilizer he has bought from TVA and he said that his cooperative has handled about 2,200 tons of this TVA fertilizer for which they have paid the commercial price, and they have received and distributed something in excess of 3,400 tons of the free fertilizer.

The records introduced in the Senate show that last year the TVA gave away more than $2,000,000 worth of this particular fertilizer to farmers throughout the TVA area through these cooperatives on the grounds of tests and experimentations. The particular fertilizer in question has been in standard production and use by American farmers since 1907.

Getting back to the $7,800 which Mr. Connally's cooperative had on hand at the end of last year's operation—I asked him whether any corporation income tax had been paid on that. His reply was that no income tax has been paid; that his organization has made an application for exemption from corporation income tax on the basis that they are a cooperative.

The United States Treasury states that the corporation income tax on $7,800 profits for a given year would be approximately $1,600.

Mr. Connally said that various private enterprise distributors of fertilizer were doing business in the same area, in which his cooperative has been functioning, and was kind enough to give me the names of some of them. I talked, among other people, to a Mr. Duncan, of Chillhowie, Va., who is in charge of the Vance Supply Co. fertilizer plant there. He said that in times of competition it would be entirely impossible to compete with the operations of this southwestern cooperative with their free fertilizer, and that his company last year, a rather large company that has been long in business, instead of paying no income tax, made a profit of about $45,000, of which it paid $26,000 in taxes to the Government.

That, of course, is the story of just one of these 175 cooperatives which Mr. Lilienthal's operation has sponsored, but it is the story of the one he selected as the sample in his annual report, and it's the story as told by the head of that cooperative himself.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the bill to repeal the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 and to restore the atomic energy proposal to the War Department of the Government, I have just introduced.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1118) to repeal the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 and to provide for the exercise by the War Department of all powers and functions relating to atomic energy, introduced by Mr. McKELLAR, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized and directed to transfer to the War Department at the earliest possible date all property heretofore transferred to the Atomic Energy Commission and all other property of the Atomic Energy Commission, including all books, records, documents, papers, and all written or printed matter of every kind, nature, and description in the files of such Commission.

SEC. 3. The War Department shall administer the property transferred to it pursuant to this act and, for such purposes, shall have all the powers and duties with respect to the development and production of military weapons utilizing fissionable material or atomic energy, and with respect to the maintenance of secrecy concerning the details of such weapons and the materials and processes utilized in the development and production thereof, which it had prior to the enactment of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of War is authorized and directed to report to the Congress at the earliest practicable date concerning plans for the use and control of such materials and processes developed in connection with the production of military weapons utilizing fissionable material or atomic energy as may be used for civilian purposes.

SEC. 5. Any person who shall disclose or cause the disclosure, or who shall conspire with any person to disclose or cause the disclosure, directly or indirectly, of any information of any kind which has not prior to the date of enactment of this act been made available to the public concerning the production of fissionable materials or any detail of any military weapon utilizing fissionable materials or atomic energy or of the development, manufacture, or production of any such military weapon, to any person not entitled to receive such information, shall be guilty of a capital offense and upon conviction thereof shall be sentenced to death by hanging.

SEC. 6. The unexpended balances of any funds heretofore made available to the Atomic Energy Commission are hereby transferred to and shall be available to the War Department in carrying out its functions under this act, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be necessary for such purposes.

REDUCTION OF INCOME TAX—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income-tax payments, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO FISCAL MATTERS—AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 61) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to fiscal matters, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MURRAY submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE ON LABOR LEGISLATION

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Senator KILGORE regarding proposed labor legislation, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTRAST BETWEEN DEMOCRACY AND COMMUNISM—ARTICLE FROM LABOR'S MONTHLY SURVEY

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article presenting the way of life in a democracy as contrasted with the way of life of communism, from the March-April issue of Labor's Monthly Survey, which appears in the Appendix.]

CARE OF THE BLIND IN PENNSYLVANIA

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by O. E. Day, chief, State Council for the Blind, Department of Welfare of Pennsylvania, and a statement by Miss S. M. R. O'Hara, dealing with the care of the blind in Pennsylvania, which appear in the Appendix.]

JEFFERSON'S AUTHORSHIP OF DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Julian P. Boyd, librarian of Princeton University, relating to the discovery of a fragment of Jefferson's text of the Declaration of Independence, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. VANDENBERG'S ROLE—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Evening Star entitled "Mr. VANDENBERG'S Role," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEWSPRINT SHORTAGE—EDITORIAL FROM THE RED OAK (IOWA) EXPRESS

[Mr. WILSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Freedom Depends on Paper," from the Red Oak (Iowa) Express, which appears in the Appendix.]

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Before the Senator from Illinois proceeds, let the Chair state the parliamentary situation. The pending question is a series of 12 amendments offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON],

which, by order of the Senate, will be considered en bloc. Therefore the pending question is the block of amendments offered by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, having seen first hand the destruction wrought by World War I, having visited England, France, Belgium, and Germany immediately before and after the conclusion of World War II, and having carefully examined several of the concentration camps, having had first-hand reports and visual evidence of the destruction in other parts of the world caused by World War II, I am fully conscious of the great need for assistance to unfortunate peoples throughout the world.

None of the nations, according to authentic report, suffered more in physical and mental anguish than did the little country of Greece, and my sympathies go out to the people of Greece in this, their great hour of need.

I am not unlike the vast majority of the American people in this regard. Historically, throughout more than a century and a half of our progress, we have proved to be the most generous, charitable, and kind-hearted people on the face of the earth. No greater demonstration of this generosity has come to my personal attention than our conduct at the close of World War I.

We had just conquered the German armies in the field, and immediately the American people contributed millions of dollars' worth of food and clothing, and even shipped boatloads of live cattle into the heart of Germany to sustain and support the bodies of the undernourished children of the soldiers of the army we had just brought to its knees. At the same time, the American people raised millions of dollars and sent clothing and food to the distressed and starving children of Armenia who had been the tragic victims of the vicious atrocities of another enemy in that war—Turkey.

We are presently sending food and supplies to the heart of the nations we have recently conquered in World War II. To this noble purpose, I fully subscribe. The fact is that there are more people hungry, starving, suffering without clothing and homes; there is more hate, suspicion, and fear throughout the world at this very hour than at any other period in the history of mankind. The heart of America goes out to these distressed people of the earth. But the cold fact also is that the full production of our fields and factories, if it were devoted in its entirety, could not reach them all nor materially eliminate their pain and suffering.

The proposition presently before the Congress of the United States is in part the supplying of necessities of life and the essentials of life to help rehabilitate the ancient, historic, and heroic people of Greece. To that endeavor, I fully subscribe. But that is not all, nor in my judgment is it even the larger part, of the program to which we are asked to give our complete approval. We are asked to send not only food and supplies, but arms and military and civilian missions to build up the armed strength of both Greece and Turkey, and to do this as the sole responsibility of the United States of America. This is truly a new course in the history of America's foreign endeavor. It is being sold to the American people as a new emotional crisis, and I know of no other policy that is capable of more mischief than for us, the greatest free country in the world, to undertake this program alone.

I realize full well that when I oppose this gigantic, initial, and individual undertaking on the part of the United States, I lay myself open, and will be subjected to, the same criticism that I received when I objected to the pouring out of American arms to the Soviet Union during the war, without having some definite evidence of their intent and desire to subscribe to some of the ideals of free people. I realize I will be subject to the same criticism that I was subjected to when I objected to the pouring out of American relief supplies under the so-called UNRRA, without some assurance that the American people were not dissipating their wealth, food, and sustenance, to be used to further the cause of communism throughout the world. I realize I will be subjected to the criticism of those who will charge that my action now is an evidence of my unwillingness to oppose communism.

Mr. President, I oppose communism with all my heart. I recognize the right of the Russian people to follow communism, if they so desire, within their own territorial limitations. I object to their imposing it on other people, or expanding their philosophy in our own country. I objected to its expansion with our help by allowing their agents to distribute our relief to advance their cause throughout the world. I objected to the infiltration of Communist left-wing alien-minded individuals into the departments, agencies, and bureaus of the Government of the United States, prior to and during the recent war. I objected when the rule was changed, at the outbreak of this war, whereby men with former Communist affiliations were allowed to become commissioned officers in the Army of the United States. I was criticized for my objections then. I continue to oppose communism with all my heart.

Realizing, however, that the few men in charge of our National Government and its foreign policy were actually appeasing and aiding communism at home and abroad, throughout the war and afterward, I was desperately anxious to find some means of arriving at a peace based upon justice as a reward for the terrific suffering and sacrifice of the American people. I am one who voted with all good faith for the establishment of the United Nations organization. I believed that, even if in its formative stages it was to be no more than the meeting ground to organize the conscience of the world, it might serve that purpose. Wanting to face the facts, I was doubtful as to the possibility of ever bringing the Communists of the world into any general decent understanding, but I felt that this was the organization through which we might ferret out, expose, and demonstrate their obstinate determination never to cooperate, and thereby mobilize through that institution those nations who would band together to advance the cause of peace and the rights of minorities for the liberty-loving people of the world.

I sincerely believe that it was a grave mistake for the leaders of our Nation, being in possession of all the facts, to delay bringing this matter to the attention of the United Nations, and then to use that delay as an excuse for taking this desperately bold step as an emergency measure in a crisis that may lead either to war or to the ultimate bankruptcy of our country. Mr. President, I believe that the steps proposed may provide the spark that will lead us into the war which the proponents wish to prevent. With all my heart I want peace based upon justice. I know of no authentic veteran who does not want peace based upon justice.

I objected during the recent war to the constant misleading statements made to the American people that we were then pouring out our resources, finances, and substance to support democratic governments, when, in fact, many of the governments we assisted had no element of democracy in their being. I object now to calling Greece a democratic country, when everyone knows that Greece is ruled by a corrupt royal regime. I object to having the American people told now that we are supporting a democratic country when we support Turkey, which actually is a tyrannical dictatorship, one which enriched itself by trade and other alliances with our enemies until the very last hour of the recent war.

I firmly believe that the step now proposed is only the first step, and that it will start a chain reaction that will drag us into constant conflicts around the globe.

During the recent war we sent our guns, planes, and military equipment to Russia to the tune of $11,000,000,000, and to Yugoslavia. Even the Greek guerrillas, whom we propose to stop today, are in large part armed with American weapons. We propose now to send other American weapons to compete with American weapons already there. We propose to send American weapons into Turkey to be used with weapons which Turkey produced and designed for Germany, against which we fought during the war, with no assurance based upon Turkey's history that she is a dependable ally for the future. I object to calling these grants of American weapons and money loans, for they will in no sense be considered as loans and will never be repaid.

We are already being told that the next step is to furnish $600,000,000 to Korea. We will send American weapons, supplies, and personnel into Austria; then will come Italy, China, France, and Britain again. We will take over the policing of the Adriatic, the Aegean, the Black, and the Mediterranean Seas. Where that will lead America in expenditure and draining of American resources and funds no man can tell. To pretend that we are not picking up the defense of the life line and the age-old British Empire's frontiers to maintain for all future time does not change the fact that that is exactly what we are proposing to do. I object to having the American people take over the British program of suppression around the world.

To say that the United Nations can, by a vote, ask us to withdraw the aid we now propose to give is a pious hope, for so long as the members of the United Nations know that it is our established general policy to supply arms, money, and military missions throughout the world to nations who cry for help, they will not shoot Santa Claus, and they will never ask us to withdraw. Nor will the people of Greece and Turkey ask us to withdraw until they decide to take a course of their own; and then, having weakened ourselves, we may find it necessary to send other American missions and arms to meet the American arms which it is now proposed to distribute throughout the world.

Different persons arrive at somewhat the same conclusions for different reasons. There will be and are some who oppose the proposed program for reasons with which I totally disagree. I want no truck with, or part of, communism; but I do not believe that we can stop it with American dollars abroad when we know it has infiltrated even into the armed services of our own country, and into the bureaus, departments, and agencies of our American Government. American dollars will not stop such insidious infiltration or the expansion of communism abroad. In this initial step it is proposed to send dollars and supplement them with military missions. When the presence of our military missions is challenged, then we must either retreat or supplement them with troops. How many combat fronts American will be called upon to defend across the face of the earth as a result of this action, no one can now predict. We may have countless Pearl Harbors and subsequent tragic experiences around the world like the ones at Bataan and Corregidor.

I am ready and willing to vote to send supplies, surplus food, and clothing, and any reasonable amount of financial help to any people who will strive to guarantee the independence of individual nations who recognize and defend human rights and personal freedoms, but I do not believe in draining the resources of the American Nation and her people to maintain dictatorial tyrannies, socialistic governments, or monarchies which oppress their people and do not guarantee to join us in advancing the freedoms we wish so much to defend.

To supply arms and military missions, to create power blocks of various dictatorial governments around the world, denies the historic ideals that have guided our destiny thus far and still are the hope of the human race.

I still believe that the conscience of mankind could be mobilized through the mechanism set up in the United Nations. At least, we would then know which countries are willing to join us now in all-out participation to achieve and maintain the high ideals we so tenaciously support.

It has been said and will continue to be said that any vote on this measure except a vote "yea" will weaken the hand of the President of the United States. I remind the Senate that the same argument was used when another President of the United States, by secret agreements, was giving the Soviet Government nine-tenths of the Balkans, the Kurile Islands, Dairen, Port Arthur, and even agreed to give them $20,000,000,000 worth of reparations from Germany. That same argument was used when another President was agreeing with the Soviet Government to the division of little Poland, and at the same time failing to protest Russia's expansion by complete subjugation of the Baltic States.

When the Congress of the United States, after full discussions, has by vote adopted a national policy, I shall support my country's policy and program, but my understanding of true representative government is that men should vote their convictions based upon the yardstick of what is good for their country. We have already supplied billions of dollars' worth of American arms and they are scattered at this hour throughout the world. We have already burdened the future of America and her people with a debt of over $258,000,000,000. Now, if we, in addition, start this global spending and meddling, we will not be able to reduce the cost of our Government; we will not be able to save on military and naval expenditures, for we simply cannot shake our fist at people all over the world and not be prepared to back it up. Once we commit the American people to a program of spending America's millions and billions all over the world, it will be doubly hard to deny any demand for ever-increased appropriations at home.

Any pretense of substantially reducing the taxes of our American people will prove to be a delusion, for while we may effect a reduction of taxes this year, the necessities of tomorrow caused by this action will quickly wipe out any reduction presently made.

Mr. President, I firmly believe we should start a genuine fight against the expansion of communism by an immediate relentless search for, and elimination of, the Communist element embedded within our own Government, its departments, agencies, and bureaus.

I believe we should, through the facilities of the United Nations organization, establish definitely which of the countries of the earth will participate in a joint undertaking to stop the cruel expansion of communism elsewhere.

I repeat, I believe that the policy of undertaking this gigantic program alone may do for us what the policing of the world did for the British Empire. It may very easily ultimately lead us to war on countless fronts and ultimately lead us to bankruptcy and the international bread line. Not even the most ardent advocate of the proposed program can guarantee that this will not be the ultimate end.

I believe firmly that the hope of those who love liberty, the freedom of worship, and representative government depends upon our maintaining a strong and solvent America. I believe that it is the duty of elected representatives of the people to cast their vote solely for those things which they believe will contribute to the future strength and solvency of America.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I noted in the press this morning that there has been a renewal of the proposal to loan a billion dollars to Russia. What would be the Senator's attitude toward such a loan? Would he oppose it, together with the other loans which have been suggested? I do not want to ask him whether he would favor loaning to both sides of a controversy, but that is what it seemed to me to amount to.

Mr. BROOKS. To answer the Senator's question, I do not know how authentic the report is. When we were appeasing Russia, when we were giving her everything she wanted during and after the war, there was a good deal of talk about advancing her a loan of $1,000,000,000. I may be wrong, but I think it was finally admitted by the State Department that we had advanced it, but it was held in abeyance. To me it would seem stupid and silly to loan another billion dollars to Russia, when we are starting out now to prevent Russia from expanding communism. But that is what we did before. We built her up. We helped to make Russia the colossus of Europe. There was a time when we had an air power which was greater than any air power in the world, when we had a Navy which was greater than that of the combined naval powers of the world, and we had the fastest, hardest-striking army in the world. That was the time to have prevented the expansion of Russia and to have refused her the right to annex the Baltic States and to dominate and control the Balkans. Now with our Army and our Navy demobilized, we must start from scratch; we must begin where we started before. We are saying we will not send troops; that is not contemplated now. Troops were not contemplated when we started lend-lease shipments, as the Senators knows. The same words were used then.

I cannot say where this program will lead unless Russia backs away; and if she backs away she will advance at some other point. If we start this program with Greece and with Turkey we will have to extend greater help to Austria, to Italy, to France, to Great Britain, and to Korea and China. I do not think the resources of America can stop communism as such, and I do not think we can raise an army sufficiently large to stop it as such if Russia decides to move. If our men were there they might be in the position they were in at Bataan and Corregidor; they could not retreat; they would be cut off from their own country and we could not reach them.

That is what I visualize in this program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Senator will yield further, I want to say that I agree wholeheartedly with his position in this matter. But it seems to me that the Senate is entitled to a statement from the Sate Department that no loan is now contemplated to the Soviet Union. If we are making loans in opposition to her, then certainly we should not be making loans in her behalf. I

think it is incumbent upon the State Department to inform us immediately if such a loan is contemplated or that no such loan will be made. I should like to challenge the Senators on the floor who are sponsoring this proposal to give us an answer, unless the Senator from Illinois can answer it.

Mr. BROOKS. I cannot give the Senator an answer to the specific suggestion, but I can give him an answer to another problem of like nature. I think it depends on who in the State Department decides to do these things. In the State Department, I do not think the right hand knows what the left hand is doing. In this instance they are asking for money for the purpose of stopping communism. The President yesterday sent Congress a message asking it to amend the Neutrality Act so as to prevent the shipment of machine tools; and yet less than 6 weeks ago the State Department was before the Committee on Appropriations asking it to change a provision which was put into the deficiency bill last year prohibiting the use of money for the shipment of lend-lease suppplies beyond January 1 of this year. They told us there were approximately, as I recall, $30,000,000 worth of supplies which still ought to be shipped, and they wanted us to change the rule or law so as to permit them to send lend-lease supplies over there. I asked them what countries they had in mind. They named about 8 or 10. Finally, I asked, "Is that all?" They said, "No; Russia." The question was asked, "How much of this $30,000,000?"—if that is the correct figure; I think it is approximately correct—"will go to Russia?" Then we learned that $25,000,000 of it was to go to Russia, but they forgot to name Russia until the very last.

The committee said, "No; we will not do it." They argued; and they said, "You have got to do it." "What is it for?" we asked. Then we learned that included among the items was one of the finest refineries for high-octane gasoline in the world—more modern than anything we have in the United States. Less than 6 weeks ago the State Department was before the Appropriations Committee saying that we had committed ourselves. We said to them, "What about Russia's committing herself to give us an accounting for lend-lease?"

Mr. President, at this moment the time seems to be very opportune for such an accounting; at this moment Russia appears to be willing to talk to us about the $11,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease we gave her. But what about the 95 ships we gave? There seems to be no indication that Russia wants to talk about that.

Yet, we were supposed to send Russia $25,000,000 worth of goods—not merely machine tools, although some machine tools were to be included, but, in addition, and the largest items, the finest, most modern refinery for high-octane gasoline in the world. We said, "We will hold the matter in abeyance and see what we shall do."

But now comes word from the President, who must have had the advice of the State Department, requesting that machine tools be withheld, although the same State Department has been asking us to send Russia machine tools and the finest, most modern high-octane gasoline refinery. So I am not surprised that the State Department should ask us to lend a billion dollars to Russia while we are undertaking to stop Russia in Greece and Turkey.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield further, let me say that during the war between Japan and China, before we went to war with Japan, before Pearl Harbor, of course we were shipping aviation gasoline and scrap iron, scrap copper, and various other scrap materials to Japan, and at the same time we were sending funds out of our Treasury to China. In other words, we were building up both sides, so that they would have a real fight.

I wonder if that same policy is being pursued at the present time; and I wonder how Senators who say that the President has committed us to such a foreign policy and that we must go along because he has already committed us, can explain their ability to go along with that kind of policy. Has the President committed the Senate to that kind of a policy of helping both sides and playing both sides against the middle? Does it not occur to the Senator from Illinois that at this time, before this bill is enacted, we should require an accounting to clarify the whole position and reach an understanding of this apparently traditional policy of playing both sides against each other and helping both sides?

Mr. BROOKS. I may say to the Senator that I think one of the most tragic aspects of the entire war was that the American soldiers at Bataan and the ones who ultimately went to capture the islands in the Pacific found that the very shells which were breaking upon them and destroying them had been produced from scrap iron sent to Japan from the United States, and the very planes the Japanese used to strafe them were driven by gasoline which we furnished to the country which finally attacked us.

I have tried to make that clear in what I have said. Undoubtedly, some place along the line we shall send another mission and other arms to go forth and meet the arms we shall manufacture in the United States and shall distribute all over the world. I do not see how we can ultimately miss running into them somewhere, if this course is followed.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I wonder if there is any obligation upon the Congress or the Senate simply because the President or some of the leaders say we are committed and that we should go along with that kind of a program, if in our judgment we do not think so.

Mr. BROOKS. Of course, I think we have no obligation, as such. I do think the situation is regrettable, and I know that the Senator from South Dakota must feel as I do. I hate ever to be put in the position of denying the President of the United States; but in a matter so vital as this, I do not represent the President of the United States; I represent the people who sent me here. They sent me here believing, at least, that I would do what I told them I would do; and that is one thing I have done and shall continue to do. When I leave here, some one else can take my place on the basis of the statements he makes as to what he will do. But I think we should stand up for the things we told the people of our States we would do when we came here.

If the President can lead us off on a tangent, then in my judgment we have "missed the boat."

I wish to state my position clearly: When the President discusses this question fully, and when we finally conclude what program the country should adopt, I shall support that program with everything I have, including my life. In the meantime, I think I should state my convictions and vote my convictions.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. For the benefit of some of the newer Members of the Senate, will the Senator be kind enough to explain what he considers to be the obligation of the Senate in the case of a national policy of this kind, concerning which, as I understand, we are to advise and approve.

Mr. BROOKS. I have just stated what I think the Senate's obligation is; namely, that each individual Senator has an obligation to support his conscience and his own convictions when a matter of this kind is presented to us, especially a matter which some of us at least have a deep conviction that it is going to lead us right down the road to war all over the world or to bankruptcy or to the bread lines. In such a case, how can we do otherwise than vote our own minds and our own hearts? That is what I think our obligation should be.

I repeat that I regret that we have been put into this position; but it is not fair for someone to belabor a Senator by saying that he is weakening the hand of the President of the United States. It may be that momentarily we are weakening the hand of the President of the United States, but we are strengthening representative government; and we may have to fight for it harder than we ever have fought before in our lives, if a program of this kind goes into effect.

Mr. MALONE. What is the law, or what does the Constitution provide—that we have equal responsibility or that we are supposed to follow a lead?

Mr. BROOKS. The pending matter is simply a bill providing for a loan. Of course, the word "loan" is not a good one to use in this case. If only a loan were wanted, it could be made through the International Bank, for the International Bank is in existence, and it would be a good agency to handle such a transaction.

Let me digress for a moment to refer to the International Bank. Russia does not belong to the bank; so we would not be slapping her in the face by letting such a loan or grant be handled by the International Bank. As I recall, we contribute 37 percent of the funds of the bank, and the other countries who are members of the bank contribute 63 percent of its funds. As I have said, Russia is not a member of the bank. I think that by May 1 there will be $800,000,000 subscribed to the bank, and the largest part of it will be the United States' contribution. So if we wish to avoid shaking our fist by sending military missions, that would be a good place to have this loan handled. Then the people who want to have such a loan made could urge that it be made by that bank; and if the loan were made by the bank, the contribution made by the United States in that connection would be larger than the contribution made by any other nation. I think that would be the proper place to handle this matter, if it is desired to make loans, although the pending proposal is not for loans, but simply for out-and-out grants.

However, I would even vote for a grant if the provision for military missions were omitted and we were not called upon to go forth shaking our fist all over the world.

I honestly believe that if we start this program we may be challenged, and then we shall either have to retreat or fight; and then we shall have to adopt universal military training, which we have been talking about for a long time, and we shall again have conscription and regulation. There will be no other choice, once we are challenged. No Senator would vote against adopting such a course if the American flag and American soldiers were challenged by another country.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield further to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Has the Senator been advised as to where the great over-all plan for occupation, or spheres of influence, or whatever it is, upon which we are about to embark, may lead us?

Mr. BROOKS. I have been advised only through the answers to the questions which were submitted to the State Department by Senators, and I gather that the Department says that after the action now contemplated we will act in each case according to the circumstances of the particular situation. If we start this chain, we create the circumstance, we establish the policy. When any nation says, "We are going Communist if you don't come," that is a call to arms for us again, because we have established the policy, and where that will lead I do not know. We cannot go beyond that. If the State Department says, "We take each one according to circumstance," all I know is that, so far as the countries I have named are concerned, we are going to be getting calls for help, and we will go to their aid all over the world again, but with military missions.

Mr. MALONE. What would be the alternative? Suppose the Senate rejected this proposal; what, in the Senator's judgment, would be the long-range alternative?

Mr. BROOKS. The next alternative is to find out what we can do with the United Nations. We can send supplies, we can send food, we can aid these people, we can make them a reconstruction loan through the International Bank. The United States and Great Britain contributed 51 percent to the capital of that bank. Russia is no part of it. We can channel money through that agency, and lend the countries money for reconstruction, if we keep out of the military aspect of it.

Mr. MALONE. Are we shipping any kind of goods or any form of aid to Russia at this time?

Mr. BROOKS. As to that I am not sure. I stated that we were asked to do so, in the Committee on Appropriations, and some money is going into Russia through UNRRA. I should like to have the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations answer as to that, if he will. He was presiding at the time. Some few weeks ago we were asked to authorize the shipment of a great plant for the refining of high-octane gasoline, and other supplies. I understand that within the last 10 days there has been a repeated call to have that go through. Is that true, I ask the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is true. Without agreeing or disagreeing with the premise the Senator from Illinois has made in the presentation of his case, I feel quite strongly that one thing we cannot do in this world is carry water on both shoulders at the same time. I feel that that is the fundamental weakness of our position and of the position of the State Department today. What the able Senator from Illinois has indicated is true, that there has been almost continual pressure on the Committee on Appropriations, since the first of the year, to release for shipment to Russia lend-lease supplies totaling in excess of $25,000,000. That pressure has consisted of individuals high in the State Department coming before the committee and testifying, and of letters and calls and personal contacts from officials high in the State Department, all of them putting pressure on the Committee on Appropriations to release supplies to Russia at this time. The last, as the Senator from Illinois has indicated, was in the nature of a communication which came from across the seas, or from that direction.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Can the Senator from New Hampshire enlighten us further as to the type of this assistance. Was it anything in the nature of munitions of war, that could be used in fighting this country?

Mr. BRIDGES. The principal item, I think, was oil-refining equipment for the refining of high-octane gasoline. As I understand, high-octane gasoline is used for planes, particularly fighting planes; and this, again, made the Committee on Appropriations suspicious, and has made us very firm, to date, in our refusal to take action in any way which would release these lend-lease goods to Russia.

Let me point out to the Senator that I supported lend-lease. I think it performed a real service during the war. But when I supported it, I was under the impression that it would end with the cessation of hostilities, with the termination of the war. But in spite of that it was continued. It necessitated last year action by the Congress of the United States, originating in the Committee on Appropriations, to prohibit further lend-lease supplies going across after December 31, 1946. Mind you, that was about a year and a half after the war was over, and the sending of supplies was still continuing. So we had to pass that legislation at that time, to prohibit it after December 31, 1946.

In spite of the war being over, in spite of the intent of lend-lease being ended, in spite of Congress taking affirmative action prohibiting further sending of lend-lease after December 31 of last year, the State Department still insisted, and is still insisting, on sending millions of dollars worth of lend-lease supplies to Russia, and is at the moment, so far as I know, demanding that that be done.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I desire to address a question to the Senator from New Hampshire, the able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Where is this refinery for high-octane gas and where are the materials which the State Department seeks to have sent to Russia?

Mr. BRIDGES. They are still in this country, and still in the hands of the contractor, or the person with whom the contract was made, according to my understanding.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to say that it is most revealing and most shocking that the State Department of this Government would seek at this time to have sent to Russia materials for the manufacture of airplane gasoline, when the very purpose expressed in the pending and proposed legislation is to stop the spread of communism into the lower countries of Europe, which means to stop Russia. It is utterly irreconcilable that any department of this Government should appear before one committee of the Senate and ask that materials be sent into Russia for the manufacture of high-octane gasoline with which to operate their planes, and then appear before another committee of the Senate and ask that steps be taken and money be advanced to prevent the spread of communism by Russia. It is not understandable.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am amazed, in listening to this discussion, to hear the reference that is made, first, to the $11,000,000,000 lend-lease which was given by this country to Russia to make her allegedly a mighty military power, and now to have Members of this body surprised that the State Department is still requesting that $25,000,000 of supplies, at the tail end of the lend-lease program,

be made available to Russia. How many Members of the Senate know that since VJ-day $233,000,000 have been made available to Russia under the lend-lease program? It came to my attention a few weeks ago that shipments aggregating millions of dollars were still going to Russia under a program which was represented as being a war aid. I directed a letter to the Administrator of the Lend-Lease Administration a few weeks ago—I regret I do not have the letter with me; it is in my office at this time—in reply to which I was notified that $233,000,000 worth of lend-lease goods had been shipped to Russia since VJ-day.

What I want to know, and I ask my good friend from Illinois the question, is why the State Department does not give us sufficient information so that Senators, as representatives of the people, may be in position to determine accurately whether the President and the State Department are intent upon building Russia into a still greater military power. Now, almost 2 years after VJ-day, do we in fact intend, in line with other representations which are being made, to determine, through the United Nations or in some other way, whether Russia is going to collaborate with the United States and other peace-loving nations to restore peace and maintain peace, or are we going to make a mockery out of the objectives for which millions of young Americans fought in World War II?

Can the Senator advise us on that point and tell us what information is available which will enable us to determine which way our foreign policy is being directed at this particular time?

Mr. BROOKS. I would say to the Senator that the only information I have is that which has come to me through the answers submitted by the Department of State to the questions propounded by Senators, plus other statements made by the Department. But I pointed out the inconsistency of the State Department asking us now to appropriate money for a loan, so-called, and to send military missions to stop the expansion of communism on the border of Russia, and asking the Committee on Appropriations, as they did a short time ago, to permit the shipment to Russia of $25,000,000 worth of supplies and lend-lease goods, represented in part by a high-octane-gas plant which would help them destroy, faster than we could furnish the supplies, the things which were built up in the other country. I think there has been a very great inconsistency, and I think the greatest inconsistency is what we are proposing to do now. We are starting out again to furnish American arms to meet American arms already there, and we shall probably face them again, in due course of time, all over the world.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I gladly yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. This discussion has reached a point of revelation that ought to be made known to all the people of the country. From the statements which have been made to the Senate on the pending issue it appears that, on the one hand, the Government has been sending millions of dollars into Russia to equip her and at the same time has been seeking permission, through a committee of the Senate, to send other equipment, while, on the other hand, it is proposing to embark on a course designed, as it is said, to stop the spread of communism by sending money and military personnel to other nations.

Reference was made a few minutes ago to supplies going into Russia under lend-lease. I wonder if the able Senator from Illinois will permit me to address a question to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, as to the aid which has gone into Russia since the end of the war through UNRRA.

Mr. BROOKS. Yes; I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I ask that question.

Mr. BRIDGES. It is my understanding that UNRRA shipments, of which as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia knows, we furnish about 72 percent, are still continuing. The supplies are being bought in this country at this time, even though UNRRA, in theory, has expired. We still have in process of accumulation and in the process of shipment to two of the states or countries of the Soviet Empire, namely, White Russia and the Ukraine, many tens of millions of dollars worth of American supplies, which are going through UNRRA to those two divisions of the Soviet Empire, and also to some of the Russian satellite countries. The State Department says that that is done in accordance with an international commitment; but I may point out that if it were desired to stop carrying water on both shoulders and be consistent, we always have the control, through export licenses, of whether or not goods can be shipped from this country. We have the power and the right to control the shipment of goods to both divisions of the Russian Empire, and to Russian satellite countries such as Yugoslavia, that is at the present time so violently hostile to the United States.

Mr. BROOKS. Furthermore, reference to the answers submitted by the Department of State to questions shows that that was one of the questions which was asked. Question 71 was this:

> Question. How much money has the American Government contributed through various sources to the Government of Yugoslavia in the past 3 years?

The answer is rather unusual. I might say in many respects it is a very typical State Department answer:

> Answer. Yugoslavia has received $32,000,000 of lend-lease aid since July 1942—

As I understand, what we are worried about is the march of communism from Yugoslavia into Greece. That is the movement we want to stop.

> Yugoslavia has received $32,000,000 of lend-lease aid since July 1942, of which $39,000 has been received since September 1945.

Note these words:

> Data for the period of the last 3 years are not readily available. The United States share of UNRRA's contribution to the Yugoslavia relief program was $312,000,000.

We have already poured $312,000,000 through UNRRA. I objected at the time, to having their own Communist agents administering our millions of dollars. Now we have got to send missions and money to stop the Communists, because they are going into Greece; but we gave them $312,000,000 in relief. We gave them $32,000,000 of lend-lease since July 1942, but data for the period of the last 3 years are not readily available.

The $312,000,000 is exclusive of freight.

> Based on 72 percent of the total contribution, all of which was furnished in the past 3 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In reference to distribution under UNRRA, during the month of April, it so happened that on yesterday I received an answer to a letter which I wrote to UNRRA, asking for the distribution at this time. I have the schedule here, as of April 1, and I should like to read it. Possibly it might clear up some of the questions as to what we are planning to do during the month of April by way of UNRRA shipments. I may say that 80 percent of our shipments, even today, are going to Russia and to Russian-controlled countries. The shipments are being loaded in New York now. That was verified yesterday by UNRRA.

To Austria, which is Russian-controlled, we are shipping $4,083,810, during the current month. To Bylo-Russia, which is merely a Russian province, there has been allocated $607,000; to Czechoslovakia, $5,281,550. Poland is scheduled to get $14,437,800. The Ukraine Soviet Socialist Republic is getting $1,880,500. Yugoslavia is given $21,027,600. Those shipments are in the process of being loaded at this particular time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations a question, if the Senator from Illinois will yield for a moment. What type of equipment is Russia buying at this time, through what we call lend-lease or the extension loans that they have now obtained from the United States?

Mr. BRIDGES. A large part of what they are buying, as I said, is oil refining equipment; and then there is other equipment of a varied nature. I do not have the figures. I have them in the Appropriations Committee, but I do not have them on the floor of the Senate so as to give the details. But the equipment is miscellaneous.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee remember the number of trucks we have sent to Russia?

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator mean during the whole period?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; during the whole period.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the number of trucks sent was about 111,000.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will look up the figures, I think he will find that the number is far greater than that.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am sure it is.

Mr. WHERRY. It is more nearly 300,000 vehicles.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; the Senator from Nebraska is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I think the number stated by the Senator from New Hampshire is the number sent to Russia since we thought lend-lease was terminated.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. It is my opinion, Mr. President, that it is necessary that we know the type of equipment that is going into Russia. I am informed that Russia is one of the countries which has been the recipient of a great number of box cars and of other railroad equipment. It seems to me from what the distinguished Senator from Illinois has pointed out and from the observations made by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, that we should find out of what the equipment sent to Russia consists; and whether or not Russia is paying for it? Is Russia paying cash for it? Are we to be paid for it in the end? Are we continuing the policy of sending Russia equipment which is vital to her in order to pursue an expansionist policy, on the one hand, and on the other hand, are we proposing to stop Russia's expansionist policy through furnishing aid to Greece and Turkey? I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee if he can answer that question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I do not have the figures with me. I can secure them, and shall do so.

The Senator from Nebraska is correct in saying that more than 300,000 vehicles were furnished to Russia. When I gave the smaller figure I was referring to the period after the war ended.

Mr. President, the point I want to make is that I am personally sympathetic to stopping the spread of communism over the world, and I feel that the area of Turkey and Greece is a strategic area. But to me it is almost inconceivable that the same administration which asks Congress loyally to support the proposal for aid to Greece and Turkey at the same time is furnishing aid to Russia and Russian satellite countries. To me, such a procedure is the height of inconsistency. I simply cannot understand it. It represents the weakness of our whole policy.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me for a question?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator from Nebraska in his question spoke of supplies being sent into Russia and Russian-dominated countries at this time by our own country under lend-lease. The Senator spoke of boxcars and of trucks and other vehicles being sent to Russia. Let me say to the able Senator that millions upon millions of dollars worth of equipment has been sent into those countries under UNRRA. I think I am correct in saying that most Senators believed when they voted the appropriation for UNRRA that they were voting to provide food and clothing and shelter for needy and distressed people. But let me say to the Senator that UNRRA not only has sent food and clothing, but thousands of railroad cars, coal cars, boxcars, and other equipment which is needed in this country. Within the last 2 months I myself saw in the yards at Newark, N. J., new locomotives awaiting shipment abroad, with "UNRRA" written on them. So when I see such materials being channeled to countries whose expansionist program we now say we want to stop, I say most earnestly that it is the most distorted administration of the purposes for which UNRRA was set up that can be imagined. The abuses under UNRRA are terrible to think of.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Does the distinguished Senator from Illinois have any information as to how many occupied countries have been cleaned out of heavy industrial materials, such as industrial plants which, in the case of countries now controlled by Russia have been moved to Russia? I refer to countries such as Germany and Manchuria, to which a good portion of the repair parts and equipment were sent by this country in the first place. Does the Senator know whether most of the heavy equipment in those occupied countries has been removed to Russia?

Mr. BROOKS. I do not know, and I do not think anyone knows. We cannot know what goes on behind the iron curtain. We helped the Russians advance into the space which they now occupy. We permitted them to move into Berlin by waiting so they could move in there first. Wherever Russian armies moved in they took out heavy equipment and machinery. So the only supposition that can be drawn from that is that wherever they are they have appropriated unto their own use materials which were useful to them, regardless of whether we in the first place sent the materials to the people of the occupied countries in all good conscience as relief or for their assistance. Russia takes such material to her own use.

What I am now saying is that the same department of our Government which has followed the inconsistent program of furnishing material which was then taken by Russia for her own use, wants to determine how the aid now proposed to be furnished shall be handled. It is proposed that we shall trust them, until some day we will find ourselves again in the middle of a stream. We cannot change horses in the middle of that stream, and will again find ourselves engaged in a war. We cannot direct events except to fight wherever we can obtain a foothold at such a time.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Is it not a fact that is generally conceded, and do not newspaper reports indicate—at least all the reports to which I have had access indicate—that the movement of heavy industries to Russia is on? Is it not conceded that such industries have been removed from Germany and the other areas occupied by Russia; that heavy machinery has been taken out of Korea and Manchuria, and other areas occupied by Russia and moved into Russia? Is not that common knowledge?

Mr. BROOKS. It is my understanding that it is common knowledge.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am rising at the moment only to keep the record straight in respect to one or two matters which have drifted into the debate. I am not rising in any aspect to challenge the able address made by the Senator from Illinois, whose courage and candor in this matter I totally respect. Some references, however, were made both by the able Senator from Colorado and by some of the questions since intervening, which evidently refer back to the statement I made regarding the fact that Congress does not find itself totally a free agent in making a decision of the character which here impends after the President of the United States has made a recommendation. I want to revert to that phase of the matter because I want to be very sure no one misunderstands either me or the situation which Senators confront, whether they like it or not.

I have never for an instant challenged the fact that every Senator has a complete right and duty to face the facts in this situation precisely as the able Senator from Illinois has faced them from his point of view. I have no challenge to the exercise of that right whatsoever—so long as it is exercised in this country, I might add. I am not interested in itinerant saboteurs. What I submitted to the Senate, Mr. President, and I am sure that Senators upon reflection will remember it, was that among the factors which we cannot escape considering is the price of noncompliance with the Presidential recommendation. That is the extent to which I have injected this argument into the debate.

We must weigh the price of noncompliance against the price of compliance as one of the factors in making up our independent minds. I am not, I repeat, challenging for an instant the right and the duty of every Senator to make his decision pursuant to his own conscience and judgment in the face of the facts as he weighs them. The only thing I submit is that among the facts which must be weighed is the price of noncompliance with the general purpose to which the President of the United States has addressed himself.

The President of the United States has undertaken to say that this Republic of ours stands in this world against the overthrow of independent government either by sabotage from within or assault from without. He has expressed a great fundamental principle to which American idealism has been attached since the days of the Declaration of Independence.

When I addressed the Senate upon this subject, I was totally frank with the Senate in respect to it, and I laid perfectly candidly upon the line the fact that this is a fundamental disagreement between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, involved, not only at this point in Greece and Turkey, but involved in every aspect of our interna-

tional relations. It is involved in every decision which has to be made in the United Nations. It is involved in every decision which General MacArthur has to make in distant Japan. It is involved in every decision which has to be made in the occupied zones in Germany. Fundamentally, as I stated when I presented this case in the first instance, we confront a deadlock between the viewpoints of the Soviet Union and those of the Government of the United States.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Not until I have finished this statement, and then I shall be very glad to yield.

In dealing with the Soviet problem, I assert that it has been our experience for the past year and a half that the hope for peaceful agreement rests and depends largely upon whether we can make it plain to the governing authorities in Moscow that there is a deadline of ideals beyond which we will not retreat.

I agree that this is a guessing contest for everyone. It is my opinion, for whatever it may be worth, that there is a chance for the Soviet Union and the United States of America to find a basis upon which they can live and let live in the world, and in that fashion avoid the conflict which neither nation wants any part of—and, least of all, the Senator who now speaks.

I know of no way that we can hope successfully to approach even the perimeter of that sort of an agreement, except as we make it perfectly plain that the United States says what it means and means what it says, and that no policy of appeasement of any aggressive government on the face of this earth is a part of our program. I have submitted to the Senate that when the President of the United States takes a courageous, constructive, dedicated position in respect to that objective, among the factors which Senators must weigh when they vote upon this bill is what the price of noncompliance is, what the price is of notifying the Politbureau in Moscow that this Government is divided at home and that all they have to do is wait for us to fall apart.

That is not a conclusive factor. I go back to the point where I started. I say that the Senator from Illinois and all like him confront the duty of doing precisely what he has done in presenting his own honest views. I have never even intimated that Senators should subordinate their viewpoint to that of the Executive. But I say again that, whether we like it or not, we cannot escape the fact that in making up our minds as to what our duty is, the cost of noncompliance with this particular kind of a Presidential recommendation is one of the things which we cannot escape.

If the Senator from Nevada wishes to interrupt me on that point, I am very glad to yield to him.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator be kind enough to give us some idea of what he considers the price to be?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am afraid I do not understand the Senator's question. If he will make it a little plainer I shall try to answer to the best of my ability.

Mr. MALONE. I shall be glad to do so. The Senator says that we must consider the price of noncompliance. What is the price?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Every Senator will have to weigh that decision for himself. I am not the keeper of the conscience of any Senator except myself.

Mr. MALONE. May we have the benefit of the Senator's advice?

Mr. VANDENBERG. In his original presentation of this subject, the Senator from Michigan stated as frankly as he knew how to state, that in his opinion—and I dislike to repeat this because it may seem that I am attempting to force Presidential duress upon Senators; but the Senator asked me what I thought. I believe that if the Congress should fail to uphold the hand of the President of the United States in respect to this general challenge—omitting details upon which, obviously, we have a right to be consulted—there would never be another opportunity for us pacifically to impress the next aggressor with any degree of success.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. What is the Senator's opinion as to the alternative?

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is the alternative to which the Senator refers?

Mr. MALONE. What is the alternative if everything happens which the Senator outlines—if we do not go along with this loan, and admit that we are divided at home, which we are?

Mr. VANDENBERG. In my opinion we shall have sacrificed the moral and spiritual leadership of the world; and from that point on, since we should have encouraged aggressors to believe that they could proceed with immunity, regardless of us, the Senator will have to draw upon his own imagination as to what would happen.

I have previously tried to express the thought that no one has any remote right to discuss this subject dogmatically. No man has a right to say, "I know the answer." No Senator knows the answer. The President of the United States does not know the answer. This is one of those situations, in these restless, impatient times, in which the only choice we have in connection with this problem and many others is the choice of a calculated risk.

We never have an opportunity to do as free agents precisely as we would like to do; and the Senator, like all other Senators, will have to take his own calculated risks, subject to the factors involved.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Does this calculated risk involve war with Russia?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not prepared to discuss the question of war with Russia, even though it be involved in the calculations of some of those who survey this plan. I do not think it is necessary to talk about war with Russia, provided we can proceed with a united country to impress the Soviet Government with the fact that we propose to be absolutely, scrupulously fair to them, that we are prepared to guarantee their legitimate borders for the next 40 years against any aggression, and if we make it completely and scrupulously plain that we do not have one single aggressive motive against Russia. I am unable to believe if we can make our own position clear and immutable it is necessary to talk about war.

I may be wrong, and I repeat that no man dares to be dogmatic upon this subject, but in my view this bill looks in the direction of peace instead of in the direction of war. Otherwise, I could not support it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. Will the distinguished Senator from Michigan give us his opinion, for the benefit of some of us, as to whether we in effect are laying the gauntlet down to Russia, and whether if she picks it up we are in war.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator has three "ifs" in that question.

Mr. MALONE. I will take all of them out. Are we in war if Russia decides we are wrong in fixing her boundaries?

Mr. VANDENBERG. We are in war at any time Russia decides she wishes to go to war. In my opinion, the last thing on earth that Russia wishes to do is to go to war, precisely as the last thing on earth we wish to do is to go to war.

Mr. MALONE. Are we in war if Russia takes up the challenge?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That depends entirely on what the Senator means by taking up the challenge.

Mr. MALONE. Suppose she does not stop in Greece, but keeps on coming. Are we in war if we permit this action to be taken?

Mr. VANDENBERG. We are not in war unless and until the Soviet Government decides to go to war. On that subject I have no prophecy to offer, except that I am totally of the opinion that war is unnecessary, that it is futile, provided we can lay down specifications which are clear and sure for both nations.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. If Russia, however, continues to come, shall we back up or go to war once we are there?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The trouble with the Senator's questions is that his terms require definition.

Mr. MALONE. I shall define them if the Senator will tell me what he does not understand with reference to them.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator means, if Russia starts to blow us up are we in war? the answer is "Yes."

Mr. MALONE. I do not mean that. But if we give Greece $400,000,000, a few soldiers, and material, if Russia continues to come across Greece, what is the next move? Are we in war in order to stop her? Is that part of my question plain?

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the first place, when we go to Greece we have gone on a mission which is designed for the purpose of making Greece itself self-sufficient in maintaining lawful peace.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Just a moment. There is no Russian offensive as such against Greece. It is a communistic infiltration—and all of this is a matter of argument—from surrounding satellite

countries. The question of who is to blame for what happened on the Greek border is one of the things which the United Nations itself will shortly decide. In my opinion, when that decision is made, unless the Soviets intervene with a veto, there will be established a border commission of the United Nations—and nothing in our plan would interfere with it at all—which will largely take over the responsibility of what happens on the border.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that with $400,000,000 and a few soldiers Greece can stop Russia?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly not, if Russia wants to invade Greece.

Mr. MALONE. It seems to me that my original question is still pertinent. What shall we do if Russia continues her travel through Europe which she has already started?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I cannot answer the Senator's question.

Mr. MALONE. Shall we back down in Greece?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I cannot answer the Senator's question, because questions of that magnitude and that awful impact will have to be answered as the situation requires when the time comes. I might as easily ask the Senator, What shall we do if we allow Greece to collapse, if we allow Turkey to collapse, and if a chain reaction sets in which produces a Communist-dominated world from the Dardanelles to the China Sea and westward to the Atlantic Ocean, and we find ourselves substantially encircled a few years hence by a communistic world? I might ask the Senator, What shall we do under those circumstances? I should not expect the Senator to answer the question, because no man can answer it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. I think that should be considered. Did the President say that our move into Greece is to stop Russia or the Russian people? Is that what he meant?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not think he said it was to stop Russia. As to what he meant, he will have to say for himself.

Mr. MALONE. What did he say?

Mr. VANDENBERG. He clearly indicated that the purpose was to stop aggression and to defend the right of independent self-government in those two key places of the world.

Mr. MALONE. Then, does not that answer the question; that if Russia keeps coming we are in war?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Nevada will have to answer his own question, I repeat, just as every other Senator will have to answer the question for himself as to what will happen if we allow self-government to fail in Greece, if we allow independent government to fall in Turkey, whatever its character may be, and if we allow this chain reaction to set in, which can easily consume three-fourths of the world.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; but I do not want to spend all afternoon on the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like earnestly to make this reply to the Senator, that there are certainly very few facts in the report submitted by the Committee on Foreign Relations on the very things which some of us would like to know. I too want to preface my remarks, as the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has, with the statement that I am open-minded on this subject. Certainly some of the questions being asked today should be asked of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am about to come to them, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask a question, if the Senator will yield. Does the State Department have a foreign policy for every foreign country?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not know what the Senator's question means.

Mr. WHERRY. I can indicate what it means. In the United States News for February 7 Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State, is quoted by the editor of that publication as stating that the State Department has a foreign policy for all foreign countries; that the policies are top secrets of the State Department and are known only to a few Army officers. Certainly the distinguished Senator from Michigan, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, ought to know if the Secretary of State has such a policy and blueprint and program. If he does, I should like to ask a second question: Can the Senator give us the facts as to how far the State Department wants to go? It is proposed that we start with Greece and Turkey. Are we to go from there to Korea, and from there back to Italy and then to France and then to Great Britain and then perhaps to Germany, and finally wind up in China? I think the Senator from Nevada asked a question which should be answered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sure he did.

Mr. WHERRY. What is this foreign policy? Does the Senator from Michigan know it? If he does know it, why should not the Senate know it, if the Senate votes to provide this initial loan?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should consider the question submitted by the able Senator from Nebraska totally incapable of being answered. This world is in a state of restless flux; we cannot tell what the headlines on the front page will be day after tomorrow. If the State Department was smart enough to be able to have in its library a chart to cover its policy for the next year with respect to every country on the earth, it would be a State Department entitled to a higher opinion than I have of it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield briefly. I should like to proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be brief.

Does the State Department have the same policy in China that it has in continental Europe, relative to stopping communism? Is it a consistent policy?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, we could go off on 50 of these detours if we wished to do so. The Senator from Nebraska knows perfectly well that I have stated publicly that I have been highly critical of the State Department's policy heretofore in China, because it has looked toward the creation of a coalition with Communists, and in my opinion no Communist ever entered a coalition for any purpose except to destroy it. Therefore, in that aspect, I have not been in step with some phases of the China policy during the last year or two. Nevertheless, one of the greatest and ablest men of this Nation, gifted not only with a military sense but with a high sense of statesmanship, has spent a year—one of the best years of his life—in China, trying to work out a policy for this Nation; and so far as I am concerned, I have been quite willing that he should have the opportunity to see whether it could be done.

Again, I say no man can be dogmatic as to what are the answers to these questions in these difficult times. As to China, the answer apparently is that General Marshall's errand did not succeed.

So far as I am concerned, I should think that the fulfillment of our great hopes in China rests upon the success with which Chiang Kai-shek can enlarge and liberalize his own national government, within which he has been able to assemble every political party in China except the armed Communists; and I should feel that in the case of China, as in the case of all other foreign nations, despite the characteristics of the Chinese Government—characteristics which we do not like, and which we would greatly prefer to change—our great hope in China, I say very frankly to the able Senator from Nebraska, would be for success for the generalissimo in enlarging and liberalizing his own Nationalist Government as against the armed Communists.

What the policy of the State Department is I am unable to testify. There is a considerable amount of misunderstanding about the so-called bipartisan foreign policy in this country. I have tried to make that plain on several occasions. It is very narrowly channeled within very specific things; namely, the minor peace treaties in Europe and the activities of the United Nations.

I have never been consulted about the Chinese policy or the pan-American policy or many other policies, and I am not in a position to be an expert witness for the Senator from Nebraska. My information probably is a little more intimate than that of other Senators; but speaking generally, the facts are as I have indicated.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. In the interest of accuracy, and to do credit to General Marshall, it is true, is it not, that when he returned from China, before he later went back to China, he appeared before

the Foreign Relations Committee and made a full disclosure of what he had been doing and what he hoped to do?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Oh, yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a minute?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I trust that the distinguished Senator from Michigan will not become impatient with me or with some other Senators who are asking questions.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I hope I did not indicate any impatience.

Mr. WHERRY. I really feel that in the last hour I have learned more about these matters than I have learned at any other time during the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Nebraska is welcome to any information I have.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly, and we are seeking information. I hope the Senator will take these questions in that light—namely, that those of us who are asking questions are not in any way attempting to disrupt the program. On the other hand, I think we have an entire right to have the full light of every fact that is available.

Personally, I could not understand the policy in China. I do not understand it today. I certainly think it has been an inconsistent policy, and I should like to know more about it.

I cannot understand the policy in South America. Here we are going to stop communism abroad, and yet under Mr. Braden we went into Argentina and used the Embassy as the seat of communism in an election in which we intervened. I cannot understand that policy, and I think we have a right to know what the policy is going to be; and I think we also have a right to know the amount of money which will be used for the purpose of the pending bill. Certainly, if it is going to run into billions of dollars, a time will come when it will not be a question of whether we want to take the moral and spiritual leadership; for if the United States becomes bankrupt and insolvent there will be no chance for America to give the kind of leadership that is now contemplated.

There is nothing in the report to indicate what we might be led into if the eventualities which have been suggested by the distinguished Senator from Nevada should come to pass.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the first part of the Senator's last interruption I can cordially welcome. So far as I am concerned, I have gone to extreme lengths in endeavoring to provide the Senate with information, as the questionnaire which is on the desks of Senators clearly shows. I hope I have demonstrated no impatience in undertaking to answer factual questions.

So far as the Senator's later expressed view is concerned, I can only say that, again, that is a matter of opinion, and the Senator is entitled to his opinion.

But when he complains that the report of the committee does not draw a blueprint which answers every question which can arise day after tomorrow in this distraught earth, when no man knows for 20 minutes at a time what is going to happen, the Senator from Nebraska is asking something totally unreasonable, from my point of view.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, has the Senator finished?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Finished what?

Mr. PEPPER. Has the Senator from Michigan finished his reply to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. VANDENBERG. One never finishes replying to the Senator from Nebraska. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan probably will.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, unless the Senator from Nebraska desires to make further inquiries at this time, I ask the Senator from Michigan to yield to me.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I was going to ask the distinguished Senator whether he thinks that what prompted the able Senator from Nebraska to ask his questions was perhaps a dilemma in which some Senators may find themselves as to whether we should regard the President's recommendation as indicating a general policy, or whether we should regard it in the light of what the State Department might regard as an incident or event somewhat localized in character. Does the Senator think there might be some justification for the belief that the President made it clear that he was speaking about a policy?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I think that is a fair question. I think the President's message defined what is being done in terms of a doctrine, a little more definitely than I interpret the situation, as I undertook to make plain when I presented the plan from the Foreign Relations Committee. To me it is a plan; it is a part of a pattern, and as such is to be distinguished from a policy. I would not want to disguise any phase of this matter, because of all the things I believe in one of the most important is that the country should be candidly dealt with in a question of this nature. I agree to that completely. The American people are not children; they do not wish to be fooled; they want the facts and the truth.

As I tried to say when I presented the matter more formally a few days ago, it would be silly to attempt to ignore the implications which are involved in this plan and pattern. To what extent and in what direction it ultimately expresses itself, the Senator from Florida can guess as well as I can. I only submit that in making that sort of a guess we must parallel it with a guess as to what may happen if we do not do what the President recommends.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. In furtherance of the policy indicated by the President, which possibly the Senator from Nebraska and others of us have in mind, in the first place is the fact that the President appeared personally before a joint sessison of the Congress, rather than requesting aid in the way of an ordinary routine message; in the second place, the President started right off:

> The gravity of the situation which confronts the world today necessitates my appearance before a joint session of the Congress.

The next line of the President's message is:

> The foreign policy and the national security of this country are involved.

Then at a later place in the President's message, on page 4 as it is printed, the President said:

> I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

From those words I think anyone would undoubtedly be justified in assuming that the Congress was asked to pass on a momentous matter, that we were asked by the President to approve a policy rather than a condition, for the reasons stated by the President in his message.

If it is a policy, it is a fair inquiry as to what is the implication of the policy, what is its significance? If it is merely an incident, if it is only a particular situation, then we can more adequately estimate what it will cost, and it is a matter of limited implication and significance.

Of course, none of us can control what is said in the press, but when we find men like Walter Lippman, and other eminent columnists, discussing this as a "policy," and when we find it in the press of the country, in the comments of the country, compared by responsible people with the Monroe Doctrine, then would not the Senator think in all fairness that there was some justification for the feeling that we are here about to make a momentous decision, and that it is one of the utmost gravity to the Nation?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I agree completely with the Senator that there is justification for the deepest searching of souls I have known of in the 19 years I have been a Member of this body, because unquestionably we here assume a position of fidelity in respect to our ideals to a degree which heretofore has never been so plainly stated.

What we stand for may be a matter of argument, but I am unable to believe that we do not all stand for the righteousness of independent liberties to which the President fundamentally addressed himself. I am very sure the Senator from Florida does.

What that involves for day after tomorrow, I can only repeat, depends upon day after tomorrow. I sometimes wonder if the Great Architect of the Universe Himself knows what is going to happen day after tomorrow. Certainly no Senator upon this floor does.

I cannot answer questions based upon hypotheses which are put together out of the utterly ruthless factors which are at large in this world upon the one hand, and the utterly desperate factors of famine and want and subjugation which are involved on the other.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to interject, if the Senator will allow me, that

what he has said is characteristic of his approach all the way through this matter, and I wish to commend him for it, and also to commend the President. The President did not quibble, he did not weasel, he did not try to evade. He laid the matter squarely before the Congress in a joint session, and the first sentence he used referred to the gravity of the situation. But by the same token candor bids me say that in my opinion the State Department has not been equally candid in its presentation of the matter. I feel that it is only fair that we understand that we are making here a decision which may be a matter of policy, or, to use the interesting figure of the able Senator from Michigan, a part of a pattern, I believe, rather than using the word "policy."

If I may drop to a detail——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before the Senator leaves that point, I should like to say a word.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What the Senator says is substantially true. I decline to gloss over any phase or factor of the problem with which we are confronted. When I presented the matter I said that there must be no soft illusions about what we do. I must constantly add that there are no soft illusions as to what happens to us when we confront the Soviet Union, in one controversy after another, utterly unable to make any progress in behalf of fundamental rights and human freedoms.

If one is looking for the larger implications, consideration with me is whether or not it is possible to make real progress by a program of absolute candor in dealing with Moscow, candor not only in assuring Russia that we do not have an iota of conquest against her in our souls, candor, on the other hand, that we do have in our souls a lot of iron in respect to our ideals. I am unable to believe, I repeat, that that is not the most hopeful aproach to a pacific settlement instead of an approach which would notify the Politburo in Moscow that the Congress of the United States has divided with the President of the United States, that the people have divided behind them, and all in the world that Communist aggression has to do is to wait for us to collapse.

I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I think, again, the Senator has been just as fair and just as candid as an honest mind, well informed, could be.

Is it not also fair to infer, from what the Senator has said, that the provocation for this policy, or pattern, is the existing situation of the Soviet Union and this country, vis-à-vis; that this is not a relief bill for Greece, but relief for Greece is an incident which could be handled in several different ways; that the real significance of this pattern, this policy, we are asked to approve, is the belief of the President, and the belief of the State Department, and the belief of the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that what is proposed is the right position for us to take vis-à-vis our relations in the world today with the Soviet Union?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator says this is not a relief bill for Greece, in fact.

Mr. PEPPER. I mean that relief is not the major element.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Exactly. In order to assess the justification for the Senator's statement, we shall have to define the word "relief."

Mr. PEPPER. I mean economic relief, if the Senator will allow.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well. Unfortunately, as the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate unanimously believes, economic relief for Greece by itself is futile and useless. It is simply a transient bounty, which will go down the drain the way the other bounties have gone, for the last 2 years, except as Greece can be assured of a lawful peace within which to develop her own institutions. So it seems to me that the word "relief" which the Senator used, in its larger sense, in the first instance, is the sense in which the word applies, and on that basis I think it is a relief measure.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. Am I correct in inferring that the sense in which the Senator is now using the term "relief" would also be large enough to include the word "security"?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; I think so. The Senator from Michigan would not want to retreat a sixteenth of an inch from the feeling which he deeply has, that the security of the United States is involved in the creation of a world in which Communist aggression has stopped, on a pacific basis, if there is any human way to achieve that objective; and that is the effort in which the Senator from Michigan thinks he is engaged.

Mr. PEPPER. So, the Senator is honest and sincere in his belief, as was the President in his presentation, that this measure is necessary on the part of the United States, vis-à-vis its relationships with Russia as a world power, and vis-à-vis the spread and contagion of communism in the west.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes, I think so.

Mr. PEPPER. Now, if the Senator will let me drop down to a lesser detail, I do not recall that a statement has ever been made, either on the floor or in the committee, as to what was the amount of the British aid to the Turkish armed forces before that aid was withdrawn. Does the Senator happen to have that information?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not have it available at the moment.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will yield further, it was my understanding that what precipitated primarily our proffer of aid for the armed forces of Greece was the withdrawal of such aid by the British Nation; and I wondered how the amount that the British had been contributing compared with the amount that we propose to contribute in the next 15 months?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not have those figures at the moment.

Now, Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, before he enters upon another branch of the subject?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. There has been much speculation in this debate, and there have been many implications drawn as to what may or may not happen as a result of this contemplated program. In view of the fact that the debate has been proceeding on that premise, would the Senator care to make an observation with respect to the implication the leaders of Russia might make, in the event the pending bill providing for the Greek loan and the Turkish loan should be defeated by the Senate, so far as communism being advanced into the Balkan countries is concerned?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think I made a statement on that subject before the Senator came in, but I am very glad to answer it again, and categorically. It is the fundamental point I had in mind when I said that while Senators are perfectly free agents to vote as they please on this issue, one of the factors they must consider is the price of noncompliance with the President's recommendation. Whether one likes it or not, he cannot escape the fact that that is one of the things that must be put in the balances when conscience weighs its decision.

The Senator from Illinois is asking me what is the price of noncompliance, and I say to him, as I said before, that it seems to me, in view of the basic psychology which is constantly involved in relationships between the United States and the Soviet Union, in view of that controversial psychology, and in view of the record of the past 6 years, if divisive refusal to unify the Presidential and congressional voices should become apparent, it would be a straight notice to the Soviet Union in accordance with their old policy of waiting for us to surrender, either through our impatience or through our anxiety to do business at any price. In my opinion, the chance of ever getting another pacific agreement with Moscow would have disappeared for keeps.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the able Senator a further question? Does he agree with me that the refusal of the Senate to grant the Greco-Turkish loan would be almost tantamount to an invitation to Russia to spread the communistic doctrine in Greece and Turkey?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the answer is obviously yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Then, after that, let me say——

Mr. VANDENBERG. But before the Senator takes his next step, I remind him that when I presented this matter in the first instance, I dealt directly with that matter.

Mr. LUCAS. I regret that I was not present at the time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I then asked a few questions. For instance, if you were a citizen of Athens and were on the rim of Communist invasion and subjugation; if under such circumstances your only hope was that held out by the message of the President of the United States, and if you heard that Congress had declined to join forces on any basis with the President of the United States, in his purpose, what would you do, as a citizen of Athens, except resign yourself to the inevitable?

What would you do if you were a citizen of Ankara, and had been paying a majority of your taxes for the purpose of maintaining an army of defense along your country's border line in connection with a war of nerves which had all but exhausted not only your nerves but your resources, and the President of the United States had said, "Something must be done to protect the integrity of this Turkish people"—what would you think if you were a citizen of Ankara under those circumstances, and the word came that the Congress of the United States had declined to proceed in the direction indicated by the President, namely, that the integrity of Turkey must be defended? What would you do except resign yourself to the inevitable?

And what would you do if you were a member of the Politburo in Moscow, if you got the word? What would you do? The question answers itself.

Mr. LUCAS. I totally agree with the Senator. It seems to me that what he has said in the last few moments touches the vital problem with which the Senate should concern itself. Favorable and prompt action on the pending bill is vital to the safety and security of our country. It is vital to the citizens of Greece and Turkey, as the Senator has so well expressed it. But, following that up, if the Senate does not uphold the hands of the President of the United States, I undertake to say that it will be an invitation to Russia to spread the doctrine of communism through the Balkan countries. What is then to be done? The able Senator from Nevada has been talking about war, saying this is a road to war with Russia. What are we then to do, after we shall have denied the President's request for a loan, so far as our own defenses are concerned? In my humble opinion we must retire into our own economic and political shell and begin preparing for a World War III some time in the future.

I understand and appreciate the risk we take in traveling on either road, but I am unable to believe, as the able Senator from Nevada indicated, that this is the road to war. I definitely think, if there is going to be any peace at all in this world, that what the President has requested the Senate of the United States to do is the primary road away from war. I am as sure as that I am standing here on the floor of the Senate that once communism spreads its ungodly influence throughout Europe and Asia and finally reaches the shores of South America, and we are totally encircled by it, some day soon we will wake up with another war in progress, and we will have a difficult time defending ourselves against the rest of the world under those circumstances.

Mr. McMAHON and Mr. WILSON addressed the Chair.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, before I yield further I desire to make an additional comment in view of the observation made by the able Senator from Illinois. I spoke about the reaction of the citizen of Athens and about the reaction of the citizen of Ankara. I am not primarily interested in those reactions because of my interest in Athens or in Ankara. I am interested in them because it seems to me that if they are what they inevitably must be in the event of the failure of this program, immediately Communist aggression, subjugation, and conquest have been extended to two key points in the world's geography and the chain reaction is almost as surely as anything in this word to extend from the Dardanelles to the China Sea, and, I repeat, westward to the Atlantic. I am interested in what the citizen of Athens and the citizen of Ankara think because of the effect of their thinking upon the security of my own United States. I think everything we do should stem from an understanding of our own intelligent self-interest.

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to make a comment. The Senator was asked as to what he thought the price of noncompliance would be if we failed to vote this loan. The Senator will recollect that, within perhaps 48 hours after the President made this recommendation, I commented to him to the effect that I did not know about the outcome of our efforts at Lake Success to bring about effective control of atomic energy, but I felt certain in my bones that if we did not go forward and uphold the President's hand in this situation, we would find that we would positively make no progress in those negotiations, which I for one look on as the basis of keeping the peace. I say to the Senator that if we were to retreat and defeat this loan we would see an immediate closing of those negotiations, which may be closed without success, and which may result in an atomic war. But we have at least got a chance of fair success if we tell Russia that we intend to uphold the President's hand, as the Senator has pointed out that we must.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Connecticut made that observation. A few moments ago I indicated, I think in response to the able Senator from Florida, that while we are here dealing specifically with only one segment of a problem, and that is all that is involved at this particular point, nevertheless there is a general pattern due to the fact that we find ourselves in this same type of collision and controversy in almost every forum on earth wherever the Soviet Union and the United States of America confront each other.

In giving some examples at that time I neglected to refer to the problem of atomic energy. I am grateful to the Senator from Connecticut for reminding me of it, because that is the overriding exhibit of all, which clearly demonstrates that we must go to everlasting lengths not only in preserving our own atomic secret but in endeavoring to find a common denominator on this earth whereby not only the United States but also the Soviet Union can join in outlawing the use of fissionable material for destructive purposes. That is just one more of those dire necessities which challenge us not to meet the Soviet Union tomorrow afternoon with defiance, but to meet it in firm friendliness, making them understand, on the one hand that we do not pose one single conquest against them and that we have every purpose to help defend their legitimate rights and boundaries, and have offered a 40-year contract to do it, but making them understand, on the other hand, that the price of an agreement in this world in which communism and free enterprise can live and let live is an acknowledgment of the fact that the United States of America stands for some human rights and fundamental principles which are too priceless to be surrendered. Except as that consciousness can be driven into the Moscow mind we cannot hope for the agreement for which I am pleading.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WILSON. I wish to ask a question in order to clarify the situation in my own mind. I find on page 3 of the bill, subsection (3), this language:

> by detailing a limited number of members of the military service of the United States to assist those countries, in an advisory capacity only.

The total appropriation for Greece is $300,000,000, is it not?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; $150,000,000 of it for military supplies.

Mr. WILSON. Does the Senator feel that that is a limited amount?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That it is what?

Mr. WILSON. That one-half of the total amount which is to be devoted to military supplies represents a limited amount of such supplies?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; because the fundamental need in Greece, according to every testimony we received, is the creation of lawful peace within which Greece can rehabilitate herself, and there is reasonable hope that if lawful peace is established in Greece, Greece can rebuild herself with the resources which she now possesses, and those which are to be made available to her not only here, but in a subsequent relief bill.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. I know that what the Senator told me is the hope and the ambition of many, but can the Senator tell me where in the report of the Foreign Relations Committee we can find anything to substantiate his opinion?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, we are right back to the same thing we discussed for an hour earlier in the day, if I may say so with deference to the Senator. No man can be dogmatic on this subject. I may be as wrong as I can be——

Mr. WILSON. Oh, no——

Mr. VANDENBERG. But this is a world in flux. There is no blueprint for it after tomorrow.

My hope may not be justified, but in my opinion it is justified. That is all there is to it.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WILSON. I am sorry I nettled the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I was simply asking for information. I think the people would like to have the information.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So would I.

Mr. WILSON. Why did not the Senator, then, instead of making a speech in answer to my question, say he did not know? I am asking for information. I think the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee ought to say either "Yes" or "No." I asked only for one thing. God knows, I want to do right.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is the Senator's question?

Mr. WILSON. I am afraid to repeat it, because the distinguished Senator from Michigan did not understand it to begin with. I wanted him to tell me where in the report of the committee I can find the things to justify the statements he has made.

Mr. VANDENBERG. All I can say to my able friend from Iowa is that I think he will find throughout the committee report the answer to his question, insofar as an answer is possible. What I tried to say previously to the Senator was that I did not think there was any answer to the Senator's question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. A moment ago the Senator said that it was impossible to form a coalition government with the Communist Party in any nation. My question is this: The United Nations is in effect a coalition government. We cannot take the Communists into a coalition government because, as the Senator said, if we take them into it they will try to destroy it. The only reason they would come in would be to sabotage and destroy it. Is that a basis for lack of confidence in the United Nations, because the Soviet Union is part of a world coalition government?

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the first place, I do not think think there is a lack of confidence in the United Nations today. On the contrary, I should say that during the past 3 weeks the response which has come to the President's program has indicated a greater degree of confidence in the United Nations than I had ever supposed existed. In fact, I have found the United Nations embraced and glorified upon many occasions during the past 3 weeks by those who heretofore have had no use whatever for it. So I cannot accept the Senator's premise that there is a lack of confidence in the United Nations.

I shall try to answer the remainder of the Senator's question, which I think is a fair question. Frankly, the United Nations is not a government. It was not intended to be a government. It totally lacks the characteristics of a government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. What is it, then?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is an association of nations for a given set of purposes, those purposes being to sustain and further international peace and security, human rights, and fundamental freedoms. In the operation of the United Nations one of the functional difficulties which is constantly developing question marks in the popular mind, to which the Senator refers, is the Soviet use of the veto. So, in a degree, the thing to which I referred applies even to our relationships in the United Nations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Why was there so much talk about surrendering sovereignty to the United Nations if the United Nations is not a government, and if it has none of the qualifications or qualities of a government?

Mr. VANDENBERG. There was no surrender of sovereignty except on a voluntary basis. I do not think there is any surrender of sovereignty in the United Nations.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I had understood—and I think the President so stated—that the proposed aid to Greece was for the purpose of helping a free people. Does the Senator suggest for one moment that the Greeks are a free people?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The present Government of Greece, according to approximately 600 American observers, was chosen in an absolutely free election. To that extent I should say that it has credentials of popular support exceeding those of some other governments we might mention. Whether that election was preceded by terrorism on one side or the other which affected the result and caused certain factions from voting, I am unable to say. But certainly the monarchy is not a democracy in any such sense as we use the word, if that is what the Senator means.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That was the point I was about to suggest. Greece is a monarchy. In no particular is it a republic or a democracy.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is quite correct. Greece is a monarchy. It is a self-chosen monarchy, at least on the record, and according to substantial testimony supporting the procedure which produced it. The fact remains that Greece is still an independent nation; and it is the independence of Greece, rather than the democracy of Greece, which is the sine qua non in this situation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator has made a very good case for the obligation of this country to use its influence, and if necessary, its power, to preserve the independence and protect the security of Turkey and Greece. I assume the Senator would extend that principle to other nations and other peoples as well.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes. I would extend it completely to Soviet peoples.

Mr. PEPPER. And to other peoples as well.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the Senator if he does not think it is an arguable question, about which there may be an honest difference of opinion, as to whether the method which is here proposed is the most desirable method for the United States to employ in the execution of such a policy and in the discharge of such an obligation?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have discovered that it is an arguable thesis.

Mr. PEPPER. The thing which I should like to have the Senator acknowledge is the fact that there may be some justification for difference of opinion on the subject.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me interrupt the Senator and say categorically "Yes." I repeat that no man has a right to be dogmatic on this subject.

Mr. PEPPER. That is characteristic of the fair attitude of the able Senator from Michigan.

There are two categories of action which might justify the concern of a great many people. One involves the question as to what we should do at an international conference, for example, where the question of the control of the Dardanelles is at issue, what we should do as a friend of Turkey if pressure were to be exerted against the security and independence of Turkey and we were called upon to express an opinion or take a position as a nation upon that question.

In quite another category is the question of what we should do, as an individual nation and as a member of the United Nations, if Turkey were attacked by Russia or any other nation. We might be called upon to go to the aid of other nations. It seems to me that the second category involves entirely different tactics. In this case it is proposed that we start in the first instance by sending a military mission to Turkey and contributing $100,000,000 in the next 15 months for the equipment, training, and maintenance of the Turkish Army in Turkey.

My point is this: Cannot the Senator see that Senators might conscientiously feel that we might well exhaust everything that could be done in the first category before resorting to a precedent which many consider dangerous, namely, for the first time sending a military mission to Turkey and putting up $100,000,000 in 15 months, without knowing whether or not we shall have to put up more hereafter, to equip, train, and maintain a Turkish army in Turkey?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I recognize the difference in the categories to which the Senator refers. All I can do is to repeat what I said when I presented the report in the first instance. I think there is a crying, fundamental need for Washington and Moscow to confront each other with all the cards face-up on the table with respect to all the various points of divergence and controversy. Where I differ with the Senator is that I think the procedure to which we here commit ourselves, far from interfering with that sort of a show-down, infinitely encourages the kind of a result which ought to come from it if the result is to be of any advantage, because otherwise I fear the Politburo in Moscow would misunderstand, as it has so often in the past, the extent to which we tenaciously adhere to some of our ideals and some of our designs. I think one of the prerequisites to a successful contact of the sort I am discussing is an understanding in Moscow that the days when we signed on dotted lines at war conferences have gone. I am not saying that we should not have done so, though God knows that when a man signs on the dotted line in a war conference it involves the possible loss of millions of American lives, nevertheless we signed on dotted lines at con-

ferences. But until it is perfectly clear that we are no longer signing on dotted lines my point is that I think even our friends in Moscow could not misunderstand the necessity which would be involved in the agreement for which I pray.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. But, Mr. President, have we not been hearing it said for at least a year that we had already adopted, through the State Department and with the able assistance of the distinguished Senator from Michigan, a get-tough policy with Russia; that we were standing up at international conferences; that we actually stood up, as it were, on the matter of the Dardanelles; that we had given notice to Russia that we would not acquiesce in her pressing for exclusive control of these countries, or even for control of the Black Sea powers and the Dardanelles; and have we not been sending battleships, or at least cruisers and destroyers, there which may be there now? And did we not send the carrier *Franklin D. Roosevelt* there and let the planes meet in the sky during the time of the Greek election; and have not all those manifestations been made by us as a nation in the exercise of our own sovereignty to indicate that we were standing up for principles? Can we not in the United Nations, can we not in our international councils, and can we not as a nation in the discharge of our own obligations stand up for principle and for the security of these countries without resorting to the precedent of sending a military mission, which we have never done before, to Turkey, to train, equip, and maintain an army in Turkey, 4,000 miles from the United States of America?

That is the serious question with which many of us are troubled. Can we not accomplish it in some other way, without adopting this dangerous precedent which from now on will give the Soviet Union practical justification to do the same thing in any nation in the world, including South America, if she should choose to do so?

One last question to add to that. Suppose, Mr. President, that a little while ago, when Peron, the President of Argentina, was shouting against Yankee imperialism and contending against the United States in Argentina's domestic election, he had indicated that he was receiving Russian assistance; suppose Russia had sent a military mission over there and said, "We will send you some military equipment and will show you how to use it and we will provide $100,000,000 for the next 15 months to maintain an Argentine Army to protect you in your fear against Yankee imperialism." What would we have said about that? If we do this, how can we say that Russia will be doing anything more wrong than we are doing if she does the same thing in some other nation of the world?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is that the end of the question?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; that is the end.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Wait a minute. I have the encyclopedia to answer first.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know of a Webster's unabridged dictionary that would be more capable of responding to the question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The fundamental difference between the able Senator from Florida and myself in this particular situation in which we find ourselves is a very simple one. The Government of Greece has said to us, "Except as we can have your aid, not only your economic aid but your aid to strengthen our resources in the defense of lawful peace, except as we can have these things promptly, immediately, there is little or no hope for us to maintain our independence."

In my opinion, which evidently differs from that of the Senator from Florida, the downfall of Greece under existing circumstances would expand the satellite movement of communism to a point where it would outflank Turkey and inevitably produce the same result in Turkey; and having been produced in Turkey, in the opinion of the Senator from Michigan, it would be an almost irresistible chain reaction across areas of the earth which would finally bring us into an exposure and a hazard which we had far better confront in its incipience at this point than to wait for its accumulation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, before the Senator finishes——

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not like to filibuster this bill, Mr. President. I rose about 2 hours ago to keep the record straight with respect to one or two things that had been said by previous speakers. My sincere feeling is that whatever the Senate intends to do about this matter, we ought to be about the business of doing it, because if our answer is "yes," the sooner the world knows that the answer is "yes," the less hazardous it will be for us. If our answer is "no," whatever chance Greece has to live to recoup in other directions will be the greater the sooner she has that answer. So I should like to proceed, if possible, with some progress on the bill itself this afternoon, and I am wondering whether as a reward for this rather prolonged catechism I could get a unanimous consent agreement to vote on the pending amendment in 10 minutes. I make that request, Mr. President.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I shall be glad to help the Senator all I can to reach an early disposition of the pending measure. I think we ought to dispose of it at the earliest possible time. But when the Senator says—quite good naturedly, of course, and I do not think he really meant it—that the time consumed in answering the questions which have been propounded is in the nature of a filibuster——

Mr. VANDENBERG. I did not say there was a filibuster.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Michigan said he did not want a filibuster.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator said he did not want a filibuster, and therefore he did not want to answer any more questions.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I hope the Senator will not take any of my sins unto himself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am not complaining. I simply want to observe that when there are so many questions the Senate has not finished its job yet. Until all the questions are resolved and until everyone is satisfied, I think the discussion should proceed. We speak of free speech in this body, and certainly we should go ahead with the discussion of this measure until all Members of the Senate have finished the debate and until all questions are answered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Colorado does not complain of any efforts I have made to limit considerations; does he?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Oh, no; except the Senator from Michigan just asked unanimous consent that the Senate vote within ten minutes on the pending amendments. I thought he made that proposal jokingly, but then he followed it with what I thought was a serious request.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Colorado would not blame me for trying; would he?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; but I was going to suggest to the Senator from Michigan that I myself would like to make a unanimous request that the Senate vote on this question at 5 o'clock on Monday.

However, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] who had to leave the floor of the Senate a few moments ago, asked me whether I would object to a unanimous-consent proposal to have the Senate vote this afternoon; and I agreed to it. Until the Senator from North Dakota is present, I would not wish even so much as to suggest the unanimous-consent agreement which I had in mind; namely, to have the Senate vote at 5 o'clock on Monday afternoon on the bill and on all amendments pertaining thereto.

But for the reasons I have already stated, I must object to the unanimous-consent request that has been made by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me before he yields the floor?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not desire to live up to the observation made by the Senator from Michigan; namely, that the Senator from Nebraska is never finished. I am not on my feet for that purpose.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I hope the Senator from Nebraska understood me.

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly did.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I did not mean he is never terminated; I meant he is never plowed under.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on the theory that I am never plowed under, and without attempting to keep the Senator from Michigan on his feet much longer, I should like to ask several questions, if he will answer them.

First, what military equipment does the Senator from Michigan believe we can learn, from the report or elsewhere,

will be shipped to Greece for the purpose of reestablishing the peace that is needed there, and also what military equipment will go to Turkey? As I understand, $300,000,000 of the $400,000,000 will be set aside for both Greece and Turkey for military purposes. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think so, that is approximately correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to know whether any tanks are to be shipped to those countries or whether any heavy artillery is to be shipped to them. In short, what will be required to reestablish the peace which we are told we are going to have in Greece?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts to wait for a few moments. Does the distinguished Senator from Michigan know from the record and the report the answers to the questions I have asked?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the first thing I wish to say, in answering, is in respect to naval equipment, because I distinctly remember the answer in that respect. The answer is that the naval equipment will largely consist of mine sweepers, for the purpose of clearing harbors.

So far as the military phase is concerned, the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who has a keener mind on that phase of the matter than I have, probably could give the Senator from Nebraska a better answer than I could; and, accordingly, I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, insofar as Greece is concerned, I think I am correct in stating that it is not planned to send any weapons larger than infantry mortars. I do not think it is planned to send any tanks. Most of the military supply will be signal equipment, such as walkie-talkie sets and other forms of radio. Such equipment is the most difficult kind to learn to handle, and consequently most of the instruction which will be given will be in the operation of such signal and communications sets.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator that I read the speech he made, even though I did not have an opportunity to hear it. I also read the colloquy in which he engaged with the Senator from Illinois, which is a restatement of the matter. But what would happen if the emergency required more than that? Does the pending measure contain any limitation which would prevent our sending heavier equipment to Greece?

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator refer to the type of equipment?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. Does the bill provide any limitation as to the kind of military equipment which would be shipped to Greece or Turkey?

Mr. LODGE. No; I do not think there is any limitation as to the character of the equipment.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is correct. So we may assume that the first $150,000,000 for Greece or the first $150,000,000 for Turkey might be used to provide any equipment that was required to establish peace. Is that correct?

Mr. LODGE. Up to that amount of money.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; up to that amount of money, or up to equipment of that much value.

Mr. LODGE. But I imagine that most of the money which is to be provided under the bill will be largely accounted for by the equipment which it is planned to send. For instance, in the case of Turkey it is planned to send equipment to rebuild the ports and the roads and the railroads and other communications, and I imagine that work will take a great deal of the funds to be allocated under this bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I should like to ask the Senator what equipment is to be sent to Turkey.

Mr. LODGE. As I have just said, it is planned to send there equipment to rebuild the ports, docks, roads, and communications facilities, such as telephones and telegraph, and some surplus weapons, such as antiaircraft guns, and perhaps some obsolete airplanes. The list is not entirely firm yet.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator tell me where I can get a break-down of the equipment which is to be sent, and where such a break-down is to be found in the report?

Mr. LODGE. That matter has not been broken down any more definitely in the report than I have stated to the Senator just now, because the list is not yet absolutely firm. It is subject to change in the future.

I am merely telling the distinguished Senator what the present intention is. Of course, the War Department or the Navy Department would have the right and, in fact, the duty to change the items on the list if circumstances made it seem advisable to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator; that is exactly my interpretation of the matter. In other words, there is no limitation as to what equipment may be sent into either country. That is the point on which I am seeking information.

Mr. LODGE. There is a distinct limitation.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; there is the $150,000,000 limitation on the first installment.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; that is the limitation; and I think we can assume that only weapons which are surplus or obsolete will be sent there. I do not assume that our Army or Navy will send any equipment which is scarce or in short supply in this country.

Mr. WHERRY. That is one of the questions which has been bothering me ever since I have been trying to make up my mind about this initial loan.

Mr. President, not only do I substantiate the words of the Senator from Iowa, who rose to his feet this afternoon and said, "I want to do what is right in this matter, but certainly the report is devoid of facts," but I wish to say that we cannot learn the facts from the report which is before us. What the military implications are, I do not know.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan has made a very fine speech, in his inimitable style, relative to what the price will be if we do not intervene. But I wish to state that when we boil it down, all we have is a guess as to what will be the price if we go the other way. We are entitled to know what that price will be.

Mr. LODGE. I am trying to ascertain what the able Senator has in mind.

Mr. WHERRY. In the first place, I begin with the point that the mission proposed is a military mission, and that it is proposed that we send there, not only equipment, but also provision for the training of soldiers. While the theoretical purpose is the establishment of peace in Greece, yet there is no limitation as to how far we might go in establishing peace in either Greece or Turkey.

Mr. LODGE. Nevertheless, there is a money limitation. I wish to state to the Senator from Nebraska, because I think he is asking a very interesting and valuable line of questions, that the bill does provide a money limit as to the amount of equipment and kind of equipment that can be sent. Of course, we might wish to go beyond that; but if we do, we shall have to have further information before we make an additional authorization. I do not see what the significance is as between sending 50 rifles on the one hand or 1 light tank on the other. I do not see what the importance of that is.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator from Massachusetts like me to make an observation or state a premise?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I would.

Mr. WHERRY. Because I should like to understand the viewpoint of the Senator from Massachusetts. He has been over there, and I myself have been there, and we have seen the situation fairly well, I think. Let me tell the Senator what my apprehension is. We are told, first, that what is contemplated is a relief loan, in the sense that it will provide security for Greece. The details were explained. It was said it was a sort of WPA, so far as relief was concerned, that we are to have an agricultural program, to plant trees, and all that sort of thing. I can understand that. But when we boil it down, out of the $400,000,000, $300,000,000 is set aside for military purposes. When we get to the point of making up our minds as to what the price might be, what the Senator from Nevada suggested this afternoon may happen, that is, that we go in there to establish peace, and come to the place where we cannot stop, or, if we stop, then we are lost. I should like to have the Senator tell me whether there is any limit in the bill to what is contained in the title or the whereases, or is it the beginning of a military operation in Greece and Turkey which might lead us into war, and if it is, I should like to ask the Senator what the impact will be then?

Mr. LODGE. Let me reply to the Senator, first of all, by saying that I quite agree with him that what is proposed is not another WPA, and those who depicted it as being another WPA were not being frank. It is not that kind of a proposition at all.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Such a characterization does not include the presentation I made of the bill, because if anyone ever was frank in saying to the Sen-

ate that it was not a suggestion for a WPA it was I when I presented the bill.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator has been completely honorable and frank about it from the beginning.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not mean to imply that the distinguished Senator from Michigan would state that it was a WPA bill. I did not have him in mind. But it has been mentioned as a great, glorified WPA project in Greece. I agree that it is not that at all.

Mr. LODGE. It is not that at all. I have been searching my mind for some weeks to find an adjective that would describe it. It contains some relief features, some economic features, some political features, some more or less military features. If I wanted to put it in one word, I would say it was a strategic proposition.

Mr. WHERRY. Strategic from a military point of view?

Mr. LODGE. From a diplomatic point of view. We cannot divide those things up into watertight compartments, any more than we can take a knife and cut a pail of water in two. The diplomatic, the financial, the political, all merge in together, and if they do not, we have not something which has any vigor to it. My belief is that a step of this kind is a step toward peace and away from war. That is my belief.

In answer to the Senator's principal question, I cannot read the future any better than can anyone else. Of course, we wish we could gaze into the crystal ball and know exactly what will be confronting us here a year from now, but we cannot do it. But with what vision God gives me, I can say that I think this is a sound step to take.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield further, if he would care to make one more observation?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the equipment we send, and the military aid we give, should involve an open conflict, then what would the result be?

Mr. LODGE. There is nothing we are sending, either to Greece or to Turkey—and this is my own opinion—and there is nothing we can send either to Greece or Turkey, which will put them in such a position that they can undertake offensive international combat action on a large and effective scale, because the population just is not there. I cannot conceive of anything we could do which would put either of those two countries in a position to take a military offensive. The most we could do—and we are getting very far afield in this discussion, but we are trying to examine all the approaches—the most we could do would be to put those countries in a position to resist aggression. I do not see how we could ever put them on such a footing that they could undertake an attack.

Mr. WHERRY. How will we be involved if we put them on a footing to resist aggression, or oppression—"Communist aggression" is the President's phrase, I think—with no limit in the bill except——

Mr. LODGE. Except dollars.

Mr. WHERRY. Except an initial limit on the amount of dollars, and we can easily increase that if we need to, because the President says if the necessity arises he will come to Congress for more authority. I am seeking information, which I cannot get from the report. The facts are not in the report. But I ask the Senator, as a military expert, and as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, if we do not stop the aggression, will we in any way be caught in the entanglement of an open war with Russia? If we are, what will be the implications then?

Mr. LODGE. It is not my belief that the proposal will lead in that direction. I should certainly be very much opposed to that. That is not the type of question the answer to which one can find in a report. The question is a very searching and important one, but it is also such a transcendental question one cannot find the answer to it in a report. I certainly cannot see anything in the proposal before us that is going to put us into an aggressive or offensive posture.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. LODGE. Yes. By the way, I appreciate being called a military expert, but I am not that at all. I am merely another humble worker in the vineyard.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the service the distinguished Senator rendered in the World War, and I was greatly pleased to meet him over there and talk with him when he was in the service. I value his judgment.

Mr. LODGE. And I am pleased to meet the Senator from Nebraska here, too.

Mr. WHERRY. I was about to ask another question of the distinguished Senator from Michigan, but I hesitate to ask him because now he is apparently worn out by the questions already asked him.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Hardly that, but I did not think it was necessary for me to walk sentry post in this dialogue.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan the significance of the time element. I have heard it said many times by the distinguished Senator that we have to have this done by March 31, and here it is the middle of April. By the time we get through with it and get it to the House probably another month will have passed. I have tried to expedite this matter. I think the Senator will agree with me that we want to bring this bill to a vote. But I should like to ask what the Senator meant when he said he would like to have the bill passed now, at the most favorable time. What is the significance of the time element in the passing of the bill?

Before the Senator answers, if he does not mind, permit me to make an observation. I have been a Member of the Senate for 4½ years, the Senator has been a Member for nearly 20, four or five times as long. Certainly since I have been in the Senate there has been one emergency after another. The cry has been, "We have to do this, and we have to do it now. We cannot wait 5 minutes. We have to pass it."

I want to uphold the hands of the President. If it is a question of doing that, and if that is the only significance there is to the request for speed, I should like to know it. Otherwise, I should like to know what the time element means. Personally, I think the question before us is so large, and that the implications that might involve us are so great, that we should have plenty of time for consideration. There should be sufficient debate to enable the people of the country to know what we are going into if we vote this initial $400,000,000.

I say that, not as being prejudiced in any way; I am still open-minded. I am still searching for light on the question. That is why I am asking the question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is the question?

Mr. WHERRY. What is the significance of the time limit, why do we have to act now? I think the Senator's words were that we should have the bill taken up in the Senate at the most favorable time. What is the emergency?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator is just as well advised on that subject as I am, because he has listened to all the presentations, and he has read the report.

On the 31st of March the Greek Government ceased to enjoy the support which it had previously received from the British Empire, under a relationship which was inherited by the British Empire as its share of postwar liquidation in that area. The Government of Greece requested assistance as of March 31. The President of the United States presented the matter on March 12. A month has gone by. During that month, so far as any experience of mine is concerned, the Committee on Foreign Relations has gone to greater length to try to produce information for Senators than ever before in connection with any bill that was ever submitted. I do not need to tell the Senator that, now that the situation is laid before the country and the world, the longer uncertainty exists respecting the answer the greater becomes the complication. That follows just as that two and two make four. I am sure the Senator will agree.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. If the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will yield, he has said that the purpose of this loan or gift, whatever it may be, is to stop aggression. May I ask what "aggression" is? It seems to me it means soldiers.

Mr. LODGE. There is such a thing as subversive war. There is the open and declared war, involving the use of soldiers, and then there is subversive war, which is the ideological struggle, which can be carried on so successfully that the Nation that wins it puts its opponent in a position where it could not wage armed warfare even if it wanted to.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. That is merely my personal view.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, for the purpose of obtaining his opinion, I should like to read two paragraphs from Kiplinger Washington Agency letter of Saturday, April 12. I should be very happy to have

the Senator comment on the following announcement:

Greece and Turkey, a little slow in Congress, but still sure.

Then Korea, six hundred millions—on the heels of Greece and Turkey.

Then will break the real story of United States intentions on world aid.

The real story is this:

Moscow Big Four meeting has already flopped—simply cannot agree on German reparations. Russia does not want treaty with Germany now.

Russia figures on collapse of Britain, France, Italy, Germany, on economic and political crack-up of all these nations—most of Europe.

Russia figures that the United States will also crack up economically, and will be forced to withdraw aid from Europe, leaving Russia free.

Time, within 2 years—as the Russians see it.

So our State Department is working feverishly on a big-scale plan for an economic-diplomatic offensive going right up to Russia's borders, even to Hungary and Rumania. They are close to famine, only United States can help. The plan is to send food and supplies and go in and supervise distribution. Thus, face Russians at their front door with food, relief, diplomacy.

This means a huge sum of money for economic relief of the world, including Britain, France, Italy, Germany, Austria, China, and others. Object is to prevent them from cracking up—keep Russia from moving in.

Amount, ten to fifteen billions, preliminary estimate, next 2 years. Get it out of the Treasury, although officials are working on methods of covering up the appearance of deficit to make the aid seem sweeter.

Why hasn't this been announced? Becaues State Department, as usual, is afraid of public opinion. And because the President is undecided on whether to let it trickle out at retail, as on Greece, Turkey, Korea, or to let the public have it at wholesale, in one piece, a big gulp. At present he seems to think Congress might swallow it better piecemeal. Nevertheless, the facts are as we report them, and will be coming along.

That is signed by Mr. Kiplinger. I should like to have an expression of the Senator's opinion on that outlook.

Mr. LODGE. That is a rather long statement, and I do not know whether it is accurate or not. I am not privy to the secret councils where our foreign policy is decided, but I can comment just the way any other Senator can comment, and to say, first of all, that I hope the leaders in this body will be privy to these decisions, that they will be consulted, and that we shall not be put on the horns of the dilemma where all we can do is choose between the lesser of different evils, after having been left out—the lesser of two evils, or possibly it might be the lesser of three or four evils. I do not think we should be put in that position. I hope we are not going to be taken by surprise. I hope we are going to be smart. I hope we are going to be intelligent. I hope we are going to be strong—and I hope we are going to anticipate some of these things. I hope we are not going to throw good money after bad. I hope we are not going to throw money down a rat hole, and I hope that when we spend so much, that we will try to get something permanent and something basic in the way of progress and in the way of improvement.

I do not call that imperialism. I think the talk about the United States being aggressive with its relief is complete nonsense. One is not aggressive with something that is good; he is aggressive with something that is destructive. If we can, by the so-called aggressiveness of which Kiplinger speaks, bring back Europe and give her people some chance, some hope, and a few of the decent things of life, so that they can once again be self-supporting, I would not call that imperialism. I should call that Christianity—and I do not apologize for it at all. If we can make that kind of expenditure and get those people back on their feet so that they can furnish a market for our goods, and so that some day they may be able to pay it back, I do not think that is a bad type of expenditure.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Is information available, or has it been made available to any Senator, so far as the Senator knows, as to what plans the State Department has?

Mr. LODGE. I have heard nothing official about far-reaching plans in the future. I read an article in the newspapers somewhat similar to what the Senator from Nevada just read to me. In Europe, for instance, we have gone ahead and restored the old crazy quilt of little independent squabbling nations; we have rebuilt the old firetrap, the old tenement house that has caught fire twice already since 1914. It stands to reason that there is no hope at all for Europe, unless we get some kind of integration. It stands to reason we cannot afford to let Europe, as a matter of humanitarianism or as a matter of realistic self-interest, go to the dogs, and so it is simply a question of whether we are going to bail them out with a lot of expensive last-minute rescue parties, or whether we are going to try to use our good offices to develop some kind of integration over there that will make some sense, and that will make possible the lifting of the political and military pressures that oppress them at this time. Then, and only then, will it be possible for them to achieve some degree of rehabilitation of their economic life.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. We have had two wars, and the Senator and I have each served in one; so it is nothing new to us. We probably would go again if it became necessary. It is my considered opinion that, since we have backed into two World Wars in the last generation, with little, if any, factual information, if we are now confronting a situation which might again lead to war, the American people should be given the facts so they will know the direction in which we are traveling. I have been listening here for 2 or 3 days to speeches. I believe one could look up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of 1939 and change the names and the dates and the places, and as applying to the present situation, substitute the speeches then made, to the effect that there shall never be anything done other than loaning a little money.

I made only one promise to my people. That was that until I understood a bill pending before the Senate and until sufficient information was furnished to the public so they could understand it, I would either not vote on it or vote against it. I have not yet made up my mind on the pending bill, and I shall not make it up until I have to, unless such information becomes available.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should like, if I may, to comment on one phase of the figures submitted by the able Senator from Nevada. We are constantly hearing the statement made that "if we go into the Greco-Turkish program, the next thing we know we will have to go into Korea." I think it ought to be made perfectly plain that there is an unescapable obligation in Korea which is totally unrelated to the question we are here discussing, and which we shall confront regardless of what we do in Greece and Turkey, because we are occupying the southern half of Korea and are responsible to the Allies, not only for the occupation but for the development of an internal situation in Korea which will permit us to retire and get out.

We have precisely the same responsibility in southern Korea that we have in the American zone of occupation in Germany, and I should like to make it very plain that, yes, there will have to be a Korean program, as there has to be a program in the American zone of occupation in Germany. But in neither instance is there any connection with the general program to which the Senator refers.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question. My question is not directed so much to the details, because I myself am convinced, after listening to the debate, that we cannot and will never know all the details surrounding this proposition. I can say for myself that I intend to vote for the bill. There have been addressed to me, and I know to other Members of this body, by persons outside this body, questions on certain fundamental matters which have been asked and answered again and again, but I heard the Senator's speech made the other day, which was directed more to the military side, and if it is possible I should like to obtain his views upon what I think are some of the fundamental questions involved in this issue.

First, respecting the reason why we should take this action now in a way which seems inconsistent with our commitments in the United Nations. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Massachusetts that this proposal fundamentally and essentially is a matter of self-interest, a matter of the security of this country based upon the idea that any war between any of the great nations would ultimately involve this Nation?

Mr. LODGE. I think this matter clearly involves the security of the United States. I think there is no question about that.

Mr. COOPER. I will ask if, in the opinion of the Senator from Massachusetts, any policy could lead more directly and surely to war in which we would be involved than a continued aggression by

one of the members of the United Nations—a continued policy of aggression?

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator restate the question?

Mr. COOPER. I ask the Senator if he knows of any course of action which would more surely lead to war and more surely involve this country in war than continued, active aggression toward and coercion of other countries by one of the members of the United Nations?

Mr. LODGE. The only thing that could lead us to it more quickly than that would be for us to give in to the aggression of other nations the minute it started. I think that would be a sure way to cause trouble.

Mr. COOPER. Of course, another important question which has been asked all of us, and it has been voiced again and again, is concerning the method which is now being proposed. I can say frankly that if I could believe that the aggression could be stopped by action of the United Nations I do not see how we could vote for the pending proposal. I wish to ask the Senator if upon the basis of the evidence we have had during the last 2 years respecting Russia's attitude toward us he believes that the continued aggression and coercion can be stopped now by the action of the United Nations?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, my personal view—and I am not an expert at all—is that the United Nations was not set up to deal with situations of this character, and that it would be taxing that organization unfairly, getting it off to a very bad start, if we sought to impose upon it functions which are clearly beyond its present power to discharge. I want to build up the United Nations and I want to make it do the things it can do just as fast as it can do them, but I do not want to swamp it, and I do not believe that this is a situation which can be dealt with by the United Nations at the present time. But I am hopeful that the action contemplated here will have some effect in lifting these military pressures and making some modicum of the good life possible for the people of the world.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts another question. The fear has been expressed here again and again that by adopting this measure we shall pursue a new course which some believe is without the United Nations, and I say again that it is my opinion and belief that we cannot achieve peace by any continued unilateral action but only through organization for collective security. I wish to ask the Senator if in his opinion this act of ours, which we could construe to be in the spirit of the purposes of the United Nations, could have the effect of bringing other members of the United Nations, and particularly Russia, to a more active and consistent participation in the United Nations itself, with good will and in good faith.

Mr. LODGE. I should hope that that would be the case. I do not consider that this bill, as it has been amended by the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, consitutes unilateral action. I think his amendment shows the deference which we have towards the United Nations, and it would be my hope, as the Senator from Kentucky says, that this action would lead eventually to more active participation in the United Nations by other nations.

Mr. COOPER. As I gather, then, it is the Senator's feeling that the entire spirit of this movement is eventually to bring about a more active participation in good will and with good faith by the members of the United Nations?

Mr. LODGE. I think if the Senator had heard the discussion in the Foreign Relations Commitee he would not have had any doubt at all of the strong desire of everyone to keep faith with the United Nations and the belief which I think animated everyone that the amendment of the Senator from Michigan accomplished that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to announce to the Members of the Senate that there will be a night session tonight, and, replying to the request of the distinguished Senator from Michigan, that if the bill is not disposed of by tomorrow at 5 o'clock we will have a night session Thursday night. So Senators should take cognizance of that announcement and be prepared to be in session tomorrow night in the event the bill has not been passed before that time.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I find myself unable, in good conscience, to vote for the Greek-Turkish program proposed by the President before the Joint Session of the Congress on March 12, 1947. Respect for the able and distinguished persons who are urging support of the President's proposal leads me to state the reasons that have brought me to this conclusion:

These reasons are:

First. The United Nations should be given an opportunity to function.

Second. The plan is primarily military, rather than humanitarian.

Third. Good-will of nations and peoples cannot be bought.

Fourth. Our first duty is to make democracy work at home.

Since much of the ground has been covered already in this debate, I shall try to be as brief as possible.

My first reason is that the United Nations should be given an opportunity to function.

We should work through the United Nations in solving our international problems. Only in the event the United Nations declines or fails to act should we act alone.

There is abundant evidence to indicate that a majority of our people, in approaching this problem, believe, first, that the impact of the airplane, atomic energy, and other modern inventions upon our way of life cannot be ignored; and, second, that Russian aggression must be stopped. I agree fully. I also believe that the solution which upon mature thought will appeal to our people as wise and logical, is first to use the agency of the United Nations. It has been set up to deal with just such problems as this. The United States, in becoming a signatory to the contract, agreed to rely upon it in just such cases as this. In section 1 of article 24 of the Charter of the United Nations, its members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. Austin reports progress toward establishing the police force or "peace force", as he calls it. Such help as it needs by way of military force should be forthcoming from its constituent members.

Some of the strongest advocates of the President's program have admitted publicly that it is unfortunate that the President did not even so much as notify the United Nations before appealing to Congress to deal with this problem. From my point of view, this failure is a fatal error, which is not corrected by an amendment, thought of afterward by the proponents of the plan, providing that if the United Nations ask us to cease and desist, we shall do so. The sound course is to start all over again, bring the matter to the attention of the United Nations, and then to have the courage, the patience, and the faith to believe that our hopes and aspirations in creating the United Nations have not been in vain.

The other day a veteran of 4 years with the 34th Infantry Division and considerable combat experience, wrote me:

> We fought for an ideal in World War II, and if the leaders of this country cannot keep peace after this last war they will not be able to do it after another. In short, we would be continually fighting because the so-called leaders of our country cannot settle a problem any other way.

I hope that this bill will not be pushed to a hasty passage. I cannot escape the feeling that before this momentous question is decided by the Congress a real opportunity should be given the American people to express themselves, and particularly should we hear more generally from the young men and young women of America, to whom the decision means so much.

My second reason is that the plan is primarily military rather than humanitarian.

The President's plan, in its bare essentials, is based upon the use of such military force as may be required to stop Russian aggression. In my judgment the so-called Greek loan is mere window dressing, mere camouflage. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] says that this plan involves strategy. Mr. President, when we talk in terms of strategy, in my book we talk in terms of military strategy. The essential crux of the plan is military support of Turkey, with the grand strategy of stopping the Russians at the Dardanelles. This involves an extension of our military frontier to the Dardanelles, to be held by American blood if necessary. This momentous decision should not be presented to the American people or decided by them under the guise of a loan to Greece and Turkey.

The President's plan to be successful cannot stop at the Dardanelles, but must be extended around the whole circumference of the Soviet Union, into Finland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Balkan States, Iran, Iraq, India, China, and Korea. If we dam the Soviet in one place and do not give it any attention at others, what do we gain?

As has been suggested today, the plan is being presented to us piecemeal. Are we to be asked later to "stop communism" in Poland, Hungary, Rumania, and other countries pervaded by it? If not, why not? The plan cannot be successful without the use and backing of strong military force. Twice in our generation our country has been involved in war. In each case the American people endured the suffering and sacrifice of war for lofty ideals; the first time to make the world safe for democracy; the second time to realize the "four freedoms." In neither case have they seen these ideals accomplished. We lost men. We exhausted irreplaceable natural resources. We created conditions which have caused dissension and doubt on the part of many of our people concerning the very foundations of our Government and our way of life. The investment, which according to the President we have made in world freedom and world peace, has not yet begun to yield returns. We have drunk the cup of war to the bitter dregs, and we want no more of it.

It is said that "Russia is not ready for war." Perhaps she is not; probably she is not ready now. But we are asked to make commitments on Russia's doorstep that may prove very embarrassing to us in a few years when Russia is ready and perchance we are not. Are our young men to go out to fight another Crimean War? If they do, will they or will they not have the help of the British, already enmeshed in socialism? Let us turn back and think carefully before we go in too far.

The President's program is a venture in power politics. The American people are being asked to supply the venture capital now, and the manpower later, when and as required. There is abundant evidence that the plan has not been carefully thought out. It is the quarterback technique already familiar to our people. It would seem from the answers submitted by the Department of State to questions that the President will call the signals without knowing, when one play is made, what the next is to be. Instead of a carefully thought out course in which each move is anticipated and planned in advance, we have a hit-or-miss affair, hastily contrived, with the British holding a stop watch, and threatening to pull the stopper if we do not act by a date they themselves have set.

My third reason is that good will of nations and peoples cannot be bought.

We have tried again and again in the past to buy good will and support of foreign nations, but each time it has proved to be a blunder. Has the President forgotten our experience? Has he forgotten that whenever we have practiced this system it has made for us something less than friends?

When Russia was a brother in arms we supplied $50,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease to other nations. Russia was given $11,300,000,000 during the war, and $232,000,000 after VJ-day. We have sent six separate notes to Russia asking for a discussion about repayment. After being prodded six times, Russia has finally indicated a willingness to discuss the matter. We supplied her satellite nations as follows: Poland, over $16,000,000; Yugoslavia, $32,000,000; Czechoslovakia, $619,000. Can we count them as our friends?

How about China, to whom we sent $1,500,000,000 during the war and $747,000,000 since VJ-day? Or France, who owes us $430,000,000 for goods shipped since the war's end? Have these gifts served their purpose and gained the desired results?

When we agreed to pay over 70 percent of the expenses of the UNRRA, some of us thought that we would not be called upon for these extras. This expense added to the aid given by private agencies comes to over $3,000,000,000.

It seems that even our worst enemies would acknowledge we have done our share, but the above is not all, because through the Export-Import Bank we supplied other billions in credit authorization to 20 nations in Europe, 20 countries of Latin America, and 8 Asiatic nations. No nation in recorded history has ever been so liberal with money and goods. And for our generosity, how have we been repaid? Is Uncle Sam held in either affectionate regard or grateful respect?

Turkey not only prospered from the war, but became a rich country, richer than ever in its history, but now Turkey, falling in line, asks us for $100,000,000.

Our experience has not been unique. Britain and France for many years played the role of Santa Claus, trying to buy and keep the friendship of these very countries. Each is now ready to acknowledge her lack of success. Can we afford to give European nations the impression that we are ready and willing to put up further and unlimited sums "to stop communism"? I am convinced that we do not have enough money, raw materials, or machinery to rehabilitate the whole world, and that if we attempt to do so we shall only succeed in reducing ourselves to the level of those that we are trying to help.

My fourth reason is our first duty is to make democracy work at home.

The most important thing before America now is to make democracy work at home, restore industrial peace, stamp out communism—within our own borders and in our own Government—balance our budget, reduce taxes, and put our economy on a sound basis. We are strong today only in comparison with the weakness of the rest of the world. The greatest contribution the United States can make to the world is to rebuild her own strength so that she can remain, as she is today, the bulwark of free government. We have more pressing measures at home than on the Dardanelles. Let us look the economic facts squarely in the face. In view of our swollen indebtedness and with the war boom over, is it within our ability to implement the Truman doctrine? According to the current number of World Report, April 15, 1947, if the President's present program is carried to the logical end, $21,000,000,000 would be committed in loans and grants in the next 3 years. These estimates are said to be on the basis of what actually will be disbursed each year.

There is already evidence that our economy is beginning to show the effect of strain. The President has noted the widespread complaint in regard to high prices. He has failed to tell the American people that one of the principal reasons for these high prices is the fact that goods and commodities have been purchased in this country in such large quantities by the Government and sent abroad. The Truman doctrine involves not only the money Congress is asked to appropriate now; it involves the prices on everything we eat, and wear, and use in our daily living for years to come. The Truman doctrine offers no prospect of tax reduction. Will we be serving the cause of humanity if, in an attempt to extend free institutions throughout the world, we jeopardize our own?

For these reasons, I support the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and I shall vote against Senate bill 938 on final passage.

To summarize, my reasons are fourfold:

First, the United Nations should be given an opportunity to function first.

Second, the plan presented by the President is primarily military rather than humanitarian;

Third, the good-will of nations and peoples cannot be bought, as has been abundantly shown by our own experience; and

Fourth, it is our first duty to make democracy work at home.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, did you ever feel impelled to say something about a big subject only to find that words to do justice to the real importance and significance of the subject just would not come? I feel like that now, Mr. President, as I venture my estimate of the situation involved in the administration's request to provide assistance to Greece and Turkey.

It is my intention, Mr. President, to support the bill before the Senate, but in doing so I want it known that there is little joy in my heart, no stars in my eyes, and few illusions in my head. I shall support, without apology or excuse, the President's program, not because I think it even approximates an answer to the problems, both foreign and domestic, which beset us, for this I plainly do not believe, but because the program was presented in such a way to the world that I cannot reject it, and because the program, from my point of view, possesses a measure of potential merit through which the United Nations may possibly become the instrument for effective force and leadership that its designers, and the faith of countless millions of human beings everywhere, intended it to be.

In his magnificent treatment of the problem the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] referred to the President's proposal as being a plan. He will not think me disrespectful when I refer to it as being at this time nothing more than a directive, an instrument which charges that a plan is to be drawn to achieve the mission set forth in the directive. A part of the plan, but possibly only a small part of the plan to be, is the requested emergency money, material, and manpower to be used and deployed in Greece and Turkey. This premise I believe to be sound, and if it is it ought to be emphasized, dramatized,

and spelled out to every American because of what the directive intends to fully accomplish and do.

The President laid down the directive in the speech he delivered to the Congress on March 12, 1947, a day and a speech I shall never forget. The President, who is primarily held responsible for the conduct of foreign relations said in part:

> It must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures. We must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way. Our help should be primarily through economic and financial aid which is essential to economic stability and orderly political processes. I ask the Congress to provide authority for assistance to Greece and Turkey in the amount of $400,000,000 for the period ending June 30, 1948. I ask the Congress to authorize the detail of civilian and military personnel to Greece and Turkey, at the request of those countries. I recommend that authority be provided for the instruction and training of selected Greek and Turkish personnel. If further funds, or further authority, should be needed for purposes indicated in this message, I shall not hesitate to bring the situation before Congress. On this subject the executive and legislative branches of the Government must work together.

Small wonder, then, Mr. President, that I see in this directive little to cause anyone to shout enthusiastically. All I can clearly see, however necessary, imperative or inevitable, is trouble and sacrifice and turmoil ahead.

The directive has a purpose and a beginning, beautiful and praiseworthy and to be desired, but it has no tangible shape or form or pattern or end. Only a plan can have these things, and there is no plan.

I talk like this, Mr. President, because I want to help our Nation to know what it is being asked to undertake. I want people to know that some of us resent the administration's urging us to move so fast into an unknown and uncharted and uncertain field. I want people to appreciate that it is one thing to write a directive, and quite another thing to carry it out. I want people to understand that they, and not their Government, are going to reap the benefits or the sorrows which result from the action being taken now. I want people to be conscious of the costs and sacrifices and burdens demanded by the program. Only by having these factors uppermost in our national awareness, can we hope, to my mind, for any appreciable degree of long-range success.

The so-called Truman policy frightens me, Mr. President, and for good cause. I cannot fully understand it, and I know of no Senator who fully understands it. We are told that the recommended assistance to Greece and Turkey will not set a precedent. Yet the President set forth very plainly that he would not hesitate to come before the Congress again if he needed additional funds or authority for the broad purposes set forth in his March 12 message to the joint session. I think every thinking American can foresee coming situations abroad which will demand, though they may not get, American money, material, and men. If we do not begin to think now about these possibilities, even probabilities, we shall be as totally unprepared for them as we were when the President let the Congress in on the Greek-Turkey secret for the first time, one short month ago.

While the President's speech included a directive, the substance and purpose of which we can understand and appreciate, it included one statement which I hold to be wholly, but not necessarily meaningly, misleading, and one which was calculated to minimize resistance and opposition. The President stated that the war having cost $341,000,000,000, he was asking the Congress for only one-tenth of 1 percent, or $400,000,000, as an investment for peace. Perhaps some others were as shocked and aroused as I was by the implications of this careless phrase. It implied (a) that we are only concerned with Greece and Turkey, (b) that we shall not be concerned with them beyond June of 1948, and (c) that the cost of war ended with VJ-day.

I trust that not a single American citizen will place any reliance or confidence in that statement. I hope every American is conscious of present-day facts; and if he is not, I trust that he will soon become thoroughly familiar with them.

In recent speeches the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] have laid before this body and the country the commitments we have made overseas since VJ-day.

In the 2-year period from the war's end until June 30 of this year, the United States will have spent more than $16,000,000,000. Two-thirds of that fantastic peacetime sum of money has been loaned, and one-third of it has been given away. All of it has been employed to make peace certain. I know of no other reason for using abroad money and material which we could so usefully employ at home.

We very properly worry about high prices and inflation, but we are adding to these national ills by aiding those in distress across the seas. Yes; long before we ever were confronted with the Greek-Turkey crisis, we had been making a mighty investment for peace.

We hope to have much of the money advanced repaid to us, but history does not give us much encouragement in that respect.

Compared to what the United States has already spent and invested in peace, the requested $400,000,000 does not loom very large.

But we must remember that it is in addition to the more than $16,000,000,000 we already have invested overseas, and we must not forget that there are other peacemaking contributions in the offing.

House Joint Resolution 153 would authorize $350,000,000 to assist in completing the great task of providing relief from the ravages of war to the people of the liberated countries. Still another measure, Senate Joint Resolution 77, would provide for membership in the International Refugee Organization at a cost of $75,000,000. Add the $400,000,000 to the $350,000,000 to the $75,000,000, and we have $825,000,000 which the Congress has not yet agreed to subscribe.

If it is right to assume that these measures will pass, where do we go from the date of passage? Which foreign nations and which international problems must be taken care of next? Is there a line which is forming on the right? Or is there reason to believe that once having taken care of Greece and Turkey and a few other odds and ends we shall have no further call on our resources from abroad?

Mr. President, we have not the remotest idea of what lies ahead. We can only assume that we shall be confronted with one further request after another. I wonder whether each future request will be presented to the Congress as a "Crisis"? Can we have any assurance that it will not? I do not think we can. The President said that on the Greece-Turkey problem the executive and legislative branches must work together. I wonder what he meant? The Senate did not know anything about the problem until the President addressed the joint session of Congress. The Senator from Michigan said he knew nothing of the matter until the President called him to the White House on February 27th. The only problem before us is whether we shall vote the 400 million dollars. Unless we want to repudiate the prestige and honor of America, we must go along. I think that from the beginning we have had no other course to take.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the Senator mean to say that he will vote for the pending measure simply because it has been put up to him on a crisis basis and on the basis that we have no other recourse? If that is the case, then if that procedure works this time, it will work at any time, and anything can be presented to the Senator as a crisis; and if that is the way to get everyone in line, it is evidently an excellent technique and will work all the time, because does not the Senator agree that from now on the crises will be more real and more urgent, after we once enter upon this undertaking?

Mr. CAIN. I can only say to the Senator from Idaho that in the remaining few minutes of these remarks I shall attempt to explain my position more thoroughly with respect to this crisis and the crises which lie ahead.

The President declared to the world by press and radio what he was going to do at the very instant when he was outlining the problem to the Congress. Russia, for example, knew as much about what the President had in mind as we did. Is this the course the President intends to follow in future cases? Let us fervently and vehemently hope not. Perhaps there are others like myself who will go along this time because we think worse trouble would result if we made America look foolish and divided in the eyes of the world by refusing the President's request. But that does not mean that we would go along next time, and the time after that. I do not think we would. But we might if the executive and the legislative begin now to map out and diagram

our international future. Problems of real magnitude do not spring up over night. They can be seen as they come up over the horizon, and they must be anticipated. If the President wants to work with Congress as the Congress wants to work with him, I think he had better begin to confer with the Congress long before another foreign loan or gift is requested.

Up to date Mr. President, there has been no bipartisan foreign policy except insofar as support of the United Nations and some peace treaties are concerned.

The Republicans know very little of what is going on in the State Department and in the office of the Executive.

For my part, I think that from now on we had better be given an opportunity to assist in fashioning a consistent foreign policy.

Despite the fact that the Presidential request before us will probably be granted, I feel that we have not been given a fair or intelligent chance to properly evaluate the scores of factors involved.

At the outset of these remarks I suggested that I would vote for the bill because it might help to breathe real life and effective force into the United Nations. Perhaps the wish is father to the thought.

I have the conviction that the United States, regardless of our strength and greatness, cannot long pursue the Truman directive without assuming obligations beyond our capacity to bear.

We cannot buy freedom for others, nor liquidate communism abroad with mere dollars; even though we had a million times more than we have. If we are going to make the attempt by ourselves we shall help others a little, but only temporarily, and then we shall as a Nation, be insolvent with no place to turn. That would be the great American tragedy. Our greatest hope for the future lies through the United Nations. What it cannot do today—as, for example it cannot help Greece and Turkey—it must be prepared to do tomorrow, if any of us are to benefit from our tomorrows.

If we recognize that our immediate obligation is to Greece and Turkey, but that our fundamental and continuing obligation is to the United Nations, we shall do everything within our power in coming months to make of the United Nations an organization which is capable and prepared to assume a score of Greek-Turkish problems. We must hurry, Mr. President, in trying to make this objective come true. We have no time to lose if we are to save civilization.

The Vandenberg amendment encourages the United Nations to assume our Greek-Turkey obligations at the earliest moment. The stage is set for a rebirth of action and positive conduct within the United Nations. I hope those nations recognize how impossible the world situation will become if they long permit the two great powers of the earth to struggle for supremacy and power and influence. If we go on as we are going now, I do not believe that war is just around the corner, but I know that war between the Soviet Union and ourselves can only be forestalled until the day when one nation thinks it is prepared to conquer the other. If I am right, and no man was ever more sincere in his assumption, I foresee that the United Nations will struggle with renewed effort and inspiration to become a fully workable organization before it is too late.

With possibly a few exceptions, I have probably seen more men die, in more gruesome fashion, and more civilians, of every age, sex, and walk of life, suffer in indescribable fashion, and more property and spiritual values destroyed, than all other Senators. There is nothing to cheer or dream about in this knowledge, but out of experience has come the knowledge that war is an answer to nothing. Anybody who thinks at all must understand this to be true. Those who want to see the truth realized must have renewed faith and confidence in the United Nations. The nations included must reconcile their prevailing difference, even if this means that the majority nations must use drastic means to force the minority nations to observe the common good. To be truly effective, the United Nations must create and develop an international police force with sufficient authority and means to defeat any aggressor nation, and to discipline any arrogant or errant member nation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let me ask the Senator from Washington, how is the United Nations to grow and thrive if we start the same process that scuttled the League of Nations, the great nations bypassing the United Nations, and taking unilateral action? It will throw it into disrepute, destroy the confidence of the people in it everywhere, and it will wither and die.

Mr. CAIN. In this instance there happens to be a difference of opinion between the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Washington. The Senator from Washington, rightly or wrongly, has the conviction that in helping Greece and Turkey, through the recommendation which has been made by the executive branch of our Government, we may give to the United Nations an opportunity, and time in which to become prepared, to do the very things I have tried to suggest in the last few minutes. I do not think there would be the faintest possible chance of the United Nations being effective in handling the problem which confronts us this afternoon.

All of us know that an international police force is intended. It is not necessary for me to say, or explain why, no international military body is presently in prospect. Should this force some day be established, I think that the nations of this world could then move in the direction of total disarmament. The senior Senator from Maryland has submitted a resolution which directs the President to call a disarmament conference. I am conclusively and completely in support of this resolution, but I very much doubt that any conference would serve a practical purpose at this time. Power politics continues to run the world, and there will be no change for the better until an international police force makes the maintenance of separate national armies unnecessary and futile.

In a recent splendid contribution the senior Senator from Massachusetts pointed out that in any foreign campaign it was not possible to separate things political from things military. How true this is, and how tragically often we neglected to observe the truth of that fact in the recent war. Perhaps we shall do a better job of combining things which supplement each other in the future.

In recognizing that we cannot dissociate things military from things political it seems equally clear that America cannot separate its domestic and international problems and obligations. The success of our participation abroad will be determined almost entirely by what we do and accomplish at home. If our people have no sympathy or understanding for what is being attempted abroad, we shall certainly fail over the long pull, but there are other ways in which we can fail in the attainment of every international objective.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is the Senator familiar with the result of the last Gallup poll?

Mr. CAIN. In what respect, may I inquire?

Mr. TAYLOR. In connection with the move about to be undertaken. Does the Senator know what it indicated as to how the people of America feel toward this proposal? Did the Senator see the Gallup poll last Sunday?

Mr. CAIN. I might make three points in replying to the Senator. First, I have not seen the poll; second, I shall make it my business to look at it; and third, each Senator speaks on the basis of his conviction after considering the facts as they appear to him.

Mr. TAYLOR. That has nothing to do with the reaction of the people to the problem before us. On March 28 the Gallup poll showed 56 percent of the people against what is proposed. That is, the question was asked, "Do you think this should be turned over to the United Nations?" The words "turned over" were used. Fifty-six percent said "Yes." Last Sunday 63 percent said "Yes" to the same question. The people do not like this plan of handling the situation.

Mr. CAIN. That is very interesting. I take it, from the Senator's position, we should automatically cast our individual votes on the basis of what the Gallup poll says a selected group of people in America think should be done.

Mr. TAYLOR. Most certainly not. I was not arguing that at all. The Senator asked what the reaction of the people was, and I was merely trying to inform him; that is all. Certainly we should use our own discretion.

Mr. CAIN. I have considerable respect obviously for what the Gallup poll said a number of people in America were thinking, and I would think about that as best I could, and study the problem in the largest sense that I could, and speak with feeling, as my own conscience dictated.

Mr. TAYLOR. May I say to the Senator there have been times when I voted against the Gallup poll. This time, it just happens that I am in accord with it.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEM. If the Senator from Washington will yield, I understand he is willing to support this bill and support an appropriation of $400,000,000 for the purpose of implementing the Truman doctrine, but he is unwilling to go further?

Mr. CAIN. I would say to the Senator from Missouri that that is not completely my position. In the first place, I shall support it on what to me are reasonable grounds.

Mr. KEM. I suppose the Senator will give us the benefit of those reasons during the course of his address?

Mr. CAIN. I shall, indeed. Primarily, my reason for supporting it is that I think the instrumentality to which all nations should turn in times of strife and trouble and turmoil, the United Nations, is not presently prepared to do the job. I should like to think that this sort of crisis would result in such a situation, recognized by everybody, as would redound ultimately to the advantage and development of the United Nations. We are going to be given an opportunity, I think, replying to the Senator from Missouri, to make the United Nations work. It cannot do so today in this instance.

Mr. KEM. Does not the Senator think it would be appropriate to seek an opinion from the United Nations as to whether it is capable, or should like an opportunity to deal with the situation?

Mr. CAIN. I may be wrong, but on the basis of such information as I have at my disposal, the United Nations, above all others, are conscious of the fact that they are not presently qualified to do the job. I believe that to be so.

Mr. KEM. The Senator believes that to be a fact, but has he had any official indication from the United Nations of that fact? Is it not true that Mr. Lie himself has scarcely veiled his displeasure at the action of the United States in proceeding in this matter without consultation or even notice?

Mr. CAIN. That, I do not know.

Mr. KEM. Returning to my first question to the Senator from Washington, as I understand, the Senator is willing to vote for the $400,000,000 appropriation, but he expressed some doubt whether our economy could stand the strain of implementing the entire doctrine as proposed by the President. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator think it wise to make a start on a plan which is hastily contrived, which has not been fully thought out, which, as the Senator himself says, is contrary to what he would like to see done with respect to the United Nations?

Mr. CAIN. Having a real hope that coming out of this present problem of Greece and Turkey there will be a rejuvenated and very positive United Nations, which can undertake such obligations in the future, I think it is very much worth while taking a chance with $400,000,000, which, as is known in this body, represents a ratio of 1 to 40 of the moneys we have invested overseas since VJ-day.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator feel, in view of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, to which we are signatory, particularly in view of the section 1, paragraph 24, of the Charter, that we have the option of deciding for ourselves whether the United Nations should handle this matter or not? Is it not true that we have already committed ourselves in advance to reliance on the United Nations and to entrusting them with the handling of a matter of this kind?

Mr. CAIN. I may say to the Senator from Missouri, that I think it very unfortunate that a complete understanding between the United States and the United Nations was not properly arrived at prior to the time of the declaration of need and the request which was made of us on March 12.

Mr. KEM. The Senator has in effect said he considered it a fatal error on the part of the President not to have given such notice. Does the Senator not believe that it would likewise be a fatal error on our part to proceed with the President's plan, which has been launched under such inauspicious circumstances?

Mr. CAIN. If I understand the Senator correctly, I take it that my answer obviously must be "No." The Senator thinks there is more virtue in opposing the proposal, because of the way in which the program was presented, than in supporting it. I take the other side of the question.

Mr. KEM. In the first place, I think that we are under solemn covenant to entrust such matters to the United Nations. In the second place, I think if we expect the United Nations to develop into anything more than a debating society we must show our faith and trust at this time above all other times.

Mr. CAIN. We only differ, I may say most respectfully to the Senator from Missouri, in the way in which we are going to achieve exactly the same objective. I think it must be done, under the circumstances, in this way. The Senator upholds the other side, for which I have considerable respect.

I have but a few additional comments to make, and with the permission of the Senate I should like to repeat the last sentence.

If our people have no sympathy or understanding for what is being attempted abroad we shall certainly fail over the long pull, but there are other ways in which we can fail in the attainment of every international objective. Our present heavy international commitments, which are certain to become heavier, are geared to our domestic economy. If anything happens to retard our industrial production or to lessen our national income, failure abroad will become not only certain but absolute.

We can best help nations beyond the seas by doing a much better job at home than we have done for a long time. If we did not have a single foreign commitment, the need for doing a better job domestically would continue to stare us in the face.

The Eightieth Congress came into being to rid this Government of unnecessary waste and extravagance; to begin to whittle away on a national debt which could result in national insolvency; to provide tax relief in order that men would be encouraged to venture capital again; to work out a relationship between management and labor which would insure continuing production. None of these objectives has been accomplished. Until they are accomplished, there is cause for every citizen to be suspicious of any stability in his future.

America cannot be foolish or shortsighted or wasteful or divided at home and have any remote chance of carrying the rest of the world around on its shoulders.

Mr. Henry Wallace opposes the intended assistance for Greece and Turkey. He considers it ruthless imperialism. That I think him wrong goes without saying, but more important to me is the thought that it matters little what he says, for he is generally held to be utterly and completely irresponsible. It was Wallace who shrugged and laughed off the serious work stoppages and industrial strife which followed his tragic, mischief-making statement of some months ago that wages and prices had no relationship.

What America needs is the application of some thoughtful, ruthless economic realism. We shall not pay our debts, carry our foreign and domestic financial burdens, and have peace either at home or abroad unless our industrial machine is fully and continually employed. Freedom for this world is geared to the assumption that America will work as it has never worked before.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will permit me to ask him another question, I should like to ask why our practice of stark economic realism should be postponed until tomorrow, rather than be undertaken today? In other words, why should we not look the economic facts of life in the face today and try to read whether our economy will stand the strain of the Truman doctrine, whether there is in it any prospect of tax reduction, whether there is in it any prospect of industrial peace, whether there is in it any satisfactory price level for years to come in this country?

Mr. CAIN. That mission has been too long delayed. The Senator from Missouri and I thoroughly agree on that.

Mr. KEM. May I suggest to the Senator from Washington for whom I have profound respect, that there could be no better time for the members of his party and mine to commence the fight for economic realism than on the vote on the pending measure?

Mr. CAIN. I think there are so many aspects to the Senator's point of view that I cannot answer them in one statement. To my mind, if we want to continue to live, we must become much more economically realistic at home than we have been for a long time, irrespective of any pending loan or grant or gift to Greece and Turkey. Secondly, it is a

matter of degree. I think we should take a chance on $400,000,000 which, if its spending results in providing a means qualified to do the job we are now undertaking to do, will then be a tremendous investment in the name of freedom.

Mr. KEM. I think the Senator has the same view of this proposal as I do; that we are taking a chance.

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. KEM. Under those circumstances, since it is the taking of a chance, would it not be better to take a chance of letting the money lie in our own Treasury?

Mr. CAIN. All factors considered, from my point of view, I can say to the Senator from Missouri, I think not, sir.

I repeat, what America needs is the application of some ruthless economic realism. We shall not pay our debts, carry our foreign and domestic burdens and have peace either at home or abroad unless our industrial machine is fully and continually employed. Freedom for this world is geared to the assumption that America will work as it has never worked before.

In my considered opinion the President was guilty the other day of uttering a statement which can do as much harm in the future as the statements of Henry Wallace have done in the past. The President said that if high prices did not come down it was cause sufficient for wages to go up.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the Senator mean to say that that is not a fact?

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator permit me to conclude this paragraph, by the end of which I shall be delighted to answer his question, if I shall not already have done so?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly.

Mr. CAIN. The President said that if high prices did not come down it was cause sufficient for wages to go up. This is economic heresy of a suicidal kind. We all know that prices must come down. All of us are looking for ways through which prices can be reduced. But none of us have any right to indicate that the evil of high prices can be cured by the equally great evil of adding to the cost of production. If we worry about inflation now, and every individual does, we know, if we know anything at all, that to take the easy way out by encouraging national wage increases is to speed the day of economic disaster for America and the world.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Does not the Senator believe that higher prices for goods, commodities and services are implicit in the Truman doctrine?

Mr. CAIN. I so stated in the earlier paragraphs of my statement.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAIN. In which I called the attention of America to the fact that one of the reasons for prevailing high prices is the shipments we are making abroad. But there are other elements of the price structure which we hope will help to bring prices down, and in that field I know the Senator and I are in perfect agreement.

Mr. President, along about 1874 or 1875 Mr. Disraeli, then Prime Minister of Great Britain, said "There is nothing around us but ruin and despair. There is no hope." Many a thinking person is inclined to believe that his statements are applicable today. I deny it, not because the ingredients for approaching disaster are not present, for they are, but because I think we have within our own spiritual, mental and physical resources the power to attain peace and opportunity for America and the United Nations.

I look to another one who had been Prime Minister of Great Britain for words and a philosophy to guide my thinking in perilous days like the present. When things were going rather well in the war in 1942 some friend said to Mr. Churchill, "It looks like the end." "No," Mr. Churchill said, "It is not the end, it is not even the beginning of the end. But perhaps," he said, "it is the end of the beginning."

That is what I think about our great problems in the year of 1947. Like many an American I dream and hope and pray that we are working for the end of our beginning toward a happier day for all mankind.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. It was said on the floor of this Chamber a few days ago that the United Nations is the last blessed hope for "peace on earth and good will toward men." I should like to ask the Senator if he agrees with that sentiment?

Mr. CAIN. If there is hope—and I think there is—it certainly will lie in an organization which is either the United Nations as presently constituted, or a better organization which will take its place. That is where the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Washington are thoroughly in agreement. But I conceive that if we endeavor to load upon them today an undertaking which they cannot accomplish, we shall have lost ever so much more ground than we should have gained. A chance—it is a fantastic chance we are taking whatever decision the Senate reaches.

Mr. KEM. The Senator will recall that it has been frequently said that the League of Nations was destroyed on the floor of the Senate. Is the Senator willing to be one of those who strike a mortal blow at the United Nations?

Mr. CAIN. In my conscious mind that is the very last thing to which I think any Senator in this Chamber would want to be a party. But I do not conceive that, in supporting the administration's request, we are either (1) bypassing, or (2) destroying the future effectiveness of the United Nations. Certainly I would not want to be a party to an undertaking of that character because I think the saving of civilization is the prize we all seek.

Mr. KEM. One more question if, the Senator please. Before the Senator votes on this matter would he not be interested in an official statement or declaration on the part of the responsible officials or the Security Council of the United Nations as to what they believe would be the effect of our action upon the future of the United Nations.

Mr. CAIN. Like every other Senator of the present number of 95 I want as much information as one can possibly receive before any vote is cast.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I should like to make a few remarks which are provoked perhaps by the able and interesting discussion by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] of the very vital point which has been raised by the thought-provoking speeches by the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Washington.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that those who oppose this measure use as a most forceful argument the fact that it will bypass the United Nations. I am bound to admit that that is a very potent argument. It is one which I should like to examine briefly from another angle.

In the report of the committee in connection with this bill there is the following language:

> During the course of its hearings the committee has carefully explored the relationship between the President's proposals and the role of the United Nations.

I believe that the President made a mistake in the manner in which this problem was handled so far as our relationship with the United Nations is concerned, and so far as the position of the United Nations in this problem is concerned. However, if it was a mistake, it has been made, and it seems to me that it has been ably remedied by the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

Reading further from the report:

> It has become increasingly clear that by taking the action suggested by the President, the United States will be fulfilling a basic objective of the United Nations Charter—to create conditions of political and economic stability which will preserve the freedom and independence of its members and thus safeguard their sovereign equality.

With that statement I am in hearty accord. I feel that all of us who sincerely and earnestly believe in the United Nations should likewise be in accord with it, because it seems to me that that is exactly what our obligation is. If we believe what we believe sincerely and earnestly, and intend to stand by it, that is exactly what this measure proposes to do.

I read further from the report:

> The United Nations was not created to supersede friendly relations between states through assistance from one state to another to carry out the purposes set forth in the Charter.

That statement means to me that when one nation can, by its individual assistance, help another nation which is a member of the United Nations, in a way which basically affects the independence, sovereignty, and status of that nation as a free and independent nation, particularly when the United Nations is unable to do so, we ought not to feel that we are doing violence to our obligation under the United Nations Charter or destroying the effectiveness of the United Nations.

Reading further from the report of the committee:

The Greek Government has requested the assistance of both the United States and the United Nations. At the request of the Greek Government, the Security Council of the United Nations is already dealing with important aspects of the Greek problem. A commission of investigation of the Security Council is concluding an investigation of the disturbed conditions along the northern Greek border.

As we all know, another commission of the United Nations is looking into the question of economic conditions in Greece. In other words, the United Nations was appealed to by Greece, and the United Nations went forward and did the things which it was able to do under the United Nations Charter, with the facilities it then had. As this report bears out—which has not been successfully denied on the floor of the Senate—the United Nations has no relief agency as such. It has no military force as such, and it has no money as such, to do the things which Greece has asked us to do. Therefore it seems to me that rather than being at variance with the United Nations in the proposed policy, we seem to be working hand-in-hand with it, the United Nations doing on its part what it has the authority and the facilities to do, and we on our part, as a liberty-loving, freedom-preserving people, doing what we have the power and facilities to do.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Is there any prohibition in the set-up of the United Nations which would keep us from furnishing the United Nations with such money as it needs to do the job?

Mr. BALDWIN. I think not, Mr. President; but I would object strenuously to that course. We have already attempted to deal with relief to foreign nations through a united organization. UNRRA was such an organization. We found that our money and our goods were being used, and others were getting the credit. Instead of our goods and money being used in the manner which seemed to Americans the most effective, desirable, and useful, they were being used in other ways. It seems to me that if we are to put American money into this undertaking we should operate it in the American way. If there is any objection, it is perfectly possible, under the terms of the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan, for the Greek people to tell us that they do not want us in their country, and for the Assembly of the United Nations, or even a majority of the Security Council, to tell us to get out. How could we be fairer than that?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator does not presume to compare the United Nations organization with UNRRA, does he?

Mr. BALDWIN. I certainly do not; but in effect our effort to put this money into the United Nations organization, which has no agency of its own to handle it, would simply require another organization to be established. Then we would be pouring our money into a project and having someone else administer it. We have seen in the past that a combined effort of that kind has not been as effective and useful in the cause of peace and in the cause of the prevention of starvation and the restoration of economic stability as we would like to have it.

Mr. MALONE. Is it not true that all the United Nations now lacks is money with which to do business? Is it not organized to handle international questions?

Mr. BALDWIN. I most earnestly hope that as a result of our action, if we pass the pending bill—and I fervently hope that it will be passed—and as a result of our gesture to the United Nations and the rest of the world, indicating our willingness to enter into any united effort, the other nations which are members of the United Nations will say, "The people of the United States have displayed splendid leadership. Let us get together with them and go forward and do this job." Then we shall begin to build the kind of an organization in the United Nations which can handle a problem of this kind. We shall then give it the power, prestige, and authority which it now lacks to do the job.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator expect any other nation except the United States actually to put up any money for such an organization?

Mr. BALDWIN. None has offered to do so.

Mr. MALONE. No other nation is known to have any money, unless we have previously loaned it to them. Therefore it does not seem very complicated to me to place the money in the organization and pull the trigger.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it altogether inappropriate to suggest that what has just been said by the able Senator from Connecticut is a little like one saying in Lincoln's time—and it must be remembered that I am a Confederate descendant, but I am proud, as an American, that all America saved the Union—"The Union is not quite ready to be saved yet; but if it breaks up, after it is all over we will try to form another, which will be a good union"?

Mr. BALDWIN. I do not know that I thoroughly grasp the Senator's analogy.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator appears to take the position that we cannot use the United Nations now for relief, or to protect the security of nations which are threatened with aggression, but that if we proceed unilaterally, outside the United Nations, and without regard to it, and save those nations individually, perhaps at some later time we can build up the United Nations to a position of such strength that it will be able to do what I assume we all agree it should be able to do at the present time. That leads to the question, Would it not be better for us now to do our utmost to act through the United Nations organization, and if it is deficient in power or authority, or, as the Senator has implied, in money, try to supply that deficiency and use the United Nations as the instrument through which to accomplish our objectives, rather than further to weaken it by admitting its impotency and acting unilaterally, even to achieve a good objective?

Mr. BALDWIN. In answer to that inquiry, let me say that if we had a year, 2 years, or 3 years in which to act, it would be well worth while to consider that particular suggestion. But we have not that much time; the time is short; the time is running out. If aid is to be given to Greece it must be given soon. That seems to me one of the chief reasons why we must proceed through this measure rather than through the United Nations, where we would be met with endless problems as to how the money should be administered, how the whole question should be handled, how best to preserve peace, and where to get the military force and the supplies to accomplish the purpose. Then, in the last analysis, what about the veto power when the matter reached the Security Council? What would be done about that? While all these questions were being considered and worked out, time would run on, the crisis would have passed, and Greece would have collapsed.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one other inquiry?

Mr. BALDWIN. Certainly.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the Senator if the latest reports in the press do not indicate that the Greek Army, without any of our money and without our equipment and a military mission being there at all, is progressing against the insurgents in the mountains, and does it not seem that the Greek Army is doing fairly well in protecting Greece, which has 7,000,000 inhabitants, against 13,000 insurgents who happen to be in the mountains. Is not the real need in Greece at the present time the need for economic aid? Does not the Senator believe that the Senate and the House could get together in a matter of hours on a program of economic aid for Greece, and then try to preserve the security of Greece either from internal aggression or outside aggression through the instrumentality of the United Nations organization?

Mr. BALDWIN. I answer the Senator's question by saying that there seems to be in the Senate substantial support for this measure. I do not know whether that had anything to do with inspiring the Greek Army to put up a really energetic defense or to preserve order in Greece. I do not understand, Mr. President, that all of the money is to be expended at once in an effort to help organize the army, to help suppress rebellions. That is the kind of thing we want, and that is what can be done under this bill, and that is what it proposes to do.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, just one other inquiry, if the Senator will yield. Is it not also a fact that the United Nations organization has taken jurisdiction of the so-called border aggression of Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria, and has sent a mission to investigate it, which is now preparing its report, and that the matter is to come up on the agenda of the United Nations? Is it not also possible that they may have done

some good in bringing about a better situation?

Mr. BALDWIN. It is possible. It may very well be that when we receive the report and have all the information available we may want to change our policy. That is perfectly possible. It may be that then the Greeks will want us to leave. They could ask us to do so, under this bill. It may be that the United Nations Assembly or the Security Council would want to have us leave after they receive this report, and then we could do so under the provisions of this bill. It seems to me that we have a very simple and sound program.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Would it not be possible to obtain some sort of a preliminary report before we vote on this measure?

Mr. BALDWIN. That I do not know. If the United Nations wanted to bestir itself in that matter, it ought to be perfectly possible.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator mentioned emergency. We have talked about emergencies for the last week. In the Senator's judgment, are we starting on another 14-year cycle of emergencies, concerning which we are not able to wait for proper information upon which to base a vote?

Mr. BALDWIN. I agree with the able Senator from Nevada that it is high time we found some other word in place of the word "emergency." We Americans have heard it over and over again and have heard it enough. I use the word "urgency." I would say that there is the probability of a crisis. It seems to me that our basic interests are involved. It has been more than a month since the President first proposed action, and we certainly have not, in the length of the debate and in the length of time which has elapsed, been treating it as much of an emergency.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. It seems to me that we have gained very little additional information from the State Department during the month of delay. Until we get some report from the Commission which has been over there on the ground, a preliminary report, any kind of direction from someone as to our part in a great international plan for establishing spheres of influence, if that is what it is, where do we go from there? The senior Senator from Michigan said that a move into Greece had no connection with the contemplated move into Korea. It seems to me that if we go into Greece for the reason the President says we are going there, then for the same reason we will go into Korea. I see no other reason to go there. They take care of themselves until someone else moves in. Can the Senator give us an idea of what the reason might be for this continuous emergency?

Mr. BALDWIN. With regard to the question of how much we know about it, as I understand the bill and the proposal a mission will be created on which there will be military representatives and naval representatives, and I have proposed an amendment which the Senate probably will consider, that there be representation from the Congress on this particular mission, so that we shall have our own representatives there who can give information directly to us, and in that way we shall probably know more than we could know from any Commission of the United Nations. Furthermore, we shall have the advantage of the knowledge and experience of the United Nations Commission. So there is every opportunity for more complete knowledge than we now have. I share with the Senator from Nevada the regret that our knowledge is not more complete and detailed than it is. As on many other occasions in life, we have to act on the best knowledge available.

Mr. MALONE. We have a Commission on the ground. I understand they are on their way back to make their report. We also have two distinguished Members of this body on the ground at this time. I understand that they will return on Monday. Would it be too much to ask that we wait until our own Senators return and ask them a few questions about what they found over there? By the use of the telephone it would not be impossible to communicate with the United Nations Committee and ask them if they could throw a little light on this debate as to whether or not they think America should act independently or through the United Nations. We have no information on that score.

Mr. BALDWIN. I would say in answer, that the probabilities are that this question will not be decided before next Monday, and if there is any knowledge or information which the Members of this body who have been to those countries and who are now on their way home can provide, there is every probability that the decision will not be made before they can be here to provide it.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee a question. I have referred to the Gallup poll. The poll which was published last Sunday was made on the basis of the same question as the poll published on March 28. The question was, "Do you think the problem of aid to Greece and Turkey should be turned over to the United Nations organization?"

On March 28, 56 percent answered "Yes." Last Sunday, 63 percent said "Yes"—that it should be turned over to the United Nations.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to ask the Senator from Michigan a question, and then I shall be happy to yield.

I should like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan whether his amendments carry out the philosophy and wish of the people, as expressed in those polls. Do the Senator's amendments turn this proposition over to the United Nations?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho knows the answer to that question, I am sure. I would say that the amendment turns over jurisdiction to the United Nations at any time that it wishes to assert jurisdiction.

What the Gallup poll intended to ask, I do not know. Although I have always found the Gallup poll interesting and encouraging when it agreed with my point of view, I have not formed the habit of considering the Gallup poll to be in the same classification as either the Constitution or the Bible. This is not a pure democracy under which we live, where Gallup polls are the controlling consideration. I quite agree that insofar as they reflect public opinion accurately—and frequently they apparently do—they are of very great interest to a representative body of this character; but if the Senator from Idaho will permit me to say so, I would hardly be able to rest my opinion in respect to a problem of this fundamental importance upon a Gallup poll.

I call the Senator's attention to the fact that in this instance, particularly, the Gallup poll might well be guilty of lacking adequate information on the part of those polled. We find that Senators who rise on the floor of the Senate have been in contact with all the documents and all the debates thus far and have been in personal contact with the President's message, and yet we find them saying that they are not sufficiently informed to be able intelligently to decide what they should do.

How we could expect to sample indiscriminately the sentiment of the American people, as Dr. Gallup does, and be fortunate enough to contact persons who are better informed than Members of the Senate are in respect to the question concerning which they are asked for an answer, it is hard to conceive. I think it is quite obvious that a poll of this particular character is not so impressive as some of the other Gallup polls are.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank the Senator for his extended answer. I appreciate it sincerely.

My only reason for bringing up the point was that the editors of the Gallup poll—Mr. Gallup himself, I assume, or at least editors writing under his name—say that their poll would appear to bear out the position of the Senator from Michigan and to support his amendments.

That is why I wish to ask him whether his amendments would turn over this undertaking to the United Nations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if I have not answered that question, I wish to be very sure that I do, because it is a perfectly fair question. In my opinion, the amendment which has been adopted gives the Security Council or the General Assembly of the United Nations a—shall we call it—residuary jurisdiction to recall this plan whenever it has the votes to do so and has such a disposition. Therefore, since the first instance, in my opinion, it would be impossible for the United Nations to take jurisdiction, I think we have gone as far to give it jurisdiction as, from my point of view, is possible, as a result of the amendment to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was in no way trying to embarrass the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is not embarrassing me in the slightest.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to point out that Mr. Gallup went a little off base in trying to read into his poll things that the poll itself did not show. That is my sole aim.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator's quarrel is with Dr. Gallup, then, and not with me.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan means to say that 1 week after this loan is granted, if the Security Council of the United Nations or the Assembly of the United Nations by majority vote, if I remember correctly, wished to take jurisdiction, it could take jurisdiction and could take this matter out of the hands of the United States of America.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me read the amendment, because it is a perfectly clear justification for the Senator's statement:

The President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein under any of the following circumstances.

The second circumstance is:

If the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of the veto) or the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable.

Even "undesirable," Mr. President. I think the answer to the Senator's question is emphatically, unequivocally, and without reservation, "Yes."

Furthermore, I should like to add, because I feel it so keenly myself, that I do not think anyone in this Chamber would accuse me of any lack of fidelity to the United Nations. I have given my life to it.

In my opinion, in all the story of the United Nations there has never been an act of voluntary allegiance equal to the unanimous adoption by the Senate of the United States of a declaration that we will yield to the judgment of the Security Council, regardless of anyone's veto. I should like to see a parallel to that act of faith on the part of anyone else on earth.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, that is the point I was about to discuss next, as a result of a preliminary question or two. I was about to discuss the very thing the Senator from Michigan has mentioned, namely, the yielding upon the part of this country to the veto power set up in the United Nations organization.

Anyone who is aware of what has been going on knows definitely, as a result of the using of the veto power by a certain nation now a member of the United Nations, that this matter never could have been handled by the United Nations in the beginning, and, in my judgment, the only way the United Nations could have had any jurisdiction whatsoever was by having us do exactly what has been done through the amendments offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

In my judgment, the United Nations would never have taken jurisdiction of this matter in the beginning, had we depended solely upon that organization to do it, because the veto power would have been used. In other words, under this amendment, we are almost forcing the United Nations to take jurisdiction—not unanimously, as is suggested under the Charter of the United Nations organization, but by only a majority of those in the Assembly or in the Security Council. We are hereby yielding some of our precious sovereignty to show our good faith in working toward peace.

Mr. President, I undertake to say that there has never been, in the interest of something that is fundamentally right, in the interest of looking forward to something that is peaceful in this world, in the interest of a suffering humanity, a greater piece of generosity upon the part of any nation, in any great, fundamental world upheaval such as the one we are experiencing at the present time.

The only reason that we do it, Mr. President, the only reason why an amendment of this kind is offered and adopted, whereby the United States of America in a way gives up its jurisdiction and its right to handle a unilateral proposition of this kind, is because we want to demonstrate to the people of America and to the people of the world that we are moving in the utmost good faith toward bringing about an everlasting peace—the kind of peace that mankind has been crying for for so long.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, today we have listened to what I consider to be one of the most spirited and searching debates I have heard on the floor of the Senate for some time.

I am sure we all appreciate the gravity of the situation which confronts us. I wish to say at the outset that I am not opposing the pending bill. It is my desire to support the President's proposal, and to support the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations who presented the pending bill in the Senate.

However, there are certain considerations which I wish to call to the attention of the Senate which may affect the final form the bill should take. I have a few amendments which I wish to present, and I shall develop these matters during the course of my discussion.

The legislation we are considering here is no ordinary bill to provide funds for relief, economic assistance, and military aid to Greece and Turkey alone. This is a bill intended, as the President of the United States said, in addressing the Congress on March 12, 1947, "to implement the foreign policy and the national security of this country."

The bill provides:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President may, from time to time, when he deems it in the interest of the United States, furnish assistance to Greece and Turkey, upon request of their governments, and upon terms and conditions determined by him—

(1) By rendering financial aid in the form of loans, credits, grants, or otherwise, to those countries;

(2) By detailing to assist those countries any persons in the employ of the Government of the United States; and the provisions of the act of May 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 442), as amended, applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to such act, as amended, shall be applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to this paragraph;

(3) By detailing a limited number of members of the military services of the United States to assist those countries, in an advisory capacity only; and the provisions of the act of May 19, 1926 (44 Stat. 565), as amended, applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to such act, as amended, shall be applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to this paragraph; and

(4) By providing for (A) the transfer to, and the procurement for, by manufacture or otherwise, and the transfer to, those countries of any articles, services, and information, and (B) the instruction and training of personnel of those countries.

The President has stated clearly the intention behind this bill. He declared:

One of the primary objectives of the foreign policy of the United States is the creation of conditions in which we and other nations will be able to work out a way of life free from coercion. * * * We shall not realize our objectives unless we are willing to help free peoples to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes. * * * I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures. * * * The disappearance of Greece as an independent state would have a profound effect upon those countries in Europe whose peoples are struggling against great difficulties to maintain their freedoms and their independence while they repair the damages of war. * * * Should we fail to aid Greece and Turkey in the fateful hour, the effect will be far reaching to the west as well as to the east. We must take immediate and resolute action.

Mr. President, the import of the proposed legislation is easy to understand. We are assuming the obligation of defending democracy and opposing communistic imperialism in the world. The able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] concisely stated the purpose of the bill when he said it is intended to "put a stop to further communistic imperialism."

Mr. President, I am sure that we all wholeheartedly share the feeling expressed by the Senator from Georgia and other Senators during this debate, that we must not fail to oppose communistic imperialism with all the vigor and resources we possess. Nevertheless, in this resolve we must not fail to recognize that there is a widespread feeling in the country that this is not solely an American problem. It is a problem of all democracies. It is one, from a financial standpoint, that we cannot shoulder alone.

In accepting the challenge of communistic imperialism, however rich we may be, we are engaging in an international undertaking which may lead us into far greater financial commitments than the ones involved in the present proposal.

The able Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is recognized as an authority on the fiscal problems of the Nation, has asked that a financial survey of the situation be made so that we might know just what our total obligations will amount to, and so enable us to determine whether we can safely undertake the financing of such a program. Although our assumption of world leadership is important and commendable, the

manner in which we assume and discharge our responsibilities is equally vital.

In a recent article published by an investment research organization in New York City, known as Value-Line Investment Survey, I find the following statement, which I quote:

> We are of the opinion that even if the United States should establish an anti-Communist regime on the Greek flank of the Dardanelles, Russia would not immediately go to war. But American commitments in Greece, if they are to achieve their purpose, would have to be followed by commitments in other parts of the world, and such extensive undertakings would weaken capitalism in the American sphere. In so doing, they would prove to be self-defeating.

Let me point out, Mr. President, that in Greece we are not dealing at the present time with a democratic government. What we do under this proposal in Greece, therefore, will be scrutinized throughout the world, and in the years to come we will be held accountable for any mistakes we may make. The present government in Greece was originally imposed on the people there by the British Army. The present government is by no means a genuine democratic government. Nevertheless, it is the government that we will, under the present plan, be called upon to sustain until such time as the people of that country may be able to express their wishes in a genuinely free election, if they ever may be permitted to do so.

Frederick R. Coudert, New York lawyer and authority on international law, in the New York Times of April 6 says that the move we are considering is not a move merely to prevent the infiltration of communism into democratic countries. If that were the only thing involved, we would not have this measure before us today.

"All sane men," says Mr. Coudert, "would recoil from any such religious wars as afflicted Europe in the sixteenth century." Mr. Coudert then asks, "Why has there been this misunderstanding and camouflage regarding our dominant and real reason?" He then goes on to point out that perhaps it was because of the bad odor of the balance-of-power policy that the effort was made to place the move on the ground that it was being used to prevent the expansion of communism.

Mr. Coudert thinks what we are really trying to do by the steps we are taking is the application of the balance of power methods to Russia. We are proposing by this measure, he points out, to hem Russia in on the Black Sea and prevent her passing through the Dardanelles to become a Mediterranean and Atlantic power, and threaten our security and safety. It was to prevent Russia from becoming a Mediterranean and Atlantic power back in 1878 that the British mobilized their fleet to stop Russia from overwhelming Turkey and gaining access to the sea.

Now, Mr. President, the representatives of the Soviet Government understand perfectly well what this program is all about. Russia has been struggling for centuries to get through the Dardanelles. The British are stepping out of the way and turning over to the United States the responsibility of holding the Russians in check. Of course, the British are more anxious to stop Russia coming through the Dardanelles than we are. They are seeking to consolidate their interests in the Near East and in Africa, and if Russia were to get through the Dardanelles at this time the British would be seriously threatened.

Naturally, the United States will have to assume the blame, as well as the credit, for having blocked Russia from becoming a Mediterranean and Atlantic power. But, in this connection, it might be well to consider what some experts seem to think about the situation. It is thought by many that later on the British and the Russians will get together. Their interests will be more complementary than ours, and it would not be unnatural for England and Russia in the years to come to enter into closer relations.

I do not offer these matters as conclusive reasons for rejecting this proposal. But I do think these considerations should give us pause; we should not act precipitately; we should certainly know the facts and pursue the inquiry suggested by the able Senator from Virginia before final action is taken.

The able chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee invited all members of the Senate who had questions or amendments to offer to come before the committee. Accordingly, I appeared with other Senators and presented some amendments. These amendments were considered by the full committee. Two of my amendments were adopted in part by the committee, and I believe the others were embodied in the committee report accompanying the bill S. 938. Mr. President, I wish to express my high appreciation for the manner in which the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and members of his committee have handled this legislation which was suddenly thrust upon them for quick action. They felt impelled to abbreviate the hearings, but their frank and statesmanlike action in setting forth in the report the full implications of the bill is commendable. In their report they have set forth with great clarity the obligations to be taken on by the executive branch of the Government in carrying out the provisions of the bill.

The Committee on Foreign Relations, in its report, among other matters, points out that—

> The committee is strongly of the opinion that the fullest success will not be achieved unless competent persons are sent to Greece to insure the development of controls at key points and to supervise their application. The United States Government must be assured that sound policies will be adopted and effectively administered in matters such as the following: Fiscal methods, a modern tax structure, a strict husbanding and control of the foreign-exchange earnings of the Greek people, conservation of remaining gold resources, a restriction on unessential imports, and the expansion of Greece's exports. These measures are necessary to enable Greece to achieve stability.

Furthermore, Mr. President, while the report specifically declares that the United States is rendering this aid to Greece of necessity "to meet a short-term crisis," it further says, "the proposals made by the President do not preclude longer-range action by United Nations agencies on behalf of Greece. On the contrary, they set the stage for such action." In the bill itself the declaration is made that this legislation is necessary because—

> The United Nations is not now in a position to furnish to Greece and Turkey the financial and economic assistance which is immediately required.

In this declaration I read the intent on the part of the United States that the United Nations should assume this as its obligation as soon as possible. I further read in another provision of the bill the same intent, where it says:

> The President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein * * * if (he is) officially notified by the United Nations that the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of the veto), or that the General Assembly finds, that action or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undersirable.

These sections of the bill have been widely acclaimed as declarations proving that we are not bypassing the United Nations but that we are accepting only an emergency responsibility to bridge the short-term crisis now confronting Greece.

I am in accord with the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in his desire to make it clear that we are not bypassing the United Nations. However, I do not believe his amendment goes far enough. I therefore intend to propose an amendment further clarifying this matter so as to make it absolutely clear that it is the understanding of this Government that the assistance we are rendering is wholly an emergency matter, it being the understanding of this Government that the rendering of such assistance is the continuing responsibility of the United Nations. I intend to offer such an amendment because I feel that we must in clear and unmistakable language set forth that this is an emergency matter, and that the continuing responsibility for assistance to Greece and Turkey by common consent is one of the very fundamental purposes involved in the establishment of the United Nations organization.

Another amendment to the bill seems to be absolutely necessary. I refer to my amendment proposing that the Congress of the United States establish a Joint Congressional Committee, composed of three members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and three members of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, which shall, not less than twice a year, during the period this act is in effect, visit the countries receiving assistance under it, and shall make full reports to the Congress and to the American people as to the administration of this act, current problems, and the conditions in the countries visited, so that the interests of the United States may

be fully understood and protected. The purpose and need of this amendment is obvious, and I will not take up any time in discussing it. It speaks for itself.

Mr. President, this legislation, calling for intervention in the affairs of Greece and Turkey in the form of economic and military assistance, presents one of the gravest questions our country has ever been called upon to face. It is a question with so many implications and ramifications that few of our citizens not familiar with foreign affairs can fully comprehend its ultimate significance.

The people of the country generally have not a full understanding of the underlying facts and circumstances. Already it appears to have created widespread confusion and conflicting opinions in the minds of the people. Daily we see in the press evidences of this confusion and misunderstanding. Columnists, editors, private citizens, and groups of citizens throughout the country are giving their views in constantly increasing volume. One cannot pick up a newspaper without observing these conflicting views.

Having only recently concluded the most terrifying and destructive war in our history, our people have been looking forward with hope and encouragement to a period of genuine peace; a period in which they might have an opportunity to recover from the tragic dislocations of the war and readjust their lives to peaceful pursuits.

In the midst of these preoccupations, they have been profoundly disturbed and confused by this sudden and unexpected proposal. Judging from my mail, which I believe is no different than the mail of other Senators, I find it has produced two conflicting reactions. One section of my correspondents express enthusiastic approval of the proposed policy. They take the view that our Government must have an immediate show-down with Russia; that the constant expansion of Russia's dominions and spheres of influence and the infiltration of communism into other countries requires the prompt and unequivocal approval of this policy. It is argued by some that inasmuch as we have the secret of the atomic bomb, and the greatest military and economic resources in the world, we can fight Russia now and settle, once and for all, these problems that are causing so much fear and uncertainty in the world. They feel convinced that we will be correct in taking a stand in Greece and Turkey to challenge the threat of Soviet imperialism and the onward march of communism which they assert threatens to engulf the world and eventually destroy our own way of life in America.

Of course, if this judgment regarding Soviet aggression is correct, and it cannot otherwise be checked, the proposal is entitled to the wholehearted and patriotic backing of the American people.

But, Mr. President, a large number of our people, perhaps a majority, as indicated by the Gallup polls and the correspondence we are receiving, are expressing grave fear and alarm lest the course proposed may inevitably lead us into national bankruptcy or into a war which may be more deadly and destructive than the one from which we just emerged. These individuals express the opinion that because of the dangerous implications involved in the proposed policy, it should not be assumed as the individual responsibility of our country. It is felt by these persons that this is a responsibility exclusively within the jurisdiction of the United Nations. It is easy to understand the reaction of this large section of our people.

Hardly a family in America escaped the ravages of the late war. Even in the most remote sections of our country few families failed to mourn the loss of sons or relatives. They have been closely touched by the horrors of World War II, the most dreadful and destructive war that has ever afflicted the earth. They do not easily react to the rhetorical appeals and stirring argument of those who feel that America is rich and powerful and should undertake the burden of making democracy safe for the whole world. They feel sincerely that this is a program for all the democratic nations working through the United Nations. If the United Nations cannot shoulder the task, they want this proven beyond any reasonable dispute.

Mr. President, it is true that we all feel thoroughly disillusioned and disappointed with the delaying tactics and maneuverings of the Soviet diplomats at the peace conferences. The press dispatches which we have been reading, and must rely on, have convinced us that Russia is not cooperating in a genuine endeavor to bring an early peace to the world. No one can condone their efforts to delay, confuse, and prevent the prompt consideration and settlement of the many difficult problems that have grown out of the war.

But, Mr. President, when we talk of military assistance to Greece and Turkey, for the purpose of preventing the infiltration of communism into the outer world or for the purpose of hemming in Russia so as to prevent her expansion and passage through the Dardanelles to participate with other big nations in the economic exploitation of the Near East, I can readily understand how large sections of our people may feel that in following such a course we are undertaking something which may lead us into far greater commitments than we are proposing to make in Greece and Turkey.

Senators on both sides of this body during the present debate have taken the floor and pointed out that this Greece-Turkey program will lead us inevitably into further and even more stupendous commitments. The able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], a few days ago said:

> Obviously, we will not be confined to this single request from Greece and Turkey but will have to underwrite all European and Asiatic countries, and I doubt if the United States is either able or willing to engage in that sort of a program. I fear that our attempt to enter the internal affairs of Greece and Turkey inevitably means another war.

Following the Senator from South Dakota, the able Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], expressed views along the same lines. Among other things, he said:

> It seems to me that in our study and discussion of this proposed loan—or shall I say grant or gift—to Greece and Turkey, we should consider it not as an isolated plan but as a tile in a large mosaic. If the United States proceeds to take the step requested, it should not do so with blinders on. The Nation should act only after a careful look around the barrel. * * * The searchlight of truth should be turned on in full force for the benefit of the American people.

The able Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], speaking on the subject of aid to Greece and Turkey, said:

> This situation is different. We are embarking on a long, new adventure. We have set out to achieve peace actively, rather than enjoy it passively and precariously. We must shed on this long, new adventure every ray of light which can be gathered from every source. Those rays of light must be directed onto the dim, difficult path which lies ahead.

The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] also expressed serious concern over what he calls "this new adventure." Let me quote him:

> At this time the Members of the Congress and perhaps the people of the country have been caught by surprise.

Yet, Mr. President, on this matter of need of abrupt and speedy action, the able columnist, Walter Lippmann, writing in the Washington Post of March 4, 1947, said:

> There is no apparent reason for forcing so abrupt a decision before March 31 except that this date happens to mark the end of the British fiscal year. The British Government, though it must cut drastically its foreign expenditures, has not suddenly run out of funds as of March 31. The fixing of that most inconvenient time limit is an accident of the procedure on the budget. * * * The immediate need, therefore, is for a stopgap arrangement with the British Government which covers the immediate emergency in Great Britain and in Greece, and will permit us to examine here, and with the British Government, the great issues which are at stake. It is not in anyone's interest that they should be dealt with in an atmosphere of panic.

It has been pointed out here before that an over-all program has been presented to the United States calling for aid and development of foreign countries which will aggregate many billions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money. Now, we are asked to underwrite this new and perhaps even more costly program. However laudable such a program may be, it could, in the end, bankrupt us. As a Wall Street research organization recently pointed out, it is not so much the danger of communism which should alarm us, as it is the danger of the deterioration of capitalism itself. This is the conclusion of the Value-Line Investment Survey which I mentioned earlier in my remarks. Let me quote this very interesting study of the proposal a little further:

> America investors are deeply concerned over taxation. Taxation far more than communistic infiltration is threatening our way of life.

* * * * *

THE SHIFT OF BRITISH POWER

The number one fact of life to hold onto in this maelstrom of postwar political readjustments is that the British are shifting their Empire. They are moving out of Asia and east Europe to consolidate in Africa and the Near East. Their great adventure is the chance of developing an Arab world and exploiting Africa.

* * * * *

There she could obtain raw materials produced with cheap labor to be processed in England for export at a profit to Britain. By agreement with either the United States or Russia she might be able to share the rich oil fields of the Near East, whence would come the oil to power the air force and fleet that would defend the African empire. The Arabs offer a brilliant opportunity, for they are a people of great ability and no organization.

* * * * *

The big danger to the British scheme is that the Russians may inject themselves into the Near East and north Africa before the British are able to carry their plans for Africa and the Near East to fruition.

It is here that the next American move becomes decisive. If the United States takes up the position in Greece that the British Army is evacuating, the burden of defending the British sphere in Africa and the Near East in its formative period falls upon the United States. Not only is Britain's African empire then protected, but Britain is in a strategic position later on to shift her alliance toward a Russia exasperated by American obstruction. Once Britain's African and Near East eastern empires are established she would have stock in trade—Arabian oil that could be shared with Russia, and foreign markets in the Balkans and in Asia that might advantageously be shared with the Russian cartels on some basis mutually satisfactory to the two socialist governments. The exclusion of American goods from European and Asiatic markets would naturally be required, since England's production competes in export with America's.

The British shift out of the Far East and eastern Europe into Africa and the Near East, and her political reorientation from the American orbit to the Russian will not come to pass in a day. Britain has still to use up her American loan. She can import only from America, because only America is rich enough to export at this time. But in the long run Britain's interests will dovetail with Russia's more closely than our own and her political alinement with Russia is therefore probable. To think thus may shock the sentiments of many good people. But in the game of power politics, which for four centuries has found England waging wars against Spain, France, Russia, and Germany with complete impartiality, there are no scruples but only interests.

* * * * *

At the same time, the Russian Government is desirous of expanding its sphere of influence to contiguous territories for three reasons: (1) For defense through buffer states; (2) for space in which to build up complementary trading areas; (3) for outlets to the sea.

How, then, will the Russians react if the United States should formulate a foreign policy that has as its obvious purpose control of the flanks on Russia's only warm water outlet?

* * * * *

To Russia the American decision to take over Greece must be a particularly bitter pill to swallow, because not only is it a threat to Russia's security as well as her expansion, but it comes right after the Russians gave their approval to America's claim for control of the militarily strategic Pacific islands. The Russians must think that we Americans want the whole world, including their back door.

The upshot cannot be favorable for the United States. The Russians will be resentful and even more suspicious than in the past. They will close ranks at home, more willingly suffering a low standard of living in order to build up their industrial potential for defense. They will look to Britain as an ally, even as a partner in the development of oil fields in the Near East, and to the exclusion of the United States.

* * * * *

The essential quality of capitalism is this: That it is an economy governed by a free market in which prices, demand, and supply are at liberty to reach an equilibrium without government intervention. Under pure socialism, prices and supplies are determined by the government and the demand is regulated by rationing.

The free economy is clearly the more efficient except during periods of deep maladjustment.

* * * * *

In every instance where the people themselves have had a chance to choose between an economy that has a degree of free determination and an economy of complete government regimentation, the people have always shown a strong preference for the free economy. Since this has been so wherever the two systems came into conflict, it may be concluded that sooner or later the Russian people will themselves insist upon a greater degree of freedom in their country.

To this the foe of Russia replies that there can be no freedom of choice in that country. That is true today. That is not true of tomorrow. Today the Russians must tighten their belts to produce capital enough to build up their income. Once they have forced through their industrialization—a process which the Russians are attempting to complete in a generation though other nations have required centuries—they will be ready to live.

* * * * *

The Russian people have a sincere admiration for America and American achievement, as attested by the dispatches of many responsible men who have visited Russia. Why, then, is it necessary to prove to them at the point of a gun that our way of life is superior to their own? Especially so when pointing the gun requires that we weaken our own way of life?

It is necessary to be practical. There must be some lines within which the contest for men's loyalties can be fought out by force of example. We are not yet such a perfect race that we can eliminate power politics altogether. But in the practical application of power politics, the first rule is not to bite off more than can be chewed. The natural, the practical sphere, in which to prove the superiority of capitalism and individualism is North and South America and the islands of the Caribbean and Pacific. These happen also to be the territories that the United States has traditionally defended. The area is large enough to be economically self-sustaining. Yet one imagines that if any responsible government authority advocated intervention in South America political and economic affairs, he would be denounced as an imperialist by the very same people who shout isolationist at anyone who is reluctant to see America control the government of Greece.

There is not such a vast gulf between the Russians and ourselves that we could not live together in peace in our own parts of the world. It is implicit in the Russian program to relax the present regimentation of the individual's life. When that happens the difference between us will be no greater than that between us and the socialist state of Great Britain.

The contest of capitalism versus communism will then get down to a question of which works better. That could be settled without warfare. It would seem to be the part of wisdom for America to strengthen capitalism by removing as many as possible of the controls that make it unworkable, such as tariffs, cartels, subsidized prices, labor monopolies, and income taxes that prevent constructive enterprise. Nobody is going to stop the expansion of communism by sticking a $250,000,000 thorn into the side of Russia. Communism will be stopped by something that works better.

I was greatly impressed today, Mr. President, at a luncheon in honor of a distinguished visitor from England, a Member of Parliament. In discussing the situation in Europe he pointed out that the proper way to stop communism is not by the establishment of Maginot Lines but by making democracy work better in democratic countries.

I continue quoting from the Value-Line, Investment Survey:

They can learn, but they will not be taught at the point of a foreign gun. Nor will they learn to admire the capitalist economy unless we capitalists see to it that it works. We have more to do in North and South America than on the flanks of the Dardanelles.

The danger to Americans is not the activity of Communist agents but the deterioration of capitalism itself. Sensing our own weakness we look for a foreign devil to blame it on. But this is self-deception. Communism would have no chance at all in a world, or even in a part of a world, in which capitalism was working. Rome did not fall because of the power of the barbarians but because of the weakness of the Romans. In weakening capitalism in order to "contain" Russia by naked military force, we do not defend ourselves intelligently.

The views expressed by the able Senators whom I have quoted are in accord with the thoughts I have been attempting to express here. I feel that before we act on this matter we must enlighten the whole people on the subject. They must back us up or we will have failed.

Many private citizens and leaders in American public life have discussed this subject during the last few days expressing with varying degrees similar views. I have had many letters from citizens of my State who appear to be considerably alarmed as a result of this proposal.

In one letter from a prominent businessman in Missoula, Mont., I find the following:

I have conversed with a number of people on the subject and the unanimous feeling is that any assistance rendered should be with extreme caution. There are varied feelings as to what might happen, such as inviting another war, encouraging more poverty-stricken nations with high hopes of our being a Santa Claus to them also. The feeling is that we should be more than ever thinking about making ourselves strong, keeping out of other people's business, and that if help in any form is rendered it should be with the thought in mind to help them become able to help themselves.

Another letter from a businessman in Great Falls, Mont., states as follows:

The illness of Greece is critical and severe but in my opinion can be treated and brought to recovery without the drastic military steps this country is contemplating. Each year thousands of people in rural Greece are

dying from exposure because their villages have been destroyed and no shelter has yet been provided. Please accept this from one who knows—I was there and saw it. This almost hopeless condition is driving the people to what we term "communism," but be assured that the Greek peop'e themselves are anything but Communists—they are individualists as all their actions of life show but are being driven by desperation to their own destruction by communistic influences. The so-called Red army in Greece is made up mostly of youngsters who were selected when Greece was invaded by the Germans and whose education has been nothing else but a series of economic and political slogans. They don't know any better. The present government has through terrorism, as I have seen it enacted by the country police, not helped any to alleviate the desperation above mentioned, nor has it taken out of the rebel army the immature youngsters. On the other hand, they have driven them further away from the present government. Without making this too long, be assured, Senator, that if the Greek people were given reasonable shelter by rebuilding their villages, a little assistance in agriculture, a chance to have an education, and freedom from oppression, and allowed to select a representative government without coercion, Greece would be safe and no American soldiers would be required.

I have numerous letters along the same lines warning that this matter should be very carefully studied before we take the course proposed.

Mr. President, these are not ill-considered arbitrary expressions from unthinking people. The citizens of this country will patriotically accept any plan shown to be essential to the preservation of our American way of life. They hesitate, however, when they are called upon to support a course which may possibly lead us into a dangerous position. No one here can justifiably cast aspersions on citizens for frankly expressing their judgment on this momentous question. We must not forget that any course we pursue must have the backing of the people, and it will be wise at the outset to take the people into our confidence and try to adopt a program here which can be shown to be sound and that will not involve us in dangerous consequences.

The situation calls for speed but not for reckless speed. If the course proposed in this legislation is the only sound course we could pursue, then it must be made clear to the American people and we may rest assured it will be accepted. That has not been done so far, because 90 percent of my correspondents express opposition to it in its present form. No longer can we depend on a select few to determine the destiny of our country. The people of this Nation are well aware of the fact that in the past serious diplomatic mistakes have been made which have been costly to us. We must not now attempt to hurry this matter through the Congress without adequate amendments and safeguards. Otherwise, we may later find that we have adopted a policy by our hasty action which may be under suspicion and distrust in the country.

Mr. President, in my opinion, when this proposal was first announced, the people of our country were not in possession of sufficient information of the conditions to have a proper understanding of its effect and meaning. I believe that the hearings subsequently held were inadequate to fully develop the justification for this program and the ultimate costs we would assume in carrying it out. Very little consideration was given to the conditions prevailing in Turkey and Greece which prompted the program.

I am satisfied, and I think we all here recognize, that the fundamental purpose of this bill is to advance the democratic cause in those two countries and strengthen the democratic position of this Nation in international affairs. If this purpose can be shown to be well-conceived and thoroughly demonstrated to the American people, I am sure that most of the present confusion and misunderstanding concerning the measure would disappear. I say this, of course, with the assumption that it must be shown to be a practical program—that it is feasible and that it will not be so costly as to threaten our national solvency.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that I am not unalterably opposed to this program, but I do feel that it requires more study and that some amendments are necessary. I should like to have seen more extensive hearings in order that all the facts and all the conditions of the program could be completely understood by the people of this country. I want the public to know exactly what we are doing in order that we may have undivided support in any course we take.

Under our democratic system any foreign policy must rest upon public approval for support. The public must be fully and completely informed on all commitments, policies, and actions. To withhold any information would be unwise and dangerous. The American people all understand that ever since the ending of the war, the Soviet Government has pursued a course of arbitrary opposition—a course of delay and obstruction to the early establishment of a just peace and settlement of the problems arising out of the war. It is generally felt that we must find some way of letting the Soviet Government know that the American people are firmly united in opposition to the imposition of her ideologies or her arbitrary will on other nations of the world. The program which we are providing in the legislation now being considered may be the only effective course for our country to pursue. I feel, however, that it has not yet been demonstrated.

It is therefore important that all its provisions and implications be made clear. I want the country to know the full extent of the burdens we are assuming and the full consequences which may result in the adoption of this policy. Only if we do this, can we have the undivided support of the American people back of it.

I do not wish to be understood as reflecting in any way on the efforts of the distinguished members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or the very able chairman of that committee who by reason of his recognized ability has the confidence of every Member of the Senate. I think the able and conscientious chairman of the committee has already made invaluable contributions to our country and to the world in connection with our peace efforts. I wish to assure him of my support to the fullest degree in the heavy burdens which he has assumed and is carrying out on behalf of our country.

In offering the amendments which I have presented to the Senate, my sole purpose has been to aid in making it clear that by our action here we are not bypassing the United Nations organization. I want to support the President and cooperate with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in this matter, because I fully appreciate the need of national unity in the face of the dangerous conditions which confront us.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the able acting majority leader. Of course, I would not make any motion without first having some understanding about it. But I feel very strongly that when we have night sessions and when everyone is acting in good faith in an effort to expedite the business of the Senate, it is only fair that Senators have some time for dinner, and that no Senator be asked to stand on the floor and speak to empty seats, while many other Senators are in the dining room getting their dinner.

I wonder what the acting majority leader would think about frankly taking a dinner recess until 7 o'clock, and then returning here. If we remain in session 3 or 4 hours after that, it would seem to me that that time, in addition to the 6 hours we would already have devoted to the session today, would make a total of 10 or 11 hours of work, which would be a fairly good working day.

I would not wish to ask the Senator to make such a decision without reflection and consultation with his colleagues; and I assume that no Senator would take advantage of the situation by attempting to break a quorum of the Senate and thereby prevent debate this evening.

But I wonder whether it would be possible for us to have a short time for dinner, and then resume our deliberations a little later in the evening.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I did not quite understand all the Senator's proposal. I should like very much to have the Senate continue to follow the announced plan, and proceed until 7:30 or 8 o'clock, at least, and then, perhaps, determine what Senators wish to do thereafter.

I am quite satisfied to have the Senator from Florida yield for the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, if he wishes to do so.

Mr. PEPPER. I was only making an informal suggestion; I would not under any circumstances make a motion to that effect without having first an understanding about the matter. I am simply saying that the Senate has been in session for 6 hours, lacking 5 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. And presumably the Senate will be in session this evening until 10 or 11 o'clock. I think the Senator from Colorado expects to address the Senate, and possibly I myself will do so, and thereafter perhaps other Senators will address the Senate. That will mean that we shall have put in a rather full working day.

If the Senator from Colorado begins to speak at this time, many Senators are downstairs having their dinner, and it is a little unfair to call them away from their meal for a quorum, thus interrupting their dinner, and then have them return to the dining room. At the same time I do not wish in any sense of the word to break a quorum and make the evening's efforts futile.

So I am wondering whether the Senator thinks we should proceed without a quorum call and without at the same time having any Senator speak to only a handful of Senators during the normal dinner hour.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from Florida. I should like to suggest to him that yesterday announcement was made that this evening the Senate would have a night session and would continue in session without interruption. Accordingly, I appeal to the distinguished Senator's sense of fairness to let us proceed.

I, myself, think the absence of a quorum should be suggested so as to get Senators into the Chamber, let the session continue until the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Florida have concluded, and then take a recess until tomorrow.

We are up against the same condition we always face in connection with night sessions. We have been attempting to bring this legislative proposal to a conclusion, and I have tried my very best——

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Nebraska has been very cooperative.

Mr. WHERRY. I have made my best efforts to have the Senate hold night sessions and to have a full attendance at them. I definitely announced on yesterday, Tuesday, that it was planned to have a session today, Wednesday, and also a session tonight, Wednesday night, to try to facilitate progress on the pending measure and to conclude action on it.

Mr. PEPPER. I understand that.

Mr. WHERRY. I should appreciate it very much if the Senator from Florida would not make such a motion as he indicated he had in mind. Let us proceed without interruption until the distinguished Senator from Colorado and the distinguished Senator from Florida have concluded their remarks. Possibly by that time some arrangement can be worked out in regard to a vote on this measure, either at the end of the week or the first of next week, in a way that might be acceptable to all of us who understand the situation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, as well as to the able Senator from Florida, that night sessions, according to my experience, are wholly inadequate and very seldom prove to be of any benefit. Let me say to the Senator that night sessions are washouts, as a rule, and they interfere greatly with the plans of many Senators. There is a very small attendance at night sessions. Of course, there are many persons in the galleries, if Senators wish to convince them.

But I think it is not fair to the Senator from Florida to ask him to speak at a time when many Senators are eating their dinner or, later on, going to the theater. It is not fair to the Senator from Colorado, either.

I think we would save time by abandoning the plan for night sessions, and by meeting tomorrow and devoting all day tomorrow to the subject now before us. At that time there will be nothing for Senators to do but speak on the pending business.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Nebraska to understand that I was not about to make a motion or take any other action in regard to the matter. I was merely making a suggestion.

I somewhat disagree with my able friend, the Senator from Texas, about the efficacy of night sessions. As a general rule, it seems to me we have a better attendance in the Senate at evening sessions than we do at sessions during the day.

But I feel the same way about having the Senate take time for both lunch and dinner, as I have heretofore stated on the floor of the Senate. It seems to me that to have a Senator address the Senate at a time when, as the Senator from Texas has so graciously said, other Senators are out of the Senate Chamber, taking their meals, reflects upon the Senate to those who come here to observe, and also is rather a discourtesy and perhaps a disadvantage and an embarrassment to the Senators who have to speak. Probably we should not here this evening attempt to make new rules.

I desire to suggest to the leadership of the Senate that I think from time to time we should have evening sessions, but when we run up to 6 o'clock, let us recess until 7, so Senators may go downstairs and have their dinners, and then let us return and have a quorum call and 2 or 3 hours of debate in the evening.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, once again I should like briefly to reply to the observation of the distinguished Senator from Florida. There seems to be argument both ways as to whether or not the Senate should run straight through, when it is to have a night session, without a recess for dinner, or whether we should recess for an hour or two and return at 7 o'clock. We have tried both ways this session, and I submit to the distinguished Senator from Florida that one of the best sessions we had this year was the night when we ran straight through. The distinguished Senator from Florida himself will recall the debate we had on the portal-to-portal bill, in which the Senator took a conspicuous part.

I myself feel that if we are to have night sessions we should run straight through and adjourn earlier. I also agree that it is difficult, when the Senate meets each day, to hold night sessions and secure a full attendance. We have had a pretty stiff session today, sitting for 6 hours, and have had a spirited debate on the pending question. I should like to comply with the Senator's request. I will say that if we are to have night sessions in the future, we will again consider recessing for 2 hours at dinnertime and return after dinner.

Inasmuch as it was announced that tonight we would sit straight through until we got ready to adjourn, we will proceed without a recess, and at this time I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hill	O'Daniel
Ball	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Ives	Pepper
Bridges	Jenner	Reed
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Bushfield	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Knowland	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Langer	Saltonstall
Capper	Lodge	Smith
Connally	Lucas	Sparkman
Cooper	McCarran	Taft
Cordon	McCarthy	Taylor
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McGrath	Thye
Eastland	McKellar	Tobey
Ecton	McMahon	Tydings
Ellender	Malone	Umstead
Ferguson	Martin	Vandenberg
Flanders	Millikin	Watkins
Green	Moore	Wherry
Gurney	Morse	Williams
Hawkes	Murray	Wilson
Hayden	Myers	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance on the Senate during the remainder of today's session and all day tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate tomorrow and Friday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request is granted.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I wish to discuss at this time another of my amendments. At the end of the bill I propose to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. As a condition precedent to the receipt of any assistance pursuant to this act, the Government requesting such assistance shall agree (a) to abolish within 90 days all hereditary offices and titles under such government; (b) to hold within 90 days free and democratic elections for the purpose of determining the chief executive officer of such government and the membership of its legislative body and to grant prior to such elections universal suffrage for all persons over the age of 21; (c) to afford to all political parties full opportunity to participate and engage in election activities prior to the holding of such elections; and (d) to grant immediate amnesty to all political opponents of the persons or parties in control of the government requesting such assistance.

The amendment is directed at one of the evils which is apparent in connection with the undertaking upon which we are urged to enter, namely, that one

of the governments we are supporting, the Government of Greece, is not a government worthy of our support. It is a government which does not hold the viewpoint which we cherish. It is not a democracy. It is a military-Fascist government. My amendment is directed toward correcting that evil before we put up our money and place our stamp of approval upon the proposal which is pending in the Senate bill. I most earnestly hope that Senators will give serious consideration to the amendment.

In his message to the Congress the President stated:

> No government is perfect.

In a further significant admission the President stated:

> The Greek Government has made mistakes. The extension of aid by this country does not mean that the United States condones everything that the Greek Government has done, or will do. We have condemned in the past, and we condemn now, extremist measures of the right or the left. We have in the past advised tolerance, and we advise tolerance now.

I call the Senate's attention to three words in this rather remarkable and frank statement by the President. He said that the Greek Government has made mistakes. He further said "The extension of aid by this country does not mean that the United States condones everything that the Greek Government has done, or will do." Evidently the President fully anticipates that the Greek Government in the future is not going to be much better than the Greek Government has been in the past. So we are giving them a blank check. We are not necessarily requiring them to adhere to any of the principles which we hold so sacred, but are simply saying, "We do not like you, we do not like what you have done, we do not like your record, we know that you have not done the right thing in the past, and we know that you will not do the right thing in the future." The President adds the words, "or will do." It seems to me that the Congress of the United States cannot go along with the President in that kind of a proposal.

I heard on the floor of the Senate today questions raised as to what the alternative would be if we rejected this program, and what the alternative would be if we accepted it. From the conclusions which I heard stated on the floor the situation is pretty bad in either event. If we accept the program we face bankruptcy; if we do not some Senators say we are offering the green light to the expansionist program of Soviet Russia.

It seems to me that there ought to be another alternative, and I think there is another alternative. I think we might proceed with a humanitarian program for Greece and still stand on our feet and demand that certain conditions in Greece and in Turkey be fully met before those countries can receive our assistance, and, what is more, before they may have our stamp of approval upon what they are doing.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has stated correctly that upon the floor this afternoon during the debate on this issue it has been stated that we face certain alternatives. The statement was made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan that he is basing his judgment on what the price will be if we do not accept the proposal. The distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] asked the question: What will the price be if we accept the proposal? The distinguished Senator from Colorado in years gone by has been a member of the Military Affairs Committee, and has had considerable experience with and a deep knowledge of world problems. I have profound respect for his judgment. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator the same question the Senator from Nevada asked the Senator from Michigan. What is the price going to be if we accept the proposal and send military aid to the countries involved, and then become involved in difficulty with Russia? Are we then in war, and if we are in war, what is the price going to be? Does the Senator care to express an opinion on that point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I should be glad to give the Senator my opinion for what it may be worth. In my opinion, we face the grave danger of getting into a war with Russia. If we escape from a war with Russia it will only be because Russia feels that she is not strong enough to fight us at this time, and she will be preparing for the day when she may be stronger and when perhaps we may be weaker, when war may come. In other words, if she is not able to set the time now she will set it at her own pleasure and at her own convenience for a later date.

As I see it, we are heading for a military clash with Russia, and there is no escape from such a clash. If Russia is strong enough I do not see how she can permit the alliance between Turkey and the United States of America which is proposed in this proposal. The proposal is for a military alliance. We are moving the uniform and we are moving the flag into Turkey. Russia cannot accept such a condition. The uniform and the flag are being moved into Turkey. If Senators will read between the lines in the President's message and listen to the debate on the floor of the Senate they will know that the flag and the uniform are going into Turkey to stop Russia. That is the objective; that is the purpose involved. Russia must know that as well as we know it.

As I stated the other evening, Russia knows that if no outside help is given to Turkey, even though she is a fairly strong nation, she will be of no danger to the Soviet Union. But when a great military power such as the United States moves into Turkey with a military alliance and attempts to use Turkey and proposes to use Turkey as a springboard to fly at the throat of Russia, certainly Russia must take note of it.

Mr. President, I have not gazed into a crystal ball, and I am not a prophet, so I do not know what Russia will do, but I feel certain that if Russia feels sufficiently strong she will resist this sort of thing with every ounce of her strength. What is proposed to be done appeals to me to be a military aggression, just as we would consider it a military aggression if Russia should move into Cuba or into one of our Latin-American neighbors. I am sure there would be great consternation and great anger and that the United States would feel terribly displeased if, for instance, Russia should move into Cuba. I am told that there are far more Communists in Cuba than there are in Turkey. So we must go back to the Golden Rule, which was laid down by the greatest Teacher man has ever had, and do unto others as we would have others do unto us. We must put ourselves in Russia's place. We must admit that this program is a threat to Russia.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Inasmuch as this has been said on the floor of the Senate before today, I am not giving away any military secrets when I mention it. If I correctly remember, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] stated that our aid to Turkey would consist of improving her harbors, docks, highway system, and communications system. It seems to me that we are getting ready to unload troops and start a campaign against someone. The purpose is not to strengthen Turkey. It is to establish a landing place for us. If I were a Russian, I would certainly be worried.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The whole proposal is to use Turkey for a springboard. That can be the only objective. Turkey is remarkably well situated on the map for such a purpose. She is well adapted to that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] propounded an inquiry to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] as to what limitation, if any, there was in paragraph (3) on page 3, with reference to the military appropriation. As I recall the answer, it was to the effect that there was no limitation on the $150,000,000 as to what the military equipment should be. The Senator has handled a great deal of legislation. Except for the amount of money involved, does he feel that there is any limitation as to what the money can be spent for so far as military equipment is concerned?

I should like to ask a further question. Is there any limitation in the bill on the number of troops that might finally be sent into Greece and Turkey?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I find no limitations, except as to the amount of money. The President and the Senator from Michigan have very frankly stated that more money may be required. The President has stated that he will ask Congress for more money if more is needed. When we undertake a military maneuver we cannot stop to place limitations on costs. This is only the first installment. No man knows what will follow. The President was frank enough to tell us that he would come back and talk to the Congress if he needed more money.

I have repeatedly heard Senators say today, and before today, in the cloakrooms and on the floor of the Senate, that they intended to vote for the bill because they did not want to let the President down. Suppose we get our flag over there, and establish our troops over there, and the war clouds begin to roll closer and the threat becomes greater. What can we do? We shall have to go on. Congress will be helpless. Congress cannot do anything about it.

During the last war we voted appropriation after appropriation. We never batted an eye. We voted whatever was asked for. We never turned down any requests. We never restricted those in authority to the extent of a single dollar on any occasion. We never questioned the amount of money asked for. We could not. American youth was in uniform. American youth was facing gunfire. It was no time for us to be quibbling over appropriations. We shall be facing exactly the same situation in this case. There is no limitation as to the amount of expenditure, the nature of the expenditure, or anything else with respect to this adventure.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Would the distinguished Senator from Colorado feel as much morally bound to vote for a declaration of war against Russia in the event she should resent our move into Greece and pick up the gauntlet which the President has thrown down as he now feels bound to vote for the bill before us?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Colorado does not intend to vote for the bill. However, if this program is carried to the point where we are to get into war, the Senator may be very certain that the Senator from Colorado will not hesitate to do everything in his power to place this Nation in a position where it can win the war. After we once get into war there is no turning back. We must give everything we have. The Senator from Colorado certainly would do that if we were to get into war. But I do not like to play with fire. I do not like to take unnecessary risks.

I can show the Senator on the map an exact parallel to the present situation which occurred in the last World War. We sent troops to the Philippine Islands. General MacArthur was in charge of them. We sent more troops than we had supply lines to take care of in case of trouble. The Philippine Islands were directly in the path of the Japanese on their way to the oil fields, the rubber fields, and the tin mines of the East Indies. Those troops were placed in a fine strategic position—directly in the path which the enemy wanted to travel. We could not have found a better location, and today we cannot find a better location than Turkey. We placed our troops directly in the path of the enemy. We had no way of supplying them with arms, munitions, and other supplies. What happened to them is history. The same thing will happen here, as I see it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Perhaps I should frame the question differently. On the basis of the Senator's experience in the Senate, if the Congress of the United States should pass the pending bill and we should enter upon this adventure, would we not then be morally bound to go to war with Russia if Russia should oppose us and attack the few men we have over there? Would we not be morally bound to go to war, just as we were in the First World War?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. Whenever the uniform is attacked, of course, we are in war. There is no escape from it.

Mr. MALONE. We could not withdraw.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No. There could be no backing up. That would be humanly impossible. Before the last World War, when we were edging closer and closer, it was said that one cannot take a single step down Niagara Falls and then back up. The same principle applies here. We cannot take one step down Niagara Falls and back up if things do not look the way we want them to look. We had better be thinking about the steps we propose to take before we take any of them. So, in this case, we ought to figure this thing out on a careful basis before we take any risks which might involve us in a war with Russia.

Mr. MALONE. Then, it is the Senator's opinion, I take it, that now is the time to spend a couple of weeks thinking this thing over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. Now is the time to think it over. This is our responsibility. This is the only opportunity the Senator and I and other Senators will have to think it over before taking action. This is our day. After this day passes we shall be in the lap of the gods, and whatever they hand out we shall have to accept.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Did the Senator hear the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] today? The suggestion he made was that perhaps it would be a good idea for us to request a report from the United Nations as to whether they are equipped to handle this question or whether they want to try to handle it. Would it not be a good idea for us to ask them and to wait until we receive a report from them before we jump in with both feet, or, to use a better expression, as the Senator has said, before we "take one step down Niagara Falls"?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I think it would be only good judgment. It would be consistent with the things we have attempted, with the hopes we have for the United Nations, to have word from them in a positive sort of way. Of course, we are doing it through the Vandenberg amendment in a negative sort of way. They can stop us. It seems to me it is not quite satisfactory. We should go beyond that. We should have a positive statement from them that they want us to go ahead. In other words, I think we should be asked by the United Nations to do this job, instead of telling them, "If you want to stop us, you may stop us." They probably know that already. I hope they will stop us. I think there is some hope that they may stop us—not because of the Vandenberg amendment, but because of their own authority which was given to them when the charter was subscribed. I think they have that authority without the Vandenberg amendment, and I hope they exercise it. I have some small hope that they will.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I gladly yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Colorado has stated that he will vote against the bill and has painted a very gloomy picture, in answer to a question, pointing out all the bad things that can happen by taking this step. It is equally fair, is it not, I ask the Senator, for those of us who will vote for the bill to feel that war is less imminent and can be postponed for a longer time, if it has to come, by taking this step than by refusing to take it and being swept over Niagara Falls? What the Senator has said is equally true, perhaps more true, of the picture if we view it from the other side of the question. Is not that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. I feel very certain, however, so long as I stay away from Niagara Falls, that I shall not be swept over it. What the Senator says, of course, is true, that we should weigh going in as against staying out. We must do that. What I am suggesting is that we weigh both possibilities against a middle-of-the-road course.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator might very well add one more feature—going in as against staying out, after the President of the United States has taken the initiative in asking us to go in. What would be the moral effect, the psychological effect, and the physical effect of staying out after that has been done?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. My answer to the question and my recommendation in connection with that kind of a proposal are that we go in with certain reservations; that we lay down conditions upon which we will go in. One of those conditions I am trying to discuss tonight. That is that we require the Government of Greece to be a democratic government selected by the people in a democratic election. I think that is one of the important conditions which we should lay down, so far as going into Greece is concerned. Turkey is a different problem, I must admit. I want to discuss tonight the situation which we are facing in the case of Greece. I think that if the Congress of the United States should prescribe conditions and make them acceptable, we would be rendering most constructive assistance to the President of the United States, to the State Department, and to the people of the United States. I feel that that is one of our great opportunities to do something constructive, to work out of this dilemma, to escape from a position between the devil and the deep sea, which is where we are at this time. Either way we go we shall be in trouble.

I feel that to be true, but I believe that there is an opportunity between those two horns of the dilemma to work out a constructive program. That is what I am trying to do.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, we all have the greatest sympathy for the heroic people of Greece. We want to do something, and we have done something in connection with the liberation of Greece. During the debate this afternoon, reference was frequently made to the fact that if we made available $250,000,000 we would forthwith make relief available which would preserve the autonomy and the confidence of the great Greek people. I am disturbed, because I read recently in the New York Times—and I assume it to be an authentic account—with a Washington date line, under date of March 20, the following statement:

> The United States has contributed approximately $435,000,000 to Greece since that country was liberated, it was learned today. Of the $354,000,000 Greece received through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, the United States contributed approximately 72 percent, or $254,000,000. The remaining $181,000,000 was authorized as follows:
>
> Lend-lease, $81,500,000; surplus-property credits, $45,000,000; Export-Import Bank loan, $25,000,000; Maritime Commission assistance for the purchase of Liberty ships, $30,000,000.
>
> This $435,000,000 in a period from November 1944 until March of this year was in addition to many millions of dollars provided by Britain and other friends of Greece.

I am wondering how we can justify it. The only way that I could accept it as being truthful and accurate would be to prove that providing an additional $250,000,000 at this time would accomplish what $435,000,000 has already failed to accomplish in providing essential relief for the people of Greece.

I am reminded that Paul Porter, who headed President Truman's economic mission to Greece, recently made a report to a liberal left-wing organization which met approximately a month ago in the Capital City. Porter, who is an astute New Dealer, in thorough sympathy with the New Deal program—his connection with OPA will be remembered—was sent to Greece to make an investigation as head of an economic mission. Of course we know he could not be influenced in the slightest degree by political considerations, because I presume he believes in the bipartisan foreign policy advocated by the President of the United States. Porter, in addressing this group—and I quote from a dispatch which appeared in the Washington Star—had this to say:

> Since its liberation from the Nazis, Greece has merely managed to survive. Greece's economic and physical resources are in much the same condition as when the Nazis were expelled.

There we have the statement of Paul Porter, who recently returned from the economic mission to Greece which he headed, that after the United Nations has made available $435,000,000 in the space of approximately a year and a half, for the relief of the people of Greece, their economic plight is about the same as it was when that heroic country was under the domination of the Nazis.

Now we are given assurances that $250,000,000 will solve all the problems facing the people of Greece at this time.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado whether we should place any credence in such assurance? The State Department may have other information and data available. I assume it has, or that the President has, but certainly there is little to justify the explicit confidence of the Members of the Senate in the assurance that another $250,000,000 will do what $453,000,000 has failed to accomplish in the past.

Can the Senator from Colorado give us any additional information on that point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, Mr. President, the Senator's conclusions are inescapable. The $250,000,000 which it is proposed to send to Greece under the provisions of this bill will be only a drop in the bucket; it will only last a little while, if it is utilized in the same way that the money previously sent to Greece was utilized and if it is poured down the same rat hole. Britain herself made a considerable contribution to Greece, during the time when our money went there and during the time when UNRRA relief went there. UNRRA aid was given to the Government of Greece, to be distributed to the people of Greece. But the Government of Greece sold the UNRRA relief supplies, goods and food, and put 85 percent of the proceeds of the sale of those supplies into the treasury of the Government of Greece. That is what happened. I was given that information by one who handled UNRRA officially in Greece.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am greatly disturbed by what the Senator from Colorado has just said; namely, that he does not believe that $250,000,000 is all the money that the Senate of the United States will be asked to provide for the relief of Greece. Certainly if additional funds will be required from our country, should we not have full information at this time, so that we can act intelligently, rather than merely take snap judgment? It will not be in the interest of the security of our country and, as is alleged, in the interest of avoiding war, for us to go along with the pending bill merely because the State Department and the President have proposed this step.

So far as I am concerned, I should prefer to take some action through the United Nations, so as to force the hand of Russia at this time, rather than to go through the back door into the Balkans or force a showdown a year hence or 2 or 3 or 5 years from now. I think that revelations which have been made during the past few months, tending to show that Uncle Sam and the American people were sold down the river by secret agreements which were made by representatives of our country in dealing with Russia, and in which Britain, our ally, participated, indicate that the time has come for all the cards to be placed face up upon the table, so that the American people and the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States may take action predicated upon what the entire program is, rather than to adopt a piecemeal program involving our taking only one step at this time, but inevitably to be followed by other steps which we are reluctant to take.

I hesitate to believe that we are not getting all the information and are not being told the entire truth when it is said that $250,000,000 is all that will be required to implement this program of relief for Greece.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I do not think the President told us that. I think he told us very plainly that he would be back for more money if he needed it. I think he put us on our guard and gave us the bad news when he delivered his message to us on March 12. If we go ahead with this kind of proposition blindly and without giving that phase of it the consideration it deserves, of course the fault is ours, and the people of the United States will have every right to hold us responsible for it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to ask the able Senator from Colorado this question: If what is proposed is to be the policy—and it is declared by the President to be the policy—should not and would not it have to be applied alike in all parts of the world where comparable situations exist?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is my understanding of a policy; namely, that it should be applied alike everywhere. In other words, if this is to be the policy, the situation in Greece is not simply a lone incident to be treated without regard to other similar situations. Of course, Greece, as we see it portrayed on the map, is only one small point; and the Greek population of 7,000,000 is not large. The Greek situation is only one small feature of the entire world program which we are facing. I feel that what the Senator has said is correct; and that the Senator is correct in his conclusion that if we are laying down a policy, that policy applies to everyone, everywhere, and is the foreign policy of the United States of America.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. It has been asked on the floor of the Senate what would be said by the Politburo if we do not accede to the President's request. What does the able Senator from Colorado think would be the effect if we stand up for this policy in Greece, and then later, if some other situation arose in some other part of the world, did not stand up for the same policy?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, it will be a singular situation if we are going to have one policy for Greece and Turkey simply because Greece and Turkey stand in the so-called path of Russia, between Russia and the oil fields of the

Middle East, and if we are to have another policy for the rest of the world. If we are to have a policy, it must be applied consistently throughout the world, if it is based on the high principles which the President so eloquently enunciated in his message of March 12.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. If we begin to implement that policy in Greece, but do not continue it in place after place all over the world, then whenever we quit, if the Senator's warning to us is valid, the Politburo will be able to say, "Well, they started off with a policy, but they have quit carrying it out."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course; and then our weakness would be shown up. Unless we are able to carry a policy through to a conclusion—right down the road, and all the way down the road—we should not adopt the policy in the first place. That is as plain as anything can be.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, if we reach the conclusion that we cannot follow this policy indefinitely, and cannot finance the world forever, what is likely to happen to us is, is it not, that we shall arm Turkey and we shall arm Greece and we shall arm other countries abroad with modern weapons, and then one day we shall find, just as Great Britain has found now, that we have come to the end and cannot go further; and then we shall have to pull out. If Russia then moves in, she will find there armed countries ready to be turned against us. Would not that be the situation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The situation could not be different from what the Senator has stated.

Mr. President, let me say that it is quite clear from Mr. Truman's apologetic statement that the present government in Greece is not the kind of government that the American people would approve if they had the full facts before them. First of all, of course, there is the notorious, venal, and corrupt monarchy which the Greek people have struggled against for a hundred years. It is important, I believe, to go back into the history of Greece and remember that early in the 19th century the Greeks fought a war of independence against the Turks. Following that war, the Greeks attempted to establish a republican form of government, but the great powers then governing the world decided that the Greek people must have a monarchy. After considerable maneuvering, the monarchy was established. Not a Greek family, not a family from the Balkans, but in actual fact a German-Bavarian family were made the rulers of Greece. This family, never popular, has had a turbulent history. King Otto was driven from the throne in 1862. The unhappy George I was assassinated in 1913. King Constantine abdicated in 1917; and after his recall in 1920 he was forced to abdicate again in 1922, in favor of George II. The late King George II was driven into exile in 1924. On October 10, 1935, a dictatorship of extreme Royalists, and aided by the Royalist Military League of high Army and Navy officers, was established. Under that dictatorship, a Greek plebiscite was held, and King George II was returned to the throne from exile. Less than 1 year later—on August 4, 1936— this on-again, gone-again ruler, in violation of his oath to preserve a constitutional form of government, authorized the notorious and hated Metaxas dictatorship. Ruthless suppression of civil liberties throughout Greece followed. Greece was attacked in 1940 by Italy. By heroic military action she repelled the invaders. Subsequently, in 1941, Germany joined the Italian-Greco war. The Greek army was defeated, and Greece surrendered unconditionally in August of 1941. King George and his government fled to Cairo, and then to London. Various officials associated with the Metaxas dictatorship were guilty of treasonable collaboration with the enemy, helping to hasten the defeat of Greece, while other officials of the Metaxas government went into exile with King George II. Slowly the resistance forces formed in Greece, and they relentlessly counterattacked the Germans. King George II, from his place of safety in London, began to prick up his ears.

On March 15, 1943, King George and his government-in-exile returned to Cairo. The various representatives of political parties and groups active in Greece against the Nazis sent delegates to call on the King, and, without exception, all of those parties and resistance leaders urged the King to issue a statement that he would not return to Greece "before people have given their decision on the form of the regime."

It is interesting, Mr. President, that the cabinet concurred with the popular demand, and so expressed themselves to the King, but King George II rejected this proposal, as well as the suggestion by the British for a national unity government. The resistance representatives of the patriots fighting in Greece against the Nazi occupation were placed under house arrest, were kept incommunicado, and later were sent back to Greece under extremely humiliating circumstances. We can go into great detail, Mr. President, as to how the British landed in Greece, how they violated their agreements with the resistance forces, and how the British General Scobie proceeded to conduct civil war in Greece against the resistance forces which had made matters so uncomfortable for the Nazis. We can show in detail how Prime Minister Churchill and Foreign Secretary Eden personally flew to Greece and intervened in the internal situation. We can show how the Royalist forces were not disarmed, while every effort was made to destroy the liberal groups that had conducted underground warfare against the Nazis. We can go into the whole history of 2 years of British blundering.

Mr. President, I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point a part of a chapter in Leland Stowe's very timely book entitled "While Time Remains." I shall not delay the Senate in quoting from the book. I regret that every Member of the Senate has not read While Time Remains.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT WAS THE GREEK "MOUNTAIN BRIGADE," AND WHO SPONSORED IT?

In April 1944—while Germans still occupied Greece—"mutiny" broke out in the Greek Army and naval forces in Egypt. These were Greeks who had fled their country to fight on beside the Allies. The EAM resistance leaders had smuggled delegates out of Greece and sent them to Cairo. These resistance delegates came to ask that they—like the French resistance delegates to the French National Committee in North Africa—should be represented in the British-dominated Greek Government-in-exile. The Greek patriots who were resisting and dying at home felt they should have some representation in their government. In Cairo the EAM delegates were received with harsh words—and locked up; finally they were shipped ignominiously home to Greece. But the British and American correspondents in Cairo were severely muzzled by censorship. They could not report any of this, nor explain what followed, until long afterward.

What followed was officially described by British officials as a Greek "mutiny." As a protest against the high-handed ousting of EAM delegates, thousands of Greek soldiers and sailors refused to obey orders. They felt that the greatest resistance movement in Greece had every right to be represented in the exile government. Fighting broke out. Many were killed. Thousands of patriotic Greeks were jailed—and Allied correspondents were not permitted to tell the world how and why this incredible thing had happened. Eighteen months later, in the late autumn of 1945, some 1,500 anti-Fascist Greeks, victims of this "mutiny," were still imprisoned in British concentration camps in remote Eritrea. They had been guilty of demanding a Greek government of national unity. At least until July 1945, it was charged that they had never been granted the right to see a representative of the International Red Cross.

It was immediately after this ruthless suppression of Greek soldiers and sailors in Egypt—when British guns first shot down Greeks—that the Churchill government proceeded to organize the Greek Mountain Brigade All Greeks in Egypt were carefully screened. Greek Republicans of all nuances from moderate conservatives to leftists, officers or men, were barred from the new brigade. It was built up as a strictly Royalist and anti-Republican fighting force. Was it a coincidence that the Churchill government was a frank champion of King George of Greece? A Greek officer, a lifelong Republican, whom I knew well in Albania in 1940, told me in Athens: In Cairo I saw the whole thing. They jailed or banned all Republican officers from the Mountain Brigade." Allied correspondents saw this, too, but they were not allowed to inform the British and American people. If the Greeks had "mutinied" in Egypt, then the Mountain Brigade was a Churchill-approved (or invented) Royalist plot.

So the British whipped the monarchist MB into fighting trim. The Mountain Brigade fought in Italy for about 1 month, long enough to help capture Rimini. Then, soon after Athens was liberated in mid-October 1944, the British brought in the Mountain Brigade. The Athenians cheered these men wildly because they were the only Greeks who had fought the Germans as a

regular army unit. But the EAM-ELAS leaders knew that the Mountain Brigade was ardently Royalist. And when General Scobie demanded that ELAS, the patriots' half-armed forces, should give up their arms, these Greeks naturally said: "Disarm the Royalist Mountain Brigade, too—or, no, thank you."

It was this dispute over disarming the British-created royalist brigade which precipitated the government crisis, which in turn produced the civil war. In Athens I checked over this, step by step, with Greeks and correspondents—and Allied officers—who were on the spot at the time. Premier Papandreou finally agreed that both ELAS and the Mountain Brigade would be disarmed. Then Papandreou retracted. He gave an EAM member, then in the government, a letter from General Scobie. The letter said that Prime Minister Churchill would not permit the royalist brigade to be disbanded, along with ELAS. The American Ambassador in Athens confirmed to me that this rejection came either from London or from General Scobie. This decision provoked the resignation of the EAM ministers. That brought on a huge EAM street demonstration on Sunday, December 3. The police fired into the unarmed, peaceful paraders. The civil war began. I asked a strongly anti-Communist Greek doctor why Churchill forbade disbanding the brigade.

"Well, who created the Mountain Brigade?" asked the doctor.

A brigade officer made this frank remark to a friend: "We were brought here for one purpose—to suppress the Left. Our men have been promised jobs in the new police force which is going to be formed."

While I was in Athens, Mountain Brigade men were being incorporated wholesale into the new Greek Army, called the national guard; or into the police. So were the pro-monarchist EDES followers who had cooperated with the Germans through most of the occupation. But to get the picture straight:

HOW DID THE GREEK CIVIL WAR START? WAS THERE A RED PLOT?

In Parliament Prime Minister Churchill gave this explanation: "From the depredations and ravages of ELAS there developed * * * a well-organized plot by which ELAS should march down to Athens and seize it by armed force and establish a reign of terror."

In his January 18 (1945) speech Mr. Churchill quoted a report from the British ambassador to Greece. Ambassador Leeper charged that a small, well-armed Communist Party had been practicing a "reign of terror" all over Greece, and added: "Nobody can estimate the number of people killed or arrested before the revolt in Athens actually began." This statement implied that left-wing guerrillas had been pillaging and killing in Athens, and throughout most of Greece, for weeks before the police began shooting on December 3.

In Athens I investigated with great care what had happened between the capital's liberation on October 12-14 and December 3. For those first two October days ELAS forces held Athens alone, until the British arrived. Naturally, they were wildly elated—and, of course, they went after Quislings and traitors. Some were killed, and in the furore of those first 2 days of liberation some innocent citizens possibly became victims of passions long pent up. But as soon as the British came, General Scobie requested ELAS to withdraw their forces from Athens—and ELAS withdrew. That, indeed, was a strange procedure for "well-organized plotters" who, in Churchill's version, later planned to march on Athens and "establish a reign of terror." On October 14 ELAS vastly outnumbered the British and held Athens in their power. Why, then, did they obediently withdraw?

In Athens I met many old colleagues. We had worked together in many parts of Europe. These British and American correspondents I knew by long observation. They were journalists of great integrity and reliability. I asked them, as I asked Greek friends of the Italian war period, if looting and killing occurred on any important scale before December 3. Since British troops arrived, they told me, there had been nothing remotely resembling a "reign of terror" in Athens. The terror had started only with the civil war—and then it was war, with ruthless fighting on both sides. Frank Gervasi of Collier's and M. W. Fodor of the Chicago Sun had journeyed from Athens all the way north to Salonika and back without encountering any "massacres" or hint of ELAS "depredations." In Salonika the British commander, Major General Hollworthy, told them there had not been a single reprisal execution by ELAS since that city was liberated on November 7. Although I sought evidence on every side, Ambassador Leeper's statement about vast killings "before the revolt in Athens actually began" simply could not be substantiated. Along with other correspondents I had to conclude either that Sir Reginald had been a victim of highly emotional rumors, or that he had become involved somehow in a deliberate falsification.

Once the civil war started, many upper-class Athenians talked wildly about acts of "Communist terror." Certain ELAS extremists had run amok, they said, and committed all sorts of crimes. But when you tried to get specific dates, you could almost never place serious disorder before December 3. And American officers and officials, on the whole, confirmed this important distinction. Mike Fodor, as foreign correspondent, had known Greece for more than 20 years. No one who has ever met Fodor can question his honesty. He summed up the pre-civil war situation to me in these words: "In 25 years I've seen almost every revolution in Europe. This, right here, was the quietest, calmest, and most civilized revolution I've ever seen—until the shooting began by the police and the British intervened."

BUT HOW DID THE SHOOTING IN ATHENS BEGIN?

During the week before December 1, the Papandreou government was stalemated on how to get ELAS and the Mountain Brigade disarmed and disbanded. When the British command, or Government, insisted that their hand-picked brigade of Royalists must have special treatment over the resistance patriots (who had opposed the Germans at far greater cost), the six EAM ministers quit the government. Yet when Winston Churchill told the world about the Greek civil war he made no pretense of reporting all the facts. He never so much as mentioned his government's stand in support of the Royalist Mountain Brigade—nor so much as mentioned the existence of the brigade.

On December 2, EAM leaders asked for governmental permission to stage a protest demonstration—and gave their word that it would be unarmed. Papandreou granted permission for the parade on December 3, next morning. Out of 1,250,000 Greeks in the greater Athens area, probably 80 percent or more were EAM supporters; mostly workers and the poor. That afternoon they got word that the demonstration was permitted. Most of them had never possessed telephones or radios. They went to bed early, so as to get up at 4 or 5 o'clock and start marching to Constitution Square in the heart of Athens. But Papandreou had a long parley with General Scobie that night, and shortly before midnight the premier canceled permission for the parade—when the people could not possibly be notified. Papandreou also decided to declare martial law. From British sources I was told that General Scobie told Papandreou it was time to "get tough" with EAM.

On Sunday morning tens of thousands of Athenian workers and their wives and children marched toward and into Constitution Square. The police had machine guns on the roofs—something no correspondent had seen before then. The EAM supporters carried placards. Some of the slogans read: "Why, America, have you abandoned us?" "America, we are tired, and we don't want civil war." "Bring the traitors to trial." "We want a real national unity government." The square was jammed with people, but correspondents close beside the police lines said there was no disorder. Then, suddenly, some of the police began firing into the tight-packed throng. In a short time 25 were dead, including a boy, aged 6. Scores more reddened the pavement from their wounds. Now it was not merely martial law, but civil war.

Later on I had a long conversation with British Ambassador Leeper. He talked so readily that I had little opportunity to ask questions. At the end of some 40 minutes, I was keenly aware of the fact that the British Ambassador had scarcely looked me straight in the eye twice throughout his prolonged monolog. This is a fact which I am compelled to report. There was a further fact. In years of rather frequent encounters with ambassadors of many nations, I had never left a consultation with such an unpleasant impression as I took away this time. I regret to have to say this, but I believe it is too important to be glossed over.

This happened, oddly enough, without so much as asking an embarrassing question. Perhaps this was because the official Churchill-Leeper version of the tragedy in Greece had won only one ardent supporter among some 20 British and American correspondents who were making their own investigation of facts in Athens. The Churchill-Leeper version badly needed support in the world press, yet about 90 percent of Anglo-American correspondents on the spot rejected large sections of it in toto. As a more recent arrival, I was probably thought to merit an extensive official review of the situation. In the course of this review, Ambassador Leeper said: "The police did not shoot first. Grenades were thrown first by the ELAS. The Communists put their women and children in the front row, as they always do, to hide their armed men. They had their guns behind and were shooting."

This statement was so completely contrary to everything I had previously heard that I maintained a poker face to hide my amazement—and did not question it. But I went back and talked again to about a dozen correspondents who—unlike the British Ambassador—had been eyewitnesses. Again I asked if there had been any shooting by the EAM demonstrators.

"None whatever. Only the police shot."

That was the unanimous verdict. "We never saw any EAM people with weapons in their hands," they said. "If any of the EAM were shooting, how was it that not a policeman was wounded?" The British correspondents were particularly incensed over their Ambassador's statement. One of them said: "There were never any women and children out in front to hide men with weapons. That's a lot of ——."

I am absolutely convinced that he was right.

In fact, the absurdity of Ambassador Leeper's accusation was demonstrated by the news photographs which Dimitri Kessel of Life risked his own life in taking that morning of death and disgrace. These pictures show Greek workers—men, women, and children—being mowed down by police fire, without a weapon in their hands. Was it merely as a precaution that Papandreou was

persuaded, the night before, to declare martial law? By the record of what happened, the Athens police should have been placed under martial law.

The massacre by the police prompted the EAM-ELAS supporters to attack police stations all over the city. British troops were ordered to uphold the forces of "law and order." And within 24 hours the British and their Greek royalist bands were in serious danger from ELAS forces, which outnumbered them greatly and were backed by the overwhelming mass of the Athenian population. That was when 100 United States Army transport planes were called upon to intervene in the civil war. American pilots flew in British and Indian troops as reinforcements. All of Athens, that lovely and shining metropolis beneath the brow of the incomparable Acropolis, became a battlefield. For 33 days the common people fought against lend-lease tanks and RAF dive bombers. They were bombed and machine gunned in their pitiful shacks and hovels in Ghizi and Kaisariani. They were "terrorists" and "Communists," the "liberators" said. The strongest of EAM and ELAS leaders were Communists, and so were a small minority of their extremely large following. But who were the terrorists? Who had started the terror? Let history answer—let time bring its own retribution.

But in these first days, even with all the organized military units on their side and even with the best and heaviest weapons, the British and the Greek royalists were pushed backward and backward. So it happened, just 2 days after the fighting started, that General Scobie accepted other allies—the Quislings and Lavals of Greece. By Scobie's order, or by his permission, the traitor "Security Battalions" were released, rearmed, and thrown against the ELAS forces.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. At this point in the RECORD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed a United Press report under the date line New York, April 10, quoting from Winston Churchill with respect to the civil war in Greece. Churchill makes an admission in his statement, and I am sure that nothing will be found inconsistent between what Churchill said and what Leland Stowe stated.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WINNIE SAVED GREECE FROM REDS, HE SAYS

NEW YORK, April 10.—Winston Churchill said today in an article in the New York Times that if he had not given the order to fire on the Communist guerrilla bands in Greece on December 6, 1944, the Communists would have taken over Greece. The defeat of the Communist coup d'etat was necessary, he said, to insure free elections in Greece.

Churchill wrote that "not only has the Communist peril been recognized as the gravest that now overhangs the world, but a series of measures of a resolute character has been taken to resist further encroachments and expansion by the Russian Soviet state in Europe and Asia."

CITES FULTON SPEECH

Churchill pointed out that this policy backs up the statements that he made in his controversial speech in Fulton, Mo., on March 5, 1946, when he warned against Russian expansion and asked for close Anglo-American cooperation.

"On Greek affairs in 1944–45 I seemed to find myself out of step. But today it seems I was pursuing the exact policy which, little more than 2 years later, the United States has adopted with strong conviction."

"All the talk of denunciation of British imperialism in Greece was sheer nonsense," Churchill said. "We had no special interest to serve, except the cause of freedom; and many others are involved in that.

"WE SEEK NOTHING

"We sought and seek nothing from Greece but to give her a fair chance of revival and thus do our duty to which we had pledged ourselves by long sentiment and alliance."

Churchill further stated that "the ambitious of this mighty Communist empire and oligarchy go far beyond the dreams of czarist days. The domination of the whole of the Balkan Peninsula by Communist rule under Soviet guidance, and the conquest and probably incorporation of Turkey are the two immediate objects of Russian desire." According to Churchill, President Truman's declaration of March 12, 1947, involves the decision of the United States to take a leading part, so far as it is necessary to world peace, in the eastern Mediterranean, or what is commonly called the Middle East.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, Leland Stowe is a reporter in whom the American people have every right to have great confidence. He tells an unbelievable story of the beginning of the civil war in Greece, how the people had petitioned for the right to assemble, and were given permission. Late the night preceding the morning when they were to assemble, the order was changed, and they were not to be permitted to meet. But they did not get the word, so they came early in the morning, and the British machine guns were turned on them. The Royalist guard turned their guns on them and mowed them down in cold blood when they appeared for a peaceable assembly. It was one of the cruelest things that has ever happened in history. Even children were murdered. It was one of those happenings in history that make one's blood boil.

Mr. President, the substance of the recent history of Greece is nothing but another chapter in the history of broken promises by an arrogant and corrupt monarchy, which for 100 years has exploited seven and a half million people for its own personal aggrandizement. Now King George II is dead and he has been succeeded by his brother, Prince Paul. From all available information, it is quite useless to attempt to hide from the fact that Prince Paul is more hated than any other member of the Greek royal family.

During the Metaxas dictatorship, Prince Paul was titular head of the Greek Fascist youth organization, the EOM. This organization carried out the customary training and monkeyshines of the Hitler youth group. They had the customary Nazi uniforms, salutes, paraphernalia, and creeds. Its creed, to which Greek children had to subscribe, read like this:

We believe in one divinely inspired and God-sent leader and savior and guide of the nation, creator of its present and future history, father of the Greek youth and outstanding fighter, John Metaxas.

Does not that sound like something that happened under Adolf Hitler? It does to me. That, of course, was in the days when Metaxas was the dictator of Greece.

This hated Greek monarchy is the pattern which the British have employed in India, the Near and Middle East, and in the Malay Peninsula to obtain agents for their policies of exploitation. This pattern of imperialism has nothing in common with the tradition, heritage, or concepts of democracy enjoyed by the American people.

Mr. President, I believe that as far as possible the Senate should wipe its hands of the lackeys who have been scattered throughout the world by the clever, empire-conscious British Government. There is no reason why we should pour out the money of American taxpayers to sustain and continue the basic mistakes of British foreign policy in Greece during the past 2 years. The American people, Mr. President, are anxious to give millions for clothing and food for the hungry, but they are not willing to expend one cent to maintain a corrupt and venal monarchy any place in this world. The Members of the Senate ought to bear this in mind when they vote on my amendment.

My amendment provides not only for the abolition of hereditary offices and titles, but it provides for free democratic elections for the purpose of determining the chief executive of such government and the membership of its legislative body.

For a people famous throughout the world for their love of liberty, who by their heroic deeds have inspired poets for centuries, the Greek people deserve a chance at democratic government once more. It is absurd, ridiculous, and stupid to pretend that the present Greek Government in any way represents the democratic choice of the majority of the people of Greece. It is pure, unadulterated sophistry to contend that the Greek Government has the support of 85 percent of the people, when in truth it has merely the support of 85 percent of those political parties with seats in the present Greek Parliament.

Roughly, half of all the Greek political parties did not participate in the election held a year ago. Not only did they not participate but a large proportion of those who did did not vote for candidates now sitting in the Parliament. Supposedly, more than a million people voted in those elections; yet the fact is that this constitutes roughly 15 to 16 percent of the population of Greece, and of this percentage many did not vote for the present Government. In other words, 85 percent of the present Parliament members support the present Government, but this 85 percent represents less than 15 percent of the people who live in Greece.

The so-called elections recently held in Greece were in no sense free or democratic. It is necessary, if one is to make a judgment on those elections, to remember that just previous to the elections civil war had raged in Greece; that the country was occupied by British troops; that neither the press nor the radio was free; that election campaigning was not allowed in any genuine sense. It is necessary to understand that the government had control of the existing food supplies. It is most relevant to remember that the Royalist groups were armed while their opponents were not armed. It is essential to understand that the political leadership of the existing political parties did not participate nor have the

opportunity to participate freely and actively in those elections. The most clever apologist in our State Department cannot produce the facts to sustain the contention that free and democratic elections were held. It may well be, Mr. President, that under the eyes of allied observers, large numbers of docile, terror-ridden peoples were herded to the polls. It is impossible, as all of us know, for outside observers unfamiliar with the history and background of the situation, with no understanding of the confusion resulting from the absence of trusted leaders, to render an accurate judgment.

If those elections, Mr. President, were fair and democratic, why would any one object to the provisions that free and democratic elections should now be held within 90 days after the request for aid has been made?

I should like to ask at this point to have inserted in the RECORD a report by Arthur Krock, which appeared in the New York Times on Tuesday, April 1, 1947. I shall not detain the Senate by reading Mr. Krock's report, except just one part of it:

This correspondent today read a report of this character:

"I feel," this trained observer wrote, "that, while the motives of the President's program to combat communism are the very best, he is repeating the same mistake which lost us Poland and other areas now behind the iron curtain and conceivably might even lose us South America. This mistake is in endorsing the worst elements of reaction in Greece and ignoring the center and and the non-Communist left."

He continued:

"All responsible and reasonable disinterested Americans with whom I have talked in Greece felt that our money would go down a rat hole unless political stability accompanies economic stabilizing and that any stability is simply unobtainable under the present Government, and possibly not without new elections following a general amnesty."

And that is what my amendment provides for.

"Whether or not the last elections were fair, it is still a fact that a substantial section of Greek public opinion feels they were not. In any new election the Left stands no chance of winning, which makes denial of the electoral test by the Government even stupider."

I ask permission to insert all of Mr. Krock's statement in the RECORD.

There be no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREEK GOVERNMENT IS A DIFFICULT CLIENT

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 31.—Although the administration has stressed that part of its newly announced foreign policy which provides aid for the Greek people, and played down the aid to Turkey, which is much more strategic from a military standpoint, the attention of critics of the current government in Athens has not been diverted by this tactic.

These critics share the general admiration of the western world for the gallant Greek resistance to the Axis, and the widespread sympathy for the economic and social plight of the Hellenes. But this has not removed the objection of some to extending the proposed aid while the Greeks are governed as at present, or distracted others from insisting that the projected Turkish intervention shall be weighed more realistically than officially it has been. Senator Austin, for example, in his explanation of the new policy to the United Nations, discussed the Turkish program very briefly indeed.

* * * * *

A REPORT FROM GREECE

The provision that any government representative of a majority may request withdrawal of the plan in Greece and Turkey is especially designed to meet the point that the government in Athens is neither truly representative nor democratic. The President passed this over lightly in his address to Congress. But nearly every day a report comes to Washington from reliable sources, sometimes brought in person, which suggests that Mr. Truman made an understatement when he said the Greek Government is not perfect. This correspondent today read a report of this character.

"I feel," this trained observer wrote, "that, while the motives of the President's program to combat communism are the very best, he is repeating the same mistake which lost us Poland and other areas now behind the iron curtain and conceivably might even lose us South America. This mistake is in endorsing the worst elements of reaction in Greece and ignoring the center and the non-Communist left."

He continued:

"All responsible and reasonably disinterested Americans with whom I have talked in Greece felt that our money would go down a rat hole unless political stability accompanies economic stabilizing, and that any stability is simply unobtainable under the present Government, and possibly not without new elections following a general amnesty.

"Whether or not the last elections were fair, it is still a fact that a substantial section of Greek public opinion feels they were not. In any new election the Left stands no chance of winning, which makes denial of the electoral test by the Government even stupider.

"The announcement that the United States is going to bail out Greece has served to impede many good things Paul Porter (the President's special Ambassador) wanted the Athens government to accomplish on the home front. It was also the signal for a new campaign of repression by the Ministry of the Interior, which is neither better nor worse than the Soviet NKVD or the Yugoslav OZNA (secret police)."

ARRESTS BY NIGHT

This observer, who would not be quoted in this space had he not impressively established his reliability, disinterestedness, and capacity to report objectively, further asserted that the Ministry, in its renewed campaign of repression, is following the secret-police technique made familiar for years in Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy and Spain, Japan, and Soviet Russia. Arrests of citizens were made between midnight and 5 o'clock a. m., and within 24 hours those seized were deported to a lonely island without a public trial.

"In one 3-day period," he added, "after the United States said it would assume political responsibility, the Greek Government arrested about 600 persons in Athens, mostly professional—doctors, lawyers, etc.—and sent them away, frankly declaring there was no longer any need to exercise restraint. There is no doubt that the loudest shouters in support of the United States are Athens' 3,000 wealthiest citizens whom the Government continues to protect against any direct taxation and who, with their gold pounds, hardly realize there is any inflation. And the rightists and extremists, encouraged by the President's speech, now trumpet that the center is almost as traitorous as the left because it doesn't make humble obeisance to the Government."

This observer concluded with the statement that, as much as he detests Communists, he would go to the mountains if he were a citizen of Greece.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the present government really, genuinely believes it is representative of the people, it has nothing to fear. That is just as Mr. Krock has reported. If it is a free and democratic government, it will not object to free and democratic elections. Only the enemies of democracy are afraid of the voice of the people. The American people do not want to pour out hundreds of millions of dollars to sustain governments which essentially are royalist, antidemocratic in their heart, and who are not supported by the people. The American people still believe that the power to govern is derived from the consent of the governed.

Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senators who have favorably reported this legislation exactly how many political prisoners are held today in concentration camps by the present Greek Government.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I may say that probably there are not very many prisoners held at one time in Greece, because political prisoners are not fed, and so it is impossible to keep very many on hand for a very long time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator thinks they do not last long?

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish we had exact information on the conditions under which the prisoners suffer, so we could present it to the Senate and to Congress while this bill is being considered.

I should also like to know how many Greek political prisoners are held by the British in Egypt and other areas under British control. My information leads me to the belief that the number of such prisoners runs well over 20,000.

It is reported from Athens by the correspondent of the Overseas News Agency that within 24 hours after the President's speech on Greece, the Government announced that it had arrested, sentenced, and deported to island prisons nearly 600 leftists. That was when they got news of the President's speech. That is what happened in the city of Athens.

Mr. President, if this present government is free and democratic, why are thousands upon thousands of Greeks in political concentration camps? Free and democratic elections cannot be held if political tyranny of this kind continues. If free speech and free press exist in Greece, why are such measures necessary? The obvious answer, of course, Mr. President, is that democratic procedure and democratic liberties do not exist in Greece. The excuse is given that several thousand Communists in the mountains are attempting to overthrow the Government. If those people now fighting in the mountains did not have the support of the Greek populace, would not the present Greek Army be able to disperse such a woeful handful of men? And if the men and women now fighting in the

mountains have the support of large parts of the Greek people, is not this by itself prima facie evidence that the present Greek Government does not represent the rank and file of the Greek people? Remember, Mr. President, the average Greek worker is paid 7,000 drachmas a day, but he needs a minimum of 10,000 drachmas a day just to buy for his family 2,500 calories of food which, as everyone knows, is roughly 500 calories above the starvation limit. Can a government which enforces a regressive taxation system, which makes no effort to stop disastrous inflation, ever entertain the support of the majority of its people? It must be obvious to everyone that for such a government, military dictatorship is necessary if it is to remain in power.

I should like permission to insert in the RECORD a remarkable article by Raymond Daniell, which appeared in the New York Times magazine, April 6, 1947. I have marked parts of it which I shall ask to have printed. I wish that I had time to read the whole article to the Senate, but I shall read a few short excerpts. Mr. Daniell is a very conservative and reputable correspondent. I am sure everyone will agree that he is not given to exaggeration, nor is he given to propaganda in the articles he writes. He is an accurate reporter. He is a reporter upon whom the readers may absolutely depend. He simply states the facts without bias, and without attempting to distort or to make it appear that one side is in a better position than the other.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado a question. He has shown by his usual logical presentation that the Government of Greece probably does not actually represent the people of Greece, or at least represents less than a majority of the people. Is it not a logical conclusion further that Greece as a matter of fact is simply a pawn in this game, regardless of what her government is? If our policy, as the President has laid it down, conflicts with the Russian policy, then whatever government Greece should have, we would do what is now proposed to be done, and probably would follow that policy into other countries regardless of what kind of governments they had. Is that not true?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Unfortunately, I am afraid that is the situation. I am afraid we are giving no concern whatever to the kind of government we propose to help. I heard the statement made on the floor of the Senate today, "Oh, well, Greece is an independent government," and therefore we should help her. When we can no longer support the kind of government that exists in Greece, it is proposed to fall back on the statement, "Theirs is an independent government, and therefore we must support that country."

I cannot go along with that kind of a proposal. I do not think the American people want to go along with such a proposal. I do not think the American people can effectively fight communism by doing such a thing. If we are going to fight communism we must have something better than communism with which to fight it, not something which is far worse than communism. As between communism and the kind of government now existing in Greece, communism is a bright and shining star. There is a much better form of government than communism, and it is a democracy. Even some of the democracies which are not exactly pure democracies are much better, in my opinion, than communism. In my opinion, communism is pretty well down the scale in forms of government. But I do not think that communism is quite as far down the scale as is the kind of government the Greek people are afflicted with at the present time.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Is it not a further logical conclusion, then, that almost throughout the ages—and we are following in the footsteps of those who have gone before—whenever for any reason one country wants to go into another country for interests of its own, it finds reasons for doing so? Then, as a matter of fact, does not our talk about the kind of governments we are going to support, the four freedoms, and all, fall a little flat?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; of course it falls flat. That is the difficulty, and that is why I cannot go along with Senators who say on the floor of the Senate "We have two choices." I say, let us make a third choice. Let us lay down some conditions. Let us insist that the situation so far as the Greek Government is concerned, be clarified and purified and improved so that it meets the standards—not the highest standards, but acceptable standards on the part of the people of the United States. Before we do anything else that is what we should do. A strange thing in connection with this matter is that if we would do such a thing there would not be civil war in Greece. There is civil war in Greece because of the depression, there is civil war in Greece because of the inefficiency and the inability of her tyrannical fascist government to do the job that a government is supposed to do. So what we should do in Greece, unless we want to pour money down a rat hole, is to do first things first, and the first thing to do there is to straighten out the Greek Government.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Then, as a matter of fact, for whatever reason we want to go into Greece now, whether it is to protect our fuel supply in Turkey or whether it is to protect the Mediterranean and keep Russia from obtaining full possession of the Dardanelles—and it is suspected in rather high quarters that that may have something to do with the program—for whatever reason then, we would take occasion to find an excuse to go into Greece regardless of what kind of a government they had. Is that not a rather logical conclusion?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I am compelled to reach that conclusion. So long as the President's new policy of interfering in civil wars—and he has laid it down in so many words, and it is the new policy—continues to be American policy, whatever kind of government we find in the country involved is not of importance to the policy; that does not make any difference. The President says that hereafter it is to be the policy of the United States to take sides in any civil war or strife we find any place on earth. That is a new policy for the United States. As a matter of fact, no nation has ever had such a policy. We complained bitterly during the War Between the States when England was more or less taking one side in the struggle, and she had to pay heavy damages when the war was over for the position she took.

The President, in his message before the joint session of Congress, said:

> I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

"By armed minorities"—that is a civil war. That sounds very fine. The policy is to support "free peoples." But we decide who are the "free peoples." We decide whether the "free peoples" are the Greek Royalist Government or the poor peasants and workers in Greece fighting for a chance to live and a chance to feed their families and take care of their families and escape from the terrible miseries which surround them. It is proposed that we go into Greece and decide who are the "free peoples" of Greece. Of course, that is what nations always do when they intervene in civil wars. They pick out the people they are going to help and try to cast the robe of purity around them. That is what we are doing in this case.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. If we went into Greece, would we not actually suppress the very thing we would like to see exist in Greece, if our talk means anything?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is true. We are going in to shoot down the very people for whom the American people naturally would have a great sympathy, and I am not referring to the Communists. As Arthur Krock has pointed out, it is the middle class. It is not the Communists on this end of the line or the Royalists on the other end, but it is the great ordinary common people—those who are in between. They are the ones who would be shot down.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MALONE. As a matter of fact, the debate brought out today, I think, very clearly that the crisis, if there is one, was precipitated by the withdrawal of English support from Greece. Then if we rush in and take up the mantle which England has cast off, are we not simply

picking up England's fight without taking the time to form a clear policy of our own?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; and we are making a great mistake, because the English people are very clever at colonization; they are very clever at working with other people. They have made that a career. They have an excellent brand of diplomacy. Our diplomacy is far less efficient than British diplomacy. Yet where England has failed dismally and is getting out because she has failed, we are going to take over, and we have had no experience in that sort of thing. Usually the British go into another country to help it; they make it pay its own way. But we do not do that. We go in with great grants out of our Treasury and try to make the program succeed with grants from our Treasury. The British do not do that. I feel very certain that we are only heading for serious trouble when we attempt to do something that the British have failed to do.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Without discussing the merits of this program, whether it is the right thing to do or the wrong thing to do—and that is a question which could be debated—are we not going in to stop the Russians from taking over the Dardanelles, the Mediterranean, and the oil fields in Turkey? Is not that the logical conclusion? Without debating whether we should do it or not, should not the truth be told to the American people?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, if that threat actually exists. I have not seen any evidence that Russia wants to take over the oil fields or take over Greece, or even Turkey. What Russia has asked for is the right to fortify the Dardanelles. If one looks at the map and considers the position of Turkey, he will see what a magnificent springboard it offers for any nation which wishes to attack Russia. When we look at the Black Sea, we must remember that it has 2,000 miles of shore line. Russia desires to defend herself. She wishes to build bases around her country. The area around the Black Sea is the only point on the compass where Russia is vulnerable. One can very readily see why she would rather place fortifications on the Dardanelles than fortify the entire shore line of the Black Sea. The Black Sea reaches up into the bowels of Russia. It is the right road to travel if we want to attack Russia. Of course Russia knows that, so Russia wants to protect herself by building fortifications on the Dardanelles. Is not that sensible?

The Senator has made some reference to my service on the Committee on Military Affairs. I recall that more than a year ago the War Department—as it should have done—figured out the defense of America. It planned bases beginning at the Philippines, on the one side, and extending into the Arctic Circle in a northerly direction. The other leg of the horseshoe was in the Azores. That is what the War Department said was needed to protect America. Those were the bases which it claimed were needed; and I think we needed them. I am sorry that the plan was not put into operation and the necessary bases established, because I think they represent the very minimum in our defenses, and that we should have them.

But when we make such military plans as that, how can we say that Russia should not make similar plans to protect herself? I think it is entirely reasonable that Russia should be given the right to have fortifications and protection on the Dardanelles. The Dardanelles is free to everyone to use. But, of course, in time of war it is a pathway into the interior of Russia. I do not think Russia is blind to that fact. I know she is not. I know that if she could place fortifications on the Dardanelles they would cost perhaps 1 percent of the cost of the fortifications she would have to have on the entire coast line of the Black Sea. She knows that, and so do we.

We are going into Greece and Turkey with our flag and our uniforms, to keep Russia away from the Dardanelles. As nearly as I can determine, that is the only object. Our whole purpose and objective is to keep Russia out of the Dardanelles with her fortifications.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. It was brought out on the floor of the Senate today rather clearly that England has always been able to stop Russia from entering the Dardanelles area. Is not that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. England has followed that policy for a hundred years. She has kept Russia out of the Mediterranean. She has kept Russia from having a warm-water port.

Mr. MALONE. She stopped Russia with her fleet on at least one occasion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As the Senator well knows, Britain has been the mistress of the seas for many years, and she has been able to keep Russia at bay. She has been able to keep her out of the Mediterranean. But that day is gone. Britain is no longer mistress of the seas. We are taking over her job. She can no longer keep Russia out of the Mediterranean. It is not possible for her to do so, so we step in and assume that job. Why we should assume it, God only knows. I do not.

Mr. MALONE. After witnessing two world wars, being in one officially and in the other unofficially, and now having this responsibility, I have long since come to the conclusion that any vote I cast on the floor of the Senate will be on one basis alone, and that is whether it fits the policy of protecting the United States.

My next question to the Senator from Colorado is this: What study has been made, if the Senator knows of any, to determine whether it would be in the interest of the United States to prevent Russia from entering the Dardanelles?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I cannot see that our intervention in that area would be in the interest of the United States. I hold the opposite opinion. I do not think it has anything to do with our defenses. I believe that our defenses lie entirely outside that area.

As I stated a moment ago, our War Department has figured out the defenses of the United States in a great horseshoe, beginning at the Azores and ending in the Philippines, with air bases all along the way. I think that is the way to defend America. I think that was a fine plan. It was designed by our highest military strategists.

I have never heard of any necessity for us to build air bases in Turkey—at least until the 28th of February, when this new plan came out. So far as I know, such a plan was never previously proposed. The War Department was a little reluctant to propose the horseshoe defense plan which I have described, because it was feared that the American people might not accept it. But now we have gone far beyond that point. We are going into the Mediterranean and attempting to build air bases far removed from us, bases which we cannot supply, bases in which we are likely to be caught if there is any trouble, just as we were caught with our bases in the Philippines. We shall probably reap the same results which we reaped at Bataan and Corregidor.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. How much closer would the Russian armed forces be to the United States of America than they are at this moment if they were allowed to come through the Dardanelles?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. They would not be any nearer to the United States. They are very close to us now over the North Pole. That is the place where this Nation is vulnerable to Russia, through Alaska and through the Arctic Circle. Russia is a very close neighbor of the United States in that area. She is many thousands of miles away from us by way of Turkey. That is a long distance away, halfway around the world. But across the Arctic Circle Russia is a very close neighbor of the United States, as the Senator well knows.

Mr. MALONE. The next observation on which I should like to have the Senator's opinion is this: Supposing we agree with Russia on a situation in which we would both be admitted to the Dardanelles, including England; supposing we are all friendly and at peace, what would be the effect of such an agreement upon the peace of the world.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is an agreement which should be worked out. That is an agreement which is more or less on the way. It is an agreement that should be worked out in the United Nations organization. The United Nations was created to immunize fever spots. That is one of the world's fever spots, and I am certain that it can be dealt with around the conference table in a peaceable way, which is the way we envisioned it when we created the United Nations.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator feel that our hostile move—I must conclude that that is what it is—in connection with the announcement by the President of the United States that we are there to stop Russia's form of government at the borders of Greece would promote such an agreement?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No. I think that our threat in Turkey and in Greece is primarily the cause of the disagreement we have been having in the United Nations and which we have recently witnessed in Moscow. I do not see how we can expect other than that. I do not know how we can expect to reach an agreement around the conference table when we have a program such as the one outlined in the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator, consistently with the answer he has just made, think this has made the solution of the German problem any less difficult?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It has made the solution of the German problem absolutely impossible—not only the German problem, but all the other problems and controversies that stand between the two great powers, Russia and the United States. Conditions can only drag on from bad to worse.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course I have to disagree with my able friend upon that point. I think I would rather follow, under the circumstances, the opinion of our great Secretary of State, George Marshall. I have no knowledge as to Marshall's position with respect to this measure, but I think it is pretty safe to assume that he did not go to Russia without some knowledge of the problem we are now discussing, and it was undoubtedly his judgment, after having been closely allied with the Russians during the great war and having a world of experience in dealing with all types and kinds of people, that a move of this kind would strengthen, rather than weaken, his hand in the conferences at Moscow. That is my position; and I cannot help but think that it is George Marshall's position also, or he would not have gone to Russia under the circumstances.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think the Senator is correct in his statement that Secretary of State Marshall knew about this. As a matter of fact, I think he is the author of the plan. I think it is the Marshall plan.

Mr. LUCAS. That may be. I do not know that it is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I presume it is.

Mr. LUCAS. I certainly think he is at least favorable to the plan, or he would not be where he is at this moment. The only point I am making is that a man who has occupied the world position which George Marshall has occupied during the last few years has undoubtedly weighed this proposition carefully and reached a very definite conclusion as to what effect, if any, it might have upon the conference now proceeding in Moscow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have no doubt of that. However, the Senator well knows that many well-laid plans backfire and do not work out the way it was hoped they would.

Mr. LUCAS. I know that. I do not assert that George Marshall has all the wisdom in the world. He has no monopoly of it. The able Senator from Colorado may be correct in his conclusions. Time will tell. We have to take one or the other horn of the dilemma which is presented. I submit that either road we take is a dangerous one. It is merely a question of judgment as to which way we should go to try to bring about a peaceful solution of the world's affairs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course it has been a very difficult road. Russia has adopted an obstinate and, I think, stupid policy of negation for many months, and certainly her policies and her position in world affairs have been enough to try a saint. I think we must admit that. It is not an easy problem to work out. I do not see how we can expect to work it out by launching in Turkey a military threat to Russia. I do not see how we can expect to reach an amicable agreement with Russia when we have that kind of a proposal in the making.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator will yield for one more observation along that line, I will say that I have never considered the situation so serious from the standpoint of a military threat as many other Members of the Senate have considered it in this debate. We have created more furor and fuss in this country regarding the question of war with Russia than has been created in any other place on the globe. I have never read a statement by anyone in authority in Russia that indicates what has been indicated on the floor of the Senate—that we are leading this country to war. I have never seen a statement come out of Russia that indicated that the policy which we are pursuing in advocating the Greek-Turkish loan was a policy of war against Russia. There may be some statements along that line. I have followed the newspapers daily and I have seen some critical statements coming from the Russian press and from some of the leaders in the political life of that nation, but I have never seen anyone go so far as those who are opposed to this loan have constantly gone on the floor of the Senate, and in some instances by gentlemen who are not Members of the Senate of the United States. We are not proposing to do any more—in fact, we are proposing to do less, as I see it—than the British have been doing ever since the war in both Turkey and Greece. I have never seen any protests upon the part of the Russian people with respect to what Great Britain has been doing in Greece with her thousands upon thousands of soldiers there, loaning money to Greece, and selling her military equipment, and being all the time back of Turkey both during the war and since the war.

If I understand the situation correctly, when Great Britain moves out of Turkey and Greece we will take over under much less favorable circumstances, from the standpoint of a military venture, than Great Britain has experience ever since VE-day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course Britain went into Greece during the war and is getting out of Greece now that the war is over.

The Senator complains about alarmist statements which were made upon the floor of the Senate. I should like to read to him what a distinguished American had to say on March 12 in the House of Representatives when the Senator was present. The President of the United States thought the situation was so serious that he came before Congress personally and delivered a message under the most solemn of conditions. This is his first sentence:

> The gravity of the situation which confronts the world today necessitates my appearance before a joint session of the Congress.
>
> The foreign policy and the national security of this country are involved.

Then the President continued his address. I have never seen a more solemn occasion than that one. The President further said:

> I am fully aware of the broad implications involved if the United States extends assistance to Greece and Turkey, and I shall discuss these implications with you at this time.

The President did not deceive us any; I am not calling the President an alarmist, but I do not think any statement which has been made on the floor of the Senate could be more alarming than the President's statement on March 12. Certainly a very serious situation exists.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that I agree with him that the situation is serious. A moment ago I said that either horn of the dilemma which we take will lead us down a dangerous road. There can be no doubt of that, in view of the conditions which now exist throughout the world.

The President did come to the Congress with that message, and it is a serious one, but I am satisfied that the President sincerely and honestly believes that this is the only step which will keep the peace. In my humble judgment, that is his position, and it is the position of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And it is the position of the Senator from Colorado, likewise, that whatever he is doing has those same objectives. I have no quarrel with the Senator over his objectives, and I have no doubt at all that the President is absolutely sincere in what he is doing, and that he believes it is for the best interests of the United States that we take the action he has suggested. I have no quarrel with that. Of course, it is only natural that he should take that position.

I am not charging bad faith on the part of the President, nor am I charging bad faith on the part of Senators who do not agree with my position. I want the Senator to understand my position. I believe that we face two horns of a dilemma, as he has mentioned, and that either one of them is bad enough. So I am trying to find a middle course which will be devoid of the dangers attaching to the two horns of the dilemma which we are facing. My intentions and my objections and my motives are just as good as those of any other person who is attempting to deal with this problem.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, no one can question the sincerity and integrity of the able Senator from Colorado. No one has ever done so since I have been

a Member of the Senate. I have frequently disagreed with the Senator, but no one has ever questioned his sincerity of purpose in relation to any of the great and important matters which frequently come before the Senate of the United States; and I am always glad to listen to the views the able Senator expresses from time to time, even though I may disagree with him.

Let me ask the able Senator this question: Does he believe that the policy upon which we are embarking is an imperialistic policy?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not exactly call it an imperialistic policy, because I am not too well informed as to what our motives are with respect to the petroleum deposits in the Middle East. I will say that it has some of the earmarks of imperialism. We have discovered the greatest petroleum deposits in all the world, and we know that the State Department and the private oil companies—the Standard Oil companies—have been working for years to settle the difficulties between other nations so that the American private oil companies can have ownership of that oil. I call that imperialism, and I think that oil will be extracted from the earth and those resources will be exploited for profit. I do not know whether the State Department or the United States Government has laid down any policies of reimbursement to the poor, miserable natives who have lived such lives of hardship in that area. I do not know whether they are to be reimbursed for the removal of that great natural resource, but I fear that they will not be taken care of.

If it is our purpose to go into the Middle East and extract that very valuable deposit of petroleum, then I say we are getting very close to a policy of imperialism, as I understand the term.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield, and then I shall not interrupt him further.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to say that I agree with the purport of the Senator's amendment which he is going to submit in due course, as I understand. I do not think it is pending at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; it is not.

Mr. LUCAS. But it deals with the oil situation. I shall support that amendment because, so far as I am concerned, I do not wish to leave the slightest impression that the Government is making this loan to Greece and Turkey in order to protect the private oil interests that now are in the Middle East—not at all. I shall support the amendment which the Senator from Colorado is going to offer along that line.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am grateful to the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the amendment is a good one, even though it may not be necessary; but in order to make the position of the Senate of the United States clear and certain, I shall support that amendment.

I support the Greek-Turkish loan solely on the theory that in my judgment it is in the interest of the safety and security of the United States. I am trying now to look far down the mountainside into the future, and not just consider the situation momentarily, as we are discussing it now.

I may be wrong; I do not say I am infallible; but I certainly hope I am right.

In the great issues that come before the Senate of the United States, I do the best I can, as every other Senator, I am certain, does. I pray that God Almighty will give us some light to enable us to see aright in regard to the issue before us, solely in the interest of free men and women everywhere.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Certainly, Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is entitled to his opinion, and I think he is searching for the right road in that connection. I certainly hope he finds it; I hope he is correct, because as I contemplate what is likely to happen in the Senate a few days from now, it seems to me that the Senator from Illinois will have his way in this matter. So I am tremendously interested in having him be right. I reluctantly disagree with him at the present time; I see these things somewhat differently from the way he sees them. But I have no quarrel at all with his objectives or his purposes or his hopes.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I am somewhat confused in regard to one statement contained in the address which the President made before the joint session of Congress. I mention this in line with the discussion between the distinguished Senator from Illinois and the distinguished Senator from Colorado. I read the following statement from the President's address to the joint session of Congress:

> The seeds of totalitarian regimes are nurtured by misery and want. They spread and grow in the evil soil of poverty and strife. They reach their full growth when the hope of a people for a better life has died.

I think it is well known and freely admitted that the governments of both countries which we intend to enter are totalitarian. From what totalitarian government are we to protect these countries? I address the question to the distinguished Senator from Colorado or to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. So far as Greece is concerned, they have a tyrannical dictatorship, and it is a totalitarian government. The Government of Turkey is, I think, a much more democratic government than is that of Greece, although it, too, is a Fascist form of government. Very few of the rights which are so precious to our people who believe in democracy are enjoyed by the people of Turkey. But I think the Government of Greece is much lower in the scale of government than is the Government of Turkey. Of course, the present Government of Turkey is a great improvement over the Government of Turkey prior to World War I. But it lacks a great deal of being a government which the United States of America, with its ideals of democracy and right living, can approve.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Apparently we are supporting the governments of both these nations, and could it be that the inference is that we are protecting them from the totalitarian Government of Russia?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is presumed that that is the reason for our military manueuver, to protect Greece from infiltration, and Turkey from outside pressure or coercion.

Mr. MALONE. From the Russian Government?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. From the Russian Government.

Now, Mr. President, to proceed with Mr. Daniell's splendid article in the New York Times, I wish to read two short paragraphs. He says:

> It will take more than the injection of dollars to put things right, as the British have learned to their sorrow.

He is talking about Greece.

> Nor will the cure be effected speedily.

Later in this splendid article he says:

> General reaction to President Truman's proposals is to accept them—

This refers to the reaction on the part of the Greeks—

> General reaction to President Truman's proposals is to accept them as a just reward for the long struggle against their latest invaders, the Italians and Germans. The more cynically minded smile and say that if the United States is terrified of Russia, she, no doubt, is willing to pay her frontier guards lavishly.

There is something for us to consider. That is what the Greeks are saying, that if we are terrified of Russia, we should be able to pay her frontier guards, such as Greece and Turkey, lavishly.

Mr. Daniell continues:

> For the concept of America here is based on Hollywood movies largely and consists of a picture of a land where everybody owns a sleek, shiny car, a lavish home and generally makes a million dollars before he dies.
>
> Among the extreme right, American intervention in the domestic troubles of Greece has encouraged extravagant talk of an imminent war with Russia.

The Senator from Illinois said he had not heard of any talk of war except on the floor of the Senate.

> On the March day, when the nation celebrated its liberation from the Turks in 1821, Royalist groups sang songs in which there was a warning to Stalin that "Truman and the atom bomb will make dust out of you."

That should make a very gruesome kind of a song, I should think.

Mr. President, there is one other paragraph I wish to read, because it shows how this relief is handled in a country like Greece. They have had a tremendous amount of relief, as the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] pointed out a few moments ago. Mr. Daniell proceeds:

> Another factor which may help is that, without security, rich Greeks who formerly kept their capital abroad may bring it home and submit to taxation. Peasants and retailers likewise have been hoarding gold sovereigns in fear of foreign invasion and

the necessity for flight. With the release of this money and the flow of goods and services, the desire to work, which is not very strong right now, may return. It must, if Greece is to recover and stand on her own feet when her present troubles are over.

In other words, the thing that is going to save Greece is what is going to save the rest of the world, that is, a little sweat and a little hard work.

Mr. President, I ask permission to insert the marked portions of this splendid article in my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It will take more than the injection of dollars to put things right, as the British have learned to their sorrow. Nor will the cure be effected speedily.

* * * * *

The next thing that strikes one is the vast quantities of cheap American motion picture and adventure magazines which drape and obscure the news kiosks, which, in the center of the city, average about three to the block. The shops are full of luxury goods, such as have not been seen in London since the war began, and all imported since liberation with borrowed funds, to be sold at inflated prices to the well-to-do.

The reason for this anomaly in a land of hunger, violence, and terror is not hard to find. A large part of 80,000,000 pounds sterling which Britain lent to Greece has been used to import expensive articles like radios, wrist watches, and cosmetics, instead of wheat, fats, clothing, and shoes, so desperately needed in the country outside the capital. The same thing will happen to American dollars unless we devise some more effective method of controlling their expenditure than the British have done. The British on the scene, who will soon turn over their function to their American successors, are the first to admit this and to warn against repetition of their methods, which consisted largely of serving in an advisory capacity.

The truth is there is no effective control of imports and the Government has been unable to resist the pressure of business interests for importation of articles which bring high prices and handsome profits, such as new American automobiles, British bicycles, and pure silk. There is no rationing of food and price controls are a joke. There is no confidence in the currency and all rents and large contracts provide for payment in gold, which the Government has to import to sell, with results that have been ruinous for its foreign exchange. Legally, the exchange is fixed at 5,000 drachmas to the dollar, but the black-market price ranges from 6,000 to 7,000.

Prime Minister Maximos gets a salary of 1,000,000 drachmas monthly. * * *

Twenty months ago clothing, textiles, and shoes worth $13,000,000 began arriving at Piraeus. Most of the 6,000-ton shipment remains unopened in the warehouses. Months of effort to have it released and distributed were fruitless, and only in the last days of March did it begin to trickle out at the rate of 500,000,000 drachmas' worth a day through retail shops which collected 3 percent from the Government for disposing of it.

The British proposed that it be released at one-third of cost to poorly paid civil servants, of which there are some 80,000, but they encountered only excuses for delay, whereas the real reason is that if it were put on the market it would force down prices of privately owned stocks in the shops.

* * * * *

For Greece's trouble is not only economic. It is hard to say which is the gravest trouble or which must be brought to a halt before the other is cured. To this correspondent, it seems that there can be no sound economy here until the bitter feuds which divide the people of the same family can be reconciled and conciliated, but members of this Government seem inclined to other methods and are now planning extensive military operations against the leftist bands in the north.

Officially, the Government has declared war on all bands, whether of left or right, but in practice it seems somewhat less than impartial. For instance, recently when a rightist leader slew some Communists he was extolled by Government spokesmen as a hero, but when he in turn was slain by Communists, General Zervas, Minister of Public Order, said:

"We will answer terrorism with terrorism ten times as strong, disaster with disaster ten times as strong, and slaughter ten times greater. And this is not anti-Christian, because God has taught us how to behave to anti-Christian Communists, who have sold their souls to the devil."

The Government points with pride to the statement that it represents 85 percent of the legal loyal parties, to the amnesty it offered the rebels who would give up arms and surrender, and it claims to believe wholeheartedly in democracy. But those who question this are not all Communists. Themistokles Sophoulis, former prime minister, who refused to join the coalition, declared to this correspondent that the Government is "stifling civil liberties." The 87-year-old leader asserted that thousands of Greeks have been exiled to islands without trial on mere police denunciation, and said that the civil service was being purged of political opponents of the regime and coercion was being used in the Army against reading anything but approved party newspapers.

Sophoulis also ridiculed the Government's claim to represent 85 percent of the people, pointing out that, while it was true that it represented that much of Parliament, it was probably representative of less than half the people. Besides the Communists, who may represent 15 percent of the 7,000,000 population, he said his own party represented 20 percent, and half a dozen smaller parties represented together about as much more.

In his view Greek public opinion has undergone a radical change toward conciliation since the election was held. He advocated an early election.

General reaction to President Truman's proposals is to accept them as a just reward for the long struggle against their latest invaders—the Italians and Germans. The more cynically minded smile and say that if the United States is terrified of Russia, she no doubt is willing to pay her frontier guards lavishly. For the concept of America here is based on Hollywood movies largely and consists of a picture of a land where everybody owns a sleek, shiny car, a lavish home, and generally makes a million dollars before he dies.

Among the extreme right, American intervention in the domestic troubles of Greece has encouraged extravagant talk of an imminent war with Russia, and on the March day when the nation celebrated its liberation from the Turks in 1821, Royalist groups sang songs in which there was a warning to Stalin that "Truman and the atom bomb will make dust out of you."

* * * * *

Another factor which may help is that, with security, rich Greeks who formerly kept their capital abroad may bring it home and submit to taxation. Peasants and retailers likewise have been hoarding gold sovereigns in fear of foreign invasion and the necessity for flight. With the release of this money and the flow of goods and services, the desire to work, which is not very strong right now, may return. It must if Greece is to recover and stand on her own feet when her present troubles are over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, since the liberation of Greece, more than $850,000,000 worth of goods, including UNRRA supplies, have been sent into the country; yet, by common consent, Greece's economy is acknowledged to be worse off today than before. That was the point which the able Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] brought out a few moments ago, that UNRRA relief, help from the United States and from Great Britain, has amounted to $850,000,000 since the war, yet Greece is in worse condition than she was before. So why should we expect that the $250,000,000 now planned to be spent under the bill would perform any great miracle? It simply will not do it.

Now it is proposed that several hundred millions of additional dollars be placed at the disposal of a Greek government which has proven, beyond a shadow of a doubt, its basic incompetence either to deal with the economic or the political situation. What happened to the eight hundred and fifty millions is certain to be the fate of the additional three hundred millions. In fact, Mr. President, the current expenditures of the Greek Government for its armed forces are running at an annual rate of, roughly, $240,000,000. They will use up all the money in 1 year with the Army.

If we are to foot the bill for the military tyranny of the present Greek Government, what portion of the funds we are to provide will actually go into reconstruction? Of course, the answer is: Not one thin dime. And if the present Greek Government is never able to establish real order, never able to attain genuine support of the Greek people, how will our funds be used effectively for reconstruction of the Greek economy?

The Associated Press carried a dispatch on April 7 stating that the Greek Parliament appropriated $40,000 as a dowry for Princess Catherine, the sister of King Paul, who is to be married very shortly to a British officer. Here is a nation, many of whose people are starving to death, a nation which is asking for help from the United States Treasury, and yet their Parliament, according to the Associated Press dispatch of April 7, appropriates $40,000 for a dowry for a princess. Of course, she will have an expensive wedding, and the United States Treasury will have to stand all the expenses of it.

Obviously, until a genuine political democracy is established in Greece, it will be impossible to restore the economy of Greece. That seems to me to be as plain as anything on this earth. The mere military conquest of this people, the mere saddling on this people of a mercenary army, can never create conditions of political stability. A mercenary army is what this bill provides for.

If Senators do not believe that, I want them to read carefully paragraph 3 on page 3 of the bill. It provides for a mercenary army, and the army is to be paid for by the Greek and Turkish Governments.

The mere military conquest of this people, the mere saddling on this people of a mercenary army devoted to an outworn and hated monarchy, can never create those conditions of political sta-

bility under which the economy itself can be improved. We must face the blunt fact, Mr. President, that the economy of Greece can only be restored when a genuinely democratic government, supported by the vast majority of the Greek people, is established. Otherwise, the funds which we have now been asked to appropriate will be wasted, will be thrown away, in precisely the same manner in which the eight hundred and fifty millions of the past 2 years have been. Remember that despite the eight hundred and fifty millions, the economic situation in Greece is worse, worse, worse, not better, and if we now commit ourselves to a half billion or a billion a year to subjugate the Greek people with bayonets to a government which they hate, we will never be able to restore the Greek economy.

Mr. President, the primary requirement for defeating communism in Greece is the establishment of a democracy—a genuine political democracy—in Greece. Whether or not the Senate is determined to have a genuinely democratic Greece is the issue. Let us be clear. Everything depends upon the establishment of a political democracy in Greece. If we do not base our foreign policy on a political democracy, we are engaging in imperialism, either our own or someone's imperialism, and in the maintenance of a corrupt monarchy. In using the American taxpayers' money to foster an unwanted military tyranny, it would be, by the most conservative standards, a colossally stupid piece of international effrontery. Furthermore, it would be a complete waste of the American taxpayers' money. America could gain nothing but hatred by such a policy. It would profit no one; it would cultivate and breed communism; it would prove that the peoples throughout the democratic world cannot look to America for encouragement.

I shall ask now that I be not interrupted until I conclude. I have a few more pages, and I will go ahead as fast as I can, because the hour is growing late.

If our aim is to stop the spread of communism and the expansion of Soviet Russia's influence over Greece and Turkey, I do not see how we can achieve it through this bill. It is obvious that we cannot stop Russia or communism by increasing the strength of the Greek and Turkish Armies

Communism is an idea and not a tangible object. You cannot fight ideas with guns. The only way to fight them is with better ideas.

The conditions which breed and spread communistic ideas should be our concern Whatever money we invest in such an enterprise should go to fight hunger and disease, and, in Greece especially, to repair the terrible destruction of her cities and farms which has been her legacy from this war.

We certainly cannot spread the ideals of democracy throughout Greece by giving arms to a Greek Government which does not practice these ideals.

The events of the past few years in Greece should teach us a few lessons. Germany and Italy tried to suppress the Greek people and failed. The Italians, with 300,000 soldiers, scattered over the country, and the Germans, with 50,000, could not subjugate them. When the Italians surrendered in 1943, the Germans increased their own garrisons, bringing them up to the strength of almost 15 divisions. Still, the guerrilla movement grew stronger every day.

Then, the Germans tried using quisling troops, but the result was stronger and stronger guerrilla units, and the creation of a deep-rooted division of the Greek people—separating them into camps of resistance fighters and collaborators. This was the beginning of the civil war which is going on today.

What happened after the liberation of Greece? The British Government brought in troops to establish order and found itself embroiled in a civil war. Ten thousand Greeks lost their lives, and approximately 500 British soldiers were killed. The British realized that the resistance movement was strong and came to a compromise. The Varkiza agreement was drawn up between the resistance forces and the government in power at that time. This agreement, indirectly backed by the British, guaranteed full political amnesty to the resistance fighters if they were to lay down their arms, and in February of 1945, the guerrilla fighters surrendered their guns to the Royalist Government. Immediately, in every city, town, and village, there sprang up government-sanctioned terriorist organizations, composed of Royalists and former collaborators, and a campaign was launched to plunder and terrorize all those who had in any way participated in the underground movement against the enemy. This terrorism grew more and more violent until it reached its peak in the summer and fall of 1945.

In the midst of this, the elections were announced, along with the plebescite which returned the king. Of course, we sent observers to these elections. Their reports declared that the voting had been orderly and that the elections resulted in a fairly clear expression of the will of the Greek people.

What these reports neglected to mention was the terrorist campaigns before the elections, which were most effective. These reports did not explain that no Greek would dare to vote against the wishes of the local terrorist organization. They did not mention that his life would not have been worth two cents the next day, or that his family's safety would have been sacrificed if he dared to vote against the groups in power.

Our observers witnessed only the outward peaceful conduct at the polls. They did not detect the seething turmoil beneath the surface. They did not see that many candidates were prevented from visiting their districts, that they had no chance to present their platform to their constituents.

Let us examine this present Greek Government closely before we act. Under this regime, people are arrested, imprisoned, and detained indefinitely without trial. Men, women, and children have been deported to dry, barren islands without trial or right of appeal. There is no freedom of speech in many areas. Freedom of movement has been limited by the activities of the terrorist bands of the left and the right. The Greek Army which we propose to aid with equipment and military advisers has been cleared of the greatest part of its democratic elements, and is now staffed by more than a thousand officers who were members of the security battalions, those formations which were created by the Nazis during the war and which the Allies have repeatedly labeled as traitorous.

Let us look at the record of its Minister of Public Security, the man to whom the guerrillas would have to surrender if they accepted the proffered amnesty in which our State Department seems to place so much faith. The man who holds this office is Gen. Napoleon Zervas. His position, in Greece, is identical with the position of J. Edgar Hoover in this country. He is at the head of the police department of Greece.

During the war, this general, with British money and arms, created a guerrilla force which at its height was composed of 8,000 well-paid and well-equipped men. This force, from 1943 till the time of the German withdrawal from Greece in 1944, did very little to disturb the enemy.

For example, Mr. President, the Minister of Security, Mr. Napoleon Zervas, is reliably reported to have collaborated with the Germans during their occupation of Greece. I had a visit from an American officer, a second lieutenant from the Office of Strategic Services, who served 8 months behind German lines and who was in Greece 9 months after the liberation of Greece. This officer testified before the Committee on Foreign Relations while this bill was pending. This lieutenant, an American citizen, showed me a German document which had come into his hands which indicated that Zervas had collaborated with the Germans. This man who now takes in Greece a place comparable to that held in this country by J. Edgar Hoover, was a collaborator.

There is no doubt, Mr. President, that the people of America do not believe that the Greek people have had a fair deal—that they have had genuine free and democratic elections.

It is worth noting that the statement that 1,500 officers now serving in the Greek Army, who served in the notorious security battalions which maintained order in Greece for the Germans during the Nazi occupation, has not been challenged. We are going in to back up that kind of crew in Greece with money from our Treasury.

It is a fair thing for the Senate of the United States to face this fact: Why are 1,500 Nazi collaborators today officers of the Greek Army? Could a genuinely democratic government tolerate such a situation? We shot them in Germany. We hung them in Germany, as we should hang them in Greece when we go in there.

I believe that the Senate, if it does nothing else, should indicate its faith and belief in democracy. We would not vote $400,000,000 to maintain the Fascist Dictator Franco. We would not vote $400,000,000 to assist the Nazi Peron government in the Argentine. We are opposed

to tyranny everywhere. We should demand that a free and fair election be held in Greece. That is what my amendment provides. As an essential feature of Greek elections, it is vital to establish full opportunity for all political parties to participate and engage in election activities. It is essential also to grant immediate amnesty to all persons who have fought the present government.

Mr. President, I have in my hand this German report which fell into the hands of the Allies. It is a military situation report from the Twenty-second German Mountain Army Corps, which speaks of the "lawful attitude" of General Zervas toward the German Army. It mentions no sabotage on the part of Zervas' guerrillas against the German invaders, while it shows that Zervas devoted his energies to fighting his rival Greek guerrillas, the men who were waging an effective underground battle against the Germans. Now we are going to help Zervas destroy the men who are on our side.

I ask unanimous consent to insert excerpts from this German report in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Following are some extracts from a German Army document in connection with the collaborationist activities of the present Greek Minister of Public Security, Gen. Napoleon Zervas. During the period under consideration Zervas was chief of the guerrilla groups known as EDDES, or as the document refers to them "Nationalist bands." The references to "Communist bands" means the ELAS, or Leftist guerrillas.

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS XXII (MOUNTAIN) ARMY BUREAU IC—No. 8813/44, CONFIDENTIAL—SEAT C L OCTOBER 8, 1944

1. REPORT ON SITUATION ON JULY 8, 1944

1. Political situation: The fact that Zervas after a temporary recurrence of activity has again returned to his lawful attitude toward the German troops was received with satisfaction by nationalist circles.

2. Situation of the bands:

(a) Nationalist bands (Zervas' bands):

At the beginning of July he (Zervas) abandoned his lawful attitude, which he had kept until now, and under pressure from the British, he attacked various posts, camps, and convoys on the road from Jannena to Igumenitsa and Arta, also on the road Philipias-Louros-Preveza. After a few days, however, he stopped the fighting and since then has kept a neutral position and does not follow any more the orders of the Allies to start again his attacks against the German troops.

(b) Greek Communist bands (ELAS bands):

The bands of the ELAS developed continuous lively activity in the southern district occupied by the corps especially on the road of Arts-Agrinion and on the railway line of Agrinion-Messolongi there took place surprise attacks and repeatedly attacks by mines and mine-laying which in part caused us considerable losses.

3. Defense situation:

* * * * *

(b) Enemy activities and sabotage:

Mine explosions, blow-ups, and general sabotage activities against our mail routes continued in the southern sector with the same frequency as before, and became more frequent in the northern sector, where during last month attacks were extremely rare. In Zervas' territory no sabotage took place.

5. Conclusions on the situation: The important factor to the above would be if the Allies would be able to force Zervas to give up his until now lawful attitude and thus use his troops again for attacks against the German forces. We must also expect continuous activities from the Greek Communist bands in the entire sector of this corps, if these forces are not stopped with frequent mopping-up operations (translator's note: Meaning on the part of the German Army), or if they are not distracted by attacks on the part of Zervas' forces.

For General Headquarters, the Intelligence Officer (signed the draft):

BURKER.

JUNE 8, 1944.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a few days ago the newspapers carried reports of the murder of 32 political prisoners being held in the prison of the city of Gythion in Southern Peloponesos by Royalist terrorists. The Government declared martial law in that section and General Zervas rushed to the spot personally to take care of the situation. Three weeks elapsed and not one of the murderers had been arrested. Instead, General Zervas used the forces under him to fight the Leftist guerriallas of the region.

Does our State Department really expect the guerrillas to hand over their guns to General Zervas? Do we hope to spread American democracy and ideals through such a man?

Remember, Senators, that when the British first intervened in Greece to "establish order" they were greeted with wild cheers. Today, as they are preparing to leave, the Greek people show no signs of sorrow over their departure. From all the reports coming out of Greece we can see that there is little but hatred in the hearts of all classes of Greeks for the British.

Mr. President, 2 years from now I do not want the same thing to be said about America.

I do not want to see us intervening in the internal affairs of another country, with the avowed intention of bringing democracy to its people, and achieving nothing but hatred in the hearts of those we intended to help. That is why I say that we must be very careful to select the right way to achieve our ends. We cannot go into Greece with half-baked plans about what can be done and no clear-cut idea of how it can be done.

Anything we do must be carefully weighed, not only insofar as it concerns our future relations with Greece, but as to how it will appear in the eyes of the rest of the world.

How will we appear to the people of the world who look up to us for our democratic institutions and our traditional championing of the oppressed and weak, if we use our money and arms to fortify an antipopular Government with such an undemocratic history?

The loss of prestige which would result from a failure of our program to bring democracy to Greece would be incalculable. We have announced to the rest of the world that we want to strengthen democracy in Greece—to establish peace and enable the Greek people to start repairing and healing the wounds which they suffered in their heroic resistance against the Germans and Italians;

We must succeed in this objective; we dare not fail; but we cannot succeed if we attempt to work through the present Greek Government.

However, I do believe we can achieve our declared ends by seeing to it that before we give any money a government is formed which represents all shades of political opinion in Greece, with a man at its head who has the confidence of the Greek people. There are several men in Greece today who have that confidence and more than enough leaders of all parties to form such a government.

With the formation of this coalition government, it would be possible to bring the civil war to an end without firing a single shot. Until we bring the civil war to an end there can be no restoration, no rehabilitation of Greece, and no real relief to the Greek people.

I think it is clear from the reports coming out of Greece today that the guerrillas would be more than willing to lay down their guns if there were any hope that they could do so without being thrown into prison. After all, these men have been fighting for over 6 years. They are sick of it. They were sick of it in 1945 when they laid down their guns. If there were a government in Greece which could be trusted not to indulge in reprisals against them and their families, there is small question that they would once again be willing to surrender their arms.

If the aid which we propose to send to Greece were conditioned upon the creation of a broad, coalition government which would honestly offer complete amnesty to the guerrilla fighters, we could bring peace and democracy to Greece, and the stature which we would gain in the eyes of the rest of the world would be even greater than what we would lose, if we were to take the wrong course, and fail.

Senators, the answer rests in our hands. We can offer to Greece the only gift which she really wants—peace, and a start on the road to the democracy which she has fought so hard to gain.

We do not have to indoctrinate the Greek people in the ways of democracy. They know and prize them as highly as we do. But they have been prevented through foreign interference from ever holding their democratic institutions once they had gained them. Now we can show the Greek people and the people of the world that we believe in our democratic principles and institutions and that we will actually help others to attain them.

It has been said many times that the democracies were weak because they did not believe in their own principles strongly enough to support and strengthen them wherever they existed.

We have now proposed to give evidence of our faith in democracy's ability to withstand the dynamic force of communism and all other totalitarian principles.

Let us then be even overly careful in seeing that no Fascist-like elements are allowed to benefit from our aid.

We are on trial before the world.

There is no way to measure the extent of our loss if we fail. Nor is there any way to measure the strength we will gain if we succeed.

Senators, we have a glorious opportunity in this bill to aid Greece. Let us take full and courageous advantage of it. Let us offer our aid to the Greek people and see to it that there is a truly democratic government in power to administer the aid. But on no condition should we send arms to the present undemocratic government and strengthen those elements which, by their Fascist-like tactics, have done more to spread communism in Greece than a thousand Russian agents could have ever accomplished.

Mr. President, many governments may come knocking on our doors during the years ahead. Are we going to submit to blackmail from every military dictatorship throughout the world on the grounds that if we do not fork over our cash, they will go communistic? Let us set up now, let us establish now, the requirement of political democracy as a basic condition for assistance from the American taxpayers' pocket. My amendment should be adopted. It would accomplish this purpose.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I notice that the Senator quoted generally his sources of information from New York newspapers. I do not believe he once quoted from a Washington newspaper. Has the Senator ever seen any article in any Washington newspaper giving the truth respecting the situation in Greece, that is, any dispatches of any kind from the scene over there?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have been very much disappointed, I will say frankly to the Senator, at the attitude taken by the Washington press concerning this great controversial question, which has so many phases and which is of so much interest to the people of the United States and to the people of the city of Washington. I have been grievously disappointed by the way they have handled this question. They have gone all-out to put over the pending measure as quickly as possible, without giving any consideration whatsoever to the points which have been raised in the debate and which have been made available to us largely from the press of New York.

Mr. TAYLOR. I found that to be the case When I was preparing my material, I had to go to newspapers outside the city of Washington. The newspapers of Washington did not give both sides of the case. They are all-out for the Greek-aid proposal. In my opinion, the way the question has been treated by the Washington press is a sad abuse of the privilege of a free press.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Certainly they have not been fair to their readers.

Mr. PEPPER obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Florida if he expects to make an extended address this evening.

Mr. PEPPER. I had expected to do so, Mr. President.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield to me so that I may propose a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I feel that the time has finally arrived when the proponents and the opponents of the pending measure can look forward to a reasonable prospect of obtaining a vote not only on the amendments but on final passage of the bill. At least, the opportunity should be provided to arrange a definite time to vote on the amendments and on the bill itself. Let me say to the Senate, and also to the distinguished occupant of the chair, that I have received suggestions from both the proponents and the opponents of the bill as to a suitable time to vote upon the amendments and upon final passage of the bill; and with the idea in mind that at least we can make the suggestion and obtain the consensus of opinion of Senators, I send to the desk a unanimous-consent request which I ask to have read, after which I shall ask that it be adopted if it is satisfactory.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the proposed order will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That on the calendar day of Monday, April 21, 1947, at the hour of 5 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment or motion that may be pending, or that may subsequently be proposed, to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, and upon the final passage of the bill itself.

Ordered, further, That on said day of Monday, April 21, the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate and said hour of 5 o'clock be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the bill, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that it will be necessary for the Senator from Nebraska to ask unanimous consent that the necessity for a quorum call be waived.

Mr. WHERRY. I make that request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the first request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the main request?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I feel that the pending measure is very important. It is a well-known fact that public opinion is turning in favor of the opponents of the measure, and more particularly in favor of having the United Nations handle the problem.

I have also pointed out that the press apparently refuses to print one word of the statement made by those of us who are in favor of turning the problem over to the United Nations. I do not know what the people of the Nation are basing their opinions upon, unless it is what they hear over the radio, which makes them take the attitude that this problem should be turned over to the United Nations. Perhaps those who come into the galleries and listen go out and tell others, but that is a slow process.

I should like to take all the time possible. I may point out that the House committee has not concluded its hearings, so the House is not prepared to take up the question, and we are not actually losing time by discussing it.

I dislike to agree to the unanimous-consent request, but if the date were made Tuesday, April 22, instead of Monday, April 21, I would agree to it. I can see no hope of delaying a final vote beyond Tuesday. I am hopeful that by that time the American people will express themselves fully, and that we shall then be ready for a vote.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for agreeing to the date of Tuesday, April 22. I have no hard and fast date in mind. I simply wish to bring the suggestion to the attention of the Senate.

I modify my unanimous-consent request and ask that the date be made Tuesday, April 22.

Let me ask the distinguished Senator from Idaho if he has any objection to making the hour 2, 3, or 4 o'clock on Tuesday afternoon?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not object to the hour of 4 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. Perhaps if I were to speak at length I could persuade him to agree to the hour of 3 o'clock. However, I appreciate his cooperation.

Mr. President, I modify my unanimous-consent request so as to make the date Tuesday, April 22, and that the hour be 4 o'clock, the time to be divided as already suggested.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nebraska, as modified? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

The order as modified is as follows:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That on the calendar day of Tuesday, April 22, 1947, at the hour of 4 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment or motion that may be pending, or that may subsequently be proposed, to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, and upon the final passage of the bill itself.

Ordered, further, That on said day of Tuesday, April 22, the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate and said hour of 4 o'clock be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the bill, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is now 8:30 o'clock. The distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] would like to make some extended remarks. We have worked pretty hard today, and I feel that in justice to him and to the Senate we should take a recess until tomorrow.

I ask unanimous consent, if the Senate is to take a recess at this time, that the distinguished Senator from Florida be recognized and have the floor tomorrow at noon.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will there be a night session tomorrow?

Mr. WHERRY. It is my present opinion that there will not be a night session tomorrow. That will depend, however, on what the majority leader decides. However, my opinion is that there will be no night session tomorrow night.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] be recognized and have the floor upon the convening of the Senate tomorrow. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 17, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 16, 1947

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Jesus, we rejoice that Thou hast entered into Thy rest. No more art Thou a man of sorrows, acquainted with grief; Thou art lifted above the scoff and the scowl of those who persecuted Thee into resplendent glory. O awaken us to a full realization of the blessedness of our inheritance, walking humbly with God and patiently among men. We pray Thee to mold Thy creatures with an unmovable faith and trust in Thy unsearchable riches. O lead us out of that twilight of understanding in which our judgment misleads our best emotions and reliance upon self is a broken reed. Deliver us from all disabling tests and give us the support which drives out fear and failure and makes us free and firm for the blessed interests of our beloved country.

Vouchsafe Thy blessing, Heavenly Father, upon these Thy servants; give them strength and wisdom for this day. Because Thou hast given us this splendid land, because Thou hast allowed us to live in this wonderful day, O lead us to work unsparingly for the unity and rights of men. In Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Lands be permitted to sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

HENRY WALLACE

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, this morning my old friend George Reedy, veteran news commentator and news analyst on Station WOL, the Mutual Network, said this:

Everybody wants to get in on the act, and Attorney General Tom C. Clark is no exception. He has joined that popular and rapidly growing group of people who "don't like Henry Wallace," and he isn't pulling any punches.

Without mentioning the ex-corn shucker and boomerang thrower by name, Clark has managed to call Wallace a liar and a man with no appreciation of the American way of life. But he warned against hasty action, and said—and I quote:

"The cheap, blundering assault now being made by some upon the bipartisan foreign policy of our Nation must not be allowed to provoke action on our part which would be utterly out of keeping with democratic principles."

So much has been said, and so well said, about Mr. Wallace that I have not mentioned him on this program. But there is a Biblical quotation which I feel is very apt. It is: "The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in one a prayer offered by the Reverend Dr. Thorning and in the other an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Gen. Eugene Reybold on the occasion of Army Week observance at the University of Delaware.

Mr. MORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in connection with a bill he introduced today on the subject of Federal aid to education.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include in one, on rural electrification, excerpts from a letter; in the second a report from the production and marketing administration of Searcy County, Ark.; and in the third a report from the production and marketing administration of Washington County, Ark.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a very interesting poem.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in one a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities and in the other an address by Eddie Rickenbacker, one of America's greatest heroes.

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

There was no objection.

HENRY A. WALLACE'S ATTACK ON MISSISSIPPI

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in one of his recent subversive speeches in England, Henry A. Wallace sneeringly referred to my State as "the enlightened State of Mississippi."

Henry did not know it, but that is about the nearest he has come to telling the truth since he has been in England.

It was the enlightened State of Mississippi that rendered one of the greatest services the American people have ever enjoyed when it led the fight in the Democratic convention that prevented Henry A. Wallace from being nominated for Vice President in 1944 instead of Harry S. Truman.

By that one act, the representatives of the enlightened State of Mississippi prevented Henry A. Wallace from becoming President of the United States, and saved this country the humiliation and the disgrace, to say nothing of the disaster, that his becoming President of the United States would have meant to the American people.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3020, with Mr. BROWN of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, it is my firm conviction that the House would be making a great mistake to pass this bill in its present form.

I do not think that there are any of us who do not recognize that the 12 years since the passage of the Wagner Act have been marked by turbulence and unrest.

We have seen the growth of powerful unions who have been exempted from judicial and legislative restraint in their relations with their members, with business, and with the Government. They have in their irresponsibility been guilty

of excesses that have caused this country great discomfort and concern. Certainly all of us recognize that legislation that will channel the great powers of these unions along lines that will take cognizance of the stake of the public in their activities is needed and should be passed by this House.

But merely because we feel that there are wrongs to be righted, we should not agree to any legislation that is put before us, no matter how high-sounding its language, and how superficially fair it may at first seem, without careful examination.

The bill contains clauses which do much toward guaranteeing each individual union member a square deal from his union. It makes an effort to end feather-bedding, racketeering, and arbitrary combinations of unions which conspire to set prices and conditions which benefit themselves alone. All of these clauses are good, but let us recognize that these clauses are merely window-dressing to secure support from those Members who feel that this Congress has an obligation to correct existing evils. The actual fact is—and I say this with restraint—this bill would in its present form strike down in one devastating blow the union shop, industry-wide bargaining, and so strangle collective bargaining with restraints and limitations as to make it ineffectual. This grave error that the majority of the Committee on Education and Labor have made is that in seeking to destroy what is bad, they are also destroying what is good. There is no need to—there is great need not to—smash the American labor movement to rid ourselves of "feather-bedding," racketeering, and similar evils. Let us look briefly at some of the clauses of this bill.

The majority of this committee in their report have stated, "Important among the provisions of the bill are those that reassure the workers freedom in their organizing and bargaining activities." This concern with the rights of the workers is praiseworthy, but were the majority of the Labor Committee concerned with the rights of the workingman when they outlawed the closed shop and permitted the union shop on only one condition—on condition that the employers give their consent? Is this an example of the bill's concern with the freedom of the workers to organize and bargain? Were the majority of the Labor Committee concerned with the rights of the workingman when they wrote in this bill clauses to outlaw welfare funds, and pension plans, to invalidate in fact two-thirds of the existing welfare plans that are administered jointly by employers and employees? Is it their concern with the rights of the workingman that caused them to do this?

Was it their concern with the rights of the workingman that caused them to outlaw sympathy strikes? Under section 2, if a small number of workers in a plant strike because of any condition, or for any reason, it is forbidden that any of the other workers in the same plant should come to their assistance and strike with them. Is that because of their great concern with the rights of the workingman?

Does section 9 (f) attempt to forbid industry-wide bargaining because it wants to break down as they say "the great labor monopolies," or is it because they recognize that organized plants cannot compete economically with those that are unorganized, and that the latter can, by the sweat of labor, drive out of competition the factories that pay a decent wage, and whose employees work under decent conditions. In order to complete the job, this bill in section 2 (14) (C) will outlaw wholesale any type of boycott, so that the unions cannot protect themselves and their employers against the competition of sweatshops.

Is this bill really concerned with the freedom of the workingman to organize and bargain? Under the provision of section 12, together with other sections of the bill, if an employer is guilty of an unfair labor practice by the terms of this bill he would be entitled to a full hearing, findings by the National Labor Relations Board and even by the courts before the findings become legally compelling. Even then the employer is subject only to remedial order and not to punishment. At most he must merely cease and desist and restore the situation to what it was or should have been before he acted. But let us see what happens to the employee. After the bill has outlawed nearly every conceivable type of strike, such as a strike to remedy unfair labor practices, this bill provides that employees who violate certain of these provisions would expose themselves to certain penalties, ex parte injunctions without a hearing, treble damages and loss of his job. Does that honestly show a great concern for the freedom of the workingman to organize and bargain freely?

The manifest unfairness of these sections are not isolated. There are others throughout the entire bill.

This bill does not assure the worker freedom and the men who wrote this bill must have known that it does not. It destroys with high-sounding words the power of labor unions to bargain equally with the employers. It will if passed in its present form bring not peace but labor war—a war bitter and dangerous. This bill in its present form plays into the hands of the radicals in our unions, who preach the doctrine of the class struggle. If this bill is passed, this Congress will have fired the opening shot. Where it will lead us no one can say. Have no illusions that you are voting for labor peace and for the protection of the workingman. You will be voting for industrial warfare—you will be voting for a bill which seeks to strangle by legal restraints the American labor movement. I urge you to vote against it.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. I have great respect for the gentleman from Massachusetts, having sat with him on the committee. I notice in the report the gentleman filed along with the minority report, particularly this statement:

> There are several simple truths which must guide us in our approach to the labor-management problem. The closed shop, the union shop, industry-wide bargaining, free and unrestricted collective bargaining without unfair advantage on either side.

And then on the next page you say:

> If unions are to retain the closed shop and the right to bargain collectively on an industry-wide basis and if, as I feel, the anti-trust laws should not be resurrected to harass unions with criminal and severe civil penalties, some method must be worked out to deal with strikes which cripple the Nation's industrial power.

So that you meet the situation just as you talked about it in committee, except that you would propose going directly to the Supreme Court and obtaining an injunction. That is what I myself fought against in the committee—an injunction, that would strike employees alone, without taking some means against the employer. What is your answer to that?

Mr. KENNEDY. I believe that this country should certainly be in a position to combat a strike that affects the health and safety of the people. Therefore, I feel that the President must have the power to step in and stop those strikes. I am not in the position of opposing everything in this bill, but there are certain things in the bill that are wrong. I do not see how the President is going to have the power to stop strikes that will affect the health and safety of the people under the procedure listed in section 203. I think he must have that power.

I agree with you that any bill providing for an injunction should carefully consider the position of the striking union and make sure that their rights are protected. I think that in those cases Federal seizure until the dispute is settled would perhaps equalize the burden in the fairest possible manner.

Mr. OWENS. Will not the gentleman admit that we have a third word in there? It is "interest." Could we not better use the word "welfare" instead of "interest," because the word "welfare" occurs in the Constitution? It is just as broad as the word "interest" and more practical.

Mr. KENNEDY. The proposal embraces two separate things, health and safety. Because the remedy is drastic these two, in my opinion, are sufficient. I believe we should apply this remedy when the strike affects health or safety, but not the welfare and interest, which may mean anything. I would not interfere in an automobile strike, because while perhaps that affects national interest, it does not affect health and safety.

Mr. OWENS. Does not the gentleman agree that "welfare" is the stronger and in line with the President's idea?

Mr. KENNEDY. No. Both "welfare" and "interest" are too indefinite. They could cover anything. I would not have the law apply except in cases where the strike affected health and safety.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the responsibility for reporting the pending bill and for its passage through the House, this omnibus labor bill, a most unusual procedure, rests definitely upon the shoulders of the Republican Party.

I agreed with the chairman of the Rules Committee, my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], when he said yesterday that "undoubtedly this bill is one of the most far-reaching" that could be presented to us and also when he said "it was one of the most important bills any Member of this House would be asked to vote upon." It certainly is far reaching, and any labor legislation is important. This bill is decidedly so, especially when, as in this bill, we are considering a new national policy of government in the matter of relationship between management and labor, and also relationships between management and labor with the Government and with the people in general. There is no question but that it is a bill of sweeping nature.

Many ideas are thrown into this bill. There are some good provisions in the bill which I would welcome an opportunity of supporting if contained in a bill by themselves and were not confused by the injection of a lot of ideas which have no place in the practical world where we are dealing with millions of human beings. These ideas, many of them, are poorly conceived and hastily thrown into the bill which we are now considering, a bill, which should it ever become law, would operate upon millions of human beings and try to determine the relationship between two of the great economic groups in this country—management on the one side and labor on the other.

The few good provisions are many times offset by the unwise, unwarranted, and impractical ideas that have been hastily conceived and, in my opinion, injected into this bill in desperation, by a desperate leadership desiring to produce quick results, and which situation invariably produces very harmful results. That is what has happened in connection with this bill. This bill, in my opinion, and I am talking in my capacity as a Member of this House, is simply another evidence of the confused and uncertain, in fact, growing into desperate leadership, of my friends on the majority side.

The first example we had this year was the matter of the wartime excise taxes, the effort of a confused, desperate leadership. After the last election, as we all remember, certain Republican leaders made what we now know and what they know was a rash promise, and to those to whom it was made it constitutes a broken promise, namely, that the wartime excise taxes would be repealed as soon as possible after this Congress convened.

Before we convened, President Truman, as a further evidence of his superb leadership, which has caught the confidence of the people of the country, issued an Executive order declaring a cessation of hostilities. Insofar as wartime taxes are concerned, that meant they would automatically expire on June 30. He recommended their extension for the next fiscal year, a period of 1 year which the next fiscal year constitutes, with an estimated revenue to the Treasury of $1,200,000,000 coming from those wartime excise taxes. Immediately some of my friends on the majority side, including certain Republican leaders, before conferring, declared they would not wait until the June 30 date, but would repeal these taxes before that time.

Mr. Chairman, that is the record. There was a definite promise made, but overnight our friends, the Republican leadership, changed their minds. They needed this money to carry out another hasty, unwise promise made in reference to a 20-percent income-tax cut across the board, a windfall for those fortunate enough to earn large incomes. Accordingly, a bill was reported out extending not for the next fiscal year but permanently the wartime excise taxes. As a result of the hasty, confused, and uncertain action of the leadership there is a broken promise. I wonder how those engaged in various businesses that these excise taxes fall upon will feel because of this political exhibition?

Another promise was a $6,000,000,000 reduction in President Truman's budget. A resolution to that effect was passed by the House. In the Senate the reduction was $4,500,000,000. President Truman, before he sent his budget recommendations up to the Congress, had reduced the budget requests of the various department and agencies by about $7,000,000,000—from about $44,000,000,000 to $36,500,000,000. Despite that fact our Republican friends promised the country to cut his budget $6,000,000,000. The House passed such a resolution. The Senate provided a $4,500,000,000 cut.

Where is the resolution now? That is one of the mysteries of this Congress. Where is this resolution which is in conference? There has only been one meeting of the full committee to which the Democrats on the conference committee were invited. If I make an incorrect statement I pause for correction. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, my distinguished friend [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. I know there has been only one meeting of the conferees. There may have been many other conferences, but there was no serious effort made to reach an agreement in this one meeting. If there was I never caught on to it. It is all in the dark. I have asked at different times about it but I have received no satisfactory reply. I have been here 36 years. There is disagreement between the House and the Senate. Conferees have been appointed on this important matter. There has been a great delay and I am puzzled. If some one can give me some information about that conference and what is going to be done it will help me a lot.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I am sure it would help us all. There is only one simple question involved, and that is the difference between the $6,000,000,000 cut by the Republican majority in the House and the $4,500,000,000 cut by the same majority in the other body. Certainly, unless they were confused, or that they are afraid of what they had done, they ought to get together and settle that question very quickly.

We all know that two appropriation bills have already passed this House totalling about $15,000,000,000. Now, if they are going to make any cut of $4,500,000,000 or $6,000,000,000, or whatever amount they agree upon—and they never will apparently, because this resolution will just die—but if there is going to be any cut in that minimum of $4,500,000,000 up to $6,000,000,000, it will have to be made in some of those bills such as the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, one of the biggest bills, about $13,000,000,000, plus. Yet, there they have only cut $124,000,000 in real money. Then we heard the furore as a result of that cut in connection with the customs service. They had to cut down the United States Secret Service 140 employees, with counterfeiting on the increase.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. They cut down the Bureau of Internal Revenue which will manifest itself on April 1, and that is where our Government gets most of its money. For every 1⅓ cents paid for wages and expenses by the Bureau of Internal Revenue there is $100 in taxes brought in. For every 1⅔ cents paid for wages by the customs service, there is $1 brought in in duties to the Government. There is the kind of false economy that the $124,000,000 has brought about. Now, there are eight or nine more supply bills. I am wondering, when they come in with the Army, the Navy, the Agricultural, and the Veterans' Administration bills, how they are going to get the four and one-half to six billion out of those bills, and I am watching with expectancy, in particular, the agricultural appropriation bill, to see if they will cut down soil erosion, cut down rural electrification, cut down the dams and projects. I am waiting with expectancy to hear what some of my friends will say who voted for the $6,000,000,000 cut in the House. The answer today is that the $6,000,000,000 cut is forgotten. One of my good friends on the other side said, "We will get around to it next year" and he said, "it will be six, seven, or eight billion dollars." Well, the promise was made this year that they would cut $6,000,000,000 and the Senate four and one-half billion for the fiscal year starting July 1, 1947, but if they cut only $500,000,000 and that will do substantial violence to the efficient services to be rendered by the Federal Government.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. With pleasure.

Mr. VURSELL. I am always interested in the views of the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. A question now.

Mr. VURSELL. I am going to ask a question.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not mean to limit the gentleman. I respect my friend very much.

Mr. VURSELL. I wonder if the gentleman believes that those who think the budget can be cut by $6,000,000,000 or $4,500,000,000, and if they miss it a little, that they might be excused, in view of the fact——

Mr. McCORMACK. What does the gentleman mean by "miss it a little"? Will the gentleman tell me?

Mr. VURSELL. I will tell the gentleman in a minute—in view of the fact that the President within the past 6 months twice has said we would have a deficit of over $2,000,000,000 this year, and the other night he said we would have a surplus of $2,000,000,000, so apparently if the President, with all of his advisers, would miss by $6,000,000,000, the Congress might be excused if it is not quite correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. What does the gentleman mean by "missing $6,000,000,000 by a little"? Will the gentleman inform me for the benefit of myself and the RECORD?

Mr. VURSELL. Well, it is a little compared with what the President has missed on his guess of the budget.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know, but how much would the gentleman say was "miss a little"?

Mr. VURSELL. A billion and a half, with the present thinking of the members of the New Deal Party who have run this Government into debt to the tune of $260,000,000,000, by that standard, would be a little.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman say you are going to cut $4,500,000,000?

Mr. VURSELL. I think we will cut more than $4,500,000,000 if you folks will give us any cooperation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, now, "if you folks will give us any cooperation." Why, that is one thing about the Democratic Party, when we are in the minority we are a constructive party. We do not blindly oppose. The last time we were in the minority was when Mr. Hoover was here, and we supported him then whenever he brought in any constructive policy.

Mr. VURSELL. When Mr. Hoover was here——

Mr. McCORMACK. Was the gentleman here when he was here?

Mr. VURSELL. No; but I was in this country when the depression broke, and for the first time the Democratic National Committee set up a fund of $1,500,000 for a propaganda machine, to destroy the Hoover administration rather than to follow a policy of cooperation.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is making a wild statement when he starts talking about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. When the gentleman talks about that, the Republican National Committee have representatives doing the same thing. I have no objection to it. It is a practical matter. I did not see anything wrong about it. It is perfectly all right, it is part of the game. We are engaged in politics, and the Republican National Committee is justified in engaging in it and so is the Democratic National Committee. I do not whine and I do not cry when our Republican friends do it. It comes with poor grace for a Republican to cry when the Democratic National Committee at some time or another engaged in practices and policies which were for the best interests of the party and at the same time for the best interests of the country.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'TOOLE. I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts missed the point of the gentleman from Illinois. The gentleman from Illinois meant that the $1,500,000 spent by the Democratic National Committee was very puny compared to what the Republicans spent.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I wonder if the gentleman has forgotten the $750,000 that John L. Lewis gave the New Deal campaign.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; but John L. Lewis is with you now.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; if the gentlemen will give me one more minute.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the Chairman for the additional time. May I say that if any labor leader who has been a Republican all his life, fighting Republican battles, continues to do so after this bill which we are considering today, then they ought to be ashamed of themselves.

On the question of confused leadership, we come to this bill which is distinctly antilabor and antimanagement, because, instead of bringing about understanding between management and labor, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] so well said should be done, it is the road to industrial discord.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this labor bill we are now considering is an important one, from many different points of view. I want to speak in behalf of freedom for the returned soldier.

As one who was with American soldiers at the crossing of the Vesle, when they were before the bloody hills of Verdun, and in the deadly Argonne Forest in 1918; again as one who was with them on the Omaha Beach; at the breakthrough at St. Lo, then on to the Siegfried line into that hell hole of the Hurtgen Forest, and with them in front of the Runstedt drive in the Bulge; from there across the Rhine to within 90 miles of Vienna—I have seen two generations of Americans dying for their country. For what? I'll tell you for what. Freedom.

These two generations, after seeing Europe, know what freedom is. It is not something they read in textbooks or hear some professor expound in college. They know what freedom means from seeing the lack of it in Europe.

What has this got to do with this bill? Just this—these returned soldiers, when they were on the battlefields of the world, thought of their old home town with all the imagination of children. Every one of them thought of what he was going to do when he got home—dreamed of running his own business.

You gentlemen in the last Congress appropriated millions of dollars so he could make that dream come true, but did it come true? No; it did not for a lot of them, because they could not get products delivered because they did not belong to a union. They could not take their truck and buy a load of potatoes and deliver it to the navy yard in Philadelphia because they did not belong; they could not deliver the milk from their own cows in their own truck to New Caanan, Conn. Why? Because they did not belong to a union in an adjoining State. They could not mix and sell their own paint in California because their three employees did not belong; they could not move into their own house in Missouri because there was a jurisdictional strike on as to who would connect up the sewer pipe; they could not sell lighting equipment in Illinois without paying a union for the privilege of putting a union tag on the product so their own employees could assemble it for sale. In Utah they had to take 10 cents a dozen less for their eggs because they were not put in a package with a union label.

Is this the sort of freedom they dreamed of from their fox holes? Can they join the carpenters, bricklayers, stonemasons, and other skilled trades? No; because they are not taking any more apprentices in those trades and we in Congress appropriate millions of dollars for housing for these ex-soldiers and they cannot get them because there is a shortage of skilled workmen and they themselves cannot learn the trade because of a closed shop.

What do they want along with millions of other Americans? Freedom from going to a hiring hall for a job. By hard work with a little capital they want to start their own business—and to know that no one is coming around the next morning and say, "Sign up or else." Freedom is such a simple word, but it means so much. All over these 48 States they came back dreaming of their glorious country. Are they not entitled to freedom—an ex-serviceman, as such, is not entitled to a lot of privileges but certainly he is entitled to a square deal and he is not getting it in the labor field.

When I am saying these things I am not asking you to give money for the ex-serviceman from a paternalistic government. I am only asking for something that is not guaranteed by the Constitution but given to him by his Creator—the right to work where and when he pleases—just plain freedom.

Oh, yes; I know that the labor czars of international unions will come before us with a halo of patriotism hanging around

their heads and in an arrogant manner say with a deep professor voice "The frontiers are gone—individual freedom was for the pioneers. You cannot have individual freedom in a modern society."

But that ex-soldier from the fox holes of Europe or the jungles of the Pacific dreamed a dream as the pioneers did of yesterday—what he could do as an individual when he got home.

But now it seems somewhere along the line of individual effort he has got to dig in again for freedom—the cause of freedom always entails work and labor. Somebody has got to speak the truth. Some of us have got to stand for individual freedom. The issue for a million ex-servicemen is freedom in our time.

Freedom to turn the key in his own shop door—go home to his family and know that during the night no one is going to throw a brick through his window—that on the morrow his few employees will be there to work—that there will not be any picket line marching up and down asking all to boycott his place—give the individual his freedom and there will still be a frontier.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCOWEN].

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this bill for a number of reasons. In my opinion, this bill will bring about the correction of many abuses which exist. Likewise, I believe it will make for individual freedom of the workingman.

That many abuses have existed, and do still exist, has been made clear in several speeches already given in this debate. For about 7 weeks hearings were held by the Education and Labor Committee, at which testimony was given by labor leaders, by management, by representatives of small business, and by civilians in many business activities. Some of the information was indeed startling. Gangsters and racketeers played their full part in many places. It is not necessary to give examples of the situations and occurrences. Scores of instances will be found in the printed report of the hearings. Read some of these in the report of the hearings, and you will be surprised that such things could go on in this free Republic under our Constitution with its Bill of Rights.

This bill is intended to protect the workingman himself as well as the employer and the general public. This bill not only protects the union man himself, but it is in reality the workingman's bill of rights. The only person who is condemned in this bill is the racketeer and those who have been guilty of wrongdoing. The right of the workingman to organize and to bargain collectively is preserved. In fact, his right to select his own bargaining representative by a secret ballot free from force from any person or any organization is guaranteed. He is further guaranteed the right to decide whether he wishes to accept the latest offer of his employer or to strike, and he can decide it without fear of any danger to himself or family and according to his own judgment.

If this bill should become a law, the rights of freemen under our Constitution will be restored to each and every workingman. He cannot hereafter be suspended or expelled from his union by any arbitrary action. He can no longer be coerced into doing many things that he does not want to do. The time of intimidation of the workingman by unscrupulous leaders will be ended by the enactment of this bill into a law. The many good labor leaders who have been doing right, and there are many of them, have no fear from the provisions of this bill. The local unions to which members belong because they want to belong will have no cause to dislike this bill if enacted into a law.

It is the considered opinion of the Education and Labor Committee that this bill will be a law only a very few months until the great majority of labor leaders and laboring men will themselves come to see its justice, its fairness, and will come to appreciate the real freedom that has been restored to them. All will soon delight in the overthrow of tyranny and be glad that the Eightieth Congress had the courage to enact the workingman's bill of rights.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, a number of the members of the Committee on Education and Labor have expressed tribute to the chairman of that committee for the manner in which he conducted the hearings which extended over a period of some 6 weeks, and during which time about 138 witnesses were heard. I should like to join with the others in paying that deserved tribute to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY]. I have never attended a committee where the chairman conducted the hearings with such dignity, decorum, and such high sense of fairness as that displayed by the gentleman from New Jersey in presiding over this committee. I am glad to join with others, and I think this represents the views of most of the members, both the minority and the majority on the committee, in paying my tribute which the gentleman deserves, especially in view of the fact that some have seen fit to criticize him.

Mr. Chairman, this bill contains a provision which is unique in the history of labor legislation in this country. It puts the public welfare ahead of the special interests of either management or labor. For the first time in history, it is definitely stated as a principle of public policy that in industrial relations the public has an interest that is paramount. Here is what the bill, in its preamble, says:

> Industrial strife which interferes with the normal flow of commerce and with the full production of articles and commodities for commerce, can be avoided or substantially minimized if employers, employees, and labor organizations each recognize under law one another's legitimate rights in their relations with each other, and, above all, recognize under law that neither party has any right in its relations with any other to engage in acts or practices which jeopardize the public health, safety, or interest.

That, I say, is something new, Mr. Chairman. It is important. You can search the Wagner Act with a magnifying glass and you will not find the words "public interest" mentioned one time. And, whether it is admitted or not, I strongly suspect that a major portion of the opposition to the Hartley bill which we are now considering stems from fears of possible implications that declaration of public policy may contain.

Mr. Chairman, what is wrong with this bill that it is so loosely labeled as being "antilabor"? Since when has it become a form of fascism to protect individual freedom and restrict the activities of organized monopoly in this country? Instead of dragging out the old stereotyped "antilabor" and "Fascist" bugaboos, why do they not meet the issues contained in this bill? Do they deny that evils exist that should be corrected? Let us be realistic and honest about this thing.

Let us get down to cases. During the past year approximately 119,000,000 man-days of time were lost to production in this country, something unparalleled in the history of this or any other country of the world. It was said by the mayor of New York City not long ago that under existing conditions that city could be put on starvation in 10 or 12 days. During 1946 for 100 days the Territory of Alaska was practically isolated because of combined strikes in the shipping industry on the west coast. These conditions are far more serious than those who are now talking about this being antilabor would have you believe. Let us be realistic about it and let us get down to cases. Let us take a man who has been much talked about, John L. Lewis. He is a man who is pretty well known to the people. They have had a lot to do with him during this war and in recent months. They know something about the stranglehold he has over the American people and over the life of this Nation. They have not forgotten the strikes he pulled during the darkest hours of the war.

How many Members of this House feel that John L. Lewis should not be disturbed in the exercise of his present unbridled and ruthless power over the economic life of the American people? How many of you who are here now desire to take a stand in favor of leaving him unmolested and untouched as head of the holding companies that control the labor unions that make up the United Mine Workers of America? Mr. Chairman, I pause for someone to respond.

Mr. Chairman, what do we propose to do to curb that power to which I have referred? Just what can be done that will be effective?

We can outlaw illegal boycotting, jurisdictional strikes, sympathy strikes, mass picketing, "featherbedding," involuntary check-off, and the closed shop, howsoever desirable those objectives may be, and yet not fragment the monopolistic power of John L. Lewis—and I use him as an example to illustrate the point I am making, but there are others. He would still be supreme and practically untouched. He would still control the lives and destinies of 400,000 men. He would still be able to use the individual mine-worker unions as mere pawns in his hands and use local union officers as mere messenger boys for his gigantic empire. He could still bring the Nation to its knees, staggering and groaning from the economic

pains he has the power to inflict on the American people. He could still force Government intervention and pull his strings from an expensive suite in the Carlton Hotel. He could still flex his muscles and demonstrate his power as evidence of his qualities of monopolistic leadership while he is campaigning for president of the American Federation of Labor.

So what can be done and yet not impair the basic rights of the laboring people of this country? The answer is really very simple. It is indeed so simple that it is oftentimes overlooked. And it is really the only effective answer. That answer can be found on page 31 of the Hartley bill, supported by other provisions. There industry-wide bargaining is prohibited. It is provided that the certified representatives of employees of any employer shall be ineligible to be certified as the representatives of employees of any competing employer.

The only exception is in cases where there are less than 100 employees in competing plants and they are not more than 50 miles from each other.

The argument that the adoption of that provision will destroy unions and return workers to the status of sweatshop is simply too ridiculous to answer. That its adoption will lay waste the monopolistic empire of John L. Lewis I admit. That it will return life and vitality to the local unions I admit. That it will play havoc with the present monopoly some few men are able to maintain over human labor I admit. That it will protect the public interest against the actions of power-drunk labor bosses I admit. But what is wrong about those effects, those reforms? Are they not desirable? Let us come to grips with the real problem this Nation faces. Do we or do we not want to curb the power of John L. Lewis and his kind over the economic life of the Nation?

Mr. Chairman, I should like to pursue this subject of industry-wide bargaining a little further. It is of the highest importance and should be emphasized. This industry-wide bargaining practice has grown to such proportions in this country that the Committee on Education and Labor regards it as a most serious threat to the freedom of our economy. It tends to dehydrate and destroy the very autonomy of local unions. This results from the fact that more and more of their affairs are being handled by the directing heads of international unions, sitting behind mahogany desks a thousand miles from where the real issues exist. The local man-to-man human touch, so essential to peaceful industrial relations, is lost in the humdrum of big-time maneuvering.

The practice has the effect of concentrating tremendous power in the hands of a few men—more power than good men should want and more power than bad men should have.

It tends naturally toward more Government intervention in industrial relations. The fact that the practice embraces entire industries means that a work stoppage has a serious and immediate impact upon the Nation's economy. Government intervention follows in a frantic effort to protect the general welfare, as has been demonstrated in the coal industry and in many others during recent years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is discussing an important question with complete intellectual honesty and ought to be heard. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for giving him additional time.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I am also grateful to the gentleman for the additional time.

Mr. Chairman, in industry-wide bargaining the practice is to fix uniform wage levels, and these are usually fixed according to what the more favorably situated and efficiently operated plant can afford to pay. The result is that the less fortunate and marginal plants are often forced into the orbit of an industry-wide pattern and are forced out of business because of being unable to meet the competition. The Committee on Education and Labor had many instances presented which you can verify if you will take the time to read the hearings.

I have used the coal-mining industry as an illustration. If industry-wide bargaining is outlawed, as I hope it will be, if a dozen or even a hundred individual mines are closed down by strikes—there will still be 3,000 operating—the economic effect over the Nation will not be noticeable. The result would be that a shut-down of the entire industry would be a virtual impossibility and there is the only real protection that the American people can have against the monopolistic situation that now results in bringing the whole Nation to its knees, and which is affecting the whole Nation from coast to coast.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. On this industry-wide bargaining let us assume that the Firestone Rubber Co. pays 50 cents an hour for a tire builder in Los Angeles and 75 cents an hour in Akron for a tire builder. Then would the Firestone Rubber Co. give to the public the benefit of that saving of wages, or would the Firestone tire sell nationally at a set price?

Mr. FISHER. I am unable to advise the gentleman about the policy of any company, but I will say to the gentleman that in each individual locality, whether it be in Akron or whether it be in California, in each plant there is a local union, there is a local management, so let them go to the bargaining table and discuss their problems. Why should it be settled by an international union sitting a thousand miles away which is not familiar with local conditions and local freight rates or many local elements that enter into the composite picture of what they should pay or can afford to pay. The cost of production varies in different areas.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. May I further state that, if such a law is passed, a law should be passed making management give to the localities the benefit of that saving in wages in the place of enforcing a Nation-wide price on the article which similar article is manufactured in both places?

Mr. FISHER. That is a commendable objective for the gentleman to work on if he feels there is need for legislation on that subject.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But it is not in the bill.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman can very easily pursue that. It is not a subject of labor legislation. Surely the gentleman is not in favor of national monopolistic control through industry-wide bargaining, I assume?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will answer the gentleman, and I say that I am not in favor of monopolistic setting up prices throughout the United States, either.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman did not answer my question. Is he opposed to national monopoly over human labor as is now exercised in some instances through industry-wide bargaining?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not consider it national monopoly.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. I just wanted to ask this question at this particular point. Is it not true that the bill provides for complete company-wide bargaining?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. BUFFETT. Then that would cover this instance.

Mr. FISHER. Yes. The gentleman is correct, but I trust the bill will be amended so that noncompeting situations will be covered.

Now let me give you a few examples of what I mean. I speak of the evils of industry-wide bargaining. This Nation is witnessing at this moment a Nation-wide telephone strike that has been in progress for 10 days. It is a typical industry-wide, Nation-wide shut-down. Two of the demands of the unions are industry-wide bargaining in the future and the union or closed shop. The company insists on regional bargaining by the various companies that have contracts with the various individual unions. Why should not that be done? In that way each union will have a responsibility and a meaning. Its affairs and the wages and working conditions will be worked out on the ground and not in the Statler Hotel in Washington, D. C. And, more important, the public interest and welfare will not be subjected periodically to these Nation-wide shut-downs resulting from Nation-wide strikes.

Then there is the well-known case of the United Steelworkers Union. In October 1945, the Steelworkers Union announced a Nation-wide demand of 25 cents an hour wage increase, to be imposed on every company with which the international had a contract and many of them had no connection whatever with steel.

All the local unions were forbidden to close a contract with any manufacturer for less than this standard demand of 25

cents an hour. After this demand was made, a strike vote petition was filed with the National Labor Relations Board, and this occurred before any semblance of collective bargaining was undertaken. In many instances strike vote demands were filed by the International Union without even the prior knowledge of the local union and before the 25 cents an hour wage increase demand had even been served on many employers in whose plants a strike vote election was demanded.

You may say: "Oh that proves nothing. After all the locals did not have to vote to strike." Let us see about that. Pursuant to the strike notice, the NLRB at Cincinnati, for example, conducted a strike vote election on November 28, 1945, for 23 companies in that area with which steelworkers claimed bargaining rights. The employees of three companies voted not to strike. In the face of that fact, even the majority of employees in the three plants who voted not to strike were not heeded. The district director of the steelworkers union immediately announced that those employees would be expected to strike when notification of the strike date was issued by the international union, headed by Phil Murray.

Subsequently, all the local unions from coast to coast were notified by Mr. Murray to strike beginning on January 21, 1946, and on that day the international threw a picket line around the plants of the three companies where the no-strike vote was made, and forced them to join the Nation-wide shut-down.

Mr. Chairman, we had many instances presented to the committee where in connection with that steel strike last year, local unions in small plants, covered by the steelworkers union, were forced to strike against their will. Those were cases where no local labor dispute whatever existed, and where any differences could have been resolved in 5 minutes, were they permitted to do so. But no, they were forced to pay homage to the big moguls in the CIO, a form of absentee bossism, and the result was that the individual workers and the whole Nation suffered.

Perhaps there is time for another case in point. Up near New Canaan, Conn., there is a small dairy known as the Norman Dairy, Inc., of which Abraham Norman is the treasurer and a stockholder. The business has developed over a period of 30 years in the Norman family, and in 1945 it had a value of about $65,000 and had 10 employees. They were then doing both retail and wholesale business in New Canaan and Stamford and surrounding communities. They were even purchasing milk from other dairies in surrounding territories for pasteurization and retail purposes.

There had never been labor trouble on that farm. But things began to happen in May 1945 when the dairy was notified by one William Kennedy, the business agent of local 338, teamsters' union, that the dairy hands had joined his union and that a contract had to be signed. The union was located at Mount Vernon, N. Y., and operated out of New York State.

Mr. Norman was told to sign the contract or else face a strike. Mr. Norman, in his testimony, stated:

> We tried to point out that the adjoining towns, namely, Norwalk and other towns in which we served milk, were under the jurisdiction of a Connecticut labor union, wherein the wage scale was different, that is, lower than the wage scale prescribed in this contract, and that we could not stay in business with that type of competition.

But the Normans were told to sign, and if they could not compete they could go out of business.

Kennedy insisted they were operating on uniform contracts and no alteration in the terms of the contract would be tolerated by the union.

Having no other choice, the contract was signed without a single change. It was to expire in October 1946. But during November certain milk dealers in New York City and certain parts of New Jersey, known as the Metropolitan Milk Dealers Association, and the teamsters union, negotiated a new contract to take effect in January 1946. The Norman dairy was not a member of that association, and was not eligible to be a member. The new contract included provisions for a 5-day week of 40 hours. The Normans were told by the union the new contract had to be signed before the expiration of the one previously signed. Objection was made to the terms of the new contract. First the current contract did not expire for 10 months; that while the wage scale of the present contract was higher than that prevailing in neighboring towns in Connecticut with whom the Normans had to compete, the new contract called for additional increase of 20 percent, placing the Norman dairy at a decided disadvantage as against others in the industry in Connecticut; the new contract was based on an anticipated increase of 2 cents per quart in New York City, which was actually granted by OPA, but not for Connecticut.

Then came the pay-off. On January 25, 1946, Mr. Kennedy notified the Normans to sign the new contract or the men would strike. There was no 30-day strike notice, as required by law. The next morning, the men did not show up for work, though there was never a strike vote taken.

The family dairy operated a few days with two war veterans helping. But when the strike began from two to three hundred imported pickets from New York State were brought in to intimidate the customers and suppliers. They paraded along the farm road in front of the dairy. The dairy truck drivers were followed, pulled from cabs, threatened and on two occasions tires were stabbed.

On the second day of the strike the drivers attempting to bring in the supply of milk were followed and stopped. One of the drivers, a son of one of the dairy operators and a war hero, alive by the grace of God and a parachute, was set upon by 10 of the goons and thugs, his milk was destroyed, he was beat into insensibility and left lying on the roadside.

The dairy was then shut down for 4 months, resulting in the loss of customers accumulated over a period of 30 years, and an effort is still being made by that small dairy to overcome the terrific losses that were involved there.

Is there any Member of this House who upholds that sort of business? Is there anyone to uphold that conduct as being a proper labor activity? The Normans were not only victims of vicious criminal assaults and intimidation, but were forced to accede to terms of a contract of an industry-wide pattern, manipulated by a union some distance away. And because they could not meet those industry wide terms, they were put out of business and lost thousands of dollars.

Mr. Chairman, Congress passed the antitrust laws to prevent corporations and industrial groups from becoming too powerful. The same reasons prompted the passage of the Interstate Commerce Act, the Federal Communications Commission, the Utility Holding Company Act, and scores of others—all designed to prevent combinations and price-fixing against the public interest, and to keep open the channels of competition where private industry is involved. And yet today that same sort of monopoly has been built up in the labor-union movement. The big international unions have become holding companies for the thousands of smaller unions, and each union in most instances is forced to obey the dictates of the directing heads. That is plain monopoly over human labor, and when abused and misused, as it so frequently is by Nation-wide and industry-wide strikes, the public suffers and the local unions suffer and the individual workers suffer.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is not antilabor. It is antilabor monopoly. It contains a bill of rights protecting the workingmen who are members of unions. It prohibits conduct by unions or individuals that is obviously not in the legitimate interest of labor and is contrary to sound public policy. It is not punitive legislation. It is positive legislation.

This measure was drafted by the committee, but it was written in the hearts and minds of the American people. Read the polls of the past year, taken of public opinion. Talk to the man on the street, in the filling station, on the farm. This bill is the composite voice of the American people. And let us not be swayed for a moment by the antilabor attitude of the reactionaries who are opposed to this sort of needed and long overdue progress. This is a prolabor bill, and it should be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in voting H. R. 3020 out of committee, 5 of the 15 Republican members who voted did so with formal reservations. Ten members voted unqualifiedly. Of the five of us who voted with reservations, some at least did so with the thought of proposing amendments in the House. At the proper time, I as

well as perhaps others intend to offer certain amendments.

Every one of the 15 Republican members and most of the Democratic members labored ardously for more than 6 weeks, 6 days a week, and many times into the night trying to arrive at the truth with regard to the real rights of labor and management. Many experts and scholars testified. Many had divergent views. Labor leaders for the most part thundered against any legislative disturbance of the status quo, even though the American scene today is replete with examples of goon-squad banditry and the many crimes committed in the name of the Wagner Act against the rank-and-file workers and against the honest employer. Some representatives of management, while offering lip service to the right of the workingman, sought to limit or cripple his legitimate rights—rights that are derived from those inalienable rights of every American—of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; the right to life that includes the right to sustain life with a decent wage for himself and his family; the right to liberty that includes the liberty to organize and to work, not as a slave or menial dependent on the benevolence of his employer, but as a dignified human being; the pursuit of happiness that includes the right effectively to obtain decent and healthful working conditions and to procure by one's labors sufficient beyond mere subsistence, education for one's children, and at least the modest measures of those pleasant things that make this world bearable.

Gentlemen, I wish to pay highest tribute to the chairman of our committee. He broadened the scope of our hearings. He gave every member wide opportunity to question all of the 137 witnesses at length in order to develop every reasonable line of inquiry. He has listened with tolerance to opposing views though some of us differed on certain important questions. I know that it is his determined purpose to protect the rank-and-file workers and to bring peace to labor relations.

In my humble opinion we should seek on this floor to determine the charter for the average American worker and his union. We should correlate it with the rights of management and we should recognize that the rights of neither should infringe upon the rights of the public at large. That charter is largely written in H. R. 3020.

Our objective in the committee was a bill of rights for the worker and his union and for the average American businessman and his free enterprise, and the protection of the public against injury to our economy caused by an abuse of the right to strike.

H. R. 3020 goes a long way toward accomplishing these objectives. It can be improved by not permitting wages to be the subject of as keen competition between employers as is a mere commodity. The worker's bargaining power through his union should more nearly approximate the bargaining power of, particularly, corporate employers that can combine in various ways to obtain a market advantage.

The bill does excellent work in eliminating the irresponsible acts of union officers. It contains strong measures to harness the unbridled strength of some unions that would trample roughshod on our economy. It looks into the scene of the union hall and observes the rank-and-file worker who up to now has been mute and unable to express himself; who has been led out on strike when he did not want to go on strike; when he has been brushed aside by goon-squad tactics; where his rights were not regarded on the matter of the union's financial transactions; where he has been domineered, in many cases by party line and even Communist officers. The bill centers its attention upon this rank-and-file worker. It gives him a bill of rights within his own union. It gives him freedom of speech without danger of reprisal from opposing factions within his own union. For example, I can recall a case as was related to me of a worker in a Milwaukee plant who sought to express his opinion at a union meeting in opposition to the leaders, and immediately thereafter he was advised by union goons that if he did not keep his mouth shut, his little girl might not come home alive the next day.

The bill gives real suffrage to the rank-and-file worker on important issues, in the choice of his officers or on the decision to strike. It insures to him the secret ballot so that he might not be shouted down in his efforts to express his own will. It forces the union officers to furnish complete financial statements to members so that they will have a real knowledge of how their dues are spent.

Section 9-F, subsection 6, provides that no labor organization shall be certified as the representative of the employees if one or more of its officers is a member of the Communist Party or a party liner. Section 8-C, subsection 6, gives the union the right to expel Communists and party liners. This is extremely important because in times past, Communists and their fellow travelers made a specialty of studying trade unionism and the technique of the union hall. They became experts in the knowledge of trade-union matters so much so that many good American workers have been willing to place their fate in the hands of party-line officers only to find that they became the dupes of Communist tactics. One high-ranking officer of the United Electrical Workers in testifying before our committee brazenly stated to the committee that his was the most democratic union in the country because they accepted all shades of political belief. He openly stated that they accepted Communists on the same basis as people holding any legitimate different political belief. We know that it is the purpose of the Communist Party to use the labor union as a tool to bring about the spread of their antihuman doctrine.

One example of Communist tactics that came to the attention of our committee and concerning which a report is intended to be made subsequently in Congress by a subcommittee of the Labor Committee, is the example testified to by Mr. Louis Budenz, former editor of the Communist Daily Worker. Budenz testified that the Communist Party Political Committee in New York decided in the year 1940 that a strike should be called in the Allis-Chalmers Co., of Milwaukee, because they were one of the few firms making steel turbines for United States destroyers and that by pulling the strike in that plant they could bring about a following of the party line at that time of opposing aid to Britain. That was before Hitler attacked Russia. Budenz testified as to traveling to Milwaukee and meeting in secret with Mr. Eugene Dennis, present secretary of the Communist Party and with Mr. Harold Christoffel, the Communist Party member and president of the Allis-Chalmers local, at which secret meeting it was decided to strike the plant pursuant to the decision in New York of the Communist Party. Shortly thereafter the strike was called. It was later determined by the Milwaukee courts that over 2,000 of the strike ballots were fraudulently stuffed into the boxes. That the Communist Party, as agents of a foreign government, should be able to cause a strike in an American plant is horrifying. We have got to keep communism out of the American labor unions. This bill does that.

The Republican Party does not believe in the dictatorship of big business, neither does it believe in the dictatorship of the workers. One of its prime concerns is the welfare of the average American family. The average American wants industrial peace and freedom—fair play for the worker and fair play for the businessman. In the economic tension that will exist between our country and Russia this Congress faces a real challenge. The issue lies deeper than party lines. We must get our industrial house in order. This bill does largely that. The economic system of Russia is based on the Communist idea of state domination, no unions, no right to strike. It is based in large part on slave labor. The individual there counts for little. We in America prize human individual liberty even above the state. We believe that property rights are natural to man. The best protection of those property rights and of that liberty is in the balancing of the rights of our workers and the rights of our businessmen so that the great majority of our citizens will enjoy that private property and that human liberty. We should not delay in passing the bill that will maintain the rights of the worker and protect the rights of the businessman. We cannot delay. Time is too short. We must demonstrate to the world that we recognize Christian justice to all American citizens.

In the contention that has developed between the United States and the country of Russia we must see to it that we preserve those things which we hold sacred—that is, freedom, property rights, and all those things that are natural to man. In the economic contention and competition that we will undergo with Russia we know that that country does not believe in those things; that their

economy is based on slave labor; that their economy is based on the state over the individual. Ours is just the reverse. Ours is based on Christian concepts where the rights of the individual are superior to the rights of the state, and by protecting that right we will save our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] has expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, strikes against the public interest should be settled at once and not delayed by willful opposition of either the unions or the industries. The disputes should be arbitrated quickly and fairly, so the public will not suffer. Our country stands for reason and is opposed to the rule of force. Both the employers and employees must have the right for peaceful discussion of their disputes, but the solution of their problems should not be delayed at the cost of the innocent and suffering public.

Under our American system of government, all parties in a controversy are equal in law. Recently we have had many controversies between labor and management in which the parties were not equal and the public—the third party—was not even considered.

We must preserve the rights and laws to protect labor from the hardship and sweatshop conditions of many employers in the past, but at the same time we must have equal protection for management and the public so as to give justice and equality to all three classes.

We all remember well in the early thirties, when the awful depression came, labor suffered more than any other class when long bread lines were formed in all the large cities of this country. Congress passed many laws to help all classes, especially the wage earner, who must continue to have good wages in order to live decently and maintain high production for the consuming public.

The innocent and suffering public is demanding an end to so many uncalled-for and unjustified strikes wherein the public is the chief sufferer. Repeated work stoppages have not only injured the public, but have inflicted severe hardship upon the rank and file of the working men and women in many instances.

The public has a right to demand that the excessive abuses by some labor leaders shall be curbed, and that arbitrary disregard of labor rights by management, when it occurs, should also be corrected.

The people are expecting us to meet the labor-management issue courageously in order to curb abuses the public has suffered from time to time.

Many believe that the increased popularity of President Truman is due largely to his firm hand in the coal strike and his having filed court proceedings against John L. Lewis.

We all know that some measure must be adopted to protect the public from such a labor leader as John L. Lewis, as peaceful collective bargaining is almost impossible with him.

I am informed that some 200 labor bills have been introduced at this session of Congress. What stronger evidence do we need to show that the public is intensely interested in correcting the abuses brought on by continued disputes between labor and management? The Committee on Education and Labor has given a long and patient hearing to all the bills referred to that committee and finally, by a large majority, agreed on the bill we have now under consideration. This bill may not be perfect, but under the broad rule under which it is being considered, amendments are in order and the bill can be perfected if it is unfair to labor or management, and amendments should be adopted, when we begin reading the bill, to correct such injustices, because I do not believe that anyone in this chamber, certainly not a majority, desires to be unfair to labor or management but is certainly determined that we must have some law with teeth in it to protect the public and curb the unjustifiable strikes so that we may have full production, which is the chief weapon against inflation.

Government officials take the position that to be an employee of the Government is a privilege, not a right, and the Government is free to decide who shall work for it. Private industry takes the position that it has as much right as the Government in hiring its employees and that if the Government is free to decide who shall work for it, private enterprise should have the same privilege.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

H. R. 3020—THE GOP ANTILABOR BILL

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H. R. 3020, the Republican antilabor bill.

This bill, which the committee has recommended for approval, purports to prescribe "fair and equitable rules of conduct" for labor and for management, "to protect individual workers," and "to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes." To accomplish these objectives it writes off the statute books the National Labor Relations Act, and abolishes the National Labor Relations Board. To accomplish these objectives it discards the findings, which, based on long and careful study of the facts of the relation between employers and employees led Congress overwhelmingly to adopt the policies embodied in that act.

The provisions of the National Labor Relations Act rest upon the indisputable fact that workers individually have no power to bargain with their employers over wages, hours, and working conditions. Long before that act was passed, Chief Justice Taft said that—

> Labor unions were organized out of the necessities of the situation. A single employee was helpless in dealing with an employer. He was dependent ordinarily on his daily wage for the maintenance of himself and family. If the employer refused to pay him the wages he thought fair, he was nevertheless unable to resist abitrary and unfair treatment.

Under these circumstances employers were able to play off the needs of one worker as against another, to offer to the worker most in need of a job the lowest wages he would be willing to accept and to require all the other workers to accept that lowest standard or lose their jobs. This competition between workers for jobs led to a constantly declining standard of real wages as compared to the value of goods and service which, with the aid of an advancing technology, labor was able to produce. This the Nation recognized in the bitter years of 1929–32, and in 1935 Congress declared in the National Labor Relations Act that the inequality of bargaining power between individual workers and employers "tends to aggravate recurrent business depressions, by depressing wage rates and the purchasing power of wage earners."

The National Labor Relations Act was passed because employees, seeking to maintain their advantageous bargaining position in relation to their workers, and seeking constantly to widen the margin between wages and prices so as to increase profits, fought with all their might to prevent workers from joining together so as to deal on a basis of equality with their employers. That act was passed because Congress and the country recognized that it was bad for the public interest, bad for workers, bad for consumers, and bad for industry as well, to permit employers to utilize their tremendous economic power to frustrate the self-organization of workers, to continue to play off the individual weaknesses of one against another, to enforce competition among workers, as though labor were a commodity of commerce, like bricks or stones, to which the harsh principles of competition should be applied.

Long before the need for a National Labor Relations Act became apparent, Congress in the Clayton Act recognized that labor was not an article of commerce and that to enforce competition among workers would lead not to human and material welfare, but to degradation, depression, misery, and ultimately to class warfare. Remember that the National Labor Relations Act seeks only to prevent employers from utilizing their economic power to force workers to compete one with another, for jobs, for wages and for other terms of employment. And remember, when you consider the provisions of this committee bill which would deprive workers of their rights under that law, that under this bill employers would once again be free to hire thugs and gunmen and spies, as the La Follette committee's investigation shows they did before the National Labor Relations Act was passed, to discharge workers who join a union, to blacklist and send to economic destruction workers whose only offense would be that they sought to resist arbitrary and unfair treatment by their employer. Remember, that under this committee bill, employer dictatorship over workers is reestablished in industry.

Is this a "fair and equitable rule of conduct"? Does this "protect individual workers"? Is this in "the public interest"?

But this bill goes much farther. It prohibits (sec. 9 (f) (1); p. 30) any representative who has been selected by

the employees of one employer, from representing, with minor exceptions, the employees of another employer although the employers are all engaged in the same industry and the employees are all engaged in the same trade, craft or occupation. The bill would thus legislate competition among workers with a vengeance.

Labor, this bill in effect proclaims, is a commodity of commerce, and must be treated as such. Labor, this bill proclaims, must not be permitted to combine to deal effectively with employers to obtain a fair share of the products of industry. Labor must not be permitted to attempt to raise substandard wages paid by some employers in an industry, which in turn depress the wages of all.

Long ago, Chief Justice Taft, speaking of the necessity for combination among workers to protect their interests and the interests of society as a whole, said:

> To render this combination at all effective, employees must make their combination extend beyond one shop. It is helpful to have as many as may be in the same trade united because in the competition between employers they are bound to be affected by the standard of wages of their trade. Therefore, they may use all lawful propaganda to enlarge their membership and especially among those whose labor at lower wages will injure their whole guild.

The markets for the products of industry today are Nation-wide. The standards of wages set by employers in one section of the country have great bearing upon the prices which those employers can charge for their goods. If those wages be substantially lower than the wages paid by competing employers in other sections of the country, these employers will not long be able to keep their wages high and continue to compete in the same markets. The organized workers would thus be required to conform to the standards of the lowest paid, unorganized workers, and this bill would prohibit them from seeking redress. Conduct which the Supreme Court, as well as the Congress, thought was lawful 50 years ago by this bill would be made unlawful. Is this a fair and equitable rule of conduct? Which individual workers are benefited by it? Does anyone believe that the public interest is served by a constantly descending spiral in the wages and living standard of workers which this bill would set in motion? Does anyone seriously contend that the advantages of competition as an economic policy lie in trading upon the weakness of wage earners who must work in order to eat and pay rent and doctor bills for themselves and their wives and children? If not, this bill must be defeated.

But even where this bill does not, by its very terms, deprive workers of the decent protection accorded them under the National Labor Relations Act in the exercise of rights which they must possess in order to protect the living standards of themselves and their families; even where it does not, by its very terms, sanction the use by employers of physical and economic weapons of coercion to defeat the natural desire of workers to compete on an equal footing with employers; the bill opens wide the door for employers to intimidate their employees and make them forego the very limited and almost futile right to bargain collectively which is reserved to them under this bill.

In section 8 (d) (1) the bill provides that it shall not be an unfair labor practice in effect for an employer to tell employees that they should not join a union, provided only such a statement does not by its own terms threaten force or economic reprisal. Under this section of the bill it would now be lawful, for example, for an employer to offer a bribe to employees to induce them to refrain from joining a union or to resign their union membership. It would be lawful for an employer, who has discharged the leaders of a union because of his hostility to it, to tell employees to resign from the union, just as long as he lets the discharges stand as an object lesson to the others and does not, in express terms, threaten them with the same fate.

This bill ignores completely the undoubted fact which the Federal circuit courts of appeals and the Supreme Court of the United States have repeatedly recognized that employees who are dependent for their bread and butter on the job which it is within their employer's power to give or withhold are sensitive and responsible even to subtle suggestions of the employer's desires, and that employers need do no more than hint to assure that employees will obey them. Is a rule of conduct which is based upon disregard of this elementary fact fair and equitable? Does it protect the rights of individual workers?

Moreover, by section 8 (d) (3) of this bill, employers are once again to be authorized by law to create company unions, in the guise of employee representation committees, to thwart real self-organization by workers in their own interest. When the Congress which passed the National Labor Relations Act studied this problem, it concluded that "the active entry of some employers into a vigorous competitive race for the organization of workers is not conducive to peace in industry." Have we heard any evidence which would warrant a contrary conclusion today?

The House committee that considered the National Labor Relations Act thought it clear that "it is of the essence that the right of employees to self-organization and to join or assist labor organizations should not be reduced to a mockery by the imposition of employer-controlled organizations, particularly where such organizations are limited to the employees of a particular employer, and have no potential economic strength." This bill is predicated on the opposite premise. Is the permission granted to employers to saddle employee representation plans upon employees in lieu of labor organizations of their own choosing a fair and equitable standard of conduct? Does the destruction of the right to self-organization which this bill accomplishes protect the rights of individual workers?

This bill in section 12 (c) abolishes the right of employees to strike in protest against unfair labor practices committed by their employer. It would permit an employer to discriminate against union members by cutting their wages, assigning them to unaccustomed and ill-suited tasks and even bluntly to discharge their leaders, and yet preclude the employees from striking in protest against such discriminatory treatment. This is done on the specious theory that "an administrative remedy is available" to the employees. But the remedy available even under the National Labor Relations Act against employer discrimination of this character often takes many, many months, and sometimes years, to obtain. This is so even when the National Labor Relations Board is not hamstrung, as the Board created by this bill would be, by having its investigative and enforcement facilities divorced from it, and being deprived of the aid of attorneys in analyzing the record of hearings before its examiners and thus expediting decisions. Under the proposed bill the administrative remedy would be a delusion rather than a reality.

What the bill would accomplish is readily apparent by one example. Suppose an employer desired to evade his obligation to bargain with the representatives of the union freely chosen by his employees. He could, by committing unfair labor practices, and discriminating against union members in a hundred ways, so good and irritate them that they would be compelled to strike to save their self-respect. Make no mistake, American workmen are neither serfs nor clods. If sufficiently irked they will strike regardless of the prohibitions of this bill. In that event they lose their rights under the act and the employer may with impunity discharge their leaders and so intimidate the remaining employees that they will forego representation by the union. Is this fair and equitable? Is this likely to promote industrial peace or industrial strife?

This bill is 66 pages long. In the time available it is impossible to discuss each of the provisions of the bill and to test them against the standards which are avowed in its title, and against the standards of sound public policy which Congress embodied in the National Labor Relations Act, to protect against deprivation by employers the exercise by workers of what Chief Justice Hughes termed their "fundamental right" to organize and bargain collectively. From what has already been said, however, it is apparent that the fundamental premises underlying this bill are the self-organization and collective bargaining by workers is inimical to the public interest, that it is for Congress to limit, not to protect that practice, and that employers are to be authorized to utilize their economic power to punish employees who dare to act together to secure redress of their grievances.

These premises could not help but produce a bill such as this which deprives workers of rights which have been theirs for 150 years, which turns back the clock on the economic and social progress achieved by the last generation, which seeks again to pit individual workers against giant corporations. These premises, because they ignore the facts of industrial life, cannot possibly lead

to fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management. They cannot afford meaningful protection to individual workers, for that protection basically must be found in the right to associate and act in concert with their fellows. They cannot lead to protection of the paramount public interest, for that interest lies not in depressing, but in raising, the standard of living of wage earners in the Nation. The premises upon which this bill is founded, and the principles which it embodies, serve none of these interests. They serve rather only the interests of those employers who seek to exercise dictatorial power over their employees, who seek to trade on the weaknesses of unorganized workers, who would profit temporarily by a decreasing standard of living for workers. But that way lies national calamity, not prosperity. For these short-sighted employers would by this means deprive labor of purchasing power and would head the Nation, and themselves, straight for another depression.

If we would do more than pay lip service to the principles of liberty embedded in the Constitution, if we would truly seek to make those fair and equitable democratic principles effective in the industrial world, we would support the National Labor Relations Act, not destroy it; we would provide ample funds for its effective administration, not deplete its staff; we would reaffirm the right of employees to collective bargaining and demand that employers refrain from trampling on that right. On these premises a sound and fair and equitable structure of labor-management relations can be built; they can be built on no other.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, section 304 of H. R. 3020 deals with restrictions on political contributions. It amends section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 to make it unlawful for a corporation or labor organization not only to make a "contribution" but also an "expenditure" in connection with any election at which Presidential or Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or a Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, Congress are to be voted for. Contributions or expenditures made "in connection with any primary election or political convention held to select candidates for any of the foregoing offices" are likewise made unlawful and punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 or a fine or imprisonment of officers of the corporation or labor organization who consent to any unlawful contribution or expenditure. The present suggested amendment would make permanent, in broadened form, the restrictions on political contributions by labor organizations imposed by the War Labor Disputes Act of 1943, soon to expire.

There are a number of reasons why I am opposed to this provision of the bill:

First. The prohibition against political activities of unions has no relevancy in a bill purporting to adjust labor-management relations and to minimize industrial strife. The task of investigating contributions and expenditures in Federal election campaigns constitutes a complex and entirely separate field of legislative activity and has been so recognized by the Congress in the passage of Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, and the Hatch Political Activities Act approved August 2, 1939. To inject issues concerning political activities into a bill of the kind now under consideration would harm not help the cause of stabilized labor-management relations.

Second. If such prohibitions are to be imposed upon the political activities of labor organizations, the same prohibitions should be imposed upon employer associations such as the National Association of Manufacturers or the Chamber of Commerce. Similarly, unincorporated organizations should be included within the scope of such prohibitions. If the bill seeks to bring about equality of treatment to management and the associations which represent it in dealing with labor and labor organizations, certainly it would seem inconsistent with the purpose of the bill to restrict only the political activities of labor organizations.

Third. The evil which the prohibition seeks to correct is in fact nonexistent. The widespread activity of the Political Action Committee of the CIO in the elections of 1943 and 1944 was the signal for a furious campaign against it in the press and in Congress. Demands were made upon Congress for an investigation on the ground that the Corrupt Practices Act as amended by the Smith-Connally Act was being violated. In the midst of this furor the Senate Special Committee to Investigate Presidential, Vice Presidential and Senatorial Campaign Expenditures in 1944 was convened for the purpose of hearing testimony by the chairman of the Political Action Committee. A majority of the special committee found no violation of the Corrupt Practices Act on the part of the Political Action Committee and the Attorney General discovered no violation of the Criminal Provisions Act after investigations initiated at the request of several Members of Congress—Senate Report No. 101, page 23, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session.

Fourth. Even if the evil which is attacked in the bill did exist, the method of prohibitions and sanctions is unsound and unworkable. The special committee established by Senate Resolution 263, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, after long and careful consideration of the subject and after hearing much testimony, came to the following conclusion:

> The committee as a result of its investigations unanimously came to the conclusion that prohibitions and sanctions had failed to prevent pernicious political activity in Federal elections. They concluded that free and prompt publicity as to campaign contributions and expenses would be more likely to achieve the desired result. Therefore its recommendations as set forth above stress the reduction of prohibitions and the increase of publicity. (S. Rept. 101, p. 83, 79th Cong., 1st sess.)

Fifth. Assuming, however, that the evil did exist and that a prohibition against contributions was a sound method of combatting the abuse, the extension of the prohibition beyond contributions to expenditures is an unwarranted limitation on the rights of freedom of speech, press, and assembly. In considering a recommendation for an amendment to section 313 of the Corrupt Practices Act to prohibit not only contributions but also expenditures, a majority of the Senate's special committee on campaign expenditures rejected the recommendation for the following reasons:

> The extension of the prohibition to include expenditures would tend to limit the rights of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly as guaranteed by the Federal Constitution. The investigations which the committee has made brought out the fact that many organizations claiming to be educational are claimed by others to be purely political. The line of demarkation is difficult if not impossible to draw since it depends to a considerable extent upon human motives. An expenditure made in connection with an election may well be for the publication of pamphlets or newspaper articles or speeches justifying the point of view of the organization paying for it. An editorial in a newspaper states its position. The reproduction of that editorial in the form of a pamphlet or a speech based on that pamphlet may state the position of the organization paying for it. Free discussion of political questions should be encouraged, not prohibited. (S. Rept. 101, p. 83.)

Sixth. The effort to restrain labor organizations from using their funds for the support of political parties in England proved to be unworkable. The effect of the decision of the House of Lords in *Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants* v. *Osborne* (1910 A. C. 87) was to restrain a trade-union from using its funds for political activites. Such funds had been used to support the new Labor Party that had counted so heavily in the general election of 1906, but the Trade-Unions Act of 1913 corrected this limitation imposed upon trade-union activities, and funds could thereafter be devoted to the furtherance of political objectives if they had received authority for that purpose from the members of the union. Even the restrictive Trade Disputes and Trade-Unions Act of 1937 following the overthrow of the Labor Government did not prohibit unions from using funds for political purposes. At most it required an assent from each trade union member as a condition precedent to the legality of a levy upon him for funds for legal purposes. Passage of section 304 of the present bill would mean that we would have taken a more restrictive position against labor organizations in this respect that even the most restrictive piece of British legislation.

Seventh. There is no justification for treating labor organizations on the same basis with corporations for this purpose. The $5,000 limitation by the Hatch Act upon individual contributions to political committees has been ineffective as against corporations because its officers, directors, and members of families having controlling interests in these corporations can afford to make large contributions distributed to a large number of State, local, and independent committees. Thus we find that 31 members of the du Pont family contributed $109,832.83 to various political organizations for political

purposes. Five members of the McCormick family contributed $28,000; six Mellon family members contributed $59,500 and nine Pew family members made a total contribution of $96,995.76. See appendix 8, Tabulation of Contributions by Prominent Family Groups, Senate Report No. 101, pages 140–151. Neither wage earners who have associated themselves into a labor organization nor members of their families are in a position to make such contributions for political purposes. The necessary interest of the wage earner in the vital questions of taxation, housing, rent, and price control, full employment, minimum wages, health, education, the elimination of discrimination in employment, and other legislative matters which affect him and his family and in fact the entire community can be expressed effectively only in combination with his fellow wage earners acting through their unions. They alone have the resources and facilities to support measures and condidates which will act in labor's interest so often synonomous with the interests of the community as a whole. Restrictions upon political activity by limiting political contributions of trade-unions creates rather than eliminates a social evil. It should not be injected into the consideration of a bill to adjust labor-management relations.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago it was highly amusing to me to see the majority leader of this House endeavor to toss into the lap of the Democratic Party, John L. Lewis. The American people have not forgotten, even though the Republicans would like them to, that John L. Lewis in the last two national elections supported the Republican candidate for President and the Republican platform. He was very much sought after by that party and was high in the party councils. He was also the principal radio drawing card. There are many members on the Republican side of the House today whom the great John L. supported. You have found out now that Mr. Lewis is not only an abrasive, but also very adhesive. My Republican friends, he is your bride, to have and to hold until death does you part.

Now as to the bill itself: It is our legal duty to engage in moderation. Yet, there is no moderation in this bill because it was written sentence by sentence, paragraph by paragraph, and page by page by the National Association of Manufacturers. It is but a reprint of all of the propaganda and antilabor ideas with which that organization has flooded the Congress. The bill has one primary intent and that is to put the American working man back to the standard of servility that existed in employment 50 or 60 years ago.

You talk of labor on the floor of this House as though labor was composed of villians, thieves, and cutthroats. Who is this labor that you talk about? Sixty-eight million American men and women—your neighbors, your friends, the people who live next door to you, the man who lives upstairs, the people who pay 80 percent of the taxes of the United States, the people who supplied 75 percent of the armed forces in time of war, the people who have built this great country and who have contributed their time and money and their blood in every important moment of its existence, the people who today merely ask to be treated as Americans and seek a continuation of the guaranties of the Constitution and of the Bill of Rights.

The Republican side of the aisle has been saying for years that they are opposed to communism and to class consciousness or class struggle. Mr. Chairman, I warn you today: Pass this legislation and you will create a spirit of class consciousness the like of which this country has never seen. You will create a definite cleavage between employer and employee that will make the labor incidents of the last few years appear weak and puny. Further, you will drive hundreds of thousands of decent American workingmen into the Communist Party because they will feel that their rights have been taken away from them by their own elected Representatives in Congress. They will feel that they have no place to turn to, and will embrace the false political philosophy of communism which will give them a temporary ray of hope. I warn you gentlemen that the Communist Party is the only group in this country that is in a position to receive the disgruntled worker. By passing this legislation you may possibly bring about a national strike of every line of industry in protest against your actions. Your legislation would be more successful than the Daily Worker or all of the communistic street-corner speakers in our land. You will bring about a condition of industrial chaos that will take many years of difficult effort to untangle. Mr. Chairman, remember—moderation.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACKINNON].

UNION DEMOCRACY VERSUS DICTATORIAL CONTROL

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, this bill contains important proposals to bring that democracy to all unions that is now provided by the best unions. These provisions, 10 in number, have well been termed "the bill of rights"; they protect both the union member and the public.

BILL OF RIGHTS

In substance, these guarantee:

First. The right to free speech within their union and the right to conduct their organization in conformance with the free will of a majority of the members.

Second. Protection against unreasonable fees and dues.

Third. Protection against being compelled to join in collateral financial schemes.

Fourth. Protection in their right to resign.

Fifth. Political freedom.

Sixth. A fair hearing on disciplinary action limited to reasonable grounds.

Seventh. Protection to the unorganized workers in their right to work when the union denies their membership on some ground not applicable to other members.

Eighth. A secret ballot, frequent election of officers, and reasonable notice of meetings on strikes and other important union matters.

Ninth. Protection from spying and intimidation in their personal and family affairs.

Tenth. Full disclosure to members of the financial affairs of both locals and internationals.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

At the inception of our deliberations it became apparent that the first problem we had to decide was whether we were going to permit undemocratic practices to continue in those labor unions that we gave special privileges in the Wagner Act. In our committee hearings we noted that unions using the Wagner Act as their avenue to power had come to the point where they now literally control the very means of livelihood of millions of workers. It is unthinkable that organizations with such great power to control the economic welfare of millions of their fellow men should continue to exist under protection of Federal law without minimum guaranties being made to protect their members against the growing abuse of such power. Instances where they have abused this power are to numerous to mention.

DEMOCRATS ADMIT NEED FOR LABOR LEGISLATION

As is well stated in the minority report at page 95:

> No one can deny that labor unions have engaged in some activities that are so clearly unjustifiable that this Congress can and should legislate against them immediately.

That was in the minority report, not the majority report. I submit to this House that some of the "activities that are so clearly unjustifiable" as to warrant legislation are some of the undemocratic practices in the administration of unions that are within the common knowledge of all of us.

PUBLIC INTEREST

In fact, labor unions today stand at the very threshold of a man's right to a livelihood. As such they are clothed with a public interest and the right and duty of Congress to legislate with respect to them cannot be denied. They are more than social clubs. And those who oppose this bill, by telling you how important these unions are to millions of workers and to our economy, answer their own argument that Congress should not or cannot legislate with respect to them since they prove the tremendous public interest that is involved.

The minority report at page 76 claims that these features providing democratic guaranties in union affairs are without parallel when compared to any other form of voluntary association. If this statement were true, which it is not, I submit that the power of labor organizations over their fellow men is without parallel when compared to any other form of voluntary association. And while most men join labor unions voluntarily, still there are many to whom the act of association is not voluntary and both groups are entitled to protection against undemocratic practices.

The minority report also states that such regulatory measures are not an appropriate subject for Federal legislation and that we are attempting the impossible. But you and I know it is not impossible. That it is possible and would interfere with present undemocratic practices is the reason these provisions are opposed.

EMPLOYERS COULD NOT INTERFERE WITH UNIONS

The minority report also claims that this would be the opening wedge for employers to gain control of union affairs, but this argument falls of its own weight because of section 8 (a) (1) and (2) of the act which make it an unfair labor practice for an employer to interfere with the administration of any labor organization.

QUESTION INVOLVED

The question in this bill is whether you are in favor of laws which place it in the power of a few men to strangle the national economy or whether you favor sanity in labor relations.

Clearly this country ought not to be exposed to another wave of paralyzing strikes. No one wants to be unjust to labor, organized or unorganized, but no one ought to want to continue unrestricted power in the union labor bosses after the demonstrations we have had, in the last few years, as to how they use it.

LABOR OLIGARCHY

Do we at the present time have a labor oligarchy of union bosses? Let us turn to the minority report for our answer.

The minority report claims that these provisions providing for democracy in unions will place—

> labor organizations under the constant threat of struggle for existence.

See page 77 of the minority report.

That is a very serious indictment that the minority makes of labor unions. That statement when carefully examined means that it would be a threat to the very existence of labor unions if they were required to live under democratic principles. I am sure that these principles which will guarantee democratic rights to each individual member of a labor union will make labor unions grow strongly and on a solid foundation and will foster rather than threaten their growth. Out of these provisions will come, I am sure, new strength to unions solidly grounded in the free activity of their members free from outside dictation of any sort. Then again on page 87 of the minority report, we find a bold statement supporting the continuation of union control by the top bosses. The statement reads:

> Many local comittees are untrained or dominated by elements much more radical than those in the international organizations.

In other words, the argument made by the minority report is that the public must be protected from the rank and file, and that the labor-union bosses are the ones to protect the Nation from the radicalism of the rank and file of their membership. I do not hold to that philosophy. I hold to the philosophy that the best protection this Nation can have is the guaranty of thorough democratic processes to each individual member in all labor organizations. The rank-and-file member is the one to be protected and to have the argument made to this Congress that the country needs protection from the rank and file of labor shows clearly who is opposing this bill and who the opposition is protecting. I have full confidence that the rank-and-file members of American labor do have the intelligence, judgment, courage, and sense of civic responsibility to administer their own affairs in a sound, constructive, and American way.

In the minds of those who oppose this bill, any bill would be a drastic bill which really curbs the power of the labor bosses by modifying their great advantages under existing legislation.

GROWING LABOR ABUSES

There are those of you who mention the threat of fascism. I hold no brief for either communism or fascism, but several facts are plain. Labor abuses have been growing under the protection of the Wagner Act—the sit-down strike, the racketeers with their murder, arson, extortion, and highjacking, the Petrillo taxes, the jurisdictional strikes, the secondary boycott of farmers' produce, mass picketing, strikes in public utilities and hospitals, and now a seemingly never-ending wave of national strikes against the national interest. Every day that Congress delays the enactment of curative laws we have an increase in the severity of the abuses to be remedied. This means that every new bill is necessarily a more severe bill because the abuses have become more severe.

I plead with those of you who oppose fascism, if you also oppose communism, to join with us who want reasonable labor legislation to now stop these abuses which both of us admit exist, and put a stop to both fascism and communism.

We can do this by guaranteeing democracy in unions and putting our faith in the American worker.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I am especially concerned with sections 203–205 of the pending bill dealing with strikes imperiling the public health and safety. In my judgment the provisions contained in these sections are not adequate to deal with the menace of strikes in public utilities, including transportation, communication, and the production and distribution of food and fuel. At best, the bill provides for temporary restraint and delay, whereas it is my fixed conviction that in this type of strike there must be not merely regulation and delay, but a prohibition of them.

The Nation-wide telephone strike, now in its second week, is merely the latest of a long series of events which establish to my mind the absolute necessity for prohibiting strikes of such character. It is not by the grace of the leaders of this strike that even emergency calls are going through, but rather by the loyalty and devotion to duty of a small number of supervisors and other persons who are maintaining at least the bare essential communications by working double shifts; while others have been called from their posts without the faintest regard for the needs of the public, and without regard for the sometimes fatal consequences of the lack of telephone service.

In fairness to the strikers, it should be said that it is probable that the great majority are perfectly willing to work, and to continue the negotiation of such grievances as they have, but they are subjected to pressure of a strike-minded group of leaders who have gotten out of control of the rank and file of the workers who made them, and who pay them.

As an illustration of this, let me call to your attention the Associated Press story appearing yesterday that telephone workers in stricken Woodward, Okla., were resigning from their union, rather than obey instructions not to return to their posts following the disastrous tornado there.

With half the town in ruins, the union wired to the workers, as follows:

> Do not permit members to report to work. If they do so, pull them off the job. Responsibility for situation there rests with company for rejecting union's proposal before strike and during strike. Company took position week ago could handle all emergencies. Let them handle them. By working you cancel efforts of many pickets. This is not time to weaken.

The operators replied:

> Girls refuse to stop. Will work as long as needed. Have you seen this place? Several members injured and homeless. Services not required at first-aid stations. Can help more by doing what we are trained for. Would be ashamed of a union which would put up pickets in a disaster like this. Criticism by the entire town would be shameful.

I hold no brief for the management of the Bell Telephone System. The workers may have some just cause for complaint, although it is a generally accepted fact that telephone employees earn normally good wages and enjoy working conditions and benefits far superior to the average worker. I am not immediately concerned with the merits of the present dispute and whether the weight of justice lies on the side of management or union. There is a third interest which we must consider; an interest which, in these circumstances, becomes paramount, and that is the interest of the public. The worker can accomplish nothing by continuing to irritate and damage the people at large. Whatever the final results of this strike, the Bell Telephone Co. will survive it. If new and costly benefits are given the telephone employees, the cost will, of course, be paid not by the telephone company but by every user of a telephone. There is room for doubt, however, if unions will survive many more strikes of a character which threaten grave injury to the public.

Nothing can be gained by this termination of essential service which could not be gained by negotiations properly regulated with benefits made retroactive.

In considering present labor difficulties we must remember that there is a vast difference between a strike which is limited in character and whose effects are largely confined to the employer and employee, and a strike which has a drastic effect on the health and safety of the people generally. The prob-

lems are entirely different, and the method of dealing with them should likewise be entirely different.

For example, a strike in a hat factory affects the man or company who owns the factory and his employees. The factory may be bankrupt, its employees may go hungry. This is a serious matter and obviously requires the best machinery we can create for its peaceful adjustment, but the public can get along without hats. Thus, while such a strike is of concern, it does not give rise to national emergency. I would regulate as best we can the relations involved, but I would not for a moment attempt to prohibit, or unduly restrict, the free rights of labor to strike in that hat factory. A strike in the telephone company, however, or in the coal mines, or oil fields supplying necessary fuel to the homes and factories of America, or in railroads or electric light companies, or in general in any field which seriously affects the production and distribution of fuel or food or other elements vital to the continuance of life itself, should not be talked about, or mildly regulated, but should be prohibited entirely.

Our civilization is very complex. A century and a half ago the family was largely sufficient unto itself and could get along somehow no matter what its neighbors were up to. Candles lighted houses and wood from the adjacent fields heated them, and food was home grown and home preserved and the essentials of life were at hand. Today we are wholly dependent for our warmth and shelter and our food and our lives on electric light and power companies, and coal and fuel oil and transportation. The interruption of these can destroy us.

It is absolute necessity, therefore, that drives me to the conclusion that we cannot tolerate strikes in such utilities and the alternative must be found. The alternative, in my judgment, is compulsory arbitration in which workers, with their eyes open to exactly what they are facing, voluntarily give up the right to strike if they want to work in utilities at all, and obtain in lieu of that right certain very definite benefits such as tenure of position, health, and sickness benefits, insurance benefits, and in general a security which they would perhaps not obtain in another type of employment.

The recent strike in the coal mines, the clever and contemptuous so-called memorial period which John L. Lewis has just flagrantly engineered; a public utility strike which not so long ago completely paralyzed the great city of Pittsburgh; the transportation strike in Philadelphia and Washington; the tugboat strike in New York, and many other examples have hung as a constant threat over the health and lives of our citizens. These things are persuasive beyond any mere theories that if we are to survive in our present complex civilization, we must control utility strikes of the character I have described.

It was more than a year ago that I introduced the original resolution to study means to prevent strikes in public utilities and I am more than ever convinced of its necessity.

The proper and equitable solution of labor difficulties generally, and the prohibiting of strikes in public utilities can be accomplished without violating the fundamental rights of labor to organize, to form strong unions for the constant improvement of working conditions, and as a last resort to strike. These rights I shall always support. But, like all other rights, they are subject to modification, and the modification that I propose is essential for the protection of the physical safety and even the lives of our people.

This bill is deficient in its treatment of this very important and special phase of the problem. We still have it before us, and I must keep insisting that we deal with it adequately.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. LOVE].

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, the current problem of industrial relations is our most critical domestic issue. A solution to this crisis must be immediately found if our country is to remain strong and if we expect to continue and improve the standard of living of our people.

From the beginning of our Nation there have been many domestic disputes and misunderstandings between individuals and between organizations. Our Government has heretofore provided laws and courts to adjudicate these grievances.

The Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the land. Individuals and organizations must not be permitted to take the law into their own hands. We must have respect for law. It is for this reason that we have government. When those who disregard the laws of government and attempt to settle their own controversies by force or by coercion government ceases to exist and anarchy and chaos result.

Today we are faced with critical industrial disputes between management and labor. Not only are management and labor suffering as a result of these disputes, but the public is paying the penalty.

The critical state of industrial disputes must not continue. We, the legislators of our Government, must have the courage to enact just laws for industrial relations that will guarantee an equality of rights for management and labor and the public. The constitutional rights and the general welfare of all the people must be recognized and protected by these laws.

It is true that the rights of labor must be safeguarded, but as our Government must check monopolies in business so must monopolies be checked in labor.

It is also true that workers must have the right to strike, but the right to strike is not the right to cause the baby's milk to spoil or to imperil the health and safety of the public.

The legislation before us attempts to regulate industrial relations between labor and management and to provide for the general welfare of all the people.

The present bill is not perfect. I do not agree with all its provisions, but, taken as a whole, I believe the bill is a substantial beginning to the solution of our critical problem of industrial strife. I shall vote for this legislation with the sincere hope that its enactment will result in industrial peace.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been called a bill of rights for labor. That is correct but only partially true. This is a bill of rights and lefts under the belt for labor, not only under the belt but in the back, in good old foreign fascist style. This bill without changing one word could just as easily have been introduced in the Reichstag in the days of Nazism at its worst. I do not mean by that, Mr. Chairman, that you are Adolf Hitler. There is absolutely no difference between this and the labor union policy of Hitlerism in Germany, word for word. The tragic thing about it is that we, the representatives of the people, meaning the gentlemen on both sides of the aisle, did not write this bill. Not only did we not write it but we did not even see it, and right now not one-half of the Members, both Republican and Democrat, of this Congress have read the bill. This bill was written on the fifth floor of the Old House Office Building, written by over a score of corporation lawyers, paid not by the Government of the United States, not by even small business, but paid by big business, monopoly business.

You say that this bill is to protect the public. What do you mean by that? Who is the public? Is the public the 15,000,000 organized workers of America with their families totalling 60,000,000 people? Is the public small business? No! By this bill you define the public henceforth as the monopolies of America. The public interest for you is monopoly interest.

It is inconceivable that we can turn back the pages of history in this progressive hour as far as this bill does. This bill scraps the Norris-LaGuardia Act which was signed by President Hoover, then President of the United States. This bill turns back the pages of history to the 1700's in England when it was a criminal conspiracy for workers to attempt to strike. You are not just conservative or reactionary, you have a Dark Ages concept.

One speaker raised the question of this being a Christian Nation and therefore this bill should go forward and be passed in the name of Christianity. I want to speak, therefore, on that basis: Christian concepts. Prices are spiraling upward today and wages are being maintained at the levels they were a year ago.

The average worker in America makes today for his family less money than you spend on your automobile, less money than you spend on food as Congressmen. Under this bill even these meager wages are going to be driven further down because labor will not have the power to maintain present wage levels. Do you believe it is a Christian concept, therefore, to take away bread and butter from the mouths of people made in the image of God? Do you believe it is a Christian concept not to give them enough money to afford decent shelter for them and their children? Do you believe it is a Christian

concept to destroy the American abundant life?

If the words of the Master could be heard in this Chamber today, they would be, "When I was hungry, you fed me, and when I was naked, you clothed me, and inasmuch as you have done it unto one of these", the least unto the millions of workers of America, "you have done it unto me." It is a sacrilege to say that this bill is based upon Christian concepts. This bill is undemocratic and un-Christian. This bill is a direct return to chattel slavery of the working people of America. I do not even think it is possible that this bill will ever become law, but if it does pass in the House and pass in the Senate and the veto of our President is overridden, do not think for a moment that the working people of America, who are the public, who are the majority, are going to take this kind of un-American fascism, un-Christian legislation lying down. They are not going to do it. They are going to meet you in 1948 at the polls and they are going to beat you wherever you rise and try to run for public office.

The people are the public, they are the majority, and the NAM cannot save you in that hour of free elections. This is the time for you men and women not to vote as rubber stamps. This legislation is being thrust down your throats with a rubber stamp, and on it is printed, not "Republican," not "USA," but "NAM." It is time for you to spit up the gag. Stand up like men and vote against this bill in order that the people of America may go forward, so that our Nation will not perish from the earth; so that it will be a Nation of the people, for the people, and by the people.

The bill, H. R. 3020, which a majority of the Labor Committee railroaded to the floor without even the courtesy of consultation with the minority members of the committee, is the worst conceived piece of legislation ever to come before this House. Its 66 pages of text breathe only one spirit; Hatred for American workers. Its provisions, if conceivably they could ever become law or be thought of as constitutional, would repeal the thirteenth amendment against involuntary servitude and make of American working men and women chattels bound to accept the unrestrained and capricious dictates of their employers.

It is profoundly discouraging to think that supposedly responsible representatives of the people should, even in their most irresponsible moments, have given countenance to proposals so alien to our entire tradition. This bill would set us upon the path which Germany and Italy have already traveled. In attempting to settle our industrial and labor problems by the use of force applied by the Government rather than by the processes of collective bargaining, tolerance, and reason, it would have us adopt the methods of the labor front and the police state. Apparently, many have not yet learned the clear lesson of the last 25 years: That you cannot strike down the free trade union movement without at the same time inevitably destroying free enterprise and the right of industry to manage its affairs.

In countless ways this measure is designed to wreck collective bargaining, even where it is operating most successfully. By this bill the obligation to bargain collectively is diluted to a mechanistic formula contemplating five meetings within a month and nothing else. Even at those five meetings the parties are forbidden to discuss many matters of mutual interest. Unions are broken up into the smallest possible units so that employers, if they are willing to bargain at all, will bargain with so many different groups of their employees that they will have little time for the conduct of their business affairs. The company union is not only to become legal; it is to be affirmatively encouraged as a part of Federal policy, restoring the hypocrisy of the years from 1933 to 1937 when employers, while actually dealing with themselves, pretended to be dealing with their employees. This bill would, with only insignificant exceptions, make all strikes illegal. Yet no one has yet devised a method by which collective bargaining can be effective if employees are deprived of their sole weapon against employer injustice or shortsightedness.

The sponsors of this bill talk of equalizing the responsibilities of management and labor. Their conception of equalizing is to remove any possibility that employers can be found guilty of unfair labor practices and to saddle labor with such restrictions as inevitably will cause the complete destruction of the labor movement. Do the sponsors of this bill seriously suppose American workers would take all of this lying down? Is it not clear that, if this bill became law, the majority would invite a wave of labor troubles which would make the strikes of the past year and a half look like 15-minute rest periods? But with this important difference—this time the strikes would be directed against this legislation and not against private employers. By in effect putting workers outside the pale of our democratic society, the majority would arouse class feelings of which our country has been happily free; free precisely because all our citizens, whether employers or workers, have had the equal protection of the laws and the same rights within our society. There is a hollow mockery in the statement of the proponents of this measure that they are "merely correcting some New Deal mistakes." With trivial exceptions they would repeal the Norris-LaGuardia Act, signed by that earnest New Dealer, Herbert Hoover, thereby at a stroke reinviting the Federal courts again to indulge those abuses which called forth that necessary and bipartisan measure. With trivial exceptions the Clayton Act of 1914 is repealed; the sponsors of this bill would deny the declaration of the Clayton Act that "the labor of a human being is not a commodity," and make of workingmen only an item in manufacturing costs. Any combination of workers to raise their wages would, under this pernicious bill, make them liable to treble damages under the Sherman Act. The older Members of the House will recall the outraged cries which greeted the Supreme Court's decisions in the Bedford Cut Stone and Duplex against Deering cases, where the Court held that actions of workers to protect themselves against unfair goods were violations of the Sherman Antitrust Act. This bill goes further than did those cases; under those cases the Supreme Court said that the primary objective of the strike must violate the Sherman Act; under these bills it is enough if an object of the strike is to fix industry-wide wage rates.

Under this measure if workers attempt to strike at a sweat-shop competitor whose wage rates threaten their own, they are engaged in a criminal conspiracy. That was the law in England in the late 1700's. For over a century the doctrine of criminal conspiracy has been dead in this country. Now the sponsors of this measure would revive that doctrine. It is the rankest misrepresentation to say that this bill merely corrects abuses or straightens out the New Deal, it adopts out of a century and a half of history all the worst legislation, all the worst court decisions, and all the worst proposed legislation. Those decisions and those proposals have for decades been denounced by Republicans and Democrats alike. Even if the purpose of this bill—to give corporate management whatever it wants and to harass and destroy the labor movement—were frankly stated it would be a bad bill. For vast segments of industry in this country have achieved stable collective bargaining relationships with their employees, which are assets quite as tangible as the plants and machinery they own. This bill, by fragmentizing unions, by forbidding industry-wide relationships, by outlawing the closed shop, the check-off, and many other devices which have proved useful in obtaining industrial stability, would produce such chaos and would be so provocative of strikes that no employer, however benevolent and well-intentioned, could longer peacefully settle his labor problems. This bill is a gold brick thrown at the heads of employers, unions, workers, and the public.

This measure is proposed at a time when, despite all the agitation about unfair New Deal legislation American industry is operating at profit levels without precedent in the history of our country. If the proof of the pudding is in the eating, each member of this House should support the measures so ably sponsored by President Roosevelt which have succeeded in increasing the purchasing power of American workers, commensurate with our increased productive capacities. Everyone recognizes that our present problem lies in prices which are too high and profits which are too swollen. Instead of dealing with that problem, however, the sponsors of this measure say now let us give labor a good kick in the teeth so that prices may stay up, wages decline, and profits rise still further. This is Alice-in-Wonderland economics.

Those who support this measure shout a single refrain: "What about big strikes?" There is an answer to big strikes; indeed, there are two answers. One is the Russian answer of destroying all businesses and making labor an implement of the state. It has the merit that it works, but only through a police state and the denial of industrial and political liberty. The other is the Nazi

and Fascist answer of destroying trade unions and forbidding strikes. For awhile that worked, too, until it threw the world into a convulsion from which it will not soon recover. And that, too, depended upon a police state and the denial of political, religious, and civil liberty. Free enterprise and free labor are luxuries; luxuries which I believe our country powerful and wealthy enough to afford. But luxuries have their price; to enjoy them we must be prepared to pay something in the way of occasional and temporary inconveniences in the form of strikes. Despite the difficult postwar transition period, with the epidemic of strikes through which we have come, no one has been permanently injured. Profits are at all-time highs; finished goods are being produced at a rate hitherto undreamed of; unemployment is low; we are the most favored Nation in the world. Now this bill proposes, because of the slight inconveniences which many of us suffered during some of those strikes, to reverse our political history; to substitute for a free and voluntary labor, conscious of its rights and able to protect them, the approach of the slave master and the slave state.

This is one cake which you cannot both have and eat. Either we must live with the concept that we are equal citizens in a democracy, working together for a national purpose, or, turning our backs, stand committed to the proposition that employers are to be the uncontrolled leaders of our enterprises and that workers shall not dare assert their rights. We have only these choices, and the choice is crucial; either to follow the road of voluntary accommodation through collective bargaining in good faith, or the eventual substitution of the police state and the withering away of civil and political liberty.

Confronted with a national emergency, labor undertook during the war to give a no-strike pledge. That pledge was, with only the most trivial exceptions, lived up to. Free labor, proud of its rights and status, produced during the war a flood of military supplies which was the wonder of our military chiefs and resulted in the destruction of the slave-labor systems of two continents. Labor's loyalty to our institutions in time of national need was not accident or happenstance but reflected the sense of participation in our life which generations of free institutions have given our people. No better system of labor relations has been devised anywhere in the civilized world. Do not be misled by the statements of the proponents of this measure who would have you believe that under this legislation labor could continue free; I only ask that each Member of the House read the bill and the minority report which we have prepared before making his judgment concerning its incredible implications.

I have not time to analyze page by page and section by section this legislative absurdity. It is an exaggeration to say that the sponsors of this measure, in a spirit of vindictiveness best illustrated by the procedure which they have adopted to conceal its provisions from disinterested scrutiny, have proposed that we give up the American way of life. There has not been time for the country to become aware of what is now proposed, and this too is deliberate, designed to prevent consideration of the measure by the American people. Once its implications are known there will be, I am confident, a roar of protest from Americans in all walks of life who are not likely to allow cherished institutions to be thus violated. I repeat: Read the bill, read the minority report, and join those of us who would retain American freedom rather than barter that freedom away for an alien autocracy.

ANALYSIS OF HARTLEY BILL

For those who have been saying "it cannot happen here," and for those who have been fooling themselves with the idea that the Members of Congress would never dare to go as far as their speeches on labor would indicate, the answer is now available in black and white. Congressman HARTLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Labor and Education, has put his suggestions down in black and white. Anyone who has any doubts as to what this man has in store for the working people of America, or who has any doubts that he really means business, should take some time off to do nothing more than read this bill.

The Hartley bill is 66 pages long. It would not be an adequate description of this bill to say that it destroys the rights and protections given labor under all of the legislation of the past 50 years. This bill does at least that; but it also does much more. This bill deliberately and carefully takes the very laws intended for protection of working men and women and turns those laws around and aims them at destroying unions. It does not merely turn the clock back 50 or 60 years by removing protections against antilabor injunctions or by removing protections against unfair labor practices of employers; it deliberately creates new kinds of restrictions, new kinds of injunctions that did not even exist 50 years ago.

It deliberately says not only that employers are to be free to attack unions in all of the ways that employers attacked unions 50 years ago; it goes further and sets up Government agencies with power to put the Government squarely in support of the employer and makes the Government a means of regimenting, crippling, and hog-tying the entire labor movement.

In very blunt terms it is quite fair and accurate to say that this law has been carefully designed to permit crippling if not total destruction of the labor movement and, at the same time, to guarantee that if the labor movement survives at all it is to survive solely as a labor front; controlled, operated, and regulated by Government in the interest of employers.

It is not possible in a short space even to outline the details of all of the 66 pages contained in the bill. It may give a slight indication of what the Hartley bill is like to point out that for all practical purposes it eliminates 2 of the 5 employer unfair labor practices now in the law and creates 13 unfair labor practices for unions and employees, in addition to a 2-page list of certain additional unlawful concerted activities which are subjected to court injunctions apart from general provisions for antistrike injunctions in so-called public utilities and general provisions subjecting unions to Antitrust Act prosecutions, to harassing lawsuits, to requirements of filing and reports, and restrictions on political activities.

So that there may be no doubt, however, as to the accuracy of the general description given above, we will set forth briefly a few of the major items contained in this bill.

I. DESTRUCTION OF NATIONAL UNIONS

No union may represent the employees of more than one employer. National unions which thus now deal with all of the major employers in their industry would be compelled to break themselves up. While this bill would permit the various separate unions, each representing a separate employer, to be affiliated with a common national organization, the Hartley bill would even prohibit the local to have any national affiliation if the activities of the local were subject to any control or approval by the national, and would prohibit any strike in which any two locals were cooperating or consulting on common policy.

II. DESTRUCTION OF INDUSTRIAL UNIONS

As part of this same attempt to disrupt and break up the functioning of labor unions, this bill has a series of additional disruptive provisions. The Hartley bill requires that, whenever anyone asks for it, there must be a separate ballot "for any craft, department, plant, trade, calling, profession, or other distinguishable group." Thus, it aims at breaking up collective bargaining into as small and scattered groups and units as possible so that the union and the collective-bargaining process may be carved up into meaningless segments.

III. DESTRUCTION OF UNION SECURITY

It outlaws the closed shop. It pretends to preserve the union shop and maintenance of membership, but it ties these clauses up into so many knots and tangles that for all practical purposes any form of union security is marked for destruction.

IV. PREVENTION OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The four corners of the world have been reached to discover ingenious excuses for preventing collective bargaining wherever possible.

We have pointed out above how a series of provisions would break collective bargaining up into separate unions for each employer and separate units for each craft, each plant, each group of professional employees, each department, and even each distinguishable group.

We have pointed out above the series of walls and traps set up to prevent any collective bargaining, let alone agreement, on union security.

It goes further in other directions to attempt to prevent or upset collective bargaining. Here are some examples from the Hartley bill:

If a union does not receive a majority vote on the first ballot on representation, even where several unions are involved, there is to be no run-off. No union will be certified in such a case unless within 60 days it can prove to the

Board that it represents over 50 percent of the workers—in which case it can have a run-off election.

If a union loses an election, no further election can be held for a year; but if the union wins, then a group of discontented employees can come to the Board at any time to get an election to "decertify" the union.

Even if a union wins all elections it may not be certified if any one of its national officers or any one of its local officers is a member of the Communist Party or can be said to have promoted or supported the policies, teachings, and doctrines of that party.

The subjects on which collective bargaining may take place are sharply limited to five specified subjects which do not include welfare, insurance, union security, and many other items.

The employer is given a multitude of excuses for refusing to bargain at all even with the certified union since one of the penalties for the long list of so-called unlawful concerted activities is that there is a loss of rights under the National Labor Relations Act.

V. DESTRUCTION OF RIGHT TO STRIKE AND PICKET

This bill contains provisions outlawing strikes of all kinds except after an extensive "cooling off" period.

This bill sets aside the Norris-LaGuardia Act to permit the Attorney General of the United States to secure a strike-breaking injunction against certain national strikes. Under the Hartley bill it could last forever. While the strike is thus being broken by injunction, this bill provides for ballots to be conducted by the National Labor Relations Board, going over the head of the collective-bargaining representative, to ask the workers to accept the employer's offer; the Hartley bill even provides means for setting aside the collective-bargaining representative completely in any settlement.

The Hartley bill has collected into one document a list of all the different kinds of strikes that anyone has ever suggested for prohibition. Among the "unlawful concerted activities" outlawed by the Hartley bill are the sympathy strike, jurisdictional strike, monopolistic strike, boycott, any strike to enforce featherbedding. The Hartley bill would make a strike for recognition unlawful if the employer is not required under the law to recognize the union; in the same section the Hartley bill would make a strike for recognition unlawful if the employer is required under the law to recognize the union. The Hartley bill would even make it unlawful for a union to strike to prevent an employer from engaging in an unfair labor practice.

The Hartley bill has a long series of definitions of the various strikes listed above. By virtue of these various definitions it is illegal to strike against scab goods; it is illegal to strike if there has been cooperation and agreement with another local union representing employees of competing employers; it is illegal to strike for larger safety crews or against speed-up; it is illegal to strike for any item—such as welfare funds, insurance, union security, and so forth—which is not specifically part of what Mr. Hartley says is a legitimate subject of collective bargaining. The Hartley bill would also make it a subject for Federal injunction if in the court's opinion picketing is not conducted "in a manner reasonably required to give notice" of the labor dispute, or if there is picketing of any home, or if the court declares that there has been physical obstruction of the free access to an employer's premises. In all of these instances injunctions are to be permitted without hearing or notice and without any limitation by the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

In addition, this bill creates a new unfair labor practice consisting of a union's refusal to bargain. If this contemplates merely requiring a union to negotiate in good faith with an employer it would obviously not be needed since that is the very purpose of a union's existence. What it does involve is the placing of the power in the hands of the Board to issue a cease and desist order against a strike on the basis of the Board's determination that it did not feel that the union had yielded sufficiently in negotiations.

VI. THE GOVERNMENT TAKES OVER THE LABOR MOVEMENT

The Hartley bill contains a series of attempted regulations of the detailed operation of unions themselves. The Hartley bill places virtually no limit on this process and puts the Government in the business of directing and running labor unions.

The Hartley bill, for example, has a blanket provision stating that the affairs of the organization must be conducted in a manner that is fair. The bill then proceeds to make it an unfair labor practice for a union to fail to comply with this requirement. Thus any complaint as to the fairness of a union's operation can become the subject of investigation and order by the Board.

It should be remembered that this is just a catch-all provision picking up anything and everything that may have been omitted in a series of nine other unfair labor practices directed to the internal operation of unions. Among the other things on which the Board is given specific power to regulate the operation of the union are the following:

First. The Board can determine what are reasonable dues, fees, and so forth.

Second. Unions may not set up insurance or benefit plans in which all members must participate.

Third. Unions may not discipline any disrupter who attacks or undermines the organization and not expel or suspend any member for any reason other than those dictated by the proposed bill.

Fourth. Unions may not enforce a union security contract with respect to any member expelled for any reason other than nonpayment of dues.

Fifth. A number of other restrictions and internal regulations on balloting, term of office, strike decisions, financial records and reports.

VII. STRIKEBREAKING BY INJUNCTION REVIVED AND STRENGTHENED

In several different sections this bill carves and slices the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act until nothing is left. This means that where the anti-injunction law does not apply injunctions may be issued even against peaceful strikes and picketing and without any notice or open court testimony.

This bill permits such injunctions at the request of employers against picketing and strikes of certain types as indicated above.

This bill permits such injunctions in other cases at the request of the Attorney General. The Hartley bill permits the Attorney General to secure such an injunction whenever the President finds a threat to "interstate or foreign commerce in transportation, public utility, or communication services essential to the public health, safety, or interest."

Under the Hartley bill the National Labor Relations Board is to take such a ballot at the end of 30 days and at the same time, completely disregarding the collective-bargaining representative, the employees are to vote as to who shall accept the employer's terms for them.

If the employees reject the employer's offer, the injunction continues but the Chief Justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and two others will spend the next month or two examining the case and rendering an opinion.

The employer is free to accept or reject this opinion. As to the union, however, if it rejects then once more the NLRB is to take a vote of the employees both as to acceptance and as to who is to represent them. Whether the opinion is accepted or rejected the injunction is to continue until the Attorney General moves to discharge it.

The minimum time for all of this is 3 months and it will be remembered that under other sections of the bills the threat of strikes must have been preceded by a cooling-off period lasting under the Hartley bill as long as the agency enforcing the act wishes.

VIII. OTHER PROVISIONS

We have given above a few of the major highlights. These aspects of the bill reflect such complete irresponsibility, such complete willingness to tear the laws into pieces and to wreck collective bargaining and the labor movement that it seems pointless to go into the many other aspects of the bill.

The following list of a few of the other items in this bill may give an idea of the willingness of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] to omit nothing:

THE HARTLEY BILL

First. Expressly permits employer to establish and maintain company union.

Second. Abolishes NLRB and sets up new Administrator and Labor-Management Relations Board.

Third. Excludes supervisors, including straw bosses, pushers, gang leaders, clerical, and others, from collective-bargaining rights.

Fourth. Denies strikers rights under act if they receive unemployment compensation.

Fifth. Sets a 6 months' statute of limitations on the filing of charges and a 6 months' statute of limitations on the issuance of a complaint.

Sixth. Replaces the Conciliation Service by a new Office of Conciliation.

Seventh. Subjects union treasurers to harassment through lawsuits throughout the country and makes union responsible even for unauthorized acts of individuals.

Eighth. Subjects union to prosecution under the Sherman Antitrust Act even for legitimate union activity.

Ninth. Outlaws any expenditure by a union even for education and public discussion of political matters.

It should be remembered that this list for each of these bills is in addition to all of the aspects of the bills mentioned in the earlier sections of this memorandum.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to discuss the subject of the change in membership of the National Labor Relations Board, but before I get into that subject I should like to reply briefly to the gentleman from New York, who attended 8 of the 55 sessions we had and then only for a short time, so that he did not have an opportunity to listen to the volume of evidence which we heard from all over the Nation concerning the things which were happening to the general public. So in quoting from the Bible, he can go back to those words in the Bible that refer to those who labored in the vineyard a whole day and not for just a slight portion of the day.

One interesting matter in the hearings before the committee was the remark of the chairman of the National Labor Relations Board that he would be pleased when the time came where he would no longer have a position because of the fact that the employers had recognized that they should bargain collectively. I think that was a mighty fine statement, and he seemed to say it sincerely, at least as sincerely as a man could who was trying to talk himself out of his position. However, in order to judge whether or not he would ever so lose his job, let us analyze the facts.

When the National Labor Relations Act was passed in 1935 its purpose was to diminish the causes of labor disputes that affect interstate commerce. It also was passed for the purpose of equalizing the employee with the employer because he could not bargain with a corporate body or other such association when he had no association. Unfortunately, it had the effect that any unilateral act would have, because it gave power to the employee to pursue his remedy against the employer. Leaders gradually took that power from the employees and asked for additional power so that they could save the liberties of the employees, and what happened? They gradually took more power and more power, until they have been crushing the liberties they would save beneath their heels rather than saving them.

I say this from experience. I have represented both employers and employees. I have represented members of the A. F. of L., the CIO, and laboring men of other unions many times. I had to fight to preserve the rights of employees against their own union. I had to fight to keep them from being discharged. I not only had to fight, but I beat them many times when they discharged men without hearings, hundreds at a time, and obtained reinstatement in their jobs and hundreds of thousands of dollars of back pay for them. So I know whereof I speak.

Coming now to the question of what happened with respect to the act, in the 6 years which preceded the passage of the act, according to the majority report, there were approximately 750 labor disputes a year, involving about 300,000 employees. In the 6 years after the passage of the act there was an average of 2,500 disputes a year involving over a million workers. In the 6 years which followed that the strikes jumped to 3,500 a year, involving over 1,500,000 workers.

In 1945 it jumped to 38,000,000 mandays lost, and in 1946 to 119,000,000 mandays lost, not including the loss to all the other people who were not directly involved in the disputes. Therefore, we needed an amendment. In making the amendment, we did not want one which would repeal the act, as the gentleman from New York said yesterday who is on the same side of the aisle as I. If he were just going to repeal it, I do not know why he would have to have some lawyer sitting beside him, as he said, to help him just to draw an act to repeal it. We do not want to repeal it. We, the majority, want to give workers the act. We want to safeguard the rights of employees and of the general public. That is what has been done, especially in the bill of rights which has been given to the employees.

One of the main features to which objection originally was made was that the Wagner Act provided that the Board would be the investigatory body, the prosecuting body, the examining body, and finally, the judge and jury. Obviously, that had to be changed, but it was not changed during all these years until we provided in this bill for the first time that those powers are divided. We have created an administrator, and this administrator is a separate body of the Government who will investigate the cases, and when charges of unfair labor practices are filed with him, if he finds they are just and fair charges, he will issue a complaint and file it before the Board and prosecute it before the Board to a final conclusion; then go before the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for an order affirming and enforcing the order of the Board and the issuance of a proper cease-and-desist order. The Board, on the other hand, would thereby be limited to being a judicial or quasi-judicial body to listen to the evidence and pass upon the evidence presented to it by the administrator.

Here is another important change. Previously, the Board merely made its decisions as to whether or not it would dismiss the complaint or allow the complaint on the basis of the testimony. Now, it must decide it on the basis of the weight of the testimony; that is, upon the basis of the preponderance of the evidence, as is done in other cases. When a case goes to the upper court, that court, because it could not review the facts if there was any evidence, even slightly more than a scintilla of evidence, would have to affirm, can now, under the present bill, review it on the question of whether or not the decision and order of the Board is against the manifest weight of the evidence, or whether or not the evidence is substantial. That is a very material change in the matter of procedure.

It also changes the procedure as to the introduction of evidence before the Board. It must now be conducted according to the rules of evidence applicable in the district courts of the United States under the rules adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States, and the Board cannot exclude the rules of evidence as was heretofore done.

You can see in these major changes how we have attempted to help. It is not going to cost one penny more. In fact, it is going to cost less, because previously the court had to provide for every one of these things now being done through an administrator, and the Board is a separate body that functions as a court. That is the reason we need a new board, because when you have a unilateral board that is only thinking of helping the employee against the employer, they cannot think along the same lines as a board which is now required to act bilaterally in passing upon complaints of both management and labor. That is the reason for the creation of an entirely new board.

I think, on the whole, those changes alone would have made the act necessary without the bill of rights which has been given to the employees.

I submit to you that this bill should be passed in its present form.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I am aware of the gentleman's interest in labor and the fact that he, as a lawyer, has frequently represented labor and labor unions. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he can assure the membership of this House, after the great study he has given to this bill, that the rights of the workingmen are protected by this bill and, in fact, will be enhanced by the passage of this bill.

Mr. OWENS. I do not believe there is any question about the fact that the rights of the workingmen will be enhanced. I do not mean that every provision in the bill is just as it should be. If there are any amendments, they should be considered. I certainly would suggest some, and I suggest some changes should be made in conference, but on the whole, the bill is splendid.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION. I would like to have the gentleman clear up in a few words the matter of requiring the employer to agree for the organization of a union in a union shop.

Mr. OWENS. I will be glad to do that. Previously, in the matter of the closed shop, the union was supposed to furnish the employees. The bad feature of that was that during the war the

unions would not attempt to furnish the men. In a union shop, under the bill, an employer has a right to employ his own employees, but within 30 days thereafter, if he is required, through the regular procedure——

Mr. ROBSION. Can it be justified? Must it be upon agreement with the employer?

Mr. OWENS. There may be an argument as to whether it can be justified, but when the employer has agreed he would like to have a union shop, and more than half of the men say they would like to have a union shop, I believe the others can give way to the wishes of the employer and the other employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS] has again expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in favor of the pending legislation. It is, in my opinion, long overdue. I do not say that this is a perfect bill. I reserve the right to support constructive and clarifying amendments. I am sorry that we have conditions in this country which make it necessary to enact legislation which goes as far as does this bill. Under the circumstances, however, I do not see that we can do less and effectively meet the difficulties between labor and industry which confront the country today. The history of organized labor in this country during the past 15 years is a tragic record of bad leadership. There have been some sound constructive labor leaders, men of vision and statesmanship. In the main, however, labor leadership in recent years has gotten into the hands of men who are hungry for power and who were thoroughly unscrupulous as to the ways in which they secured and exercised that power. In some of our largest and most important unions the leadership has fallen into the hands of outright Communists or those who are controlled by Communists. In the case of other unions, labor racketeers have taken control. Under existing legislation as administered by New Deal agencies, it has been impossible for the splendid, honest, patriotic, American citizen who represents 95 percent of our labor-union membership to exercise any control over labor policies. They have had nothing to say concerning them.

In many cases they have not dared to raise their voices for fear of reprisal and persecution. They have been the tools and pawns of a leadership more interested in perpetuating its own power than in the welfare of the workers of this country.

Now, as never before, we need unity and cooperation in this country. We are facing some of the greatest problems which ever confronted any Nation. We can meet those problems successfully only if we have the strength which comes from unity and cooperation. Yet during the past few years it has been demonstrated time and again that the chief activity of labor leadership in this country has been stirring up strife and dissension. These labor leaders have tried to make their followers believe that the interests of labor and capital were antagonistic. The fact is that at least 95 percent of the time the interests of labor and capital are identical and what helps one, helps the other. It is only when there is cooperation between the two that we can realize the great opportunities that lie before us as a Nation.

One illustration of the sad lack of leadership in labor is that in all the consideration and discussion which has gone on in Congress over the admitted need of revised labor legislation, there has not been the slightest cooperation on the part of labor leaders. Their sincere cooperation could have made this a much better bill than it is, and they could have rendered no greater service to the laboring people of this country than by cooperating in finding a remedy to the many abuses which exist. Instead of cooperation, labor has chosen to take the position that nothing was wrong as far as labor was concerned; that all of the fault was with industry and the public.

Thus it has become necessary that we enact this somewhat drastic legislation. It must be made drastic because that is the only kind of language that our present type of labor leaders seem to understand. It must be made drastic to protect the rank and file of the laboring people of this country against the excesses of their leaders. Because of the general recognition of this situation on the part of the public and Congress, this legislation is going to pass the House by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, defects and unfair and often destructive practices obtain under existing labor laws.

The passage of remedial labor legislation to prevent industrial strikes, and above all to prevent strikes affecting the public, is long overdue.

The opposition of organized labor, or at least of the spokesmen of organized labor, is short-sighted. They run true to form. They oppose any legislation.

The statement of Mr. Van Bittner, as carried in the public press, in behalf of the CIO before the committee is rather typical of the opposition of selfish and designing labor leaders. His statement was an insult to the committee, the Congress, and to the country. It was utterly fallacious and without any foundation whatsoever. The substance of his position was that Congress was incapable of legislation respecting labor. He took the absurd, ridiculous view that it was entirely in order for Congress to pass the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the National Labor Relation Act. It was entirely all right for Congress to pass legislation to provide and protect collective bargaining. He asserted the contradictory position that while it was all right for Congress to pass legislation to promote organized labor, it was all wrong for Congress to even consider passing remedial legislation. His view, while typical of designing labor leaders, is untenable and unthinkable.

Nor have I any sympathy with the view of statesmen who would soft-pedal spokesmen for organized labor, who have always urged that no legislation should be considered because the public mind was aroused and insisted that calm deliberations should obtain in the consideration of labor legislation. It takes an attack to declare war. What patriotic or thoughtful or sensible citizen would advocate delay in national defense because patriotic citizens were aroused? For three long months during the present sessions, and for at least eight previous years, Congress has given consideration to the evils in existing labor legislation. If ever there was deliberation, amounting to repeated delays, that has characterized the consideration of any legislation, it has certainly been with respect to labor legislation.

I commend the committee for reporting the bill. Among others, I would like to see an amendment that would definitely ban the union shop. I would like to strengthen the provisions preventing strikes against the public interest.

I would welcome a perfecting amendment to the industry-wide bargaining provisions of the bill.

It is time for labor to clean house. It is time for the workers to be free and for freedom of speech among workers to obtain. It is time for the public safety and public interest to be safeguarded.

When organized labor was asking Congress for labor legislation, we didn't hear so much about involuntary servitude. There is confusion in much of the talk to the effect that legislation to curb strikes and to prevent racketeering is involuntary servitude. The contention is absurd.

There are in society no absolute rights. The right to free speech does not license the right to libel. The right to bear arms does not license and approve killing and murder. The public right is always paramount to private right. The talk about involuntary servitude is not only confusing but utterly unsound. Taxation, eminent domain, conscription, all put public rights above private rights. The right to quit work is not absolute. It is not synonomous with the right to conspire with others to paralyze or break down an essential public service.

The right not to work is by no means synonomous with the agreement of union employees to cut off a city's lights and power, as was done at Pittsburgh some time ago. The right to quit work is not the right to conspire with others to shut off food supplies. It is not the right to halt transportation, as was done in the railroad strike in the spring of 1946. The right to quit work is not synonomous with the right to deprive a city of police protection as was attempted in Boston 28 years ago.

Freedom from involuntary servitude is precious. It must be protected. It must be safeguarded. Such protection and such safeguarding cannot be accorded by using the words as a cloak for abuse or as a cloak for the actual destruction of freedom. I am sympathetic

with organized labor. I believe in the general right to strike, but it is justice in requiring men not to strike when to strike would deprive thousands of others of the right to work. The public interest is paramount. I oppose discrimination, mass picketing, the closed shop, the union shop, and industry-wide bargaining.

Legislation should be fair to employers and to employees, but above all, it should be fair to the public. I oppose any strike at any time against the great public interest. If the United States could win the greatest war in human history, the United States is able to provide for remedial legislation without paralyzing and crippling the public interest that would promote the welfare of employers and employees, and at the same time protect the public.

Unfortunately both management and labor leaders are often selfish. They put their immediate interests first. Often the industrialist asserts that totalitarianism will result unless Congress curbs labor and prevents strikes. William Green and Philip Murray cry out just as loudly that if Congress undertakes to regulate labor or curb its unfair practices or amend existing legislation, communism will obtain. Management and labor are each therefore capitalizing upon the current concern about totalitarianism and communism in the effort to persuade public opinion. As I indicated, however, labor offers no remedy. The House proposes to do something about the matter. Labor insists upon collective bargaining but when collective bargaining breaks down or is perverted by force, the public suffers. Confusion, nonproduction, strife, and unemployment, whether caused by management or by labor, is fertile ground for totalitarianism and communism.

I believe that there is a middle ground. Such ground has been found in solving the problems of taxation, of agriculture, of preparedness, and of national safety, and I believe that there is a middle ground that is embraced in the pending bill that will contribute to the solution of the problems between management and labor.

We live in an atomic age. Free enterprise must work. Assaults are being made upon the system. If the world is to survive, war must be eliminated. If free enterprise is to survive in America, strikes must be eliminated.

We did not prevent strikes during the war, nor have we prevented or controlled strikes since the war.

There exists a lopsided set of restrictions which permit unions to carry on activities that would be criminal if carried on by management. Under existing law, strikes obtain although they violate contracts. Labor should be made accountable for the violation of its contracts. There must be no monopoly either by management or labor. Jurisdictional strikes should be prohibited. Secondary boycotts should be eliminated. Sympathy strikes should be abolished. The rights of the consumer must be safeguarded. The public must be protected. The labor problem must be solved. The pending bill should be promptly enacted.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

FINANCIAL REPORTS BY LABOR UNIONS NOT REQUIRED BY OTHER NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, the Republican majority has characterized this bill, H. R. 3020, as labor's bill of rights. The Republicans claim to have written the bill and assume full responsibility for its success or failure. Of course that is a reasonable position for them to take.

There are undoubtedly bad practices of labor unions and individual members of unions that need correction, but in order to correct abuses it should not be necessary to burn down the whole house. It seems to me that is what this legislation intends to do. Therefore, if this bill is made law, instead of it being labor's bill of rights labor will be handed a crown of thorns.

Mr. Chairman, I want to confine my remarks to section 303 (a). This section is just another example of the type of purposeless, meaningless, ill-advised legislation which the majority is attempting to push through this House. This legislation can result in nothing more than imposing upon the labor unions of this country and on the Department of Labor needlessly burdensome requirements serving no salutary purpose.

This section of the bill would require every labor organization whose members are employed in industry affecting commerce to file annual sworn reports with the Secretary of Labor, showing the name and address of the organization, its receipts and disbursements, the names of its principal officers, and the compensation and allowance or reimbursement for expenses paid to each, the names and addresses of all employers with which it maintains collective-bargaining relations, a copy of its constitution and bylaws and the conditions governing administration and expulsion from membership and such other information regarding its organization and activities as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe by regulation.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that there is nothing in this section of the bill which is basically noxious to labor unions, but at the same time it should not be the purpose of this Congress to enact vindictive legislation which serves no useful purpose to anyone.

In the main, this section of the bill requires the labor unions to furnish information to the Department of Labor which it already furnishes to its membership and to the Treasury Department. Available statistics show that of 25 international union organizations of the American Federation of Labor, 22 provide for regular reports of finances either directly to the local unions or to the conventions, and three provide for regular publications of financial reports. Of the 35 CIO international unions, 31 provide for regular financial audits by a certified public accountant, 30 publish financial reports available to anyone, and 5 provide for financial reports to local unions or its members.

Now, let us see what, if anything, this section of the bill accomplishes. First, it would require the Department of Labor, whose budget has already been cut by this House by 44 percent, to establish an organization to prescribe forms, to issue and promulgate regulations for carrying out the purposes of this section, and to compile data. It would require additional personnel to handle, and additional space to store, these documents. These additional responsibilities cannot be performed by the Department of Labor without additional funds.

Aside from gathering dust in the vaults of the Department of Labor, the use to which these documents will be put is not clarified in the bill. Under the express provisions of the bill the Secretary of Labor is prohibited from making these reports public.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the Members of this House that under section 1117 of the Revenue Act of 1943 all tax-exempt organizations, including labor organizations, are required to file financial returns with the Bureau of Internal Revenue. To a great extent the information which would be furnished in the reports required under this bill would be duplicatory of the information contained in the returns filed with the Treasury Department under the Revenue Act.

So that here we have a provision in the bill which requires the preparation of reports by the labor organizations, the submission of these reports to the Department of Labor, the expenditure of substantial sums of Federal funds, so that these reports may be filed in the Federal Archives.

Now, aside from the requirement in this provision of the bill for the filing of financial statements by the Labor Department, this provision goes considerably further. It singles out from all the nonprofit organizations in this country, the labor organization, and it says, "You must file with the Department a statement of the policies or practices which you follow in admitting individuals to and expelling individuals from membership in your organization." Is this same requirement imposed on the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Association of Railroads, or any other employer organization? Mr. Chairman, I submit that this imposition is foisted upon the labor organizations alone in this bill.

This is a fundamental inequity, it is repugnant to all our basic democratic principles, it is government by regulation at its worst, it is anachronism which emerges out of the pages of darker days in our labor history, it is unjustifiable, it is purposeless, and I urge this House to repudiate it.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few comments on the effect this atavistic antilabor bill would have in my district. The authors of this bill have failed completely to take any constructive action. They have deliberately avoided any consideration of the

real problem in industrial relations, although the measure is entitled "The Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947."

The people in my city of San Francisco are by no means unfamiliar with the relationship between workers and their employers, with which this bill assumes to deal. I may say that we have acquired some degree of maturity in this respect in the city by the Golden Gate. In these days we do not have very many labor-management crises, such as we once had. We do not pretend to have solved all of the fundamental problems, but men are bound to learn something through experience. In San Francisco we have over 200 labor unions, strong and militant. We have dozens of employer unions, equally strong and militant. They have met each other often—and argued out their differences. And now, it seems to me, they pretty much have each other's measure. As a result, we get some degree of intelligent appraisal from each side on any given problem of industrial relations. We have achieved, at least, what may be called industrial balance.

I do not pretend to know exactly what will happen if this crazy-quilt measure is enacted, in the form recommended by the committee, but I am sure that this import balance will be destroyed. I make this statement as one who is not a neophyte in the field of labor-management relations. I do not pretend to have discovered any legislative panacea for all of the irritating problems which occur in this field, but I am convinced that our intensive experience in San Francisco has shown that a practical industrial balance can be achieved under our present laws, with far less drastic alterations than are contemplated in this bill.

It cannot be said that any union is as powerful as our greatest corporations. Therefore, we cannot hope to achieve national industrial balance if we permit our great industries to operate on a Nation-wide basis, indeed on a world-wide basis, and at the same time decrease the size and scope of our labor unions. To restrict the geographical area of bargaining between the management and employees of a corporation which does business in every State in this Nation merely reduces the strength of the union, while it leaves the corporation with all of its great power and more.

San Francisco is a seaport city, and the balance between the workers and the employers on the docks and the ships sets a pattern for the rest of the community. The maritime workers there have won the closed shop and industry-wide collective bargaining through long years of industrial struggle. No one will deny that working conditions and standards of living are infinitely better now than in the days when ship captains used to fire the whole crew in a port so that a "runner" could scout the waterfront bars for a new crew, collect a cut from each man, and share it with the skipper. The seaman had to buy his way into a job aboard ship before the closed shop was established. The memories of that graft and double dealing are strong today, kept so by mouth to mouth repetition of cruel stories dating back to the time when shanghaiing was an established institution.

I do not believe that the shipowners of San Francisco want to return to those barbarous days of old. And I doubt whether the shipowners in any American port where they do not now have the closed shop and the hiring hall like the frequent bloody conflicts which are the result of the infamous hiring pay-off system.

In San Francisco our water front is the core of our economic life. If you take away the hiring halls by abolishing the so-called closed shop you will disturb our entire population. If you take away industry-wide bargaining you will put one group of men against another in the same kind of work, and incite bitter rivalry between companies engaged in the same kind of business.

Is it the theory of the proponents of this measure that the only way to promote private enterprise in America is to encourage cut-rate competition in wages? If so, they are negating the great modern doctrine that labor is not a commodity or an article of commerce, and are pointing their course backward toward the age of slavery.

In San Francisco our building trades are stable, and have been since they won their independence in the days when labor was in demand after the great earthquake and fire, 41 years ago this month. These unions have the closed shop. Many other unions there have the closed shop, and many employers in those stabilized industries have said that this is a satisfactory way to assign journeymen to their jobs. In industries were skills are not standardized the collective-bargaining agreements do not contain closed shop or hiring-hall provisions.

The stability of the great metal trades industries in our shipyards and naval establishments, which are vitally necessary for our national defense, would likewise be upset by abolition of the closed shop and industry-wide collective bargaining. Our Government recognized the truth of these statements during the late war, and no one can dispute the fact the closed shop and collective bargaining in vast regions of the country were paramount factors in the success of our armed forces and the unprecedented volume of American production which determined the outcome of the war in every part of the world.

All of this epochal system of equity in industrial relations, which has been created with such painstaking effort and patriotic thought in the crucial era preceding and during the war, would be torn to pieces by this destructive legislation, and the American people would be thrust back into the old barbaric struggles which many of us had hoped were but ugly memories of a never-to-be-repeated past.

I do not contend that we have national balance in industrial relations today. But we must discover the root causes of industrial disharmony, and not be deceived by superficial charges that labor has too much power or management too great control.

One of the root causes is that both management and labor have failed to consider the major adjustments that each has to make to conform to the alterations demanded by industrial change. We have reached a stage in this country's industrial and economic life where a return to the past, as envisioned in this bill, is unthinkable. America must go forward if she is to fulfill her destiny as a world leader.

The real problem is a human problem. It is not entirely one of science and engineering or of systems like the closed shop and industry-wide collective bargaining. The fundamental problem is in human relations.

We are inclined to boast about our industrial superiority. But how many of our industrial engineers can measure the human equation like they can the productivity equation? Most of them have failed to recognize that the human being's relation to his fellow man is a factor of major importance in the productivity equation.

Nowhere in this bill is there an effort to help management and labor work out a better cooperative spirit, which would be a service to all the people. There is no effort to set up, for example, a Nation-wide system of union-employer cooperative councils, which have proved so successful where they have been used, in which the worker could get the feel of contributing his thoughts to industry, as well as his brawn. There is no direction here to a Federal agency to explore the whole field of human relations in industry so that the Government of the people can do on a large scale what a few private individuals are trying to do with private funds. There is no indication in this bill that its framers want to bring labor and management together to study how industrial workers, isolated from a feeling of participation in industry, may gain that feeling of affiliation so essential to the community spirit in all of us. The family farmer or small businessman has the feeling of social usefulness, but the production line worker is isolated from the type of community living and production which was the basis of this great Nation's growth.

Elton Mayo, of Harvard University, who is conducting a study of the problems of human relations in industry, recently said:

> The group has an impulse to self-preservation as strong as, or stronger than, that of the individual; and many strikes are actually symptomatic of the attempt of a group to hold together, however the so-called causes are stated. Economics, psychology physiology, all ignore the fact that complex group association is the distinguishing character of the human being.

Men must work together. They cannot work together if by law we separate the workers and allow other elements in the community to grow stronger. Men work effectively in teams. With team achievement, workers get more satisfaction than in individual achievement. And the employers get more profits. Therefore, a system by which industrialists would create teams of workers, through conference with the workers themselves, might bring about an adjustment in our highly mechanized society which would result in real achievement and industrial peace.

This is the kind of labor-management action I would like to see provided here. On the contrary, the pending bill is re-

strictive, punitive, reactionary, and bitterly antilabor.

I would be even more deeply concerned about this measure, Mr. Chairman, if I believed there were any real likelihood that it would be enacted into law in its present form. But it is obvious, from published reports emanating from the other body, that it cannot be passed by the Congress without radical changes, and I am hopeful that it will never appear among the Nation's statutes.

I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that the leaders of the majority party in this House do not expect final approval of many of the provisions which they have incorporated in this bill. In my opinion, it is a deliberate legislative hoax, designed to enable the majority Members of this body to report to the radical antilabor interests which helped to elect them that they at least tried to carry out the repressive policies of those radical groups. Then, when the measure finally goes to the White House in its altered form, they will seek to propitiate the men and women of labor with the crocodile plea: "Well, it was not so bad, after all."

By its espousal of this retrogressive legislation the party of Abraham Lincoln has repudiated the basic principles of its founder. The present-day leaders of the Republican Party are apparently committed to the doctrine that human labor shall be exploited for financial profit without the protections which true disciples of Lincoln have gradually written into law since the great emancipator abolished slavery in this country. Such a doctrine cannot endure in modern America.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, in the declaration of policy this act provides means for protecting the rights of employers, employees, and their representatives in their relations to one another, and above all it recognizes under law that neither party has any right in its relations with any other to engage in acts or practices which jeopardize the public health, safety, or interest.

I think that no person who is a loyal citizen has any quarrel with this declaration of policy. It has occurred to me that too often in the past much of our legislation with respect to both industry and labor has failed to take into account the paramount interest of the general public.

In the light of recent and current industrial strife, each of us has been forced to recognize the need for proper legislation which would protect for each citizen his inherent constitutional rights. That corrective legislation is needed is axiomatic, but such legislation must be so carefully drawn that it will promote equity and we must not permit ourselves to become prejudiced by apparent abuses on the part of certain unscrupulous and powerful individuals who have abused existing legislation and infringed upon the rights of the general public, the workers, and the employers alike. Every citizen needs and is entitled to equity, and just protection under the laws of our Nation.

Many of the provisions contained in H. R. 3020 are directed at much needed correction, but I am fearful that some of them have not been properly thought through and that their consequences may be reflected in the transfer of special privilege from one group to another. This should be avoided. It is not clear to me that all the provisions of this act are in keeping with the declared objectives set forth in the declaration of policy.

There are several phases of this bill to which I wish to refer in a general way. Many of its provisions are designed to protect individual members of labor organizations from exploitation by their own leadership. I think it has been evident in the past that decisions reached by powerful organization officials, far from the scene of industrial strife, have been made arbitrarily without proper consideration to the wishes and welfare of the workers involved.

This bill would guarantee to the workers a more democratic conduct of their own organization and would reserve to them many of the prerogatives which have been usurped by unscrupulous leaders.

In our debate, it has been said that the two major provisions of this bill are those affecting the so-called closed shop and those relating to industry-wide bargaining.

It is inappropriate for me to discuss those provisions of this bill with respect to the closed-shop issue which I believe are improper. The reason is that the legislature of my State, the Commonwealth of Virginia, at a special session earlier this year, has made the existence of the closed shop illegal in my State.

There is much that can be said on both sides of the question with respect to industry-wide bargaining. In this practice there are possibilities of abuse perhaps as serious as industrial monopolies. We have sought to deal with those in antitrust legislation. On the other hand, industry-wide bargaining is frequently helpful both to the workers and the employers. Numerous illustrations of this can be cited, and there are times, I believe, in which it can be demonstrated that bargaining on a purely local level is not in the best interest of the general welfare. I think this problem needs much more careful thought than has been given to it. I do not think the answer is found merely by making this practice illegal.

In view of the many considerations which commend this legislation to me, and the many which likewise impel me to oppose it, it is my judgment that this bill should be recommitted and sent back to the committee for further study in order that it may be put into a final form which would assure equal justice and the protection of the rights of all our people.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of this bill. It is a comprehensive piece of legislation widely affecting the employer and employee relations in our country. It defines many rights and many duties of both employer and employee as between themselves. It also recognizes that the general public has rights to be protected against unwarranted injuries that labor-management conflicts may impose.

This bill is designed to curb or prevent many evils. I call attention to a very important fact. Every restrictive provision in this measure is aimed at a well-known evil established by our experience of the last 20 years. There is no injustice to any class when we restrain unwarranted injuries to others by any of its members.

It is a trite thing to recognize the importance of labor in the affairs of this Nation. Our wage earners are more than 50,000,000. They are the largest group in every section of our country.

I think I would not be mistaken if I said that, looking down the long course of the years, that which is best for this great body of workers is best for our country. Then, with even greater emphasis and with greater assurance, I could say that which in the long course of the years is best for this country is best for the humblest man in this Republic.

The wage earner may be a union-labor man today, but in his lifetime and that of his children and grandchildren he is a citizen of this Republic. In a land of freedom, open avenues to opportunity, equality, and just government by law, he can find a reward beyond that which any class government can ever give.

A democratic government is concerned with the welfare of its humblest citizens. A true democracy is at war with class government at any level.

This bill proposes restrictions on certain activities of labor unions. The explanation is not that the members of labor unions as a whole are different from the rest of the population. The fact is they are like the rest of us.

Congress has been generous to labor. It still wants to be; but the privileges Congress granted have been abused to the injury of the American people. When labor unions are so organized and permit themselves to be so manipulated that they produce a Lewis and a Petrillo, they give those dictators more power than any white man in this country ought to have.

When a Lewis can tell the people of this country whether or not they can have fuel to heat their homes or run their factories, and when a Petrillo can decide what music the American people can hear and at what price to his union, it is time for Congress to awaken to the fact that it owes a duty to act for the protection of the American people.

The committee report on this bill states facts which constitutes a severe arraignment of the evils suffered by our Nation due to management-labor conflicts of the last 20 years. We are well aware that the victims of these conditions have not been confined to employers and employees. Practically every citizen in the Nation has been materially affected by the evil conditions that have thus brought distress to the country.

This legislation is directed to the purpose of relieving the country of much of the industrial strife to which it has been subjected.

In the main, this bill is far more than a measure to ameliorate controversies between employers and employees. It is true that the industrial strife that has inflicted the Nation originates out of the employer-employee relation. This industrial strife is a growing evil. It reached its zenith in the last year when there was a direct loss of 116,000,000 man-days of employment; when the number of strikes reached an all-time high of 4,985.

These figures fail enormously to reflect adequately the full loss imposed upon the Nation by the indirect reduction of employment, the curtailment of production, and the denial of much-needed products to the cousumers of the country. The loss to our Nation in the reconversion period and the inflationary factors released, imposed immeasurable hardships.

Who were the victims of this infliction upon the country? Primarily the victims were the great masses of the public who were not parties to the controversies. These thousands of conflicts had millions of innocent victims. Today, a primary concern of the Congress is to afford protection to the public, to these victims of the industrial strife.

In many cases we have seen heartless injustices imposed upon the public, with apparently little corncern by the immediate parties to the conflct, as to how much suffering they might inflict upon the public.

A strike is a crude method of settling disputes. To strike means to hit the other fellow. Strikes and lock-outs are coercive conflicts where, like war, might prevails rather than right. They are justified only by the failure to provide any better protection for the worker.

Long ago we attempted by the establishment of courts to provide the public against the grosser offenses of the criminal. We outlawed the duel. Some decades ago strong employer groups so organized themselves that they could crush their competitors and combine to prey on the consumers of the country by the control of production and prices. That was a form of economic compulsion that the law attempted to remove from the consumers of the country. Antitrust legislation became necessary to protect the public against that type of racketeering.

We now face the duty of going further and placing restrictions against another form of economic compulsion too frequently exercised in the employer-employee relation.

Great numbers of citizens have been deterred from exercising their normal rights through fear of physical violence and injury to persons and property. Innumerable men in public life, at every level, have catered, yielded, compromised, and surrendered public rights for their own political peace or advancement.

This situation has yielded itself to the class favoritism and class Government in the administration and enforcement of the law and in its interpretation by the courts.

In recent years an irresponsible type of leadership has imposed itself on labor organizations to their misfortune. With the catering, favoritism, compromising, and yielding of governmental authorities, there has grown up an arrogant quality of leadership that has been demoralizing both to the public life of the country and to the union membership. It was unfortunate that so often labor was unable to clean its own house when, under mercenary leadership, as happened in some unions, an arrogancy was exhibited that has been highly detrimental to labor's cause.

Notwithstanding the Nation-wide dissatisfaction with such leadership, the organizations under them seemed unable to throw off their yokes. The arrogant character of this leadership is manifested in the growing extent to which unconscionable demands are made on employers without offering any services in return for what is demanded.

I am pleased to see that this bill very properly includes inhibitions against "featherbedding." The success of labor must be in getting paid for what it does, and not in pay for what it does not do.

No comprehensive legislation to restrict this industrial strife could properly leave out an inhibition against this kind of racketeering. Demands of this character are rapidly spreading—demands for the payment of money and other financial concessions where no services are performed or offered in return, and which demands are made without any contract, legal or moral right. These demands have the moral quality of racketeering and extortion.

It is unlikely that any bill dealing with so many subjects and as lengthy as the one before us should entirely satisfy the viewpoint of any one Member of Congress. Fundamentally, I think this is a useful bill. It attempts to meet some great evils of our time. It combats evils of monumental proportions. I have no inclination to vote against it, because it might not in every respect suit my exact viewpoint.

The broad explanation of this situation is not that the members of the labor unions as a whole are different from the rest of the population. The fact is they are fundamentally the same. The average union man is just an average citizen of our country and is in no sense an outlaw. This legislation is not good if ultimately it is not for his benefit. The laboring people of the country are fundamentally like the rest of us, with the same ambitions and hopes in life a large part of the members of labor organizations are today hoping for legislation that will place labor-union activities on a higher and more patriotic basis.

A sound conception of American citizenship will concede that the humblest American citizen should be more deeply concerned in a government of equality, fairness, and justice, rather than any possible advantage that may come to him by a system of class government which would give him temporary advantages at the expense of the rest of the country. Every right-thinking American must be more interested in what kind of government he is going to build for himself, his children, and grandchildren than he is in the hope that through class government he can gain some advantage to himself at the disadvantage of the rest of the country. Democracy, if it has any legitimate meaning, is a negation, a denial of the thought that any one group, however numerous, can best profit under a system of class government.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks which I previously made.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this 1 minute for the purpose of directing a question to the proponent of this bill, specifically the chairman of the committee, and the person whose name the bill carries.

This bill has been hailed by its proponents as a new bill of rights for the working people of this country. In view of the Republican claims in the last election with respect to discrimination in employment and its pledges for the enactment of fair employment practice controls, I now inquire of the chairman if he will accept an amendment incorporating the principles of fair employment practices to be added to the so-called bill of rights that the gentleman proclaims his bill to be.

Mr. HARTLEY. I will say to the gentleman that as far as that issue is concerned, I am opposed to injecting that argument into this bill. I will say to the gentleman, if he wants a hearing on that bill, he can have it before my committee.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Why not accept the amendment? FEPC is germane to the subject with which the bill deals.

EFFECT OF H. R. 3020 ON THE NORRIS-LAGUARDIA ACT

One of the worst features of a great many bad features in this 66-page invitation to industrial chaos which we are considering is the insidious manner in which labor's enemies would gut the Norris-LaGuardia Act under the guise of prescribing fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management and of protecting the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations. This proposal would protect the rights of individual workers to such an extent that the drafters found it necessary to nullify the Norris-LaGuardia Act in five different sections. Five different times they found it necessary to withdraw the protection of that act so wisely raised against the forces which would settle industrial relations problems by the law of injunction.

Let us examine the statute and determine the purposes for which this legislation would remove the Norris-LaGuardia restraints upon the equity jurisdiction of Federal courts.

Under this bill, the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act would not be applicable in the following situations: First, in actions to prevent unfair labor practices; second, in actions involving any activities declared to be unlawful concerted activities; third, in any action by

the Attorney General to enjoin strikes imperiling public health and safety; fourth, in any proceeding involving a violation of the antitrust laws; and, fifth, in actions and proceedings involving violations of agreements between an employer and a labor organization or other representative of employees.

Now, let us reexamine each one of these situations in which the majority deems it expedient to deny the protection of the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

First. Section 10 (h) provides that in actions to prevent unfair labor practices the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the Norris-LaGuardia Act. The proponents of this provision will say that this is no change from the present National Labor Relations Act. The answer is only true in part. This provision is contained in the present NLRA, but it has been given much wider scope by saddling labor with a number of new unfair labor practices which are subject to this provision.

Second. Section 12 (c) provides that the Norris-LaGuardia Act shall not have any application in any action or proceeding in a court of the United States involving any activity defined in this section as unlawful. Section 12 defines a number of activities which are termed "unlawful concerted activities." Those activities include the use of force or violence in a labor dispute; engaging in a sympathy strike, jurisdictional strike, monopolistic strike, illegal boycott, sitdown strike, or strike to force an employer to accede to featherbedding practices; or to strike for a number of objectives considered to be improper.

A quick examination of these provisions leaves an individual having a trusting nature with the impression that most of these suggestions are rather sound. Section 12 contains a provision to outlaw illegal boycotts. The definition of illegal boycott in this bill is so broad in scope that it will outlaw many activities which have been recognized as justifiable for many years. For example, suppose that employer A operates an air line; employer B also operate an air line. A decides to cut the wages of his mechanics and the mechanics go out on a strike. Under the definition of "illegal boycott" in this bill the mechanics employed by B could be ordered by him to service the planes owned by A and any refusal on their part to act as strikebreakers would make them liable to the following actions: a Federal court injunction to forbid this "illegal boycott," suit for damages by company A, loss of status as employees under the National Labor Relations Act, and criminal penalties and triple damages under the antitrust laws. Truly a bill to protect the rights of individual workers. All the rights they will have left will be a right to pay fines and a right to go to jail.

Third. Section 203 (b) provides that the Norris-LaGuardia Act shall not be applicable in any case in which the Attorney General has been directed to petition a district court for an injunction to stop a strike threatening to imperil the public health, safety, or interest. The rights of the citizens of this country deserve to be protected from this overwhelming power in the hands of the Attorney General by more specific language than "public health, safety, or interest." Any strike has some effect on the public interest. If it were not so, the strike would be of little value.

Fourth. Section 301 (c) provides that the Norris-LaGuardia Act shall not be applicable in any proceeding involving a violation of the antitrust laws. It has been pointed out many times that the antitrust laws were not designed for the regulation of labor unions and their provisions do not easily lend themselves to that purpose. The evidence of failure in this field prior to the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act should be sufficient warning that such laws do not create industrial peace. By this provision the majority indicate their willingness and even desire to return to the days when the strike-breaking injunction was available to every private employer who desired to go to court and claim a violation of the antitrust laws.

Fifth. Section 302 (e) provides that the Norris-LaGuardia Act shall have no application in actions and proceedings involving violations of agreements between an employer and a labor organization or other representative of employees. The proponents of this legislation are not satisfied to open up the Federal courts to innumerable suits for breach of contract, they must also provide that an alert employer can secure an injunction even before the breach occurs.

Net income[1] of leading corporations for the years 1945 and 1946[2]

[In thousands of dollars]

Industrial groups	Number of companies	Net income after taxes		Percent change	Percent return	
		1945	1946		1945	1946
Baking	23	$29,093	$60,872	+109.2	10.2	21.8
Dairy products	16	38,989	65,454	+67.9	12.0	18.9
Meat packing	17	34,825	70,461	+102.3	5.4	10.8
Cotton goods	46	28,760	102,896	+257.8	7.8	27.1
Silk and rayon	13	14,280	42,419	+197.1	9.5	24.5
Woolen goods	7	11,986	30,328	+153.0	10.3	25.2
Clothing and apparel	31	14,909	35,430	+137.6	9.8	23.3
Shoes, leather products	21	17,262	26,757	+55.0	8.2	12.7
Tires, rubber products	27	66,152	136,759	+106.7	10.7	20.6
Iron and steel	51	183,531	273,336	+48.9	5.1	7.5
Agricultural implements	12	54,671	45,520	−16.7	7.1	5.7
Nonferrous metals	26	110,710	136,685	+23.5	5.8	7.1
Total manufacturing	1,511	2,997,938	4,091,355	+36.5	9.3	12.1

[1] Net income is shown as reported—after depreciation, interest, taxes, and other charges and reserves, but before dividends. Net worth includes book value of outstanding preferred and common stock and surplus account at beginning of each year.
[2] National City Bank Newsletter, March 1947.

	June 14, 1946	July 15, 1946	Nov. 15, 1946	Feb. 15, 1947
Consumer price index	133.3	141.2	152.2	152.8
Foods (retail) (years 1935-39=100)	145.6	165.7	187.7	182.3

Percentage increase, June 15, 1946, to Feb. 14, 1947:
Consumer price index ..... percent.. 14.6
Foods ..... do.... 25.2

Profits (in billions)[1]

	All corporations
First quarter 1946	$9.1
Second quarter 1946	11.4
Third quarter 1946	13.6
Fourth quarter 1946	14.9
Year 1946	12.0
Average 1942-45	9.5
Average 1936-39	3.9

[1] Department of Commerce.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this so-called labor bill is one of the rankest pieces of labor legislation ever foisted upon the average American working man and woman.

One of the expressions we have heard repeated over and over again in recent years is to the effect that people all over the world look to the United States of America to see what kind of leadership we will afford to a world which is crying for a helping hand.

During the years of the war we heard the declaration that we were civilization's sole hope. We lived up to every expectation and in effect answered every prayer.

After the war we answered the pleas of starving millions with food, money, and clothing. We demonstrated our sincere interest in the promotion of peace and freedom for all peoples.

We believe sincerely now that little people everywhere look to this land as the outstanding example of democracy in action—and if people looked to us for inspiration and leadership in other years—their eyes are turned this way today.

If our conduct was instrumental in inspiring the people of other lands—in the conduct of war and the working for peace—then just as emphatically is it certain that our conduct in the field of economics and social justice will set the pattern to be followed by those whom we influence in other areas of the world.

What this Congress does today to the working men and women of this Republic, will demonstrate in the clearest of all possible manners the attitude of this Congress toward those who toil to produce the industrial wealth of the Nation.

The measure which this Congress has for consideration—the measure which is labeled "labor legislation"—is a step backward. It is a deliberate attempt to blot out the social progress which has been achieved by the average American during the past 50 years.

I know it is natural for the proponents of any measure to label a proposition with fancy title and surround it with high-sounding phrases, but there is a limit beyond which common decency cannot be stretched.

In hypocritical fashion this bill is tagged as one to relieve the American worker from a tyranny more despotic than one could think possible in a free country.

This is the label that is attached to the measure which is the first step back along the road to a decadent social era when men and women who worked in mills and factories were looked upon as no more than chattels and serfs and were subjected to abuse and ridicule while industrialists grew fat and sleek on the profits created by the men and women who toiled in their sweatshops.

This is a bill to relieve the American worker from the despots who brought them organization and made it possible for them to speak out against the foul and vicious conduct of management in the days before trade-unions became a fact on the American industrial scene.

This is a bill to free the American worker from the tyrants who did away with the dawn-to-dark slave factories, the company stores, the run-down hovels where mill workers were forced to live, the slave wages which provided no more than enough to keep bread on the tables, and condemned children to work at the looms and machines at 10 and 12 years of age.

Oh, what hypocrisy!

It was trade-unions that made the American worker free in fact rather than in fancy. It was the labor union which freed the American worker from the tyranny of the antilabor injunction which made it impossible for that worker to speak out against inhuman working conditions, to band together for the betterment of his own and his family's economic lot in life, to hope to live as a decent member of society, to own his own home, to educate his children, and look forward to an old age free of the constant fear of poverty and hunger.

This the labor union did for the American working man and woman, and you can chant your fancy phrases from now till doomsday, but there is no one better aware of what labor unions have accomplished for our society than the American workingman himself.

He knows what his lot was before the advent of trade-unions and he has a pretty good idea what it will be again if measures like this succeed in finding their way onto the statute books of the Nation.

Labor has but one weapon in its constant fight for a decent share of the fruits of its toil—it is the strike. The right to strike is fundamental and is guaranteed to the American worker by the Constitution which this Congress is sworn to uphold. Yet, with tongue in cheek you would restore in one fell swoop the most evil chapter in the story of industrial relations by placing the hated antilabor injunction in the hands of industrialists who will not hesitate to use it to pin back the ears of any man who will dare to speak out against injustice in a factory or shop.

You say these men and women should not strike—they should bargain and bargain and bargain interminably—all the while prices climb and climb and the struggle for food and clothing becomes more and more desperate.

The men who now propose this measure promised a few months ago that they could reduce prices and promote prosperity if they could rid the country of price controls.

As hated as those controls were they at least guaranteed that the average American family would get enough to eat.

The controls were removed and the law of supply and demand commenced its functioning, but although months have passed it is still all demand and no supply.

I shudder to think of the men and women in my district who work in the mills for 90 cents an hour—some 83 cents an hour—and have to provide a home and clothes and food and medical care for a family with four or six children.

Everyone recognizes the serious condition which prevails, but does this Congress address itself to an attempt to restore prices to a sane level? No, quite the contrary. It solemnly and coldbloodedly tells the American worker, "You shall not make any attempt to increase your wages." It tells the American worker—whom it now professes to free from tyranny and despotism—that he, he alone, is responsible for the plight in which he finds himself. He is responsible for high prices and little food, but never a word is said about the fattest profit picture in the history of the country.

Some of our papers direct their vicious criticism against this oppressed American worker because he has struggled to get a few more cents with which to make an effort to make ends meet. But never a line do they write in criticism of the selfish greed of the profit seekers whose goal is all the traffic will bear.

The proponents of this bill profess to believe that big unions are detrimental to our industrial life, and through this measure they have set out to break the unions except—more pious language—for neighborhood groups.

The effect will not be to restore industrial order, but to produce chaos. The bill professes to abolish the closed shop and put an end to industry-wide bargaining. Actually, what it endeavors to do is break labor unions now in existence into small segments which can be taken on piecemeal and destroyed. The proposal is but the forerunner of a wave of so-called company unions and the "yellow dog" contract given the blessings of the Congress of the United States.

But while this move goes forward with vigor and determination, not a sound is heard in criticism of the constant growth of monopoly in this country—much of that growth fostered by the millions which this Government pumped into the industrial machinery during the war years. Big business alone is in a position to take advantage of the gigantic construction program, the research and development that went into the industrial set-up to produce the badly needed material of war.

This Government provided all sorts of aid and incentive to industry during the war and provided tax refunds and other aids after the war.

Yet, this Congress smilingly overlooks the growth of monopoly in business but violently objects to the growth of labor unions—growth which has been made possible solely by the desire of the men and women in the shops to be represented at the bargaining table by effective and intelligent agents.

Just a few days ago this House labored over an appropriation bill which was to provide the funds for the operation of the Department of Labor. A great many pages were filled with words of economy. The Labor Department was to be curtailed in its operations—and running through all those pages is the same theme—the Labor Department was under attack because it was prolabor. What a commentary on the great American love of democracy. A Cabinet post is to be reduced to impotency—all because its people have the intestinal fortitude to speak out occasionally in behalf of the rank and file American.

Now the Department of Labor is to be smashed at again. One of its chief functions is to be made an independent agency. Why, there can be but one answer; as presently set up the National Labor Relations Board is prolabor. Why is there a curse on being prolabor? What is wrong about raising a voice in behalf of Americans? Do not these men and women pull their share of the load? Have they not a right to expect that some branch of this Federal system will seek to protect their interests?

Then, what is to be the attitude of the new independent agency proposed? You say it is not to be antilabor, it is to be fair and impartial. I deny that. How can you say fair and impartial when you arm it, as you do here, with all the machinery for antilabor injunctions, union-busting mandates, company-union guarantees, and the rest of the provisos of this legislation? I say it is to be antilabor and for that reason alone is it proposed.

This is not legislation for the common good—this is punishment because labor unions have grown so powerful. American workers now have a voice in the functioning of our industrial machinery and some industrialists resent this. They are determined that, at whatever the cost, these men and women must be returned to the position of humble and suppliant employees, glad to work for whatever pittance is awarded them.

This Congress, if it passes this measure, is lending its weight to that plan. This Congress is notifying the people of other lands—the people who look this way for leadership and inspiration—that democracy is a great thing on paper, but it does not work out here in fact.

All Americans have a right to share in the great possibilities of this great Nation. This legislation denies the mem-

bers of labor unions a right to participate and drives them to the rear where they are expected to be seen and not heard.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, how does the time stand?

The CHAIRMAN. The minority has 23 minutes remaining; the majority, 31.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this proposed labor bill now before the Congress, because I believe it will tend toward taking us back into the Dark Ages.

By the Dark Ages, I refer to that time and period previous to the enactment of the Wagner Labor Act and what happened for about 50 years prior to the time it was recorded on the statute books.

We should all feel grateful, and ever remember former Senator LaFollette, who headed the special investigating committee, which brought to light the many discriminations against the American working classes, and helped to a great degree enact some favorable legislation in their behalf.

The first major strike in this country took place at Pittsburgh, in the steel Ruhr, back in the year 1892. Many of us here will remember that Carnegie paid a man by the name of Frick a million dollars to break the strike, while he took a trip abroad. Pinkerton detectives were called in and, together with the police, soldiers, and traitors, many workers were shot from river boats, with Gatling guns camouflaged in hayracks. Frick was shot in the neck by Alexander Berkman and, while recuperating in the hospital, had many days and fretful hours to dwell over the suffering and grief that he had brought to countless workmen and their families. He had the opportunity to recall that his parents had been of the working class—and that he, himself, had been reared in a company house, at a rental of about $4 a month. No doubt he recalled the hardships that he and they had endured on sweatshop wages and lack of fit working conditions. He became very remorseful and bitter. When Carnegie sent him a wire as he was leaving the hospital, asking him to come to his office, he wrote as the return message, "I'll see you in hell; we're both going there."

The steelworkers' union was broken, together with the hearts of workers, throughout the country. As the candle of Carnegie's life grew dim, he, too, became remorseful, because he built great libraries in various cities throughout the country. It did not mean a great deal to the men in the mills, because with working 12 hours, and hours spent in getting to and from their job, they had little time to spend in reading books. It was Carnegie's desire to go out of this world poor and without money.

Then we had the railroad strike at Chicago in 1893. Railroad workers were shot down in the streets by Federal troops. The men who participated in the strike were black-listed all over the country and they never knew why or how they obtained their addresses. As they went into other cities to seek employment, naturally they were asked for references or place of previous employment. The letters came back, with the emblem of a broken car wheel on the railroad letter heads, which served as a tip off that they were not to be hired.

In 1902 along came the miners' strike in the anthracite coal region, in which 149,000 persons participated, myself included. The strike lasted from April until October. True, we experienced the untold hardships of eating only corn meal mush; being evicted from company houses and forced to live in tents—large families of 8 and 10 children, together with their parents, but a great deal was accomplished toward better working conditions. We were given the right and privilege to work 8 hours a day and got out from under slavery. The first major strike was won. Previous to that time, representatives of the commissaries or company stores would search homes 3 or 4 days before pay day, in an endeavor to find some article or merchandise that had not been purchased through them. If found, the father and other mine workers in the family were certain to receive their discharge. That was during the period so often referred to as rugged individualism or free enterprise. Do you, fellow colleagues, believe that the boys or girls of today would want to go back to that kind of living?

I remember the strike of 1904, at Pueblo, Colo. No American should ever forget that one. The miners and their families were evicted from company homes—the tents in which they found refuge were burned by troops under the command of Major General Bell. The men were arrested and transported to the plains of Kansas, while their wives and children were left behind without food or shelter. They traveled back through the villages—tired and hungry; and if they got onto the railroad property were arrested for trespassing. That is the era, perhaps, to which some will refer as the "good old days," and to which they are so eager to have us go back.

At the time of the Pueblo strike a young fellow by the name of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., was graduated from Brown University. His father, who owned the Pueblo Coal & Fuel Co., asked him to go out there and make a personal report back to him on existing conditions. When he returned he advised his father not to sell the mines—but to give it away and get the blood off his hands. To that fine son—a real American in every sense of the word—and to the everlasting credit of his esteemed father, he took his advice and in the following years became the world's greatest philanthropist; leaving a great fortune alone to cancer research.

Then along came 1937—just 10 short years ago. Here on the floor of Congress our attention was called to the Memorial Day massacre. At the steel plant in Chicago 19 men laid down their lives and scores were injured by police because they dared to form a picket line. At that time Congress amended the Wagner Labor Act, demanding that American labor be given the rights and protection provided by the Constitution of the United States.

In 1939 legislation came before the Congress, known as the Federal mine inspection bill. All that bill called for was that in the event of an explosion in a mine the Federal investigators would be moved in with a rescue car. After they donned their helmets and gas masks and removed the bodies, they were to make a report on what they had seen with their own eyes and to ascertain what caused the explosion. Heretofore, when explosions occurred they were not allowed to make a report on what they had seen or to make a report on what caused it. The company or mine operator would move in 50 to 100 workmen, repair the fan and the mine and then notify the State inspectors to come on in.

Yet this body of Congressmen, supposedly the greatest law-making body in the world, would not pass this proposed legislation to save and protect human beings. I voted for the bill, and before the ink was dry on the recording of my vote I had two calls from two heads of the largest steel corporations in the district which I represent, asking what kind of a Representative or Congressman I was. They asked, "Do you realize you do not have a miner in your district?" I told them I did not care whether I had a miner in my district or not—I wanted to know why a hundred men were killed, and that I was trying to stop them from killing miners by the hundreds. They apparently were not concerned with the loss of life, they were simply concerned with the cost of repairing the mines. Usually the State inspector made a sugar-coated report, that he could not find anything to cause the explosion, and the widows and children would have no evidence to take the mine owners or operators into court.

In the year 1941, a very moderate form of a mine inspection bill was passed by the Congress. However, had the 1939 proposed bill been enacted, it would have saved many lives and disruptions in the mining industry and throughout the entire country.

Mr. Chairman, we seem to be drifting back into those so-called good old days. It has been my privilege, and I indeed consider it a privilege, to have participated in five strikes in my lifetime—three major ones. I have had no regrets—and am grateful for the opportunity that I had, in some small degree, to make some contribution to labor and the progress that it has been able to make through the last several decades. Their working conditions have been made safer, sanitary, and more endurable. These are privileges that the older members of my family—my fellow workmen and neighbors strove for and dreamed of. The suffering and deprivations of many years were worth the sacrifice.

If I had that part of my life to live over again, I would do the same thing and if the right was taken away from me to join a union, if I preferred to do so—I would be just as happy to have my life taken away. I plead with my colleagues here, do not take the right of joining a union away from any man or woman—nor do not take away the right to a closed shop. If any of you have ever worked in a steel plant, factory, or mine, you can realize the situation, I am sure.

Under the old way, for every couple of hundred men employed, there was at

least one stool pigeon. The La Follette committee proved that pretty well in its report. It was their job to work among the men and make a report every morning. They would lie about the workmen and their families. Thousands of men, during the lean years, lost their jobs because the stool pigeon probably went to sleep and had nothing to report—so in the morning an innocent man was his victim. Is that what you want to go back to? If you do, then you are taking the first step backward. You talk about war; you talk about battles that we have gotten into, including Pearl Harbor. You talk about men who have laid down their lives for their country. Men get down in the well and talk about the soldier and why he is fighting for this and that. Have we representatives from the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars for this bill? Has the committee or Members of the House received telegrams from any of them expressing their approval of this bill? Of course you have not. I do not think you have anything from the American Legion or the Veterans of Foreign Wars or any other veteran organization. It is not right to come down into this well and talk about the soldiers who died on this or that battle front. Why bring them into it? They knew what they laid down their lives for. Eighty percent of our soldiers were the sons of laborers and farmers. Do you want to take their rights away? No; I do not believe you do.

If the Congress is sincere in wanting to pass a good labor bill, now is the time. But you will not accomplish this by asking men questions over the table. You will have to send Congressmen themselves into the mines, factories, steel plants, oil fields, automobile industry, and railroad yards. After they spend 4 or 5 months down in the bowels of the earth and sweatshops, living in miners' cabins and company houses, eating their food, instead of at Fan and Bill's famous steak house, I feel confident that at the end of that time a good, honest, and fair labor bill would be drawn up, and the country would and could be assured of no more strikes.

If the Members of Congress would do this, they would have done something worth while for the Nation and we would not have to worry so much about the peace treaties with other nations. We would have established in this country a true democracy—a real spirit of love for the rest of the world and mankind.

If ever this country needed to work, it is now, in order to retire our debt, reduce taxes, and retain our rightful place in world trade.

The President is doing his best and has asked that wages and prices be stabilized. Industry and utilities should make a determined and honest effort to put on the scales of justice the same weight of willingness and cooperation for industrial peace as does labor. If they do so, then, and only then, will we have a balanced prosperity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to pay particular tribute to the gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable FRED HARTLEY, JR., for the fine work that he has done as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor. He has been tireless in his efforts, and he has been efficient in molding legislation that will make history in this Congress.

I am somewhat puzzled as I sit here and listen to the debate, especially by some members of the minority. But before I mention that particular phase of it I would like to pay personal tribute to each and every member of the Committee on Education and Labor and to tell them that it has been a personal pleasure to work with them.

However, I understand that all of us here in Congress are good Americans, and I cannot understand for the life of me why certain insinuations are made that this Eightieth Congress would do anything that would deal a bad or serious blow to the American people. Whom do we serve as Congressmen? We serve our district, yes; we serve labor, yes; we serve industry, yes; we serve all phases of American life. Not only that, but we are held responsible for our actions here to the Nation, because the deeds we do here are recorded, and they react in only one way, and that must be for the good of all the people. How can anyone say that this Congress is antilabor or that this committee is antilabor? I do not think that this Congress or the Committee on Education and Labor has ever acted in an antilabor fashion. We do not do business that way. This Congress will go down in history, I am confident, as a doing Congress, a Congress that will meet its obligations and come up to the point where action is needed. And they will give action. The Committee on Labor in its hearings heard all sides of the story; labor, big business and little business, and they have weighed the evidence; they have formulated legislation, and now they are proceeding to enact laws that will be for the best interest of all the people.

Yes, labor came before this committee, and industry came before this committee. Some members of industry would say, "You must throw out all the present labor laws, there is no need for such laws. The workingman deserves no consideration for his actions." Then we would have labor leaders come before us and say, "Do not touch any of the existing laws. We need them. We do not want you to bother with them." We even had one labor leader say that it would be better if Congress would convene only once every 10 years. Certainly it is a blessing that Congress is convening this year.

We were elected to Congress to do the job that we are now doing. We were not elected to Congress to do what we are told to do. I do not believe there is any Congressman here, and I mean this, who has come to the Halls of this Congress pledged to do a job for any individual or any group of individuals. Once he comes through the portals of these doors here he must vote to the dictates of his own conscience, and then he must answer for that vote to his constituents, and then it must be the way that it would be good for all the people of this country.

Last week a very prominent judge back in Erie, Pa., told me this story. He said, "Congressmen remind me of the little lad who was sent to the grocery store and then forgot what he was sent for." He said, "I am glad to see that you do not conform to that type." I wrote back and said, "That goes for the Eightieth Congress, not an individual. This Congress knows what it has been sent down here to do and we expect to do it."

Yes; this Eightieth Congress realizes many things. It realizes the perils of labor and it realizes the perils of industry. I say that this Eightieth Congress feels sincerely and knows keenly that the greatest souls in America work under those dirty shirts that dig the coal in the mines, under those greasy shirts that labor in the mills. Those souls have the heart of America at stake. We are not trying to legislate any legislation here that would hurt anyone. No; this Congress is going to pass legislation here that is fair to everybody.

This bill acts in the best interests of the people of these United States. When I say that the men of America, the workingmen of America, want a functionable bill, I mean just what I say. You know what they want most? It is pay days. They want the pay day to come around regularly, and they want more take-home pay.

Another thing they would like to have is the privilege of doing in the years to come what they have not in the past and that is to know the boss again. They have not known the boss for 10 years. The boss would like to go out in the plant and know his men again. He would like to be able to go through the plant and say, "Hello, Tom, good morning, Sam." They should work together in this great country of ours, not be fighting one another all the time but rather working together.

Yes; this bill, H. R. 3020, reaches out to the men in America who want freedom. They want to be recognized as individuals again. They do not want to be part of a chain that is driving them all the time to concepts they do not agree to. Let us reestablish the American rights of the workingman so that he can go ahead and proceed as he would like to in his life. Yes, he wants a constitution to work under. He wants to work under the greatest Constitution of all times, but not a constitution for industry, not one written for the purpose of industrial procedures and gains, nor one written only by labor, that is going to hold him down to adhering to the things that labor demands. He wants to be a man in his own right, under his own name. He does not want to be known as a number in America, he wants to be a citizen and work under the greatest Constitution that any nation in this entire world has ever known, and that is the Constitution of these United States of America. H. R. 3020 gives that right to the workingmen of these United States.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Congress, as a new Member I have listened with a great deal of interest to these debates, and, as all of you know, none of us have had the time to properly study this 68-page bill. There are four or five volumes of hearings which record the testimony of the witnesses. There is not a man here outside the committee members themselves who has had an opportunity to read that testimony and analyze it. Nor have we had an opportunity to analyze the majority report to compare it with the views of the minority.

I do not know how anyone can vote intelligently on this bill. Of course, we can give vent to our prejudices and our emotions, but to really decide this important issue in the light of reason, I do not think we have sufficient time to give it full and proper consideration.

One or two remarks have been made before this House by a member of the committee on the majority side which I think reveal the crux of the whole situation.

He stated that the teeth in this bill is the closed shop, and, secondly, the provision for industry-wide bargaining. He complained that labor has too much power. Therefore we must take away from labor that power.

As I understand the preamble of this bill, its purpose is to promote industrial peace. I say to you, pay attention to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] who has spoken from experience and who knows what it is to work in the mines and steel mills and who speaks as a man who knows something about labor. I wonder how many of you men here really know anything about the problems and conditions under which working people work and live. You see, when he spoke of Colorado he was speaking of the Ludlow massacre. We in Colorado know about that. We know about company unions, and we know the things that people do when company unions exist. We know the fight that men and women of labor have made and the fight that has been going on to raise their living standards and their fight for those things in life that give them human dignity.

Gentlemen, when you preach that this is a bill of rights you do not really mean that. You cannot mean it if you know anything about labor problems. As a matter of fact, let me tell you what this bill does. This bill will not promote industrial peace. It is a declaration of war, and do not forget it. If this bill become law you will have more industrial strife than you have ever had in the history of this Nation.

I read in the RECORD the other day where William Green of the American Federation of Labor testified that there is bitterness in the hearts of working men and women as a result of the intemperate attitude of Members of this body concerning workers' problems. When you pass this sort of legislation, you are going to run into trouble.

I think it well to remind you that in this legislation you are dealing with the faith, the hopes, the aspirations, and the welfare of human beings. The labor of a human being is not a commodity or an article of commerce. Reason, logic, and human dignity demand that the labor of human beings cannot be placed in the same category as a lifeless, cold piece of merchandise or a machine. In your bill you not only, in a measure, restrict the full enjoyment of the political democracy of millions upon millions of people in this Nation, but you completely destroy and deny to them every hope of economic democracy which they have just begun to share as a result of the progressive and forward-looking legislation fathered and sponsored by that great humanitarian, the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Moreover, by your legislation you are setting up and establishing rules for industrial warfare. These rules are weighted heavily against the working men and women of this Nation. This legislation will divide the workers from each other and divide the unions which unite them. As a result of this division and this legislative denial for workers to exert their full economic strength there can be no just and equitable collective bargaining. It follows then that the real purpose of this legislation is to divide the forces of labor, separating them unit by unit in order that they may be eventually conquered. You follow the age-old principle of divide and conquer.

This division is accomplished in many ways. One of the ways is to grind the bargaining representatives into small, completely segregated and isolated units.

The essence of this method is found in section 9 (f) (1) appearing at page 30 of the bill. By and large under this section a representative may bargain only on behalf of the employees of a single employer. He may not bargain with a group of employers on behalf of the employees of the members of the employer group; he may not represent employees on an industry-wide or market-wide scale or on a regional or local scale. He may appear only on behalf of the employees of a single employer. There is but one very unimportant exception to this which allows common representation where the employees represented are not more than 100 in number and where the plants of the employers involved are less than 50 miles apart. Employers may, of course, continue to band together. And the committee majority, tongue in cheek, would tell you that equality of bargaining power is promoted by this bill. How can they say that when local No. 43 of some union, denied the advice, support, and resources of its international union, will be faced at the bargaining table by an association representing most of the employers in an industry, with vast reserves of economic power. The kind of bargaining envisioned by this provision shocks the Anglo-American sense of fair play. It sets David against Goliath and denies David the stones and slingshot which are his only means of defense.

There are a few reasons which have been advanced from time to time for the elimination of industry-wide bargaining, but whatever may be said for them independently, they cannot be made to support the drastic action proposed here. Not only does this provision prohibit industry-wide bargaining; it outlaws all common representation. It prohibits any sort of coordination, liaison, or assistance between local and local or between local and regional or local and national office. Coordination between even the smallest of locals is deemed monopolistic by this Act. If, indeed, the purpose of the provision is to avoid strikes, its method is to destroy collective action. This is its theme—no unions, no strikes.

There is the bona fide belief among some that the local is less anxious to strike than the international organization and that strikes may be prevented if the bargaining is localized. But experience shows that this is not the case. Market-wide and regional bargaining has made for stability of labor relations. Our conciliators have often found that after the locals have failed in their negotiations, representatives of the international unions have then been called to assist with great success. The reason for this is perhaps because many of the locals are untrained or some of them may be dominated by radical elements, anxious to make trouble. Actually we are past the day when collective bargaining will yield to the tactics of a David Harum horse trade; it requires the technical assistance which can be supplied by only the large organizations.

It is a fact that market-wide collective bargaining has proven successful in many industries and represents the natural trend in bargaining development. Both employers and employees have benefited from this development and have already testified to this effect. Such widely varied groups as the pottery and glassware industries, the needlework trade, shipbuilding, and the maritime industries, men's clothing and full-fashioned hosiery have agreed on the record that industry-wide bargaining is an effective means of securing stability and peace in industrial relations.

Experience has also shown the many other decided advantages to the practice which is now sought to be outlawed. Management has by this means been provided with predictables in labor costs. Labor is secured from reckless and arbitrary wage slashes made without regard to its effect on the industry and on the Nation. Fair standards in wages, hours, and working conditions have been promoted and maintained for the benefit not only of the wage earners but also of the employers. Stabilization of wage rates has discouraged unfair competition in wage policies and has strengthened the economy.

It must be recognized, by those who care to look, that the trend toward market-wide bargaining is a wholesome, normal development in the evolution of labor relations. The short-pants era of table banging and horse trading is largely historical. The developing era is one of intelligent appraisal of the economic problems by both sides, requiring the wider use of technical assistants, economists, engineers, lawyers, and sociologists. A broader area for collective bargaining is for that reason required. Only on that level can the experts be employed, and only on that level can they obtain the required bird's-eye view of the total

situation with its long-term implications. Turning back to the tense days at the end of the last century cannot obliterate this trend. It can result only in worse tensions which threaten to obliterate our society.

The growth of the giant corporations with their concentrations of control and ownership, interlocked through banking connections, compelled the labor market to develop strong labor unions to restore, at least partially, the equilibrium necessary to the well-being of this country. This was the purpose of the Wagner Act. To destroy that act, to destroy these unions, to restore the old rules protecting the businessman from the risks of the game, and to assure him of all of the scores is what this new Labor Relations Act proposes. It seeks to regain the lost businessman's paradise of the early part of this century. Have we forgotten that that paradise, like all things established on a basic inconsistency, was bound to crash and did crash in 1929 and 1932. Are we still fooled by the traditional doctrine that the worker must be disorganized if business is to be safe? The majority of the committee sponsoring this bill honestly believe that this doctrine is sound. It is for that reason they have declared war. If they prevail we shall all lose and it may be too late in the game to recover our losses.

If you are looking to the 1948 campaign, if you think you have a mandate from the people to do this thing, I say to you, you are mistaken. I am one of the few Democrats who was able to oust a Republican encumbent who had sat here for two terms. I spoke to the people of my locality as I speak to you today. There was no mandate to destroy the gains that labor had made through the past 10 or 12 years. I think you are making not only a serious mistake politically—perhaps that is unimportant—but I say to you, you are breaking the back of labor. You are taking away from the working men and women of this Nation the gains they have made for 50 or 60 years.

I urge upon the Members of this House to view this bill in the light of reason, to put aside all prejudice and to give it that mature deliberation which its importance demands. I sincerely trust that an amendment will be offered striking from this bill the vicious provisions which prohibit industry-wide bargaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] has expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I am not unmindful of the work of the committee which reported H. R. 3020 and the exhaustive study they have made of problems which affect labor-management relations. I recognize there should be some legislation correcting certain ills which exist in our present labor laws. Jurisdictional strikes, many secondary boycotts, certain racketeering carried on under the guise of union activity, should be regulated and corrected and the general public, whose interest all recognize as paramount, should be fully protected.

I am more than willing to support a labor bill which makes certain corrections in our labor-management set-up and which protects the general public. One of my chief objections to the proposed legislation is its provision to outlaw or eliminate industry-wide bargaining. What little time I have, I shall devote to that subject.

During this debate I have heard the various ills of labor-management recited—such as secondary boycotts, jurisdictional strikes, racketeering in various forms—but none of these ills which have been recited flow from industry-wide bargaining itself. Therefore, in seeking to prevent and eliminate such ills and to protect the general public from the same, the solution is not the outlawing of industry-wide bargaining.

In the debate on this bill, I have heard it stated that the people of the country, by their vote last November, expect some action to be taken by this House to correct inequities in the industrial field. I take no exception to that statement. I believe the people of the country do expect and have a right to expect certain corrective labor legislation, but I do not believe the people of this country expect this House to outlaw industry-wide bargaining. To my knowledge, no candidate announced as a part of his corrective program the outlawing of industry-wide bargaining.

In my judgment, the law should not contain any provision favorable or unfavorable to industry-wide bargaining; this is a matter of negotiation between the particular industry and the labor employed in that industry. I believe I am well within the facts when I state that to eliminate industry-wide bargaining would largely throw the coal industry into chaos. Anyone who is familiar with the history of the coal industry knows that at one time negotiations were based at the union level, later at the district level, and finally we had industry-wide bargaining and industry-wide bargaining has brought stability to that industry. It has not resulted in monopolistic practices.

Our free-enterprise system in this country cannot thrive in a rigid system of control. The nature of certain businesses require elasticity. If we put rigidity into our labor laws, it will result in dislocations. We have heard during this debate that of course there would be dislocations—that is to be expected but it is necessary for the common good. We have some 600,000 coal miners in the United States, representing probably some six or seven thousand operations. The coal industry is important to our national welfare, it should not be laid on the altar and sacrificed by reason of some contingent happening or occurrence. What will be the result in the coal fields in this Nation if we eliminate industry-wide bargaining? We might as well face the facts at this time and accept the responsibility. With the elimination of industry-wide bargaining and under the provision of this proposed legislation, each union would have to bargain directly with the coal operator in a particular mine. The coal business is highly competitive. John Jones, who operates a mine, is not going to enter a contract with the union and agree to pay them a certain amount as a mule skinner or for loading a ton of coal, until he knows what his competitor, who has an operation in the same county or an adjoining county, is going to pay. Consequently, there will be no contracts closed. The coal will not flow from the mines. What then is the remedy?

There are certain other industries in which industry-wide bargaining lends itself to our free enterprise system. I sincerely urge the Members of this House to make an intelligent study of this provision, think it through and see what the inevitable result would be in many of our industries. Factories in one section of the country will negotiate wage scales which will eliminate competition in other sections of the country. In writing our labor legislation, let us write it in a manner which will strengthen our free enterprise system.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHADWICK].

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Chairman, for the short period of only 3 months I have had the honor of sharing the responsibilities of this body, but up to this time I have refrained from addressing the House. This was largely because the matters theretofore before us were ones upon which I felt that I had no special personal knowledge, beyond that more fully available to many of my colleagues.

Today it is different; we have before us legislation of great import on a subject about which I believe I do know something. All of my life I have practiced law, and in an industrial community; and I have observed at closest range the changing picture of labor-management relations, bringing us where we are now. I am glad therefore to have some voice in advancing this much needed legislation; and I am grateful to the chairman of the Labor Committee for leave to use a little of his time to discuss one special aspect of this bill.

But, first may I say, without any suggestion of mere conventional courtesy, that the draftsmanship of this bill is of itself a matter for congratulation to that committee. When we consider the broad field of their investigation, the complications which have log-jammed over the years, and the unavoidable novelty of some of the remedies recommended, and then realize, as we must, that these have been effectively and logically marshaled into a single piece of legislation, with a complete continuity of thought, with a notable absence of circumlocutions, and the legalistic style which mars so much legislative draftsmanship; and finally with a general clarity of statement which scarcely ever falters. I feel this is really a magnum opus of legislation, which is a credit to its draftsmen, our colleagues of the committee.

I have praised the form of the bill; I could praise most of the substance. This is, I think, a job we were sent here to

do; and a job generally well done. I am not in entire agreement with the committee; there are several particulars in which the bill differs greatly from my own individual ideas. I have already told my colleagues of the Pennsylvania delegation of one of these issues, and why I feel as I do. I shall not pursue the matter further now, because I want to devote these few minutes to another aspect, to me the most hopeful and significant of the whole bill.

This is the proposal to do away entirely, and I hope forever, with that extraordinary body, the National Labor Relations Board. If the bill did only that, it would be a grand piece of legislation. Doing that, it might vary far more from my other ideas than it does, and it would still recommend itself to me.

I observed the original complexion of that Board and have watched it function. If I am mistaken in my belief that it is the most un-American tribunal ever foisted by law on the people of this country, the mistake does not grow out of any misappraisal of the Board, but must rather reflect my ignorance of some past malign era of our history which has escaped my reading. At any rate, I am glad I did not have to live and practice law under any judicial or quasi-judicial administration of public affairs which might have been worse than this.

I know there has been a change, first in the personnel and more recently in the philosophy of decision, of this ill-omened body. But so far as I am concerned, nothing can wipe out the blot of the early and vitally important first years. Probably none of us are impressed with either the significance or the sincerity of deathbed repentances of this sort. A tribunal which suddenly begins to talk plain commonsense only after the people have finally roared their wrath does not deserve our sympathy, consideration, or respect.

But we came here to bury Caesar, not to praise or even unduly blame him. This Board was no doubt itself a victim of the circumstances of its conception. I suppose the Council of Ten in Venice were well-intending gentlemen, too, trying to accomplish what they conceived to be a wise purpose; but that did not help the unfortunates whose names were dropped into the lion's mouth, and who found themselves marching over the Bridge of Sighs, after a farce of a trial and a preordained conviction. That is what has happened to American employers, caught in the toils of this body—this extraordinary body and their extraordinary coterie of so-called special examiners. Thank God their day is apparently about done.

And there is a lesson in all this, Mr. Chairman, not merely for these men who betrayed and distorted truth itself in their excited preoccupation with ideological, if not political, objectives; and not merely for the political philosophies which bred and nurtured this monstrosity, but for us of the majority as well. And this truth is that in our democracy there is and must be a line beyond which neither partisanship or the enthusiasms of the doctrinaire can be permitted to go without endangering not merely the schemers' own plans but the essential integrity of government. And this line should and must not merely protect our courts, but our quasi-judicial and policy-making bodies as well. If they cannot be first of all completely American in their fairness and impartiality, they should not exist at all. And in that spirit we should all welcome the new Labor-Management Relations Board. The pitfalls of their problem are written plainly in the records of their predecessor. But to avoid them all they have only to be fair.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to H. R. 3020 because it is a bill that enslaves labor. The 35,000 members of organized labor in my congressional district want no part of the so-called new Republican bill of rights for labor. In my opinion this bill puts labor back to the days of the secret meetings held by the old Knights of Labor of 1879. Since that time labor has had a hard and difficult climb. Many of us from industrial regions remember the bloody struggle for shorter hours and a liveable wage. We also remember the cruelty exercised by the large corporations in the way of bloodshed by so-called yellow-dog company police. We remember the company unions, court injunctions, yellow-dog contracts, evictions from homes, bread lines, and soup kitchens.

In this bill, we feel that it is the beginning of the march back to the "good old Republican days." Yes, gentlemen of the majority side, you may pass this bill and return the organized worker to industrial slavery, but he will rise again and demand his freedom by using the ballot box in 1948.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, shortly after I arrived in Washington as a freshman Congressman and witnessed the dozens of antilabor bills dropped in the hopper, I began to suspect that there were plans afoot to destroy the American labor movement. Later I read the vicious antilabor propaganda which was circulated by irresponsible sections of the press and noted the lynch-labor attitude of some of my colleagues. Now, after reading this bill, H. R. 3020, I know that my fears were far from groundless.

The Hartley bill is not aimed to correct abuses in the field of labor relations but is designed to cripple and destroy the organizations of the working men and women of America. I am shocked that such an irresponsible, unjust, and unfair proposal should be reported out by supposedly responsible Members of Congress.

It is impossible to discuss this bill on its merits, because it has no merits. It is a patchwork pieced together from all the antilabor recommendations made by the National Association of Manufacturers and the various other powerful trade associations who look upon labor unions as threats to their enormous profits. The result indicates complete irresponsibility, a lack of understanding of the nature of collective bargaining and labor relations, and a callous disregard for the rights of wage earners and the living standards of the American people.

I have said, and I repeat, that this bill contains every antilabor proposal which has been made by the National Association of Manufacturers. This fact will become obvious to every Member of this body who troubles to compare the recent NAM recommendations with the contents of this bill.

Early in this session I received a leather-bound booklet from the National Association of Manufacturers with my name lettered in gold on the cover. I believe that my colleagues were similarly favored. This booklet, entitled "Now Let's Build America," contained the legislative recommendations of the Fifty-first Annual Congress of American Industry held last December under NAM sponsorship. It may, therefore, be looked upon as a statement of the official position of the NAM regarding labor legislation and other matters.

I should like at this time to point out the close parallel between the NAM proposals and the provisions of the legislation now under consideration by this body.

The very first recommendation of the NAM was the amendment of the National Labor Relations Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act. These were the NAM's suggestions:

First. Limitation of collective bargaining to the subjects of wages, hours, and working conditions;

Second. Outlawing of jurisdictional strikes, sympathy strikes, strikes against the Government, and strikes to force recognition of an uncertified union;

Third. Outlawing of any strike until a secret ballot has been taken on the latest offer of the employer;

Fourth. Requirement of approval of a strike by a secret ballot and a majority of all employees in the plant or bargaining unit; and

Fifth. Banning of mass picketing.

The Hartley bill covers all of these items in the NAM recommendation. It limits the subject matter for collective bargaining and hence for strikes to a narrow field, and excludes such subjects as welfare funds, vacation funds, union hiring halls, union security provisions, apprenticeship qualifications, assignment of work, and many other matters which have in the past been dealt with through collective bargaining and which are of vital interest to the worker. Jurisdictional strikes, sympathy strikes, and secondary boycotts, are declared illegal by the bill. The NAM conditions whereby a strike may take place are written into the bill when it provides that before a strike can take place it must be authorized by a majority of all men in the plan—not a majority of the union—by a secret ballot wherein they decide between the employer's last offer and the strike. Picketing becomes a meaningless gesture under restrictions written into the Hartley bill. The effect of these provisions alone is virtual destruction of the Wagner Act.

Another NAM proposal is to outlaw industry-wide bargaining. Here, again, the Hartley bill parallels the NAM

recommendation. It not only limits collective bargaining to employees of a single employer, but it contains provisions which would permit the breakup of a union in one plant into separate bargaining units. Thus national unions would be broken up into hundreds of local groups, and formulation of uniform wage policies through the Nation would be rendered impossible.

The objectives of this proposal are clear: by breaking labor unions up into tiny segments it will be possible for the industrial giants to launch an offensive and destroy the organizations of the workers piece by piece. End result will be sweatshop conditions in many plants which will result in unfair competition between progressive employers and their sweatshop competitors.

Such a proposal shows a lack of understanding of the national character of American industry, which makes localization of collective bargaining impossible. It represents an attempt to completely destroy labor unions and is unfair to most employers. It will result in labor unrest and industrial strife.

A third major NAM recommendation reads as follows:

> The monopolistic * * * control over the available supply of labor must be eliminated by outlawing the closed shop and every other form of compulsory union membership.

Once again we find that the Hartley bill follows the NAM recommendation. It contains provisions to outlaw the closed-shop contracts which today cover millions of workers. In addition, it virtually destroys all other forms of union-shop and union-security contracts. Such provisions completely ignore the fact that union-security contracts have a recognized function in modern industrial relations and that such contracts are based upon the principle of majority rule and equal sharing of responsibilities for benefits received.

Union-security contracts make for industrial peace, greater efficiency in production, and fulfillment of contract responsibilities. As Mr. William Green recently stated:

> No union can be expected to fulfill a contract if only part of the employees in a plant are members of the union and subject to its discipline. * * * Those who are in the benefits of the union should share in its responsibility.

To abolish or discourage union-security contracts is to pave the way to greater industrial strife, cause conflict between union and nonunion men, and permit unscrupulous employers to use stool pigeons, spies, and antiunionists to destroy labor unions.

The bill denies to nearly 5,000,000 supervisory employees the benefits of collective bargaining—another NAM suggestion. In fact, the hundred and one antilabor provisions of this bill simply represent a codification of the NAM antilabor, pro-big-business program. Its purpose is to render the American workingman helpless in order that he may be exploited and plundered by the selfish interests who are today making the largest profits in American history. Not content with corporate profits after taxes of $12,000,000,000 in 1946, the enemies of labor want to take from the worker his only defense—his union—and thus destroy his standard of living between the inflated cost of living and a depression of wage levels.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record here as wholly and completely opposed to this bill. In my opinion, it is totally lacking in merit. It contains nothing constructive. Its only objective is to cripple, to harass, to punish, and to destroy labor unions. Its result would be to curtail production, create industrial strife, and lower the living standards of the American people.

It is intended to repeal the National Labor Relations Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and to eliminate those provisions of the Clayton Act which were meant to restrict its application to labor unions. It invokes injunctions as a strike-breaking technique. It subjects labor to the ancient common-law doctrine of conspiracy—thus turning the clock backward for centuries. Only those who seek to destroy labor unions can honestly support this proposed legislation. Only the NAM can rejoice if this bill becomes law.

This bill cannot give America the industrial peace which we all desire. The road to industrial peace is to be found in a Government policy which will eliminate the causes of industrial conflict. The root cause of labor unrest and industrial strife is found in the high cost of living, the decrease in labor's real wages, the lack of economic security. Only a domestic program based on a high-wage policy, the lowering of the cost of living, the expansion of social-security coverage, and full production and full employment with rising living standards can give America industrial peace.

As I studied the Hartley bill, I could not help but remember the words of Abraham Lincoln:

> All that serves labor, serves the Nation. All that harms labor is treason to America. No line can be drawn between the two. If any man tells you he loves America, yet hate labor, he is a liar. If any man tells you he trusts America, yet fears labor, he is a fool. There is no America without labor, and to fleece the one is to rob the other.

Surely it is high time for the Congress to discard its lynch-labor attitude, and with mature judgment, and in the spirit of Lincoln, reject this irresponsible proposal aimed at the destruction of the entire American labor movement.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, a vote for the bill, H. R. 3020, now under consideration will not bring peace in the labor-management field. It will, however, bring enslavement to the working men and women of America. For that reason I am opposed to the bill and will vote against it.

All of us are agreed, I am sure, that existing labor laws could and should be amended to remedy certain evils that experience shows have developed.

Unfortunately, however, our Republican friends are not satisfied with removing these evils. Yielding to the pressure of the National Association of Manufacturers, they are going all out to restore the employer to the type of throne he occupied in the dark days of the yellow-dog contracts, the days of injunctions without hearing, the days when the American workingman was a pawn of his employer.

It is the same old story repeating itself. Under the pretense that this legislation is in the interest of the employee, and of the public, the proponents of the bill are using it as a vehicle to forge shackles for the worker.

The enactment would not only break down Nation-wide unions but it would break up plant-wide unions into individual units within the plant. It would render these labor units impotent and thus subject the individual worker to the whims of the employer. It would compel him to accept unfair working conditions and wages or to get out. He could not, as an individual, force the correction of the bad conditions under which he may be forced to work.

H. R. 3020 is a vicious bill and should be defeated.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. It is a voluminous document consisting of 68 pages and as it has taken me several hours to go through it during the limited time at my disposal it would be impossible to go over the provisions of the bill as I should like to. My reaction to the bill is that it is a great waste of effort. A bill accomplishing the same objectives could have been written on one page with these words, A bill to kill labor.

Oh, yes; I have seen the so-called bill of rights which is supposed to be given to labor. Labor's rights under this bill are so insignificant I wonder why the committee even bothered to mention the subject. As I say, the time at my disposal is so limited I cannot go over the bill as I should like to but I would like to point out one of the most singular paragraphs of the majority report which appears on page 4 and reads:

> In 1945 approximately 38,000,000 man-days of labor were lost as a result of strikes. And this total was trebled in 1946, when there were 116,000,000 man-days lost and the number of strikes hit a new high of 4,985. The resulting loss in national wealth is staggering.

The report does not remind Members of Congress that more than three-quarters of all those lost man-days were due to the refusal of employers to grant, without a strike, wage increase of 18½ cents recommended either by Government fact-finding boards or the President himself, and finally granted by employers after the strikes. Yet these are the facts.

Some Members may say, "Yes; but to grant these wage increases price increases were needed." In the steel industry a $5 per ton increase was granted the industry after the wage settlement and it was estimated that this was nearly twice as large per ton as the wage increase. In the fall of 1946 the OPA reexamined these price increases and found that the steel industry, by curtailing the production of low-end price items, had

actually averaged a $9 per ton increase or more than four times the amount of the wage increase. The profits of the steel industry show this very clearly. For example, United States Steel which secured profits of $25,900,000 in the last 6 months of 1945, secured $64,600,000 in the last 6 months of 1946. Other leading steel companies showed even larger increases.

Profits during the year 1946 were approximately $12,000,000,000 after taxes compared to $3,900,000,000 average for 1936–39. These profits reached a rate of $15,000,000,000 annually in the last quarter of 1946 and for the first quarter of 1947 at the rate of $17,000,000,000, or nearly four and one-half times the 1936–39 average. Remember that these profits were made on top of an 18½-cent wage increase in many industries, and that this wage increase even at the time it was granted did not restore take-home pay to 1945 levels.

I mention these things because they are so completely omitted from the majority report or the considerations of the proponents of this legislation. I think the record shows that these gentlemen who profess such a lively interest in the public welfare are completely neglectful of the average man and woman in the United States today. The majority report is full of self-serving statements about the interest of its authors in protecting the rights of individual workers, "in their relations with labor organizations." I believe it is amply demonstrated that the authors of this legislation are far more concerned about protecting the most profitable corporations in America against the demands and needs of individual workers, organized or unorganized.

As for me, I am outraged by the objectives of the authors of this bill. And I am alarmed as to the economic effects which it is bound to have, not only in the long run where its effects cannot fail to be disastrous, but in the near future.

Like many of my colleagues, I am a frequent reader of the United States News. In this week's issue that weekly says:

> It is getting near to the time when the country will have to learn the economic facts of life, when it will discover that every boom has its end.

The article goes on to say that we can expect declining prices, declining profits, and that unemployment will shoot up. This same forecast may be found in almost any leading business or financial journal. Many of these journals are cautioning employers for their own good to make moderate wage increases and/or at least a token price reduction. Apparently, these journals fear the rise of public indignation over these unprecedented profits, as well they might.

Like many of the rest of you, I hear from my constituents with considerable regularity. More and more of them are writing to tell me what inflation is doing to them. And more and more of them blame this inflation upon the premature destruction of price control. Some of them admit to me that they were for the removal of price controls and voted their convictions at the last election, but now regret doing so and have learned a lesson. They tell me about the cost of food, and what high prices are doing to their budgets and their savings. When I go home and talk to my constituents who are wage earners, I find that many of them are cashing their bonds—not in order to supply themselves with consumer durable goods, like refrigerators and washing machines, but to pay the doctor and the dentist and even some of them to buy groceries. Yet the United States News tells us that there are still a few weeks or a few months before the end of the boom. Government figures show that the cost of living since June of last year has increased by 20 percent as of March 1947. This is about two-fifths of the total increase since 1939, in the space of about 9 months. The price of the food budget has increased much more rapidly in these 9 months. A dollar spent in March of this year would not buy more food, if as much, as the housewife could buy last June for 72 cents.

It now takes $72.52 a week to support a family of four at minimum standards of health and decency—which is below what we like to call the American standard of living—according to the Heller budget. Government statistics show—United States Bureau of Labor Statistics—that the average weekly wage of production workers in industry early this year was only $45.83 per week. Let me underscore the word average, because I want to remind you that half of these workers and their families were living somehow on less than this average.

I recite what may seem to some of you these dry statistical facts because I want you to realize that these are the conditions upon which it is proposed to superimpose this legislation.

I say to you, that if the American people experience a depression like that of 1929, they will know where to look when they place the responsibility. Granted that this legislation is being undertaken at the demand of a small group of greedy men who are not satisfied with their outrageous profits and are willing to smash the labor movement in order to increase both their profits and their control over industry. Nevertheless, it is we who are today called upon to say whether this grab is successful and whether by our votes we shall make it so. If we make a mistake on this issue, the American people will hold us responsible.

This is an enormous responsibility because it means that whereas in 1929 it was possible for Congress to say that it did not know and could not foresee the effect of its economic policies during the 1920's, we have no such excuse. It should be as clear as daylight to us, and it will be to the American people, that we have greased the skids on the slide carrying the American economy into another depression. We gave the car a dangerous push last summer and were deceived by the fact that the car still seemed to be going up.

Today Congress must decide whether we are going to attempt a major repair job on the roller coaster of the business cycle or whether we are going to give the car a push down the last and steepest incline we have helped to build.

The authors of this bill are clearly not interested in pushing the American economy steadily uphill to higher living standards. They are bent upon establishing monopoly control over the roller coaster and taking the American people for a dangerous ride.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill will mark the last rights of labor. For example, it provides for a cooling-off period, which I think is 30 days. If anybody needs a cooling-off period, to my mind the proponents of this bill need the cooling-off period. Its authors acted in heat and much turbulence. Somebody in the cloak room said that the bill, as far as labor is concerned, is not tough; it is just "Molo-tough." I believe it was written with a jaundiced eye against labor and by a pen dipped in the ink of hatred of labor. It destroys the closed shop, so if the bill is passed the entire Nation will be checkerboarded with closed shops, union shops, nonunion shops and company shops, with concomitant inequities of wages, hours, and conditions of employment. It would prevent industry-wide bargaining for employees. It would not prevent industry-wide bargaining for management. It would thus fragmentize labor into small units and enable management to divide and conquer. It is rather anomalous that the bill exempts from its scope industries covered by the Railroad Labor Act; that is, it exempts and permits industry-wide bargaining in case of the railroads, air lines, interstate trucks and busses. Well, if industry-wide bargaining is good for those industries, why is it not good for coal and steel and rubber and other industries? It would reinstate the obnoxious labor injunction and revive the so-called yellow dog contracts. I am old enough to remember, and many of you here are old enough to remember the tragedy of the Danbury Hatters case, involving the so-called ex parte injunction. We would bring back the days of the Danbury Hatters. In those days the judges, without hearing, issued injunctions based upon affidavits of stooges and stool pigeons and agents provocateur. The abuses in the granting of these injunctions so aroused the Nation that we in 1932 passed the Norris-LaGuardia Act which outlawed the granting of ex parte injunctions against labor. This bill would reinstate those ex parte injunctions against labor and would turn the clock back and return us to the robber baron days and the days of the industrial buccaneers.

It will enable management to make its profits primarily out of back-breaking hours and reduced wages.

It treats the human rights of laboring men and women as if they were inanimate objects.

It makes labor subject to antitrust laws with criminal penalties and treble damages.

It so hedges strikes as to destroy the right to strike and the right of threat to strike, which have helped raise wages so that today our citizenry has the highest purchasing power in the world.

It does not go to the root of the evil nor attempt to remove the cause of that evil which arises out of the high cost of living and through economic maladjustment. These create industrial strife. Strikes are the result and not the cause of industrial unrest.

It revives company unions where management can sit on both sides of the table.

It usurps the police powers of the States and tends to increase Federal bureaucracy.

The proponents of the bill have the mistaken notion that a bill of this drastic character can prevent strikes. No law can prevent a strike. Witness the fact that we have coal strikes despite prohibition against strikes in the Smith-Connally Act. The transport workers went on strike in England though such strike was in violation of an English statute.

It discourages collective bargaining and encourages individual bargaining.

In union there is strength. Labor will now lack that strength because collective security is gone. In division there is weakness. Labor will now be rendered divided, weak, and ineffective.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN].

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, this bill eliminates industry-wide bargaining. It does so to break up a labor monopoly. I hope that either by an amendment to this bill, by new law, or by the enforcement of existing law we break up all monopolies, be they monopolies of labor or management.

In my opinion there is very little difference between a cartel controlling the manufacture of a product and the labor union controlling the supply of workers who manufacture this product. Monopolistic power of either type is contrary to the best interests of our country.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON].

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, I think the Members of the House have noted with considerable interest the name-calling attacks which have been made on this bill. As I have sat here in the 2 days of debate I have been jotting down some of the things that have been said. I should like to summarize them at this time, so that we can find out what the real issues of this debate are.

It has been termed the "scab labor bill," the "kill union bill," the "death warrant for labor," "a vicious monstrosity," "the bill which will bring back the sweatshop and the yellow-dog contract," a bill which, on the one hand, is a "long step forward on the road to fascism" and on the other hand, "a bill which would drive the union-labor movement into communism." It is "a bill which was rushed through without sufficient time." It is "a bill which was written in smoke-filled rooms by corporation lawyers and not by the Members of Congress who should have written the legislation."

It was even suggested that some of the newer Members of the House might not remember the great contribution that was made by labor during the war years. On that particular point I should like to make this remark: I think the newer Members of this House on both sides of the aisle know the great contribution that was made by labor during the war years, the contribution made by the 14,000,000 workers who are members of unions, the contribution of 35,000,000 workers who are unorganized and not members of unions, the contribution made by the millions of farmers, the professional people, and the businessmen, and the contribution as well of the 15,000,000 men and women who served in the armed forces, men and women who had been members of unions and not members of unions; who had come from positions in management and from the ranks of labor. It was a great contribution that was made by all the people of America, and we recognize that.

That is typical of the kind of attack that has been made on this bill today. I think it is fundamental as we close this debate that we get down to the issues that are really involved. Let us remember that the issue in this debate and the issue that we are going to decide when we vote on this bill is not an issue of management against labor; it is not an issue of the public against labor; it is not an issue of the Republican Party against labor, as has been suggested, and I would go so far as to say that the issue is not that of the Republicans against the Democrats, because on both sides of this aisle we are going to have, I believe, substantial support for the provisions of this measure.

The issue on this particular legislation, I submit to you, is that this Congress must recognize that it is time to enact a labor bill which is not class legislation, but which is in the best interests of all the people of America.

So, what have we done? We have submitted for your approval a bill which recognizes the rights of the public and the consumer, the rights and responsibilities of employers, the rights of union leaders, and the responsibility of union leaders both to the public and to the workers they represent. What is most important is that this bill recognizes and protects the fundamental rights of the 60,000,000 people in America who work for a living and in whose interest every piece of legislation which passes this House must be written.

Why was this bill introduced? The suggestion has been made that it was introduced because a few greedy monopolists in the National Association of Manufacturers and chambers of commerce decided that they wanted more money and, therefore, ordered a bill which would allow them to wring the last dollar out of the laboring men of this country.

But what are the facts? When this Congress convened in January of this year it looked back on a record of labor-management strife about which the people of this country had declared something must be done. We know that in the year after VJ-day we had lost $6,000,000,000 in the standard of living in America, due to industrial strife. We had seen unprecedented force and violence in labor disputes throughout the country. We had seen ab[illegible] by labor leaders, abuses which many good labor leaders decried and about which they said something should be done. We had seen, as well, in the labor-management field how a few persons, irresponsible leaders of labor, could paralyze the entire country by ordering a strike by the stroke of a pen. That was the situation with which we were confronted when this session opened. That is why the Labor Committee has had these extensive hearings. That is why the committee has brought before you a bill which is all-inclusive, which goes to the root of the evils which have arisen and which recognizes and protects the interests of all the people in America.

Now, the suggestion has been made that some of those who oppose this bill are in favor of some legislation. They realize that there are some evils to be corrected but they do not like the way we have attempted to correct them. They think we have covered too many subjects in this bill. I imagine that those Members who have stated this position are in accord with the statements made by the President in his address to the Congress on January 3. He recommended that certain steps should be taken.

I think we should analyze those recommendations.

First of all, he recommended that machinery should be set up providing for peaceful settlement of jurisdictional disputes, secondary boycotts arising out of jurisdictional disputes, and disputes over the interpretation of contracts. He recommended a study of all other labor-management problems without action at this time. I wish to point out that if this Congress were to limit its action to carrying out the President's recommendations, we would be acting only on disputes which caused less than 5 percent of the days lost in strikes in the United States during the past 2 years. The people of America demand and are entitled to more action than that. It is the responsibility of this Congress to pass a bill which will give the American people the protection they need from industrial strife.

It has been said that we have drawn a bill which recognizes and protects the rights of the public, but that in doing so we are destroying the rights of labor and turning back the clock of labor reform 100 years. I think it is well for us to bear in mind who are making those charges. Are the workers of this country, the members of the unions, objecting to this bill? Or are the objections coming only from a few entrenched leaders of union labor who fear that their unrestrained power over the workers of America will be curtailed?

In that connection let us analyze the provisions of the bill, having in mind the interest of American workers. Do they object to the fact that the bill gives the right to speak freely in their union meetings? Do they object to the fact that the bill gives them the right to vote freely in democratic elections for their officers and to organize and bargain collectively? Do they object to the fact that the bill protects their right to strike over fundamental issues involving wages, hours, and working conditions? Do they

object to the fact that this bill provides that where two union leaders are fighting between themselves as to who will get the union dues from workers on a particular job, such a dispute shall not be the basis for a strike depriving innocent workers of their jobs who have no interest in the dispute? Do they object to the fact that we have attempted to control violence, mass picketing and other abuses which all good union leaders have decried?

On the contrary the workers of America have a great stake in the passage of this bill. It has been said that the public suffers from strikes; it has been said that management suffers from strikes; but we must remember that the man who suffers most, the man who has the greatest stake in industrial peace, is not the public, not management, but it is the man who has to go out on strike.

I submit to this House that the man who goes out on strike and who serves to lose most by going out should make the determination as to whether he should go out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one-half minute additional.

Mr. NIXON. So we have provided that that decision to strike will be made, not in the sumptuous quarters of a labor baron in the Carlton Hotel; not in some smoke-filled room, as the gentlemen have seen fit to describe it, where labor leaders get together and, by the stroke of a pen, decide the fate of millions of workers, but by a secret ballot by a majority of all employees in the plant affected.

In the year 1215 King John at Runnymede granted sovereign power to the barons of England. Centuries later a bill of rights was granted to the individual citizens of England, protecting them against the irresponsible power of their rulers. In 1935 the New Deal Congress enacted the National Labor Relations Act which granted unrestrained sovereign power over the workers of America to the barons of union labor. Now, I submit it is the responsibility and the opportunity of this Congress to grant to American workers their bill of rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time, one-half minute, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and I ask unanimous consent that he may proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to announce to the House that a very few minutes ago, at Texas City, Tex., on the Gulf coast, a French nitrate ship exploded and it, in turn, exploded a high-octane tanker, and as a result of those two explosions a big chemical plant blew up. Between 200 and 700 are known to be dead now. I am further advised that the Red Cross has declare a national emergency, and they are flying nurses and doctors from all over the country to the scene of that horrible disaster.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on general debate has expired.

Before the Clerk reads, the Chair wishes to state that section 101, which begins on page 3 and extends over to page 51, will be read and considered as one section and open to amendment after reading.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. (a) This act may be cited as the "Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947."

(b) Industrial strife which interferes with the normal flow of commerce and with the full production of articles and commodities for commerce, can be avoided or substantially minimized if employers, employees, and labor organizations each recognize under law one another's legitimate rights in their relations with each other, and, above all, recognize under law that neither party has any right in its relations with any other to engage in acts or practices which jeopardize the public health, safety, or interest.

It is the purpose and policy of this act, in order to promote the full flow of commerce, to prescribe the legitimate rights of both employees and employers in their relations affecting commerce, to provide orderly and peaceful procedures for preventing the interference by either with the legitimate rights of the other, to protect the rights of individual employees in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to encourage the peaceful settlement of labor disputes affecting commerce by giving the employees themselves a direct voice in the bargaining arrangements with their employers, to define and proscribe practices on the part of labor and management which affect commerce and are inimical to the general welfare, and to protect the rights of the public in connection with labor disputes affecting commerce.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, 3 weeks ago when this House was considering the annual appropriation bill for the Labor Department-Federal Security Agency I cautioned the Republican majority to stop, look, and listen before they proceeded to emasculate the Labor Department by using a meat ax on the appropriations requested for the proper functioning of that vital agency. But the majority's antilabor steam roller was well oiled, just as it is today. It saw fit, practically to a man, to deny adequate funds for the proper functioning of the Government bureaus which have the responsibility for minimizing and reducing labor disputes, and for furnishing data on labor conditions throughout our country.

Immediately after that, the majority brought to this floor from committee a tax bill which would grant less relief to the wage and salary earners in the lower income brackets than to individuals in the wealthier categories, at a time when common sense dictates we should first be concerned with reducing our huge national debt created as the result of the war.

Now our Republican friends must accept the dubious honor of bringing before us this unfair labor bill, this piece of legislative chicanery which seeks to deny working men and women the basic rights of organization and collective action; a bill which is deliberately designed to lay low organized labor and decent living standards and to turn the economic clock far back.

These three pieces of legislation, together with the fact that the cost of living today has terribly advanced due to abandonment of price ceilings at the most crucial moment in the reconversion period, are depressing the living standards of 60,000,000 of our people who earn their bread by the sweat of their brows.

Cannot we who hate communism realize that a bill shackling labor such as H. R. 3020 gives the Communists ammunition for the guns they aim at the destruction of our country? Cannot we realize that the Communists are the enemies of labor and the working class and have as their objective not the well-being of labor but the hopeless exaggeration of class conflicts and the undermining of our American economy? Cannot we see how they will exploit this nefarious antilabor bill for their revolutionary purposes?

James Burnham points out in his article entitled "The Goal of Soviet Policy" published in the current issue of American Mercury that—

> Within the United States, the Communists arouse and exploit every divisive possibility. Labor against capital, big business against little business, CIO against AFL, farmers against businessmen, Negroes against whites, Christians against Jews, Protestants against Catholics, landlords against tenants, foreign-born against native-born, South against North, unemployed against employed—wherever there is a potential rift in the national life, the Communist tactic is to deepen and tear that rift.

Mark my words: This bill will create the deepest rift we have ever had in our national life. You will create a field day for the Red Fascists.

If there were no other reason, I would vote against the pending bill because it is aimed directly at the present strike of 340,000 telephone workers, 99 9/10 percent of whom are fine, decent American citizens. You will not find many "Commies" among them. Why should they be denied the right to protest the impossible rise in the cost of living due to the greed of big business or the right to seek a decent living wage from companies which, while bloated with profits, have been notorious for the low salaries paid their employees? As one Member of Congress who is thoroughly in sympathy with them in their fight for a fair increase in pay and better conditions I feel that I would be letting them down if I were to vote for this negative and punitive legislation, drafted, if you please, by a Republican majority and some highly paid corporation lawyers who were so kind as to assist, right here in the Capital, without charge, our friends on the other side of the aisle. What a job these obliging big business lawyers have done for the Chrysler Corp. and the National Association of Manufacturers.

Mr. Chairman, is it good sense to aid and advocate liberty for other peoples of the world and at the same time subject

labor here in our own country to oppressive and arbitrary restraints? If we as a nation are to survive, if our American system of government is to continue to function, labor must be free. Sure, labor has many faults. But are we going to roast a pig by burning down the house?

The pending hastily prepared and too hastily considered bill, containing 66 pages, would not only destroy the rights and protections given to labor during the past 50 years but would deliberately take the very laws intended for protection of working men and women and turn those laws around and aim them at destroying organized labor. It would not only remove protections against antilabor injunctions and unfair labor practices of employers, it would deliberately create new kinds of restrictions, new kinds of injunctions that were unheard of a half century ago. It would reintroduce over a wide area penalties and judicial procedures which have been banned by the Congress for many, many years.

Since the development of the labor injunction in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, there has long been widespread opposition to its sweeping use in labor disputes. It is generally regarded as having broken the back of the Pullman strike in 1894, and with crippling unjustly the legitimate activities of labor unions in many cases since. After widespread objection to the misuse and abuse of judicial power in the labor injunction, the Norris-LaGuardia Act was passed and signed by President Hoover in 1932. Section 12 (c) of this bill would in effect virtually repeal that act.

Although seemingly limited to certain types of cases, the so-called unlawful concerted activities, the effect of labor injunctions would go far beyond these situations, and hamstring many other activities. Ordinarily, a temporary injunction is obtained by one party going to court and showing that there is reasonable ground to believe that illegal activities are in process or may be pending, and that these activities would cause him great harm. In this temporary restraining order, a time is set for a full hearing of both sides, a possibility which is largely illusory, since in most labor injunctions, the matter cannot be carried through to such a final determination. In other words, in practice, the temporary injunction, issued when only one side has been heard, decides the issue by throwing the weight of the Government on one side of a complicated economic dispute, without giving the other side a chance to be heard. This was clearly recognized when the Norris-LaGuardia Act was enacted. But this bill would turn the clock back of 1932 when that law became effective.

This bill would turn the clock back to and beyond the early 1920's when in a single strike, more than 300 injunctions were issued, in some cases of such sweeping character that persons in no way connected with the union were affected with severe restrictions on their freedom to speak as they chose.

This bill would turn the clock beyond 1914. In that year Congress passed the Clayton Act, which recognized that the Sherman Antitrust Act had been passed to restrict monopolistic business practices and was not a suitable instrument in dealing with other types of organizations. The Sherman Antitrust Act provided a penalty of triple damages, a type of penalty designed for, and when enforced, particularly appropriate for monopolistic practices of business. Although this device was intended to curb such practices, I know of no instance where the application of this penalty to a business concern has caused its failure. The imposition of this penalty against union activity has, however, killed unions affected, such as the Danbury hatters local.

With reason, the late Samuel Gompers termed the Clayton Act labor's "magna carta upon which the working people will rear their constitution of industrial freedom." With reason, the American Federation of Labor after 1908 began consistently to support those who would confine the Sherman antitrust law to its proper sphere of activity. With reason, the American Federation of Labor has supported those who would give the workingman a right to be heard, by curbing the injunction, which in practice usually denies him that right.

Instead, labor organizations have joined with fair-minded employers to urge the expansion of mediation services which do afford all parties such an opportunity.

This bill would do harm, however, to the Conciliation Service by divorcing it from the Department of Labor, in spite of the fact that the Secretary of Labor would continue to be primarily responsible for handling labor disputes, and in spite of the recent Reorganization Act, which Congress approved to continue and extend his powers along this line.

Mr. Chairman, I have been deeply disturbed by the short-sighted tactics of this Congress in dealing with problems of labor. This bill would subject each local to the possibility of constant and minute surveillance with respect to its financial statements, the reasonableness of all assessments or dues, the adequacy of freedom of expression, and the fairness of the conduct of the local's affairs. These terms are not defined, but, nevertheless, infraction of these general objectives might carry severe penalties. I know the House would not accept such close supervision of business practices, methods, and policies, and I think we should be fair and not subject labor to a gestapo-like scrutiny.

There appears to be a very evident determination on the part of this Congress to increase the discontent of American workers by denying them in a wholesale fashion the rights under the National Labor Relations and Fair Labor Standards Acts which they have struggled so hard to achieve. Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe that if the standard of living of the American worker were generally known abroad, and the freedom in conjunction with his fellow workers which he now enjoys were also known, much of the lure which totalitarian doctrines might have would tend to disappear. And I believe just as firmly that the policy embarked on in this Congress of wrecking labor rights would dim that light of freedom and opportunity which we in America should continue to show the world.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, in this bill, as I said a moment ago, we do away with national industry bargaining. That is, we do away with it on one side of the table and not on the other side of the table. Nobody has ever tried to stop management from organizing into boards of trade or chambers of commerce; nobody has tried to stop anybody who is a manufacturer from joining the National Association of Manufacturers, which is designed to protect management's collective judgment and interest. There are 2,300 chambers of commerce in this country and about 2,000 interstate trade associations. The National Association of Manufacturers speak for about 50 trade associations covering about 70,000 corporations.

With this bill, on the one hand we deny the right of the unions to bargain collectively over the national area, but we do not do that for management, on the other hand. They can band together as the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. can band together with its subsidiaries and indicate to labor what it wishes, but labor cannot indicate to management on an industry-wide basis what it wants and desires.

This bill, in short, would forbid the existence of national unions and would break every one of our national union organizations like the international unions of the AFL and the CIO into a series of small, weak, local organizations. There is something rather hypocritical about this.

When the unions first started to organize in major industries they were only able to organize one plant at a time. When they bargained with the employer for a single plant the answer was given that these demands could not be met for the single plant alone because they were matters of general policy affecting the entire corporation or the entire industry. So the unions organized the entire corporations. Then in industry after industry the reply was given: "Why make us the guinea pig? Why should we be asked to pay more than our competitors? Why is not this demand made on our competitors as well as on us?" And as recently as 1945 and 1946 this was the complaint, for example, of General Motors Corp. when it was the only automobile manufacturer involved in a strike. So the unions organized the competitors of General Motors Corp. Now the cry is "Go back to the separate employers and take them one at a time." In that way you fragmentize these national unions and render them impotent and useless and so weak as almost to cause them to fold up.

What will happen when we have these weak unions scattered throughout the country? There will now be competition to lower wages among the competing units of a given industry. There will be competition to make conditions of employment more burdensome. There will be competition to increase the hours of employment. That is the very reverse of the policy that has been enun-

ciated in this chamber for the last two or three decades.

I do not want to go back to that kind of condition. Unless we have strong unions then the laboring man and the laboring woman will come on evil days. This bill, to the extent that it weakens these unions, will make conditions of the laboring man and the laboring woman in this country most insufferable, and I therefore ask that this bill be defeated for that reason, and for many other reasons. Our economic structure rests on high production and lower prices achieved through competition. But we do not mean and could never mean that there should be competition as to who is to establish the worst working conditions.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. OWENS. Has not the gentleman noticed, by reference to section 9, which relates to utilities, that where there is competition it is possible for the unions, all of them, to deal Nation-wide with such industries, or in the case of steel companies, to which the gentleman referred——

Mr. CELLER. I refuse to yield further. I yielded for a question.

Mr. OWENS. I thought the gentleman yielded for a question.

Mr. CELLER. I want no limitation on industry-wide labor bargaining. If it is good for one, it is good for all. The exceptions in this bill have so many loopholes as to be valueless.

Millions of workers now work in closed shops. Destruction of the closed shop principle would create nothing but havoc. We would have some people working in closed shops and some in open shops. That would mean chaos.

The closed shop is nothing more nor less than a medium to protect the security of the worker in labor unions. It can only exist by agreement between labor and management. The closed shop is the result of the justified fear of labor after a long history of bitter experience that taught labor the employer would try to undermine, corrupt, and dissolve union organization by open shops, company unions, and the use of stooges and spies. The closed shop has been highly successful in many industries—the construction industry, A. F. of L.; the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, CIO; the International Ladies' Garment Workers.

Break the closed shop and you return clothing and garment industries to former sweat-shop conditions. Outlawing the closed shop would open the door to racketeers and Communists in the absence of disciplinary power accorded the unions by closed-shop arrangements.

The closed shop does not prevent the right of any individual to work. Union labor fought unceasingly—when nonunion labor was completely complacent—to outlaw the evil of the employer blacklist, yellow-dog contracts, and ex parte labor injunction which were violations of the right to work. There is no reason at all, morally or in common decency, why labor and management should not be allowed to enter into the closed-shop agreement which says that those who seek jobs in the plant must joint the union in order to qualify. The closed shop presently cannot be had save by the vote and will of the majority of workers. They have a right to join together to refuse to be associated with an individual whom they consider a free rider. Similarly, the employer has the right to exclude the applicant who wants to remain nonunion or antiunion and who refuses to conform with the terms of employment and who would disrupt plant management and production. The nonunion man could still work. There are many nonunion shops.

Furthermore, the union has created great benefits, including increased wages, better working conditions. The worker, therefore, should be compelled to pay dues to the union that brought about those benefits. There should be no free riders. A closed shop does not mean a closed union which bars new members. This is rank deception. The doors of the trade-unions are always open to new members.

To get a better understanding of labor conditions today we must consider the entire labor picture, beginning with the war. We must also consider the postwar psychosis of all our people. After any war there is a release of tempers, bad manners, and uncertainties. Workers came out of the war tired from the long workweek and from the suspense. First, there were the lowered living standard conditions because overtime pay and the higher wages were ended. Second, many lost their jobs when war plants closed, and they were afraid that they would not be reemployed. Many segments of management felt that the time was ripe to destroy the effectiveness of labor unions, and the general American give and take, because of frayed nerves, was missing. Things got out of hand and there were strikes. Grievances accumulated. Both labor and management during the war were able to run to boards with their grievances. Decisions were made and there was no need for collective bargaining. Management and labor are compelled now to relearn the need for free collective bargaining. They are relearning, and work stoppages this year were far less than last year. They are the lowest since VJ-day. Free collective bargaining can work. Any form of compulsory arbitration or supermachinery for the disposition of labor disputes will frustrate rather than increase industrial peace.

Philip Murray, president of the CIO, stated recently:

> In 1946 the CIO Steelworkers Union cooled off for 14 weeks. The CIO auto workers cooled off for a similar period. CIO electrical workers cooled off for over 2 months. The cooling off didn't work. In each case our CIO unions accepted the Government's compromise proposals, but were forced into a long strike to make management accept those compromises. Will mere cooling off prevent strikes? I know it will not.

Antilabor legislation calls for the employees to observe a waiting period before striking. This might be analogous to requiring employers to observe a waiting period before closing down their plants. But neither the National Labor Relations Act nor any general law so obligates employers—and on this last point reference to the Railway Act is not apropos, because there the waiting period imposed on workers is matched by the obligation of the public utility not to stop the running of the trains.

In all this discussion on labor, what is forgotten is that labor is not an inanimate mass. We are concerned here with human beings, individuals entitled to a living wage for themselves and their dear ones. They do not want strikes. Strikes hurt them as much, if not more, than management. Like the rest of us, they want peace. There is too much at stake for them. Strikes mean months of idleness, and, in many cases, want. The workingman must depend on his salary; he has no security beyond that, and no absolute guaranty of the continuance of his salary. The average annual industrial wage throughout the country is a little over $40 per week, and it is a constant struggle to maintain and achieve decent working conditions and fair living standards and a more than subsistence wage. Instead, a picture is painted for the public of a huge overwhelming labor giant grasping for power. Members of the working class are Americans, seeking a better way of life, with a fair degree of comfort, with the means of education for their children, and security in old age and protection for the American home. Consider, then, carefully, the harsh legislation that is being proposed in the light of the accomplishments and aims of our unions.

It is well to remind labor baiters and some fire-eating antilabor commentators and editors, as well as the proponents of this bill, who want laws forbidding strikes, that both the London transport strikes and the United States coal strike were forbidden—the first by British law, the second by the Smith-Connally Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

SEC. 101. The National Labor Relations Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"POLICY

"SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate the causes of certain substantial obstructions to the free flow of commerce and to mitigate and eliminate these obstructions when they have occurred by providing means for protecting the rights of employers, employees, and their representatives in their relations one with the other, and for preventing the commission by either of unfair labor practices.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 2. When used in this act—

"(1) The term 'person' includes one or more individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, labor organizations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.

"(2) The term 'employer' includes any person acting as an agent of an employer, directly or indirectly, but shall not include the United States or any instrumentality thereof, or any State or political subdivision thereof, or any person subject to the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time, or any labor organization (other than when acting as an employer), or anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization, or any corporation, community chest, fund, or foundation organized

and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation.

"(3) The term 'employee' shall include any employee and shall not be limited to the employees of a particular employer, unless the act explicitly states otherwise, and shall include any individual who has been discharged by his employer where such discharge constitutes an unfair labor practice under section 8 (a) and who has not obtained any other regular and substantially equivalent employment, and shall also include any individual whose work has ceased as a consequence of a labor dispute (unless such individual has been replaced by a regular replacement, or has obtained other regular and substantially equivalent employment, or is receiving unemployment compensation from any State), but shall not include any individual employed as a supervisor, or in the domestic service of any family or person at his home, or any individual employed by his parent or spouse, or any individual engaged in agricultural labor (as defined in section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code) or any individual employed by any person other than an employer as herein defined, or any individual having the status of an independent contractor. For the purposes of this paragraph, a 'regular replacement' means an individual who replaces an individual whose work has ceased as a consequence of a labor dispute, if the duration of his employment is not to be determined with reference to the existence or duration of such labor dispute.

"(4) The term 'representative' includes any individual or labor organization.

"(5) The term 'labor organization' means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work.

"(6) The term 'commerce' means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States and any State or other Territory, or between any foreign country and any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory, or between points in the same State but through any other State or any Territory or the District of Columbia or any foreign country.

"(7) The term 'affecting commerce' means in commerce, or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce, or having led or tending to lead to a labor dispute burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.

"(8) The term 'unfair labor practice' means any unfair labor practice listed in section 8.

"(9) The term 'Labor-Management Relations Board' means the Labor-Management Relations Board created by section 3 of this act.

"(10) The term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act provided for in section 4.

"(11) The terms 'bargain collectively' and 'collective bargaining' as applied to any disputes between an employer and his employees or their representative, means compliance with the following minimum requirements:

"(A) If an agreement is in effect between the parties providing a procedure for adjusting or settling such disputes, following such procedure.

"(B) If no such agreement is in effect, complying with the following procedure:

"(i) receipt of any proposal or counterproposal of the other party;

"(ii) discussion of such proposal and any counterproposal at a conference with the other party held at a time mutually agreeable to the parties or, in the absence of such an agreement, within a reasonable time after such receipt;

"(iii) continued discussion of the matters in dispute at not less than four separate additional conferences with the other party held within the 30-day period following the initial conference, unless agreement is sooner reached;

"(iv) if agreement is reached, putting such agreement in writing;

"(v) if agreement is not reached by the end of such 30-day period, complying with the requirements of clause (vi) before authorizing, conducting, or participating in any lock-out or strike in connection with such dispute;

"(vi) the following requirements shall be applicable as a condition of authorizing, conducting, or participating in, any lock-out or strike in connection with the dispute:

"(a) The collective-bargaining representative shall notify the Administrator of its desire to have a strike vote conducted in connection with the dispute;

"(b) Within 5 days thereafter, such representative shall inform the employees in writing of the issues in the dispute and the representative's position thereon. Copies of such statement shall be sent by registered mail to the employer and to the Administrator;

"(c) The Administrator shall promptly notify the employer of the representative's request for the strike vote;

"(d) The employer shall have a reasonable time, fixed by the Administrator, to inform the employees of the issues and his position thereon, and of his last offer of settlement. Copies of such statement shall be sent by registered mail to the representative and to the Administrator;

"(e) Within a reasonable time thereafter, the Administrator shall, after due notice to the parties, provide for a secret ballot of the employees in the bargaining unit concerned on the question whether such employees desire to reject the employer's last offer of settlement, and to strike;

"(f) The ballot shall be conducted in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon by the parties, or, in the absence of such agreement, conducted and supervised by or under the direction of the Administrator;

"(g) The ballot shall read: 'Shall the employer's last offer of settlement of the current dispute be rejected, and a strike be called?'

"(h) A lock-out or strike may not be authorized or conducted unless in such secret ballot a majority of the employees in the bargaining unit concerned vote to reject the employer's last offer of settlement, and to strike.

Such terms shall not be construed as requiring that either party reach an agreement with the other, accept any proposal or counterproposal either in whole or in part, submit counterproposals, discuss modification of an agreement during its terms except pursuant to the express provisions thereof, or discuss any subject matter other than the following: (i) Procedures and practices relating to wage rates, hours of employment, and work requirements; (ii) procedures and practices relating to discharge, suspension, lay-off, recall, seniority, and discipline, or to promotion, demotion, transfer and assignment within the bargaining unit; (iii) conditions, procedures, and practices governing safety, sanitation, and protection of health at the place of employment; (iv) vacations and leaves of absence; and (v) administrative and procedural provisions relating to the foregoing subjects.

"(12) The term 'supervisor' means any individual—

"(A) who has authority, in the interest of the employer—

"(i) to hire, transfer, suspend, lay off, recall, promote, demote, discharge, assign, reward, or discipline any individuals employed by the employer, or to adjust their grievances, or to effectively recommend any such action; or

"(ii) to determine, or make effective recommendations with respect to, the amount of wages earned by any individuals employed by the employer, or to apply, or to make effective recommendations with respect to the application of, the factors upon the basis of which the wages of any individuals employed by the employer are determined, if in connection with the foregoing the exercise of such authority is not of a merely routine or clerical nature, but requires the exercise of independent judgment;

"(B) who is employed in labor relations, personnel, employment, police, or time-study matters or in connection with claims matters of employees against employers, or who is employed to act in other respects for the employer in dealing with other individuals employed by the employer, or who is employed to secure and furnish to the employer information to be used by the employer in connection with any of the foregoing; or

"(C) who is given by the employer information that is of a confidential nature, and that is not available to the public, to competitors, or to employees generally, for use in the interest of the employer.

"(13) The term 'sympathy strike' means a strike against an employer, or other concerted interference with an employer's operations, which is called or conducted not by reason of any dispute between the employer and the employees on strike or participating in such concerted interference, but rather by reason of either (A) a dispute involving another employer or other employees of the same employer, or (B) disagreement with some governmental policy.

"(14) The term 'illegal boycott' means a concerted refusal, or threat of a concerted refusal, by individuals in the course of their employment—

"(A) to render services, where an object of the refusal or threat is to force a person to do business or to cease doing business with another person; or

"(B) to render services, where an object of the refusal or threat is to force a person to deal with or to cease dealing with a labor organization as the representative of individuals other than themselves; or

"(C) to use, install, handle, transport, or otherwise deal with particular articles, materials, or commodities by reason of the origin or proposed destination thereof, or by reason of the character of a prior or proposed future handling thereof, or by reason of the policies or practices of any person (not their employer) having any direct or indirect relationship thereto.

"(15) The term 'jurisdictional strike' means a strike against an employer, or other concerted interference with an employer's operations, an object of which is to require that particular work be assigned to employees in a particular labor organization or in a particular trade, craft, or class rather than to employees in another labor organization or in another trade, craft, or class.

"(16) The term 'monopolistic strike' means a strike or other concerted interference with an employer's operations which results from any conspiracy, collusion, or concerted plan of acting between employees of competing employers or between representatives of such employees, where the employees of such competing employers do not have a common bar-

gaining representative certified under section 9.

"(17) The term 'featherbedding practice' means a practice which has as its purpose or effect requiring an employer—

"(A) to employ or agree to employ any person or persons in excess of the number of employees reasonably required by such employer to perform actual services; or

"(B) to pay or give or agree to pay or give any money or other thing of value in lieu of employing, or on account of failure to employ, any person or persons, in connection with the conduct of the business of an employer, in excess of the number of employees reasonably required by such employer to perform actual services; or

"(C) to pay or agree to pay more than once for services performed; or

"(D) to pay or give or agree to pay or give any money or other thing of value for services, in connection with the conduct of a business, which are not to be performed; or

"(E) to pay or agree to pay any tax or exaction for the privilege of, or on account of, producing, preparing, manufacturing, selling, buying, renting, operating, using, or maintaining any article, machine, equipment, or materials; or to accede to or impose any restriction upon the production, preparation, manufacture, sale, purchase, rental, operation, use, or maintenance of the same, if such restriction is for the purpose of preventing or limiting the use of such article, machine, equipment, or materials.

"LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS BOARD

"SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created a board to be known as the 'Labor-Management Relations Board' in this act called the 'Board'), which shall be composed of three members, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than two of the members shall be members of the same political party, and all of the members shall be appointed with reference to their fitness to perform the functions imposed upon them by this act in a fair and impartial manner. Of the members first appointed after the date of the enactment of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, one shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, one for a term of 3 years, and one for a term of 5 years, from such date, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of 5 years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The Board shall annually designate one member to serve as chairman of the Board. Any member of the Board may be removed by the President, upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

"(b) A vacancy in the Board shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Board, and two members of the Board shall, at all times, constitute a quorum. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

"(c) The Board shall at the close of each fiscal year make a report in writing to Congress and to the President stating in detail the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the Board, and an account of all moneys it has disbursed.

"(d) Each member of the Board shall receive a salary of $15,000 a year, shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment. The Board may appoint, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws but subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, an executive secretary, and a secretary to each member, and may appoint such other officers and employees with regard to existing laws applicable to the employment and compensation of officers and employees of the United States, as it may from time to time find necessary for the proper performance of its duties and as may be from time to time appropriated for by Congress. The Board may not appoint or employ any attorneys except (1) such legal assistants as each member may require, (2) employees to maintain an index and digest of its decisions, and (3) trial examiners to conduct hearings. Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Board or the Administrator to appoint individuals for the purpose of conciliation or mediation or for statistical work.

"(e) All of the expenses of the Board, including all necessary traveling and subsistence expenses outside the District of Columbia incurred by the members or employees of the Board under its orders, shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Board or by any individual it designates for that purpose.

"ADMINISTRATOR OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

"SEC. 4. There is hereby established as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government an office of Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act (in this act called the 'Administrator'). The Administrator shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, with reference to his fitness to perform the functions imposed upon him by this act in a fair and impartial manner, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum. He shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment. The Administrator may establish or utilize such regional, State, local, or other agencies as may from time to time be needed. The Administrator may appoint such officers and employees as he may from time to time find necessary to assist him in the performance of his duties, except that the heads of the regional offices and the chief legal officer in each of such offices shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Attorneys appointed under this subsection may, in the discretion of the Administrator, appear for and represent the Administrator in any case in court. In case of a vacancy in the office of the Administrator, or in case of the absence of the Administrator, the President shall designate the officer or employee of the Administrator who shall serve as Administrator during such vacancy or absence. Expenses of the Administrator, including all necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by the Administrator or employees of the Administrator under his orders while away from his or their official station, shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Administrator or by any employee he designates for that purpose. It shall be the duty of the Administrator, as hereinafter provided, to investigate charges of unfair labor practices, to issue complaints if he has reasonable cause to believe such charges are true, to prosecute such complaints before the Board, to make application to the courts for enforcement of orders of the Board, to investigate representation petitions and conduct elections under section 9, and to exercise such other functions as are conferred on him by this act. The Administrator shall be made a party to all proceedings before the Board under section 10, and shall present such testimony therein and request the Board to take such action with respect thereto as in his opinion will carry out the policies of this act.

"LOCATION OF PRINCIPAL OFFICES OF BOARD AND OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

"SEC. 5. The principal offices of the Board and of the Administrator, respectively, shall be in the District of Columbia, but they may exercise any or all of their respective powers at any other place. The Board may, by one or more of its members or by any trial examiner or examiners, conduct hearings in any part of the United States. The conducting of any such hearing by a member shall not disqualify such member from subsequently participating in a decision of the Board in the same case.

"REGULATIONS AUTHORITY

"SEC. 6. The Board and the Administrator, respectively, shall have authority from time to time, in the manner prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, to make, amend, and rescind such regulations as may be necessary to carry out their respective functions under this act.

"RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 7. (a) Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist any labor organization, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in other concerted activities (not constituting unfair labor practices under section 8 (b), unlawful concerted activities under section 12, or violations of collective-bargaining agreements) for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.

"(b) Members of any labor organization shall have the right to be free from unreasonable or discriminatory financial demands of such organization, to freely express their views either within or without the organization on any subject matter without being subjected to disciplinary action by the organization, and to have the affairs of the organization conducted in a manner that is fair to its members and in conformity with the free will of a majority of the members.

"UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

"SEC. 8. (a) It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer—

"(1) to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7 (a).

"(2) to dominate or interfere with the formation or administration of any labor organization (A) by preventing such organization from determining independently or out of the employer's presence its own policies or planning independently or out of the employer's presence its own objects and courses of action; or (B) by giving, or offering to give, any reward, favor, or other thing of value to any person in a position of trust in such organization for the purpose of perverting his judgment or corrupting his conduct in respect to such organization; or (C) by assisting any labor organization (i) through deducting from the wages of any employee dues, fees, assessments, or other contributions payable by the employee to a labor organization, or collecting or assisting in the collection of any such dues, fees, assessments, or other contributions, unless such action has been voluntarily authorized in writing by such employee and such authorization is revocable by the employee at any time upon 30 days' written notice to the employer, or (ii) through making payments of any kind to such organization directly or indirectly, or to any fund or trust established by such organization, or to any fund or trust in respect of the management of which, or the disbursements from which, such organization can, either alone or in conjunction with any other person, exercise any control, directly or indirectly;

"(3) by discrimination in regard to hire or tenure of employment or any term or condition of employment to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization by any employee or any individual seeking employment as an employee;

"(4) to discharge or otherwise discriminate against an employee because he has filed charges or given testimony under this act;

"(5) to refuse to bargain collectively with the representatives of his employees currently recognized by the employer or certified as such under section 9.

"(b) It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employee, or for a representative or any officer thereof, or for any individual acting for or under the direction of a representative, or for or under the direction of any officer thereof—

"(1) by intimidating practices, to interfere with the exercise by employees of rights guaranteed in section 7 (a) or to compel or seek to compel any individual to become or remain a member of any labor organization;

"(2) in the case of a representative acting and currently recognized by the employer, or certified under section 9, as the representative of employees, to refuse to bargain collectively with the employer;

"(3) to call, authorize, engage in, or assist any strike or other concerted interference with an employer's operations, an object of which is to compel the employer to accede to the inclusion in a collective-bargaining agreement of any provision which under section 2 (ii) is not included as a proper subject matter of collective bargaining.

"(c) It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or any officer thereof, or for any individual acting for or under the direction of a labor organization or for or under the direction of any officer thereof—

"(1) to interfere with, restrain, or coerce individuals in the exercise of rights guaranteed in section 7 (b);

"(2) to impose initiation fees in amounts in excess of $25 per member unless the Board shall find that initiation fees greater than that amount are reasonable under the circumstances; or to impose any dues, or general or special assessments that are not uniform upon the same class of members, or are in excess of such reasonable amounts as the members thereof, whom such organization represents or seeks to represent as a representative under section 9, by a majority of those voting, after due notice to the membership, shall authorize; or to impose any tax or exaction on any person for any work permit or other arrangement whereby the person paying such tax or exaction would receive in return therefor the ostensible right to work or to conduct his business free from interference from such organization;

"(3) to compel any member to agree to contribute to, or participate in, any insurance or other benefit plan;

"(4) to deny to any member the right to resign from the organization at any time;

"(5) to fine or discriminate against any member, or subject him to any discipline or penalty, on account of his having criticized, complained of, or made charges or instituted proceedings against, the organization or any of its officers, or on account of his having supported or failed to support any candidate for civil office or for any office in the labor organization, or on account of his having supported or failed to support any proposition submitted to the labor organization, or to citizens generally, for a vote.

"(6) to expel or suspend any member without affording him an opportunity to be heard, or on any ground other than (A) nonpayment of dues; (B) disclosing confidential information of the labor organization; (C) participating in a violation of a collective-bargaining agreement to which the labor organization was a party; (D) being a member of the Communist Party, or actively and consistently promoting or supporting the policies, teachings, and doctrines of the Communist Party, or advocating, or being a member of any organization that advocates, the overthrow of the United States Government by force; (E) conviction of a felony; or (F) engaging in scandalous conduct tending to bring the labor organization into disrepute or in other conduct subjecting it to civil damages or criminal penalties;

"(7) to take any action or make any arrangements that would have the effect of requiring an employer to deny employment to, or terminate the employment of, any individual (A) to whom membership in such organization was not available on the same terms and conditions as those applicable to other members, or (B) to whom membership in such organization was denied on some ground other than failure to tender the initiation fees and dues uniformly required as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership therein;

"(8) to deny a secret ballot and an open count of ballots cast, on any question involving fees, dues, assessments, fines, striking, the nomination and election of officers of local labor organizations, or the expulsion of any member; or to fail to hold elections of its officers and elective personnel at least once every 4 years; or to direct or call a strike, unless at least a majority of those voting on the question have, after the membership has received due notice of proposed balloting thereon, authorized such strike;

"(9) to employ, engage, or direct any person to spy upon any member respecting his exercise or enjoyment of any lawful right, or to intimidate his family, or injure the person or property of such member or his family;

"(10) to fail to keep adequate record of its financial transactions or to fail to present annually to each member, whom it represents or seeks to represent as a representative under section 9, within 60 days after the end of its fiscal year a detailed written financial report thereof in the form of a balance sheet and an operating statement.

"(d) The following shall not constitute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice under any of the provisions of this act:

"(1) Expressing any views, argument, or opinion, or the dissemination thereof, whether in written, printed, graphic, or visual form, if it does not by its own terms threaten force or economic reprisal.

"(2) Permitting employees to confer with the employer during working hours without loss of time or pay.

"(3) Forming or maintaining by an employer of a committee of employees and discussing with it matters of mutual interest, including grievances, wages, hours of employment, and other working conditions, if the Board has not certified or the employer has not recognized a representative as their representative under section 9.

"(4) Agreeing to, and after the procedure specified in section 9 (g) has been complied with (but not before), making effective and carrying out, provisions of a collective-bargaining agreement between an employer and a labor organization that is certified under section 9 as the representative of the employees in any bargaining unit of the employer (if such provisions are not in conflict with the law of any State in which the agreement is to be carried out), whereby the employer obligates himself in either of the following respects:

"(A) Not to retain in his employ in such unit any employee who, being a member of such organization 30 days from the date such provisions become effective, or becoming a member thereafter, fails to maintain his membership therein;

"(B) Not to retain in his employ in such unit any employee who fails to become a member of such organization within not less than 30 days after his employment, or within not less than 30 days after the date such provisions become effective, whichever last occurs, or who, having become a member within such period, fails to maintain his membership therein;

except that no such provision may have the effect of denying employment or continued employment to any individual who on or before the time required tenders to the organization the initiation fees and dues regularly imposed as a condition of membership therein and to whom, in spite of such tender, membership therein was denied, or of denying employment or continued employment to an individual who has been suspended or expelled from the organization on some ground other than nonpayment of regular dues.

"REPRESENTATIVES AND ELECTIONS

"SEC. 9. (a) Representatives designated or selected for the purpose of collective bargaining by the majority of the employees in a unit appropriate for such purposes shall be the exclusive representatives of all the employees in such unit for the purpose of collective bargaining: *Provided*, That any individual employee or group of employees shall have the right at any time to present grievances to, and settle grievances with, their employer without the intervention of the bargaining representative if the settlement is not inconsistent with the terms of a collective-bargaining agreement then in effect.

"(b) The Board shall upon application under, and subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section, determine in each case whether, in order to insure to employees full freedom to exercise their rights under section 7 (a), the unit appropriate for that purpose shall be the employer unit, craft unit, plant unit, or subdivisions thereof.

"(c) Whenever written application is made to the Administrator under oath—

"(1) by a representative representing at least 30 percent of the employees in a unit claimed by such representative to be appropriate for the purposes specified in subsection (b), requesting an election to determine whether the employees in such unit do or do not desire to designate such representative as their representative for collective bargaining; or

"(2) by employees, or some person acting for employees, who constitute at least 30 percent of the employees in a unit claimed by them to be appropriate for the purposes specified in subsection (b), requesting an election to determine whether a representative that has been certified or is currently recognized by the employer as the bargaining representative is no longer a representative under subsection (a) of this section; or

"(3) by an employer alleging that any representative has presented to him a claim that such representative represents a majority of the employees in a specified unit for the purposes of collective bargaining;

the Administrator shall investigate such application, and if he has reasonable cause to believe that the facts stated therein are true and that a question of representation affecting commerce exists, he shall transmit such application, together with all documents pertaining thereto, to the Board.

"(d) The Board thereupon shall give due notice to interested persons of the filing of such application and set the matter for hearing within a reasonable time. Any interested person may intervene under regulations prescribed by the Board. If upon the evidence adduced at the hearing the Board finds that a question of representation affecting commerce exists and that the action requested in the application is necessary in order to effectuate the purposes specified in subsection (b), it shall by order determine the unit appropriate for the purposes so specified (subject, however, to the limitations of subsection (f)), shall direct the Administrator to provide for a secret ballot of the employees in the unit so determined, and shall certify the results thereof.

"(e) Whenever an order of the Board made pursuant to section 10 (c) is based in whole or in part upon facts certified following a hearing pursuant to subsection (d) of this section, and there is a petition for the en-

forcement or review of such order, such certification and the record of such hearing shall be included in the transcript of the entire record required to be filed under subsections (e) or (f) of section 10, and thereupon the decree of the court enforcing, modifying, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Board shall be made and entered upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript.

"(f) The Board shall exercise its powers under subsections (b) and (d) subject to the following limitations:

"(1) A representative that has been designated or acts as the representative of employees of any employer shall be ineligible to be certified as the representative of employees of any competing employer, unless the employees of such employers whom the representative seeks to represent are regularly less than 100 in number and the plants or other facilities of such employers at which the representative acts and seeks to act as such are less than 50 miles apart, but nothing in this paragraph shall prevent any representatives from being affiliated or associated, directly or through a federation, association, or parent organization, with representatives of employees of competing employers, if the collective bargaining, concerted activities, or terms of collective bargains or arrangements of such representatives are not subject, directly or indirectly, to common control or approval.

"(2) Upon application of any interested person or persons, the Board shall direct the Administrator to provide for a separate ballot for any craft, department, plant, trade, calling, profession, or other distinguishable group within a proposed bargaining unit, and shall exclude from the bargaining unit any such group if less than a majority of the employees in it who cast ballots shall have voted for the representative that the Board shall certify for such unit.

"(3) In determining whether a unit is appropriate for the purposes specified in subsection (b) the extent to which the employees have organized shall not be controlling.

"(4) In determining whether a question of representation affecting commerce exists, the same regulations and rules of decision shall apply regardless of the identity of the person or persons filing the application or the kind of relief sought; and in no case shall the Administrator or the Board deny to employees the right to designate or select a representative by reason of an order of the Board with respect to such representative or its predecessor that would not have issued in similar circumstances with respect to a labor organization, national or international in scope, or affiliated with such an organization.

"(5) In all elections held to select representatives for collective bargaining, employees shall be given the choice on the ballot of voting for a representative (including one not appearing on the ballot) or for no representative; and where an election does not result in a majority vote for any representative, there shall be no run-off unless within 60 days following such election a representative receiving votes in such election furnishes the Board satisfactory evidence that it represents more than 50 percent of the employees in the bargaining unit in question, in which event the run-off shall be between such representative and no representative.

"(6) No labor organization shall be certified as the representative of the employees if one or more of its national or international officers, or one or more of the officers of the organization designated on the ballot taken under subsection (d), is a member of the Communist Party or by reason of active and consistent promotion or support of the policies, teachings, and doctrines of the Communist Party can reasonably be regarded as being a member of or affiliated with such party, or believes in, or is a member of or supports any organization that believe in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force.

"(7) No election shall be directed in any bargaining unit or any subdivision thereof, within which, in the preceding 12-month period, a valid election shall have been held, except upon an application filed by employees under subsection (c) (2) of this section.

"(8) If, pursuant to any election under this section, a bargaining representative is chosen for any unit and a collective-bargaining contract covering such unit is then in effect, certification of the new representative shall not be effective unless and until such new representative becomes a party to such contract and agrees to be bound in all respects by its terms for the remainder of the contract period.

"(g) A labor organization which has made an agreement with an employer containing provisions described in section 8 (d) (4) shall be required, as a condition to being entitled to have such provision carried out by the employer, to make application to the Administrator for a secret ballot of the employees in the bargaining unit concerned on the question of whether the employees in such unit desire to have such provision carried out. The application shall be under oath and must state that the employer's agreement to such provision was not obtained either directly or indirectly by means of a strike or other concerted interference with the employer's operations, or by means of any threat thereof. The Administrator shall forthwith give notice to the employer of the filing of such application, and if within such reasonable time thereafter as may be prescribed by regulations of the Board the employer has not made objection to such application, the Administrator shall provide for a secret ballot of the employees in the bargaining unit concerned on the question of whether they desire to have such provision carried out. If within the time so prescribed the employer does make objection to the application and if in the opinion of the Administrator the matter is one concerning commerce, he shall transmit the application, together with all documents pertaining thereto, to the Board, the Board shall thereupon give due notice to interested persons of the filing of such application and set the matter for hearing within a reasonable time. Any interested person may intervene under regulations prescribed by the Board. If upon the evidence adduced at the hearing the Board finds that the facts stated in the application are true and that the matter is one affecting commerce, it shall direct the Administrator to provide for a secret ballot of the employees in the bargaining unit concerned on the question of whether they desire such provision of the agreement with the employer carried out. Such provision may be carried out by the employer only if upon the secret ballot taken under this subsection a majority of all of the employees in the bargaining unit have voted in favor thereof. An election under this subsection shall be effective to authorize the carrying out of provisions described in section 8 (d) (4) only for a period which does not extend beyond the date of the termination of the agreement in which such provisions are included, beyond 2 years from the date on which such agreement was entered into, whichever first occurs.

"(h) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the waiving of hearings by stipulation for the purpose of a consent election in conformity with regulations and rules of decision of the Board.

"PREVENTION OF UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

"SEC. 10. (a) The Board is empowered, as hereinafter provided, to adjudicate complaints of unfair labor practices affecting commerce filed by the Administrator. Such power of the Board shall be exclusive.

"(b) Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in or is engaging in any such unfair labor practice, the Administrator shall forthwith give notice to the party complained of, shall investigate such charge, and if he has reasonable cause to believe such charge is true, he shall issue and cause to be served upon such person a complaint stating such charge, except that the Administrator shall not have power to issue a complaint stating a charge of any unfair labor practice that occurred more than 6 months prior to the date on which such charge was filed with the Administrator, or stating a charge of any unfair labor practice that was filed with the Administrator more than 6 months prior to such issuance. The person complained of shall have 20 days within which to answer and serve such answer on the Administrator, unless such period is extended by the Administrator. The Administrator shall file the complaint and any answer thereto with the Board. Upon application of the Administrator or any person charged in the complaint, the Board shall set the case for hearing before the Board or a member thereof, or before a designated trial examiner or examiners, at a place which the Board shall fix, not less than 15 days after the making of such application. Any such complaint or answer may, with the approval of the Board, or with the approval of the members, examiner, or examiners conducting the hearing, be amended at any time prior to the issuance of an order based thereon. The person so complained of shall have the right to appear in person or otherwise give evidence at the place and time fixed by the Board. In the discretion of the Board, or the member, examiner, or examiners conducting the hearing, any other person may be allowed to intervene in the said proceeding and to give evidence. Any such proceeding shall, so far as practicable, be conducted in accordance with the rules of evidence applicable in the district courts of the United States under the rules of civil procedure for the district courts of the United States, adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States pursuant to the act of June 19, 1934 (U. S. C., title 28, secs. 723-B, 723-C).

"(c) The evidence before the Board, member, examiner, or examiners shall be reduced to writing and filed with the Board. Thereafter upon application of any party, the Board upon notice may, in its discretion, receive further evidence or hear argument. If upon the weight of the evidence the Board shall be of the opinion that any person named in the complaint has engaged in or is engaging in any unfair labor practice, then the Board shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person an order requiring such person to cease and desist from such unfair labor practice, and to take such affirmative action requested in the complaint (which in the case of unfair labor practices under section 8 (a) may include reinstatement of employees with or without back pay, and in the case of unfair labor practices under section 8 (b) or 8 (c) may include deprivation of rights under this act for a period not exceeding 1 year) as will effectuate the policies of this act. Such order may further require such person to make reports from time to time to the Administrator showing the extent to which he has complied with the order. If upon the weight of the evidence the Board shall not be of the opinion in the case of any person named in the complaint that such person has engaged in or is engaging in any such unfair labor practice, then the Board shall state its findings of fact and shall issue an order dismissing the said complaint as to such person. No order of the Board shall require or forbid any action by an employer with respect to any labor organization that in similar circumstances would not be required or forbidden with respect to a labor organization national or international in scope, or affiliated with such an organization. No order of the Board shall require the reinstatement of any individual as an employee,

or the payment to him of any back pay, unless the weight of the evidence shows that such individual was not suspended or discharged for cause. In case the evidence is presented before a member of the Board, or before an examiner or examiners thereof, such member, or such examiner or examiners, as the case may be, shall issue and cause to be served on the parties to the proceeding a proposed report, together with a recommended order, which shall be filed with the Board, and if no exceptions are filed within 20 days after service thereof upon such parties, or within such further period as the Board may authorize, such recommended order shall become the order of the Board and become effective as therein prescribed.

"(d) Until a transcript of the record in a case shall have been filed in a court, as hereinafter provided, the Board may, upon application of any party, upon reasonable notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify or set aside, in whole or in part, any finding or order made or issued by it.

"(e) If any person against whom an order of the Board shall issue fails to comply therewith within such reasonable period as the Board shall specify, or thereafter shall violate such order, the Administrator shall petition any circuit court of appeals of the United States (including the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia), or if all the circuit courts of appeals to which the application may be made are in vacation, any district court of the United States (including the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia) within any circuit or district, respectively, wherein the unfair labor practice in question occurred or wherein such person resides or transacts business, for the enforcement of such order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, certified by the Board, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings and order of the Board. Upon such filing, the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such person, and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein, and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and to make and enter upon the pleadings, evidence, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Board. No objection that has not been urged before the Board, its member, or its examiner or examiners, shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances. The findings of the Board as to the facts shall be conclusive unless it is made to appear to the satisfaction of the court either (1) that the findings of fact are against the manifest weight of the evidence, or (2) that the findings of fact are not supported by substantial evidence. If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Board, its member, examiner, or examiners, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Board, its member, examiner, or examiners and to be made a part of the transcript. The Board may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and it shall file such modified or new findings, which shall be conclusive unless it is made to appear to the satisfaction of the court either (1) that such findings of fact are against the manifest weight of the evidence, or (2) that such findings of fact are not supported by substantial evidence, and the Board shall file its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order. The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the appropriate circuit court of appeals if application was made to the district court as hereinabove provided, and by the Supreme Court of the United States upon writ of certiorari or certification as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, secs. 346 and 347).

"(f) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Board (including an order or certification under section 9) granting or denying in whole or in part the relief sought, may obtain a review of such order or certification in any circuit court of appeals of the United States in the circuit wherein the unfair labor practice in question was alleged to have been engaged in or wherein such person resides or transacts business, or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Board be modified or set aside or, in the case of a certification, that the certification be set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Administrator, and thereupon the aggrieved party shall file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, certified by the Board, including the pleadings and evidence upon which the order or certification complained of was entered and the findings and order on certification of the Board. Upon such filing, the court shall proceed in the same manner as in the case of an application by the Administrator under subsection (e), and shall have the same exclusive jurisdiction to grant to the petitioner such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Board, or affirming or setting aside the certification; and the findings of the Board as to the facts shall have the same weight as in the case of an application by the Administrator.

"(g) The commencement of proceedings under subsection (e) or (f) of this section shall not unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Board's order or certification.

"(h) When granting appropriate temporary relief or a restraining order, or making and entering a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part an order of the Board, as provided in this section, the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the act entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes', approved March 23, 1932 (U. S. C., title 29, secs. 101-115).

"(i) Petitions filed under this act shall be heard expeditiously and, if possible, within 10 days after they have been docketed.

"INVESTIGATORY POWERS

"SEC. 11. For the purpose of any proceeding before the Board, or before a member, examiner, or examiners thereof, or for the purpose of any investigation by the Administrator under section 9—

"(1) The Board, or any member thereof, or any trial examiner shall, upon application of the Administrator or any party to such proceedings, forthwith issue to the Administrator or to such party as the case may be, in the name of the Board, subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses or the production of any evidence in such proceeding or investigation requested in such application. Within 5 days after the service of a subpena on any person requiring the production of any evidence in his possession or under his control, such person may petition the Board or its duly authorized agent or agents to revoke, and the Board, or such agent or agents, shall revoke such subpena if in its, his, or their opinion, as the case may be, the evidence whose production is required does not relate to any matter under investigation, or any matter in question in such proceedings, or if in its, his, or their opinion, as the case may be, such subpena does not describe with sufficient particularity the evidence whose production is required. The Administrator or any member of the Board or any examiner or examiners designated by the Board for such purposes may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

"(2) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person, any district court of the United States or the United States courts of any Territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the person to whom such a subpena was issued by the Board, shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person so guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey an order requiring him to appear before the Board, its member, examiner, or examiners, or before the Administrator if the subpena so directs, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation or in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof.

"(3) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to the subpena of the Board, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty of forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

"(4) Complaints, orders, and other process and papers provided for in this act may be served either personally or by registered mail or by telegrapi or by leaving a copy thereof at the principal office or place of business of the person required to be served. The verified return by the individual so serving the same setting forth the manner of such service shall be proof of the same, and the return post-office receipt or telegraph receipt therefor when registered and mailed or telegraphed as aforesaid shall be proof of service of the same. Witnesses summoned before the Administrator or before the Board, its member, examiner, or examiners, shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

"(5) All process of any court to which application may be made under this act may be served in the judicial district wherein the defendant or other person required to be served resides or may be found.

"(6) The several departments and agencies of the Government, when directed by the President, shall furnish the Administra-

tor, upon his request, all records, papers, and information in their possession relating to any matter before the Board.

"UNLAWFUL CONCERTED ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 12. (a) The following activities, when affecting commerce, shall be unlawful concerted activities:

"(1) By the use of force or violence or threats thereof, preventing or attempting to prevent any individual from quitting or continuing in the employment of, or from accepting or refusing employment by, any employer; or by the use of force, violence, physical obstruction, or threats thereof, preventing or attempting to prevent any individual from freely going from any place and entering upon an employer's premises, or from freely leaving an employer's premises and going to any other place; or picketing an employer's place of business in numbers or in a manner otherwise than is reasonably required to give notice of the existence of a labor dispute at such place of business; or picketing or besetting the home of any individual in connection with any labor dispute.

"(2) Picketing an employer's premises for the purpose of leading persons to believe that there exists a labor dispute involving such employer, in any case in which the employees are not involved in a labor dispute with their employer.

"(3) Calling, authorizing, engaging in, or assisting—

"(A) any sympathy strike, jurisdictional strike, monopolistic strike, or illegal boycott, or any sit-down strike or other concerted interference with an employer's operations conducted by remaining on the employer's premises;

"(B) any strike or other concerted interference with an employer's operations, an object of which is to compel an employer to accede to featherbedding practices;

"(C) any strike or other concerted interference with an employer's operations, an object of which is (i) to compel any employer to recognize for collective bargaining a representative not certified under section 9 as the representatives of the employees, or (ii) to remedy practices for which an administrative remedy is available under this act, or (iii) to compel an employer to violate any law or any regulation, order, or direction issued pursuant to any law.

"(b) Any person injured in his business, person, or property by an unlawful concerted activity affecting commerce may sue the person or persons responsible therefor in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties, without regard to the amount in controversy, and may recover the damages sustained by him as a result of such unlawful concerted activity, together with the costs of the suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

"(c) No provision of the act of March 23, 1932, entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes', shall have any application in any action or proceeding in a court of the United States involving any activity defined in this section as unlawful.

"(d) A person who is found to have engaged in any activity herein defined as an unlawful concerted activity shall be subject to deprivation of rights under this act to the same extent as a person found to have engaged in an unfair labor practice under section 8 (b) or 8 (c).

"(e) Except as specifically provided in this section, nothing in this act shall be construed to diminish the right of employees to strike or to engage in other lawful concerted activities. No provision of this act, and no order of any court issued hereunder, shall be construed to require any individual to perform labor or service without his consent.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 13. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 14. This act may be cited as the 'National Labor Relations Act'."

Mr. BARDEN (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that section 101 contains over 47 pages, beginning on page 3, line 1, and ending on page 51, line 12, I ask unanimous consent that that section be considered as read and that it be printed in the RECORD and that we proceed with the consideration of amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

Page 4, line 21, after the letter "a", insert "current."

Page 5, line 18, strike out the word "or" and insert "of."

Page 10, line 2, strike out the words "procedures and practices relating to."

Page 11, line 14, after the word "who", insert "by the nature of his duties."

Page 15, line 23, strike out "$15,000" and insert "$12,000."

Page 17, line 7, strike out "$15,000" and insert "$12,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 19, line 18, after the comma, insert "and shall also have the right to refrain from any or all of such activities: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall preclude an employer from making and carrying out an agreement with a labor organization as authorized in section 8 (d) (4)."

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I objected to this committee amendment in committee, and I am carrying my objection to the floor for the reason that I do not believe it has any place in section 7 of the act. The latter part of the amendment states:

Provided, That nothing herein shall preclude an employer from making and carrying out an agreement with a labor organization as authorized in section 8 (d) (4).

This language belongs immediately after section 8 (a) (3) and not in section 7, and at the proper time I intend to offer an amendment to place that after section 8 (a) (3).

With respect to the remaining words, "and shall also have the right to refrain from any or all of such activities," I call the attention of the chairman to the fact that section 7 provides:

(a) Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist any labor organization, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in other concerted activities (not constituting unfair labor practices under section 8 (b), unlawful concerted activities under section 12, or violations of collective-bargaining agreements) for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.

I submit that when you are giving the employees the right to bargain collectively by virtue of section 7, and encouraging them to do so, to place the words at the end thereof "and shall also have the right to refrain from any or all such activities," is redundant because the words are unnecessary, inasmuch as they have the right to so refrain, but it indicates a desire on the part of Congress to discourage them, asking them to refrain from so doing. I therefore oppose this committee amendment and ask that it be voted down.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. HARTLEY. As I understand the gentleman's contention, he thinks it would be in better form to have it in section 8?

Mr. OWENS. Section 8 (a) (3). If this can be done in conference, it is perfectly all right with me.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It has been my purpose to offer an amendment to the committee amendment beginning on line 18 by striking out the proviso beginning in line 20. Now I understand that something has been said here about that committee amendment belonging in section 8.

The CHAIRMAN. The question before the Committee at this time is whether or not this particular committee amendment shall be agreed to. The gentleman from Illinois has opposed the amendment. The gentleman may offer an amendment to the committee amendment if he desires to do so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to offer several amendments. They all seek the same purpose, I may say to the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is whether or not the committee amendment shall be agreed to. The committee amendment may be amended by the gentleman if he desires, otherwise the Chair will put the question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN to the committee amendment: On page 19, strike out beginning with the colon in line 20 down through "(4)" in line 22.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, when this bill was first written, it contained a provision for the open shop. Since that time there has been written into the bill a provision for the union shop, and out through the country has gone the impression that the committee bill bans the closed shop.

That is a play upon words. There is little, if any, practical difference between a union shop and a closed shop. In a closed shop the men, when they go to work, must be members of the union. This bill provides that if the employer and the majority of the employees agree, the shop then becomes a union shop, which means that everyone who is employed in that shop must not later than 30 days from the time he becomes an

employee or within 30 days from the adoption of the union shop become a member of the union and continue therein as such so long as he works in that shop.

There is nothing to be gained by attempting to deceive the people, because sooner or later this play upon words, "union shop and closed shop," will be disclosed for just what it is. The committee, as I said in the first instance, provided for an open shop. There were in the original draft of the bill these words:

And shall also have the right—

That is, the employee shall have the right—

to refrain from any and all such activity.

Which meant simply that a man should have the right to join or not to join, to be bound by or not to be bound by, union rules. If this Congress wants to forsake the American principle that the man who must live by toil, who must work if he would eat, have clothing, a home, and be able to provide for his family—if this Congress wants to turn its back upon that principle and say that no man shall work when the employer and a bare majority of the employees say that he cannot work unless he conforms to their rules and restrictions—it has the power to do so. But my contention is, if we are going to write a labor bill for the benefit of the man who works, then we should amend this section and subsequent sections and provide that any and every man should have the opportunity to work at, when, and where he can find a job.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, all that the gentleman from Michigan is attempting to do is to take out the proviso and leave the words in the bill that I mentioned would cause the Congress to be encouraging employees not to become members of the labor unions and, in fact, take away the union shop.

I am asking now for the sake of these employees whom we are trying to help and not hurt that we vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, after which time I will withdraw my motion and let it be taken care of in conference.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. If I understood the argument of the gentleman from Michigan, it is that he seeks to strike from the bill the provisions that would permit union-shop agreements under the circumstances outlined in the bill, and also, if I understood him correctly, what he is trying to get at is to provide for the outlawing of the union shop as well as the outlawing of the closed shop.

Mr. OWENS. That is exactly what he is trying to get at.

Mr. HALLECK. I want my position known as far as that provision is concerned. I think it should be understood by everybody that the union shop stems from a contract made between employer and employee. If I understand the committee provision, it simply is that the matter is to be left to free agreement between the two bodies. The employer is protected against coercion and what we might call blackjacking, which might force him to sign such an agreement. On the employees' side there is a provision for a vote. If a majority votes for such union-shop agreement, and the employer agrees to it, freely and voluntarily, then the union-shop contract may go into effect. Otherwise, it may not go into effect.

Mr. OWENS. That is exactly correct. In other words, it is the same as under the previous act, where there was a proviso that permitted the employer to deal. In this particular case, if the employer desires a union shop, and so expresses it to the committee, and the labor organization makes an affidavit to the Administrator stating that the employer wants a union shop, and that no coercion has been exercised to secure it, the Administrator provides for a secret election, at which, if a majority of the employees vote for a union shop, thereby they have a union shop, subject to certain restrictions whereby the union cannot vote a man out of the union or refuse to take his dues, and so forth.

Mr. HALLECK. Does not the bill recommended by the committee also contain a provision granting to the States authority to deal with this whole problem if they so desire?

Mr. OWENS. Absolutely. The States can deal with the problem. It does not affect in any way the many States that have already acted upon it and others that probably will act upon it. Therefore, I say the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan should be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS] has expired.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. A question was raised as to my position. I want the committee to understand that I stand with the committee on that provision.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most vital provisions of the entire bill. This is the provision that deals with union security. If you adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] you will have no union security in this Nation. I, for one, believe that in our complex industrial society we should permit and encourage voluntary union security, in order that the American worker may fairly combat the large concentration of economic power that exists on the other side. That is the issue and the only issue in this particular amendment.

I call upon you all to join together and vote down this proposal to abolish union security.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of several provisions contained in this bill which deals with the so-called union-shop provision. Other amendments are expected to be offered as various sections are reached, provided this one is adopted, which pertain to this subject of whether we should or should not provide for the union shop in this bill. So the question is presented here, and it might as well be decided now, this being an important provision pertaining to that subject. It is just a question of whether or not this Congress wants to adopt the policy now of giving legislative recognition to the so-called union shop as a matter of public policy in this country.

The way the bill is now written it is permissible for the employees, if at least 51 percent of them in a plant or company vote for the union shop, to make it binding on those who do not vote for it.

Personally, I feel that it is a form of involuntary servitude; that it is unfair for, say, 51 percent of the employees in a plant to control the other 49 percent who perhaps are opposed to that sort of thing; yet, if as many as 51 percent of the members of the bargaining unit in a plant vote in favor of the closed shop—and that is the effect of it if the union-shop provision once goes into effect—the other 49 percent have no option; they have to pay the dues and do as they are told to do, or they are not allowed to work.

I think the right to work is one of the most sacred rights a man has. It is the right to exist. It is by work that men live. It is one of the most fundamental things we have to deal with. The right to life implies the right to work. I think it is a fundamentally wrong American public policy for this Congress to put its approval upon that sort of thing and say to 49 percent of the workers in a plant that because they happen to be outvoted by a few men they have got to accede to their desires and their wishes, join a union, pay dues, pay initiation fees, or get out and go try to find another job if they can find one. In an industry-wide union shop, they lose their right to work in that industry or industries. That is exactly the situation with which we are faced. If you want that kind of thing you should vote against this amendment. If you are opposed to that sort of thing you should vote for this amendment. We are face to face with that issue right now. In a completely unionized society, failure to join a union or expulsion from a union, would mean the absolute loss of the right to work.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. And that can intervene without any action on the part of the employer.

Mr. FISHER. Oh, yes. The employees have the right through an election to determine whether or not there will be an open shop or whether the union-shop provisions shall be contained in the contract.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. And that requires only 51 percent, no more.

Mr. FISHER. Yes; just a majority.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is not the provision of this bill "a majority of all the employees" as against the requirement under the present law of "a majority of those voting"?

Mr. FISHER. I think the gentleman is confused in his reference to the present law. It is a majority vote of the bargaining unit.

Mr. KENNEDY. Of all those voting.

Mr. FISHER. A majority of those in the bargaining unit must agree to it.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield.

Mr. POTTS. If the union should get out of hand as the gentleman supposes might be possible, would it not be within the province of the employer to correct that when the next contract came up for signing in not recognizing the union shop or insisting that there not be a union shop?

Mr. FISHER. I may say in answer to the gentleman's inquiry that that question was discussed considerably. The employer can object. I doubt if it would be an effective objection, because the union could insist upon other conditions in the contract which they would never agree to until he came around on the union-shop issue. I think it would open the thing wide for demands to be made and to be maintained and to be insisted upon with the same effect that you have now. In my judgment, that would be the effect of it.

I feel that, if the majority of those working in a plant want the union-shop provision, if they think it is a good thing, if it is a good thing for the majority of the members, then they can sell it to the others. If they can make the benefits of union membership sufficiently attractive, the employees will join voluntarily.

Under the Railway Labor Act now, by act of the Congress of the United States, the closed shop and the union shop are prohibited, and the check-off is prohibited, and they get along very well. There has not been any of the disaster that has been depicted here. Most all of the railroad employees are union men. They become sold on its merits and voluntarily join. The railway unions are among the best and strongest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. When a shop once becomes a union shop by agreement between the employer and the employees, is it not from then on in effect a closed shop? That is, when one is employed in that place of business he knows right then and there that from the date of his employment he must become a member of that union or else he cannot work in that shop.

Mr. FISHER. That is exactly right. The union shop and the closed shop are Siamese twins. In either case a man cannot work unless he belongs to the union, whether he wants to belong or not. I think any employee should have the right to join if he desires, but my objection is to compulsion where the right to work is involved. The right to work should come first.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The fact is he will from the day of employment be paying tribute to someone or else he does not work in the shop?

Mr. FISHER. He must continue membership in good standing in the union or he may be dismissed from the union for proper reasons and then, of course, he cannot work in the plant any longer, or in that industry any longer if it is covered by an industry-wide contract.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What is in the bill to prohibit the employees in a shop from forcing the employer to agree to a union shop?

Mr. FISHER. I think that would be the effect of it. There is no question about that.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HARTLEY. Is it not also true that his membership in that union shop is limited to the duration of the contract, which under no conditions shall exceed 2 years?

Mr. FISHER. That is correct.

Mr. HARTLEY. In other words, if they wanted a nonunion shop after that they could vote by a majority and do away with it?

Mr. FISHER. That is correct.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. I would like to ask the gentleman if a majority of any group and the employer agree to a thing, where do we get our authority to say that the majority shall not rule, that they shall not make the kind of contract they want to make?

Mr. FISHER. If the gentleman wants a majority of the people working in that plant, the 51 percent, to control the lives and destinies and the question of whether they do or do not belong to a union forced upon the other 49 percent, then his argument is a sound one; but the fact that 51 percent of the members of the committee voted for this bill does not necessarily mean that the other 49 percent have to vote for it or be expelled from the Congress for their failure to do so.

Mr. BREHM. We live in a country of majority rule. Fifty-one percent can elect a President that some of us think should not be elected, but we have to put up with it.

Mr. FISHER. If the gentleman feels it is sound policy for 51 percent in a plant to force the other 49 percent to be members of a labor union in order to make a living for themselves and their families, then he is absolutely right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if the Members of the House want to punish unions they will vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. The Committee on Education and Labor had no notion of punishing labor unions. It does not want to punish labor unions. It only wants to improve the conditions of union membership. That is why it included the wording that appears in the bill before you.

There are millions of workmen in this country today who are working under union-shop conditions. I dare say they are the majority of all employees in this country working under union contract.

Let me outline again just what a union shop is. A man applies for work with a particular employer. He knows that a union shop is in effect in that plant. He knows that if the employer accepts him he will be compelled to join the union within 30 days. If he does not want to join the union he will not apply for work with that particular employer. The employer takes him. Within 30 days the man joins the union. What is his obligation from then on? He only has two obligations: No. 1, to pay the initiation fee, which is regulated under this bill, and No. 2, to pay his dues. He is protected from any oppressive tactics on the part of union officials. He undergoes no risk. He undertakes merely the obligation to help support the union which in turn represents him in dealing with his employer.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is agreed to we upset countless contracts in this country under which millions of men are working on union terms satisfactory to the men and satisfactory to the employer.

I urge upon the House the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. KEATING. Does not the gentleman think that to pass this amendment, with these thousands of contracts and millions of workers now operating under a union-shop contract, would be apt to lead to greater industrial unrest in this country than would accrue by reason of the passage of the bill?

Mr. BUCK. In my opinion the enactment of this amendment would lead to complete chaos in labor relations.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HARTLEY. Is it not true also that under the terms of this bill we raise the requirements from the present status of unions where 5 to 10 percent of the membership control the situation to more than 50 percent under the terms of this bill and, furthermore, that this vote must be taken by secret ballot?

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman is correct, and I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Would it not also be fair to say that by the provisions of the bill the employer is made a free agent in determining whether or not he shall sign such a contract or shall not sign it?

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What happens to the closed-shop contracts already in existence? Are they required to go through the secret ballot?

Mr. BUCK. The closed shop under this law is abolished, and the closed-shop contracts, after the lapse of a certain amount of time, become inoperative. Then, if the members desire union-shop conditions, they will use the ballot as provided under this bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. It is also fair to say, is it not, that after a man becomes a member of the union, if he should thereafter fail to pay his dues to the union, that he loses his job?

Mr. BUCK. That is correct, but when the employee takes his job with that company he knows that fact in advance.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman just made a statement that I want to be very positive about. The bill now before us, if enacted into law in its present form, will outlaw, after the date stated in the bill, every closed-shop contract in the United States; is that correct?

Mr. BUCK. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then, having outlawed the contract, the employer and a majority of the employees, 51 percent plus, may proceed to negotiate a union contract.

Mr. BUCK. For a union shop.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then the employer and the employees having agreed on that contract, an employee may then have 30 days in which to make up his mind as to whether or not he will go along with the 51 percent plus.

Mr. BUCK. That is right. If he does not go along then he can no longer remain an employee of the company.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Or work in that plant where a contract was created under the law.

Mr. BUCK. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is the situation?

Mr. BUCK. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now, to understand the gentleman, then, the Hoffman amendment would do exactly what?

Mr. BUCK. The Hoffman amendment would outlaw the provision for a union shop. It would destroy union security and deny the union any assured membership support in any plant even where the employees want it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And generally upset the provisions of the entire bill, you might say.

Mr. BUCK. I feel that way.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The question has been raised as to the position of the employer in this union-shop arrangement. I direct the attention of the Committee to page 34 of the bill, where they will find, beginning in line 20, these words:

> The application—

And that is referring to the application for such a union-shop contract—

> shall be under oath and must state the employer's agreement to such provision was not obtained either directly or indirectly by means of a strike or other concerted interference with the employer's operations, or by means of any threat thereof.

Of course, the application is filed with the Administrator.

It is provided further, beginning with line 7, page 35:

> If within the time so prescribed the employer does make objection to the application—

And so forth.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. This amendment, if adopted, would say that if every employee unanimously voted for the union shop and the employer wanted the union shop, still they could not have it; and I do not mean just exactly 51 percent, but unanimously.

Mr. BUCK. It would be illegal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words. I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

In the State of Wisconsin we have in our statutes what is known as the voluntary union shop. It is quite similar to the provision written into this committee bill. As other gentlemen have stated, it is not a proposition concerning which the employees may strike or collectively bargain. Under the committee bill, it is permitted only where the employer and the employees—that is, 51 percent of them—want it. I think those who want to outlaw even that evidence the fact that they are essentially against the idea of a union, or at least they want to cripple it to the point where it must be ineffective.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it not a fact that with the provision on page 34 it does not make any difference whether you have this amendment or any similar amendment, because in fact you destroy the union shop by prohibiting a strike in favor of it?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. You permit it where it is voluntary.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, but how many employers are going to agree to a union shop?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I think there are a great many of them that want union shops.

Mr. KENNEDY. Did many of the employer witnesses before our committee show any evidence that they desired a union shop?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I think probably the majority of them did not, but some took the other position.

Mr. KENNEDY. This amendment is really unimportant because you are not going to have many union shops anyway.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I think we are going to have a number of them, because I think the enlightened employer sees the value of a union.

Mr. KENNEDY. Does not the gentleman really feel that if you are going to have a union shop, and you should have, you should strike out that section on page 34 that forbids the right to strike to get a union shop?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Personally I am in favor of permitting the employees to bargain for a union shop.

Mr. KENNEDY. And to strike if they want to?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACKINNON. The gentleman comes from a State where they have statutes providing for a voluntary closed shop.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Yes, a voluntary union shop.

Mr. MACKINNON. Will the gentleman enlighten the House as to what the experience under that has been, whether there has been any substantial disruption of the legitimate labor-union activity?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. As far as I know there has been none whatsoever in regard to Wisconsin. You have a similar provision in this bill. As I stated a moment ago, those that would want to outlaw even the union shop are those that are essentially against the idea of a union.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it not true that the troubles of not only Allis-Chalmers in the gentleman's own district but the J. I. Case people grew out of the fact that they have refused to sign a union-shop contract?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. The trouble with the Allis-Chalmers situation was that the local there was dominated by Communist officers. That was the chief over-all proposition in the dispute.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Has not the company refused to sign a union-shop contract?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. It has refused to deal with that particular group on almost anything because they were Communists.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why does not the gentleman answer my question?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. What is the question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman think they have refused, among other reasons, for the reason that that contract calls for a union shop?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. As I understand, the reason for refusing to negotiate with that group of officers is that they were Communists and Communist dominated.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. The fact is that if this amendment is voted down and they do write into this bill a recognition of the union-shop philosophy and authorize it where a majority of the people working in a plant vote for it, and it is agreed to by the employer, under that condition as many as 49 percent of the people working in that plant may be required and forced to pay union dues and belong to the union in order to work there; otherwise they must leave that plant. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. That is correct, if the employer agrees to it. In my opinion, the situation there is that when a majority of the workers in that plant want a union and the employer wants it, every person in that employ should belong to that union.

I also understand that the provisions of the bill, as the gentleman well knows, also prohibit every type of racketeering that has existed heretofore and very definitely it regulates the activities of the unions so that 49 percent, to which the gentleman refers, would in nowise be punished in any respect. They are merely required to pay reasonable dues which are required for the unions.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this amendment. Its adoption will in nowise punish the workingmen as has been alleged. It may not be so good for some labor leaders and politicians, but there is nothing wrong about it so far as those who really earn their living by toil are concerned, and I think it is they that deserve primary consideration.

I want to say a word in reply to the argument that is so often made that a majority of the employees in a plant have the right to impose their will upon the minority, forcing them to pay tribute for the right to work, and so forth, because they receive certain benefits which would not otherwise accrue to them. If this is a correct principle now, then the whole Constitution rests on an entirely false basis. One of the underlying concepts of that charter is protection of the rights of minorities. The idea that a majority knows what is best for a minority and can impose its will upon them is a purely authoritarian concept. The important point to be noted here is that it is the political regime controlling our Government that is forcing the minority in a plant to become subservient to the majority. It should not be overlooked that it is Federal law that empowers the majority to exercise control over the minority. Therein lies the fundamental wrong. Nothing can justify that.

Furthermore, the analogy which is sought to be drawn between an arrangement such as that provided under the Wagner Act which empowers a majority to force its will upon a minority on the one hand and majority rule in matters politic on the other is a wholly false analogy. The Constitution postulates the protection of minorities by majority rule, not the plundering of them.

Indeed, it is difficult to find in any stage in the development of trades unionism the absence of strong political interest.

We are primarily dealing not with any fundamental differences that exist between employers and employees—basically this is essentially a political problem.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FISHER. It has been pointed out repeatedly that this kind of an arrangement may be voluntarily arrived at through a majority of the members of the employees in a plant agreeing with management. Does not the gentleman believe that this issue should not be settled on that basis, but should be approached on the basis of sound public policy as to whether the Congress of the United States wants to adopt a measure which would approve of a situation which would force union membership before a man is allowed to work in any particular place?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I think the gentleman is quite correct. In other words, I think we ought to go back to the Constitution of the United States. All this amendment does is reassert the provisions in the Constitution which guarantee to every man the liberty to work where he pleases, at what work he can get that suits him best, for such wages as he can bargain for voluntarily with his employer without having to pay tribute to anyone or belong to any organization. That is my view of this amendment. Ninety-nine percent of the Members of the House know that is right.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman just made a very truthful statement, that is, if this amendment is not adopted, under the bill as it is now written, a man who goes to work in a union shop will have to pay tribute or else be out of his job. That is true, is it not?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And is that not what your party has been opposing and speaking against for years?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. ABERNETHY. You are right that it is right.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It has been stated by men who are opposed to this amendment that the provision in the bill does not impose involuntary servitude upon the minority. Of course it does.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to my beloved colleague.

Mr. JENNINGS. As I see the difficulty about majority rule, if you get a majority of the workmen in a plant who agree with the management of the plant that they want a union, why should they not have it? Many of the men of the minority of the employees, whether it be 49 percent or 30 percent or 15 percent, would get the benefit of that contract made between the majority of their fellow workmen and the management. It seems to me that it is not unreasonable that they should go along and contribute dues like the others.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In other words, papa knows best? Is not that your proposition?

Let me emphasize that it is not the workingman that will be punished by the adoption of this amendment. What earthly right have we legislators to empower by law a majority of employees in a plant to force a minority to pay tribute to anybody for the right to work or to belong to any organization?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Ohio and also the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and also the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER]. You gentlemen are sincere. You lack hypocrisy. You are telling the Members of the Congress and the country what you want, although I am opposed to both of these amendments. Nevertheless, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] will execute labor, while the committee amendment will merely give it a general anesthetic, but the result is the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, it is my contention that the political element which has intruded itself into employer-employee relationships has done more to create ill will and strife between those two groups than all other factors combined. Making political capital out of industrial capital is one of the oldest industries in the world. A study of the evolution of the trades-union movement in the different countries shows that politics has always been one of its prominent features.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. Is it not true that the gentleman in appearing before the committee, and now on the floor, is against any labor relations bill at all?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I urged in testimony before your committee the repeal of the Wagner and Norris-LaGuardia Acts. I did this purely in the interests of the workingmen themselves. My testimony will show that I took the position that the Wagner Act is not labor's Magna

Carta but its death warrant, that it is carrying them into slavery just as was done under Communist Russia, Fascist Italy, and Nazi Germany, and precisely by the same procedures.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is the gentleman, in all frankness, opposed to collective bargaining?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman is not opposed to collective bargaining if it is purely voluntary; if it is not imposed by force, that is, law. Bargaining imposed by law just is not bargaining. It is simply a species of paternalism or dictatorship.

Mr. KEATING. Does not the gentleman feel that in thousands of instances throughout this country it is necessary for the workingmen to be organized in a union in order to deal on a fair basis with its employer?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am not opposed to unions. What I am opposed to is political meddling in the field of employer-employee relationships through trade-unions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the speech of the able and distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH], who just left the floor, in behalf of the Hoffman amendment. May I urge him to make a careful reading, if he has not already done so, of that very able opinion delivered by former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and former President of the United States, William Howard Taft, bearing on this identical question. It could not be said that Chief Justice Taft was ever accused of being one-sided in his support of labor. He said in that able opinion in a case that went up from Pennsylvania that under the Constitution of the United States the working people had the right to organize. He also said that it was necessary that the workers of this country have that right and exercise it because the individual worker could not protect himself against the organized brains and capital of this country. To meet the aggregate of capital and brains, it was necessary for the workers to organize their brains and brawn.

Our colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH], states that he is opposed to the closed shop or the union shop. Under the closed shop, the union in effect hires and fires the workers in a plant. Management merely advises the union of the number of workers required and the character of work they are to do and the union sends these men to the employer. No one can work in a closed shop unless he belongs to the union and the dues are collected by management and turned over to the union.

A union shop is somewhat different to a closed shop. Management selects and employs the workers and under proper conditions can discharge them. Under this bill, the workers in any shop, factory, mine, or plant can have a union shop provided 30 percent of the workers in any particular shop or plant petition to the Administrator under this act to establish a union shop and then if 51 percent of the workers in that plant, shop, or factory vote for the union shop and the employer agrees with the majority of his workers to have a union shop, then a union shop is established and the 51 percent of the workers, by their votes, elect a bargaining agent or representative. Of course, they can select such union as they desire and thereupon they can enter into a collective-bargaining agreement as to wages, working hours, working conditions, and other matters pertaining to their employment.

Labor organizations of this country, as well as management and business, have objected to the Government interfering in the affairs of the workers and management in matters pertaining to their wages, hours, working conditions, and so forth. This bill is most democratic. It puts it up to the workers and management as to whether or not they will have a union shop, a bargaining agent and collective bargaining. In the formation of the union, the workers who oppose it can vote against it. All of these elections are conducted under the proper supervision of the Government and the balloting is secret and must be free from coercion or fraud.

No act ever passed by Congres protects the rights of individual workers and the legitimate rights of the unions as well as the workers as this measure does. No union can expell its members except for just cause set forth in this bill. Some of our colleagues here today have denounced as racketeering the collection of union dues from the minority members who are opposed to the union shop and collective bargaining. No doubt, there have been abuses in the collection and disbursement of union dues. The purpose of this bill is to cure any such abuses.

Is there any doubt in the mind of any man on the floor of this House that brains and brawn have greatly increased the wages of the workers, shortened the hours of service and bettered their working conditions? If 51 percent of those employed in the shop, mill or mine, agree on the establishment of the union and select a bargaining agent and enter into a bargaining contract, it will benefit not only the 51 percent but also equally the 49 percent. Why should the 20 percent, the 30 percent, or the 49 percent of those in the minority not contribute their share of the necessary expenses of the union as well as the 51 percent or more? If the union is established in this way and benefits come to the workers all alike, is it not only fair that the beneficiaries, whether the majority or the minority, contribute their equal share in securing these benefits?

Mr. JENNINGS. Is not that analogous to a bond issue for the building of school houses or raising the pay of school teachers? It carries by a majority vote, yet those who vote against the issue must contribute their share of the public cost of the benefit.

Mr. ROBSION. My friend from Tennessee is certainly correct, but in the case of the increase of pay for teachers, I cannot see how it would be equitable for the teachers who benefit by their teachers' organizations in securing increased salaries and other benefits who fail to contribute to their teachers' associations or their national association through whose efforts the increase was brought about. In the Bar Association of lawyers or other legitimate groups, lodges, and so forth, certain benefits accrue to the members. Each member is expected and does contribute his part. I really believe each person, who is able to do so, should carry his part.

This bill will take the so-called racketeers out of labor unions and labor contracts. It will not be the Government running the labor unions—it will be the workers and employers themselves carrying on the business of management and labor. Our friend from Michigan, by his amendment, hopes to take away the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively. I agree with Chief Justice Taft that labor has the right, under the Constitution of the United States, to organize for the benefit of themselves and their families. They not only have the right, in my opinion, but it is necessary for them to do so. I have always favored honest, sincere, collective bargaining, mediation, conciliation, and arbitration of the disputes arising between management and labor.

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETEEN MILLION DAYS LOST IN 1946

The Government records show that for the 6 years preceding the enactment of the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933—NRA—the United States had an average of 753 strikes per year involving an average of 297,000 workers; during the next 6 years there were an average of 2,541 strikes per year involving an average of 1,181,000 workers a year, and during the next 5 years, that is 1939 through 1944, there was an average of 3,514 strikes a year involving an average of 1,508,000 workers. These strikes during those 12 years or 13 years represented the loss of tens of millions of man-days of work, but the number of strikes and man-days lost increased rapidly year by year. In 1945 approximately 38,000,000 man-days of labor was lost as a result of strikes—still on the increase. In 1946, according to the Government records, there were 4,985 strikes and there were 119,000,000 man-days lost. It is said that the average pay of workers involved in these strikes was approximately $10. That means that the workers alone involved lost $1,119,000,000 in wages in 1946.

Beginning with the NRA and on down to and including 1946, we see an increase in the number of strikes of 800 percent and the number of workers involved and the number of man-days lost greatly exceeded 800 percent in 1946 over 1933. This appalling loss of man-days does not take into account the tens of millions of man-days lost as a result of indirect effect of strikes. I recall last year during the coal strike that perhaps 85 percent of the trainmen in my section were laid off and 27 daily trains in the State of

Kentucky were taken out of the service during that strike by reason of the strike. Many factories were closed in Kentucky and literally thousands were closed throughout the Nation. This was only one of the many big strikes that have taken place in the last 10 or 15 years. The losses to the workers and their families were tremendous and the loss to agriculture, industry, and commerce was even greater. It is quite evident that under our present laws the relationship between management and labor is not what it should be. Some plan must be worked out to improve the relationship between management and labor not only in the interest of management and labor but in the interest of the American people as a whole. Labor, management, and the American people as a whole all have a stake in this very, very important problem. The American people are demanding action and relief from these conditions.

Labor has rights that should be and must be respected and protected. This same thing goes as to management, business, and the American people as a whole.

The Committee on Education and Labor of the House has worked diligently for many weeks—yes, for several months—trying to find a way to protect the rights of all three of these groups and find a way to bring about better relationship between management and labor. They have heard the testimony of a multitude of witnesses in favor of and in opposition to legislation on this matter, and out of it all they have submitted to the House the bill that is now before us. The committee is made up of Republicans and Democrats. Eighteen Republicans and Democrats favorably reported this bill. Four of the members of that committee expressed themselves as being opposed, and it is now up to the House and Senate to review the work of the committees of the House and Senate, in an effort to pass a law that will be just and fair to labor and management and also protect the just rights of the 140,000,000 Americans. While much has been said over the radio and in the press urging persons to write or wire their Congressmen and Senators, I thought that we would receive a flood of letters, telegrams, and wires, but strange to say that, although this bill has been under consideration for some days in the House, I have only received three letters and telegrams urging me to support the bill and one letter and one telegram expressing opposition to the bill. During the further consideration of the bill I expect to be present all of the time and do what I can to help make it a better bill. I recognize it is very important to labor, management, and the American people. There are some things in the bill that do not meet my approval but, of course, after we have finished the bill it will then go to the Senate, and, as there may be some differences in the provisions of the Senate bill and the House bill, it will then go to conference and the conferees of the House and Senate will consider both bills and try to arrive at a just and fair compromise and report their findings to their respective bodies, and when it comes up in the House and Senate and these two Houses approve the conference report, that, then, will be the final bill, and I hope that when it does come up for final approval that the bill will be improved and that we then can say that the House and Senate, through long and earnest effort, have presented the very best bill possible.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the committee will offer a committee amendment on page 50, an amendment which should be considered in connection with the question now under discussion. That is a section which proposes to recognize State action on the question of the closed shop. It is a very important section. It is a very important section particularly in those States which have taken action upon this question, either by legislation or by constitutional amendment. I call attention to it because just this week the attorneys general of several States have been in session at Lincoln, Nebr., to consider what steps they may need to take in order to protect the validity of State enactments on the subject in view of the congressional power over interstate commerce.

Section 13 on page 50, which is a committee amendment, reads as follows:

SEC. 13. Nothing in this act shall be construed to invalidate any State law or constitutional provision which restricts the right of an employer to make agreements with labor organizations requiring as a condition of employment membership in such labor organization, and all such agreements, insofar as they purport to impose such requirements contrary to the provisions of the law or constitution of any State, are hereby divested of their character as a subject of regulation by Congress under its power to regulate commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, to the extent that such agreements shall, in addition to being subject to any applicable preventive provisions of this act, be subject to the operation and effect of such State laws and constitutional provisions as well.

It seems to me it is important to remember that will be offered as a committee amendment because it strengthens the provisions of the bill so far as bans on the closed shop are concerned in the States which have taken action. I think now there are about 12 States that have taken formal action and another dozen have that kind of action under consideration. Those who want to support the committee position can well vote, it seems to me, to support the committee in the provisions heretofore discussed and against the amendment now pending and in favor of the committee amendment which will be offered as section 13 of the amended Wagner Act.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Of course, the gentleman refers to the fact that there were 12 States, now 13 with Texas, that have voted on this proposition, which is an indication of the overwhelming public opinion in this country in that direction. In that connection I should like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the last Gallup poll on this subject 66 percent of the American people are shown as favoring the open shop, 18 percent favor the union shop, 8 percent favor the closed shop, and 8 percent have no opinion on the subject.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think that is representative of the general opinion. My State first enacted a legislative bill and then the voters in a general election confirmed that by an amendment to the State constitution, known as the right-to-work amendment. Under this trend the gentleman mentions that will be done in many other States of the country. The committee amendment will support such action where it is taken.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. I have read section 13. May I ask the gentleman if it would not suffice if in the second line, after the word "provision," a period were inserted and strike out the rest of the section?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, if you put a period there, it would be pretty broad because it would deal with subjects other than the right of the employer to make closed-shop agreements. You might nullify much of the bill, because you would establish State rights to deal with all phases of industrial relations in spite of any provisions whatsoever in the act.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. In considering the Gallup poll referred to by the gentleman from Texas, is it not the understanding of the gentleman that that poll was on the question of what a particular person preferred, a closed or union shop, the question not being: Did the person prefer to have the Congress of the United States ban legally one or the other, the closed shop or union shop?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman probably has answered the question in his question. I do not remember the exact phrasing of the Gallup poll question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last nine words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment which I do not propose to discuss in detail. I am very much constrained to express deep regret that we have been unable to find a way to face the very serious problem of labor and management, and capital, because there are now three groups involved. There used to be just capital and labor, now management has become a vital factor. I am particularly sorry that we cannot go at so vital a problem as is involved in H. R. 3020 basically rather than doing little more than treat symptoms. Granted that the companies must have relief, granted that the country must be able to go forward in production. How can capital put its money into enlargement of its industry unless it knows that it is not going to be held up by strikes and labor problems? Lead time is of basic importance to production and

it is rooted in the need to know that there will be no stoppages at any point. How are you going to handle the production of automobiles or anything else unless there can be assurance of continuous action on the part of both management and labor?

I want to see us get back to a few basic things, to be a truly united country. The greatest thing we had to give the world beginning on VJ-day was our much-vaunted genius for production. The world needed everything, everything, but we just have not got into high gear. Yes, one reads that production is high, but try and buy something that you want; just try it. If we had started our production lines of peacetime commodities promptly and kept them moving there could not have been such high prices. One of the best known of the leaders of labor joined with industrialists and Government men in stating that production is the great need in avoiding inflation and a consequent depression.

I have watched with a sad heart the results of our policies toward our workers. We seem to have taken away from a man the dignity of his own labor, the joy of his work, the urge to do a better job each day. This loss of satisfaction in work well done is one of the most distressing things that have happened to us as a people.

I regret that I must feel as I do that this bill reflects too strongly the results of the strikes that are doing so much to destroy our usefulness as a nation in a world that looks to us for help and inspiration. I cannot agree with some of its provisions. I shall do what I can to change those features that seem to me most objectionable. I shall hope that if I and those in agreement with me are not successful, conference with the other body may eliminate the worst of them. But I wish we might deal with fundamental causes and at this point, Mr. Chairman, I speak as a woman, not just as a Congresswoman. I would like to have known what are the living conditions of the workman? What does his wife have to contend with? How much of the difficulties of living is due to too little money? How much of it is due in a measure at least to the human element in the men and women themselves, and how much of it is really due to an ill-adjusted economy? Surely we must take into consideration the human element.

There is no way to avoid the hard fact that there is a real need for some disciplinary legislation, unfortunately. Once again the responsibility falls upon those of us who are Republicans. But we do not forget that it was the Republicans who disciplined capital when capital got all out of hand. Surely we cannot refuse to take a similar responsibility at this point in relation to another group. I should be happier if I could be very certain that we will remember that all the fault is never on one side. Disciplines must be set up to curb the present trends, but these should be established with justice and restraint and a sense of the common needs of all concerned. And I insist, Mr. Chairman, that we should discipline ourselves as well.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 10 words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall support this amendment. I believe it presents the issue whether or not we are going to maintain our fundamental American freedoms, which have already been frittered away to a great extent or whether we shall have a new birth of freedom for the individual. This amendment simply gives a laborer the right to refrain from joining a union. Why should an American citizen not enjoy that right?

It is true that with this right the nonunion member may enjoy benefits which have been secured by organized labor without having contributed to this result. Strictly spreaking and all other things being equal this seems unfair to those who are organized.

However, it seems to me that the other considerations outweigh this inequality. The union shop proposed in this bill differs from the closed shop only in that the former requires that the employer must voluntarily ask for the union shop, then 50 percent of the actual employees must vote for it and upon the happening of these two events it becomes a closed shop to every employee 30 days after he begins work there. From that time on he becomes the subject of union officials and must assume at least moral cooperation and responsibility for all the conduct of union leadership.

Now the principal criticism of unions today is not directed at unionism itself but to the irresponsible and corrupt management and leadership into which many unions have drifted. It requires but little reading of the hearings on this bill to cause one to shudder at the tyranny and depredation committed by such union officers and leaders. A member of such unions must assume partial responsibility for such conduct.

I have, I dare say, thousands of labor constituents in my district who cannot conscientiously become members of certain unions because they cannot and dare not accept joint responsibility for the conduct of leaders of such type. They should not be compelled by the union-shop provision in this bill to accept that stigma but have the right to refrain from joining any union whose leaders engage in disreputable practices.

It is, of course, true that all legislation is the result of compromise. But to compromise on this principle is as I said at the outset a further frittering away of a fundamental American freedom. It is further an admission that the union shop is not something that can be sold on its merits but must be riveted on the wrists and ankles of a substantial part of our citizenry for the ease and certain tribute for such aforesaid labor leaders. Therefore I believe the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 11 words.

Mr. Chairman, I have not participated in the debate up to this point. I think the members of the committee who have spoken have very well explained the bill. The knowledge of the bill and of its provisions they have displayed conclusively demonstrates the fine, thorough work they have done in its preparation. I want to commend the members of the committee for the excellent work they have done on the bill, and that commendation also applies to members of the committee on the other side of the aisle who worked with the members of the committee on this side of the aisle in bringing this bill to the floor for consideration. I make that comment because it is worthy of note that the bill was reported for action by a vote of 18 to 4.

There is no question but that the issue here presented is one of great importance. It is one about which the people of the country have debated. It has been the subject of countless polls. It has been the subject of much controversy among many honest, conscientious citizens, and certainly among honest and conscientious Members of Congress, Members striving to find the right answer.

I am glad that in the consideration of this particular proposition we have had real argument rather than epithets. I have listened to much of the debate on this bill, and I regret that on occasion we have had name-calling rather than argument, which is certainly a poor substitute for reasoned judgment.

Some reference was made to party position. I have not understood that at any time in a party announcement my party declared itself specifically for the abolition by legislative action of the union shop or the closed shop. Our position for the enactment of fair and reasonable legislation dealing with labor-management relations has been known for a long time. On that we stand and on that we are proceeding here today.

I commend the committee particularly for the provisions they have worked out in respect of this particularly troublesome problem. As I understand the bill, the closed shop, and there is a manifest difference between the closed shop and the union shop, is outlawed by the terms of the bill, but as to the union shop, this is what we are doing: First of all, it ought to be understood by everybody that whether it is a union shop or a closed shop the arrangement stems from a contract entered into by the employer with the employees. It is not ordered by Government, it is not put into effect by Government. I am one of those who have felt that Government had no right or authority to order a closed shop or a union shop into effect where the parties did not want to agree to it.

I understand that frequently employers who are against the union shop will say that they are not free agents in arriving at the contract. My view about that is that an employer has some responsibilities that he ought to be ready to meet. If by legislation we throw around him the mantle of protection to the end that whatever contract he enters into in this regard he may enter into voluntarily and without coercion, then certainly that leaves him a free agent to do what he thinks ought to be done.

On the question of giving the employees the right of free action, it is likewise provided in the bill before us that a secret ballot must be had by the employees and that a majority must vote for a union-shop agreement before it can be put into effect. I know many employers prefer a union shop. They find nothing wrong with it. They operate under it. They

take it by choice. They say if they are going to have a union they want everybody to belong to the union.

There is the right of the freedom of employment or the seeking of employment left to every man. I believe that if this provision is written into the law some of the troublesome things we have seen and which have distressed us all in connection with labor disputes on this very problem will be done away with. In any event, why not give it a try? Why not see how it will work? If it should happen in the future that this is a satisfactory and adequate provision and arrangement, then we have gone far enough. If the course of experience demonstrates it is not sufficient, then there will be time in the future to do whatever else might need to be done.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman is making a constructive defense of the principle of the union shop. However, I think the gentleman should be aware of the fact that under the operations of this bill the union shop is for all practical purposes destroyed so that in defending the provisions of this bill the gentleman is negating what he said in his very able defense of the principle of the union shop.

Mr. HALLECK. I may say to the gentleman I do not agree with his interpretation of the bill. Of course, if his interpretation is correct, then his argument is a complete answer to those who seek to strike out the provisions of the bill as the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan undertakes to do.

As I say, I do not agree with his contention as to the effect of the provisions of this bill. It seems to me that the rights of the people on the employer's side are adequately protected and that the rights of the people on the employee's side are adequately protected. If through free agreement one of these arrangements is worked out, I think the objective that probably would be sought by all will be achieved.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to call the attention of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] to the reference he made to the poll that was taken on this bill. I cannot in my wildest stretch of imagination see how any polling institution, the Gallup poll or any other, could intelligently go out among the American people and take a poll on this 68-page complicated piece of legislation. Yesterday afternoon I asked the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] a question as to whether or not Theodore Eiserman, a Wall Street lawyer, one of the attorneys for the Chrysler Corp., sat in with the Republican majority in the drafting of this bill. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] answered, as is set out in today's RECORD:

Theodore Eiserman, as you know, was what we thought one of our best witnesses.

He introduced not only a fine statement on the law but introduced his own book, and on occasions I conferred with him in my office.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. No.

Another point to which I wish to call attention is the absolute sincerity and lack of hypocrisy on the part of the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. SMITH, when he stated that the Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act should be completely wiped out. As I see it, if either of these amendments is adopted—and I am against both of them—the same effect will take place and the Wagner Act will be nullified. But let us take our friend, the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. SMITH, at his word, and that will bring us back beyond 1935, if we wipe out the Wagner Act. Of course, then we go into the depression that was caused by the Republican malfeasance and misfeasance in office during the twenties, when we had over 14,000,000 men idle during the period from '29 to '33. So let us eliminate those 4 years from Dr. SMITH'S survey.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Not right now.

Then we go back beyond 1929. Then we are in the period that the majority side are trying to revert us to by the passage of this bill. We are in that grand old period from 1921 to 1929 when we had that so-called perfect economic condition referred to by our Republican friends. The Republicans are trying to bring us back to those days through this bill. I can tell you something that was going on in my own district, the Calumet industrial region of Indiana, during the 1920 period. Men were working in the mills 7 days a week, 12 hours a day, sometimes 14 hours a day, and on every second Sunday they worked 24 hours—a double shift on every second Sunday. If this piece of legislation is enacted into law as it is written, we will revert to those days, in those good old Republican times, when we had three Republican Presidents serve beautifully under our former great Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew Mellon.

Mr. Chairman, I again want to compliment the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] for being open and aboveboard and sincere in their contentions for the Hoffman amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The question is on the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 22, line 1, strike out the word "thereof" and insert "of a representative."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 22, line 17, strike out "2 (ii)" and insert in lieu thereof "2 (11)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 24, line 19, after the word "force", insert "or other illegal or unconstitutional methods."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 25, line 15, after the word "strike", insert "or make any request to the Administrator under section 2 (11) for a strike ballot."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 25, line 19, after the word "strike", insert the word "action."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 26, line 8, after "(d)" strike out the word "The" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 30, line 21, strike out "(c)" and insert "(e)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 33, line 21, strike out the word "believe" and insert "believes."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 33, line 22, after the word "force", insert "or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 43, line 9, strike out the word "on" and insert in lieu thereof the word "of."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 45, line 16, strike out the word "or" and insert in lieu thereof the word "of."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 47, strike out all of lines 18 to 22, inclusive.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 50, after line 14, add the following:

"SEC. 13. Nothing in this act shall be construed to invalidate any State law or constitutional provision which restricts the right of an employer to make agreements with labor organizations requiring as a condition

of employment membership in such labor organization, and all such agreements, insofar as they purport to impose such requirements contrary to the provisions of the law or constitution of any State, are hereby divested of their character as a subject of regulation by Congress under its power to regulate commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, to the extent that such agreements shall, in addition to being subject to any applicable preventive provisions of this act, be subject to the operation and effect of such State laws and constitutional provisions as well."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN to the committee amendment: On page 50, line 16, after the word "provision" strike out the balance of the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill—and in many respects it is a most excellent bill, and I shall vote for it no matter what you do to it—and if I am one of the conferees who goes over to confer with the Members of the other body, I hope, ability permitting, that I will do at least as much as—I would like to hope more than—any one of the conferees from the House to carry out the will of the House.

I had thought that there was something in the thought that you should have something to trade when you went bargaining. I believe sincerely and wholeheartedly, and I am satisfied that a majority of the Republican members of the committee who wrote this bill believed, and some of them still do, that it was no more than right and fair and decent, if I may use such a word, to write into the bill a declaration that if a man, an American citizen, a returned veteran, wanted to refrain from joining in union activities he might have that privilege. Unless this amendment is adopted, he will be, in many instances, denied employment unless he joins. If the Members of the House will read the report or read the hearings held by the Committee on Labor, or if they will read the hearings of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures on racketeering, they will discover that racketeering and extortion are practiced widely and are very successfully practiced—all carried on under the guise that it is a union activity well established. Hence it was that I offered the amendment, but the House in its wisdom has voted it down. Of course, I am forced to abide for the time being by that decision.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LESINSKI. Has the gentleman, who is a member of the Expenditures Committee, found any shortage of silverware?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know the gentleman's constituents are personally interested in that and can understand his earnest desire to get whatever his constituents want.

I wish the Members of the House would take this bill and turn to page 50 and read section 13. I read it several times. I can understand why I cannot understand it but I cannot understand why seven eminent and distinguished lawyers of this body on the Republican side whom I asked late yesterday and today to explain it do not understand what it means unless the purpose is to permit the States to legalize the closed shop while at the same time saying nothing about or giving authority to the States to permit the open shop. I wish a member of the committee would tell me what that section means. If they will I will be glad to withdraw my amendment. I do not know what it means and I wonder if you gentlemen know what it means. I will ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] to tell me what it means. I know the purpose or at least I think I do. I know the statement was made in committee that the States were to be given the right to legislate on the subject. The purpose is to permit States to legislate if they want to on the closed or security union shop or open shop issue. But this section does not do that. What does that section mean?

Mr. BARDEN. I am not exactly going to try to take on the job of making the gentleman understand.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know that. I plead in confession and avoidance when I rose a moment ago, but if the gentleman will make some other Members of the House understand it, that will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. BARDEN. May I say to the gentleman that we had a pretty thorough discussion of this in the committee at the time it was adopted overwhelmingly by the committee. I am not so sure but what the gentleman voted for it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would probably follow the gentleman's advice.

Mr. BARDEN. I hope you will in this instance and withdraw your amendment. All of this amendment was taken from the Case bill. There did happen to be a slight change in the wording of it, however.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOPE). The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

May I say to the gentleman that there are certain technical requirements that must be met when you are dealing with a matter such as this for it does have some bearing upon the power vested in Congress. It is dealing with a very technical question of regulating commerce between the several States, and in view of the fact that many of the States have passed laws dealing with the closed shop, why, then, the committee felt, and I am sure the whole House will feel, that the States should be recognized and their laws should certainly be given full power and effect as far as a State is concerned.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Does it not in effect mean this, and is it not designed to have this effect, that insofar as this House or the Congress may, it concedes the right of the several States to pass legislation or laws such as have been passed by certain States.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I stated in my opening statement that I understood what the committee was trying to get at, which was to give permission to the States to legislate on interstate commerce insofar as it affected these contracts. But what I want to know is whether this section does it. If you say so, I will have to go along with you.

Mr. BARDEN. Well, I say so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right. Then I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I might call attention to the fact that the Seventy-ninth Congress about a year or two ago passed a law which did this same type of thing in regard to the insurance laws. You may remember that we divested the insurance business of its interstate character to a certain extent, and that earlier the Congress had enacted the Webb-Kenyon law to permit the States to handle the liquor traffic in the days of prohibition, and this does exactly the same thing.

Mr. BARDEN. That is right, as I recall it. The amendment is in the best possible form the committee and its attorneys could prepare it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] to the committee amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment:

Page 51, line 5, strike out "13" and insert "14."

Page 51, line 11, strike out "14" and insert "15."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANDIS:

Page 21, at the end of line 6, insert the following: "except to the extent permitted by the provisions of section 14."

Page 51, after the committee amendment ending in line 3, insert a new section reading as follows:

"TRUST FUNDS

"SEC. 14. It shall not be an unfair labor practice under section 8 (a) (2) (C) (ii) for an employer to make payments to a trust fund established by a representative, for the sole and exclusive benefit of the employees of such employer, and their families and dependents (or of such employees, families, and dependents jointly with the employees of other employers making similar payments, and their families and dependents), provided (A) such payments are held in trust for the purpose of paying, either from principal or income or both, for the benefit of employees, their families and dependents, for medical or hospital care, pensions on re-

tirement or death of employees, compensation for injuries or illness resulting from occupational activity, or insurance to provide any of the foregoing, or life insurance, disability and sickness insurance, or accident insurance; and (B) the detailed basis on which such payments are to be made is specified in a written agreement with the employer, and employees and employers are equally represented in the administration of such fund, such agreement to contain a provision that in the event the employer and employee groups deadlock on the administration of such fund, the two groups shall agree on an impartial umpire to decide such dispute, or in event of their failure to agree within a reasonable length of time, an impartial umpire to decide such dispute shall, on petition of either group, be appointed by the district court of the United States for the district where the trust fund has its principal office, and shall also contain provisions for an annual audit of the trust fund, a statement of the results of which shall be available for inspection by interested persons at the principal office of the trust fund and at such other places as may be designated in such written agreement; and (C) such payments meet the requirements for deduction by the employer under section 23 (a) or section 23 (p) of the Internal Revenue Code."

Renumber the two following sections.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, some of us have had no chance to have amendments considered in the full committee, and I think the members of the committee will bear me out in this. I hope the committee will accept this amendment. The section on page 21 that has to do with the welfare fund outlaws all of the pension, health, hospital, and other benefits of labor organizations. I do not believe the Congress intends to outlaw those benefits. This amendment is practically the same amendment that was offered to the Case bill last year to take care o these health, accident, sickness, and death benefits that the welfare funds comprise. I wish and hope that the committee will accept this amendment.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. If the gentleman's amendment is not adopted, what will be the result?

Mr. LANDIS. Those funds and benefits will all be wiped out. There are about 15 international unions affected, and it affects over 600,000 workers in America who have put money into these funds.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. If they are continued they will just do what they were intended to do from the beginning, just be beneficial to everybody interested?

Mr. LANDIS. That is correct.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MASON. Why is it, then, that the committee did not consider this when they were preparing the bill?

Mr. LANDIS. I was to offer no amendment in the committee; I was to offer amendments on the floor of the House. This is the only opportunity I have to put the amendment in the bill.

Mr. MASON. But in the testimony before the committee in the hearings this must have been stressed. Why was it not considered then and adopted as part of the bill?

Mr. LANDIS. The committee did not see fit to take everything.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman refers to it as an amendment to the Case bill of last year. Does not the gentleman mean that this is the so-called Byrd amendment, which was added to the bill in another body?

Mr. LANDIS. That is right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It was in the bill as it was approved and went to the White House?

Mr. LANDIS. This is what was known as the Byrd amendment to the Case bill last year.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Was the amendment offered in committee?

Mr. LANDIS. No; it was not.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman's amendment permit the employer and employee on a voluntary basis to set aside the trust fund for hospitalization and retirement?

Mr. LANDIS. That is right.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. That is all it does?

Mr. LANDIS. It protects all funds and benefits.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION. It will continue those trust funds that have already been created and have been in operation for years?

Mr. LANDIS. That is right; there is no question about that. You cannot wipe those out.

Mr. ROBSION. The House last year adopted it in the Byrd amendment?

Mr. LANDIS. Yes, they adopted it.

Mr. ROBSION. When they finally passed the bill the House accepted it?

Mr. LANDIS. It passed the House and Senate last year.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. If the bill passes in the present form, all those funds would be wiped out?

Mr. LANDIS. There is no question about that.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. KEATING. What would happen to the existing funds if we failed to adopt this amendment?

Mr. LANDIS. They are all outlawed. I do not know what would happen to the funds they have in their possession, but it would outlaw all funds.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman point out just where that is in the bill?

Mr. LANDIS. On page 21, line 6, (ii).

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. Chairman, I think he inadvertently and certainly without intent has left the wrong impression with the House when he says that there was no opportunity to offer this amendment in committee. May I say that in the conference, when we wrote the original drafts—and there were several drafts of the bill—the gentleman had that opportunity. I recall no instance where he was denied the right in committee to present this amendment. It was my understanding that the gentleman attempted to present his proposal after we had agreed that no additional amendments would be offered. I understood the gentleman reserved the right to bring it up on the floor.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. The Republicans in the committee made an agreement that we were not to offer any controversial amendments to this bill in the full committee and you gave us the privilege of amending the bill on the floor of the House. I am surprised.

Mr. HARTLEY. May I say that the last statement that the gentleman from Indiana made is correct. When the majority members of the committee had decided on what we wanted to present to the full committee, it was the idea then that amendments that were controversial would not be offered in the committee. The chairman certainly did not reserve the right to prevent any Member from offering any amendment on the floor of the House. However, I do not believe we have had enough opportunity to know what this amendment will really do. I am told it might result in a tax being passed on to the consumers of coal, for example, or that the workers in the automobile industry might decide that they want to tax every car, let us say $50 or $100, for some welfare, insurance, or trust fund, which would be passed on to the consumers.

A colleague asks me if this is a John L. Lewis amendment. I am not certain the gentleman from Indiana offers it in that respect, but it might be so termed.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. You will agree that it passed both the House and Senate last year?

Mr. HARTLEY. I understand as the gentleman from South Dakota has said that it was tacked on to the Case bill in the other body and finally did pass the House.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. It seems to me a very serious matter. If we passed the substance of the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana in a previous session of Congress, and if it was accepted by the House and signed by the President, and so forth, and if certain labor organizations have been operating under it and they have large funds of money which

have already been paid in, what then is the duty of the gentleman as chairman of the committee and the duty of this House? We ought to do something about it. Why not pass this amendment now, and if it is not right and proper or if it is unsound, it will be taken out in conference. But if we pass it up now, what are we going to do about it?

Mr. HARTLEY. It is up to the House as to what it wants to do, but as chairman of the committee, I feel it my duty to try and protect this bill as it was reported out of the committee, and, therefore, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. May I ask if the committee considered what the status of existing trust funds would be if the provision reported by the committee should be adopted and enacted into law? Was there any consideration of what would happen to existing funds that have been set up?

Mr. HARTLEY. To be very frank, I would say to the gentleman I do not recall that issue having been thoroughly discussed in the committee.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. The committee, not having dealt with this matter in drawing up the bill, those charged with the handling, preservation, and distribution of these funds which are now in existence will continue to be so charged. It would in no way affect the set-up which they now have. The committee considered it and overwhelmingly voted to try to some extent to put safeguards on something that had begun to grow in this country, in which we saw great danger. In the hearing before the committee it was brought out that it was a dangerous threat, and the committee in its wisdom very wisely put a provision into the bill and it was reported out by the committee. If I might offer this observation, I sincerely hope the House will not interfere with that section of the bill, because if you do I think you are digging deeper into it than you would think, on the surface.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have been very much concerned by the language in line 21. I know of a great many insurance plans, retirement plans of all kinds, in my part of the country. Some unions have representatives on the committees that administer them. Others are solely controlled by the employers and paid for by the employers. In other cases the employee pays half, and in some cases the employee pays all. There has been no criticism of this group hospitalization plan that I am aware of. Some of our oldest unions, for instance the typographical union, have similar funds. I understand they operate a home at the present time with 500 men retired from their profession. The funds are contributed by members of that union. Certainly, in an effort to prevent what some people fear is an abuse, we do not want to work a hardship on those old, established national or international unions that have administered these funds successfully and properly over a long number of years.

I would like to see the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] go into the bill, and at least let it go to conference, so that it can be discussed further. To say that they can go on and run their institution as they have in the past is not the answer. They cannot do that because their income is shut off if this becomes law.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. HARTLEY. Is it not a fact that the present provisions in the bill will permit these trust funds now in effect to continue, where the contributions are made voluntarily?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It is a question of the effect of the word "voluntary." You have approved the closed-shop plan, for example. It can be said that it is compulsion to contribute to the fund.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION. These trust funds relate to widows and children of workers, do they not?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Some of them do. Some of them are for retirement homes for aged workers.

Mr. ROBSION. I think it would even reach the burial funds and those things that are in operation in nearly all factories and shops.

I agree with the gentleman that perhaps the committee has not given the consideration that it should have given to this matter. It ought to go into the bill and go to conference where it can be considered.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is what I am urging, that we put it in the bill and send it to conference. If the members of the committee can have more time to look into it I am sure that as they do they will agree as they did to the amendment to the Case bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which never received any consideration by the committee. It was only seen by me as a member of the committee about 10 minutes ago. I understand it was not seen by the chairman until today.

This amendment looks innocuous but it can involve taxes of hundreds of millions of dollars upon the consumers of this country. It has never been my feeling that it was the job of conferees to write legislation. It has seemed to me that the place to write legislation, in the case of bills under consideration in this body, is in the House of Representatives, and I am not impressed by the argument that we should put this amendment in the bill and let the conferees see whether it is all right or not.

This committee has worked some 3 months preparing this legislation. Here is an amendment that strikes to the heart of what this bill tries to do and imposes a limitless tax upon the consumers of the country. We are asked to adopt it on 10- or 15-minute notice without the counsel of the committee or anyone else having had opportunity to study its ramifications.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. It appears to me that it is a sort of shield and suit of armor, where the man says, "Now if I can get something like this on this bill then I have got me a prophylactic that will take care of me when the next election comes along.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. I am a bit puzzled by this amendment, with all due respect to the gentleman from Indiana. In view of the fact that in section 8 (a) 2 we have a provision that states that the employer shall be guilty of an unfair labor practice by assisting any labor organization through deducting from the wages of any employee dues, fees, assessments, or other contributions payable by the employee to a labor organization, or collecting or assisting in the collection of any such dues, fees, assessments, or other contributions, unless such action has been voluntarily authorized in writing by such employee and such authorization is revocable by the employee at any time upon 30 days' written notice to the employer. This means that, if the employee authorizes it, the employer can do it. That being the case, we have the provision where the employer can collect these assessments from the employee, but over on page 23 we have a provision whereby a labor organization cannot compel any member to agree to contribute or participate in any insurance or any benefit plan.

Is it not clear that the gentleman from Indiana is asking us to do something we have already done in the bill?

Mr. BUCK. The thing is too much for me, and I do not like to vote on something I do not understand.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee may want to hold the bill just as it is, but it does occur to me that this question deserves a little deliberation. If you do not want to refer this to the conference and think the bill should be written here in the House, then let us at least know what we are doing in this matter.

The original section 8 of the Wagner Act carries a provision in defining unfair labor practices which makes it an unfair labor practice for a contribution to be made by the employer to an employees' fund. The background of that was an attempt to prevent company domination of unions, and thus it had a sound historical basis. Actually, because of the fact that the welfare funds, or funds of that sort, have been more or less in favor of labor, few attempts have actually been

made, if any, to have such contributions declared an unfair labor practice.

During the deliberations on labor legislation last year, however, the question rose in very acute form because of the so-called welfare fund which was being asked as part of the settlement in the coal strike. Growing out of the general debate on that proposition which occurred through the press and throughout the country generally, when the labor legislation was taken up in the other body, there was an amendment offered by Senator BYRD which was incorporated in the bill. It was in the bill as finally approved by the House and as it went to the President.

The language which the gentleman from Indiana seeks to offer here would place in this bill somewhat comparable provisions. It would not make for an unfair labor practice if a company made a contribution to a welfare fund, provided that welfare fund were guarded by certain restrictions, such as that it should be a trust fund for the benefit of the employees or the members of their families or used for sickness insurance or accident insurance, and that it should be subject to joint control by employer and employees and by an annual audit to insure its protection as a trust fund.

Let me read you the language of the bill, and I read from pages 20 and 21. I shall skip certain portions of the language which do not relate to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana. The amendment of the gentleman from Indiana refers particularly to section 8, paragraph (a) subsection (2) (C) (ii). I will read only the pertinent language as it follows on down through those references:

It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer (2) to dominate or interfere with the formation or administration of any labor organization (C) by assisting any labor organization (ii) through making payments of any kind to such organization directly or indirectly, or to any fund or trust established by such organization, or to any fund or trust in respect of the management of which, or the disbursements from which, such organization can, either alone or in conjunction with any other person, exercise any control, directly or indirectly.

Now, that is a rather strict prohibition to carry in a bill against any contribution by a company to any welfare fund, no matter how it may be administered. The gentleman is within his rights very properly in calling to the attention of the House the opportunity to put in some safeguarding language which would make it possible for a contribution to be made by an employer to a welfare fund under certain conditions. Those conditions are set forth in his amendment and follow the language of the so-called Byrd amendment which I have described.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Would it be proper to use the identical Byrd amendment with which we are acquainted rather than to give us an amendment which, as the gentleman says, is along the line of the Byrd amendment, which I have never yet seen to this very minute as a member of the committee?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The difficulty is that the first part of the Byrd amendment was drawn in a pattern to fit in the other bill. The first part of this is drawn in a pattern to fit in these various references to which I have already referred. So far as the substance of the amendment is concerned, it is very close to the so-called Byrd amendment, it is essentially the same.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman is a very capable parliamentarian and we look to him in that direction. The gentleman knows what happened last time. The other body put this language in the bill. Would it not be a good thing to let that happen this time in the other body after that body has had time to read this?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That depends on how the gentleman feels as to whether we should accept the responsibility here or pass it over to the other body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, the proof of the pudding is the argument at the present time on this one little amendment, and I doubt that there is a Member on the floor who really understands the amendment any more than we were expected in the minority to read a bill of 66 pages in 2 days and on the third day file a minority report.

There has not been enough study given to all this legislation, and I repeat what I said before, that this bill is nothing but a monstrosity, and I further say this, that it is a death knell to labor, and all you can say is "requiescat in pace" to labor.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall use only one minute. This amendment is a rather complicated and a long one that the committee never did have a chance to see. I heard it read here for the first time a few minutes ago, and I had no information that it was going to be offered, and I do not think the committee has had an opportunity to study it. It seems to me that a matter of such grave and far-reaching importance as this is is one that should not be acted upon hastily here. It seems to me the procedure should be as was done before when this matter came up and it was passed to the Senate, and there the Byrd amendment undertook to take care of the situation to which it referred, and if it needs attention something like the same procedure should be followed at this time. I say that especially due to the fact that the committee never had an opportunity to go into it and give any study to it.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. This was mentioned in the committee in regard to the section relating to the benefits of the union and their funds. Of course, the amendment was not read, but if any one will read the section on page 21 and then read the amendment, he will see that it is important, and if any Member in the House will give me a reason or give a good argument for voting against the amendment, I am willing to take his word for it.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. OWENS. I would really like to have an answer from the gentleman from Indiana, and that is whether or not, where we have made provision in here that the employee by voluntarily agreeing that the money can be paid to the labor organization, that does not take care of it? The labor organization can then turn it over to a trust fund or any fund that they want to. All we have done here is to say that the employer cannot turn that money over to a trust fund, but there is nothing to stop the labor organization from doing it once the money is placed in their hands.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman is correct.

Let me point out that this thing of welfare funds is getting pretty well out of hand. Under the Krug-Lewis agreement, which was agreed upon last spring, a tax of 5 cents a ton was placed upon all the coal in the bituminous mines, which amounts to about $30,000,000 a year. That is a tax directly on the consumers of this country. Mr. Lewis has already given notice that he is going to double that demand when he comes up for another contract, and make it 10 cents a ton, not a contribution from the employer, if you please, but rather a tax upon the consumers of this country. Coal is already selling for $3.75 at the pit of the mine, and it is something that can very easily get out of hand. There is even talk now that some of the unions will follow this lead that has been undertaken in some instances. They may put a cent or two tax on each loaf of bread, and they may put a cent or two on each bottle of milk. There is no end where it will lead unless it is stopped or that there will be regulation if it is permitted at all. Therefore, I say hasty action in adopting that amendment would be entirely out of order at this time.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Then the committee did, in considering the language in the bill in section 8 (2) (c), intend to prohibit the very thing that is being done under the Krug-Lewis contract?

Mr. FISHER. I think the gentleman is right. It was an attempt to prevent the very thing that caused the disastrous coal strike last summer.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That was considered, and that is the purpose of it.

Mr. FISHER. Of course, the bill was read in its entirety. It must be remembered that the end is not one resulting from funds created by employee contributions. The evil lies in the tax that,

without the consent of Congress, is levied upon products such as coal. It is a direct tax on the consumers. Other forms of welfare funds may be desirable, but here we are dealing with the question of a direct tax on the American people.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. I am curious to know from the author of this amendment why he did not present it to his own committee while they were considering the bill.

Mr. LANDIS. Any amendment I had to offer was supposed to be offered on the floor of the House. That was the understanding. I had no objection to offering the amendment to the full committee.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I trust this amendment will be voted down.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, the only argument against this constructive amendment comes from the Republican members of the committee who say that they cannot quite grasp the intent or understand the far reaching extent of the amendment. These very gentlemen, however, brought in a bill containing 66 pages, and the membership of the House did not receive much more time to study the entire bill nor the report, consisting of 114 pages, than was given to the minority members of the committee itself.

The gentleman from Indiana has stated, as I understand, that he was granted the privilege by the committee of offering the amendment on the floor of the House. Of course, it is very magnanimous and extremely liberal on the part of the majority of the committee to permit a member of the committee, a gentleman who at all times has shown great interest in the cause of labor and proper legislation, to offer the amendment.

No good or valid reason has been given thus far by anyone who has spoken in opposition to the amendment. I think the amendment is in the right direction. Of course, there may be some gentlemen who may be under the impression that it might strengthen the bill. I myself believe it is so grossly unfair to the interest of labor and lopsided to the interest of management that it could not be improved by the adoption of any amendment in the Committee of the Whole.

Further, I feel that the gentleman from Michigan does not need to be alarmed when he says that notwithstanding what the House may do or what we may do to the bill, he as a member of the conference committee will stand by the action of the House. I assure him this House will not, and could not even if it tried to, do anything to amend the bill, because it is so vicious, it is so bad, that it matters not how some of the enemies of organized labor may try, they could not make it any worse than it is.

I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana is a splendid amendment, in the interest of justice, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Does not the gentleman feel it is quite clear here that the committee did consider this very proposition, and that it is against the amendment not because it does not understand it but because it is against it on its merits? They want to prohibit the paying out to the miners of that 5 cents per ton for their trust fund.

Mr. SABATH. I believe the gentleman's observation is correct. It is not because that the committee does not understand it but that the committee understands it too well. Under the proposed amendment the employers may agree with the employees to add a few cents on each automobile, or a cent or two on a radio or any other device or product, on which tremendous profits are made by the manufacturers. They oppose this amendment notwithstanding that they are willing that the public pay 5 cents or 10 cents more for a quart of milk, 20 or 40 cents more for a pound of cheese, or 20 or 50 cents more a pound on any kind of meat. But the moment an effort is made to pass legislation or an amendment proposed to legislation that would enable an employee to derive a little benefit or security, it meets with their opposition. I hope these observations may help to bring about the adoption of this worthy amendment.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Let me say to the gentleman that I am for the amendment, too.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION. There is nothing in the amendment that relates to the 5-cent tax in the Lewis-Krug agreement. As I understand, this amendment does not apply to that at all.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman for his interpretation of the proposed amendment. I believe that he views the amendment as I do and that he will vote for it. I repeat, I believe that the amendment is in the right direction and should be adopted.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

"I TOLD YOU SO"

Mr. Chairman, I wish to state my position in the pending legislation by the words "I told you so." On June 19, 1935, our good friend Billy Connery, who has gone to his reward, had charge of the legislation, the Wagner Act—page 9688. I reiterate my remarks given at that time; and if we had heeded then, we would not need this legislation today. My statements then were as follows:

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I might preface my remarks first by stating that before I came to Congress I had been a manufacturer all of my business life, and I have employed labor and do now employ labor. During the time of my sojourn in business I never suffered a labor strike. Probably I am not the best employer of labor, and for that reason I do not believe that I am the worst. My only object in considering this bill is to try to do more for labor. I am just as much interested in seeing that labor has its just due as any man in the House. I feel no business concern can succeed today—nor could it succeed formerly within the last 25 years or more—if labor and capital did not work hand in hand. We can say, as laborers or as manufacturers, we ought to believe in the Golden Rule, and all the laws that we might pass will never take the place of that law of Him who rules supreme above.

I cannot conform to all of the things suggested in this bill because of the fact that I believe as the bill is drawn today it will cause us to see more strikes in the next 2 or 3 years than we have ever seen in the history of this country, and Members of Congress know that in the past 2 years we have had more strikes than we have ever had in the history of the country.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I do not intend to yield to anyone until I have finished my statement, and then, if I have time, I shall yield principally to those who are labor-union men or who represent the labor unions in the House.

If an employee must be left free to join a union, so should he be left free not to join a union. There are rights of the employees and there are rights of the employers, and all of those rights must be considered if we are going to pass legislation that will eliminate strikes and make conditions in the country better for the employer and for the employee; because, as I said before, labor and capital are inseparable. They must work together. The majority of businessmen are honest and are striving to do the thing that is best for labor and for their business, and if the politicians make such laws that radicals and intimidators are permitted under laws, to close industry, foment strikes, then greater harm than good will be done, men will be put out of jobs instead of employed, industry will be closed rather than operated.

I am not a lawyer. I cannot, therefore, speak of the quality of this act with legal authority, but I have read and listened to authoritative argument to which the committee of this House has paid little attention. They convince me that the measure before us is in deadly conflict with the decision of the Supreme Court in the poultry case and the long line of cases that led up to that declaration. If I am not a student of common law, I, at least, have some common sense. I understand the difference between the power of Congress to regulate intercourse between the States, which we call the commerce power, and the prohibition against any attempt by Congress to regulate production within the States. I know that the power to regulate commerce extends to the persons engaged in that commerce and the instrumentalities of that commerce, like interstate railroads, telephones, and ships. I know the difference between regulating the relations between employer and employee in carrying on interstate communication on a railroad or a telephone company, or a ship, and undertaking to regulate the employment relations of the parties who are engaged in building engines or making telephones or putting a ship together. I can see that one is a regulation of commerce and the other is a regulation of production.

I know, the Supreme Court, in the poultry case, said in very clear language that—

"Persons employed in slaughtering and selling in local trade are not employed in interstate commerce. Their hours and wages have no direct relation to interstate commerce."

I know that means that Congress cannot regulate the hours or wages or working conditions of a man engaged in plucking poultry or making shoes or manufacturing furniture, even though, after the job is finished, in each case the goods might be shipped in

interstate commerce. For the same reason, it is just as clear to me that a dispute between employer and employee about plucking poultry or making the shoes, or the furniture, is a dispute not in commerce but in production, and you cannot make it a part of commerce by saying it is or declaring that it affects commerce by using a lot of words to that effect, when, as a matter of fact, as the Supreme Court has so plainly said, as of other acts, the relations of employer and employee engaged in manufacture or local service may remotely and indirectly affect it.

I know that it is equally true that for years, whenever there was a local strike that shut down a plant, in whole or part, that any attempt to bring an injunction against the strikers, because they were restraining production and therefore restraining commerce, was denied by the Federal courts, and it was the unions who raised this issue. And I know that the Supreme Court sustained their view and, in the poultry case, the Court recites these very cases and says that—"This principle frequently has been applied in litigation growing out of labor disputes."

Of course, if all the miners in the United States quit work together in order to deprive the Nation of fuel, their purpose being to stop all its commerce, we would have a very different situation. We would have just such a one as confronted Woodrow Wilson, in 1919, when the same president of the United Mine Workers threatened the country with a general strike, just as they do today, unless we enact the Guffey bill. Then President Wilson, addressing this Congress, October 27, 1919, said: "This strike is not only unjustified; it is unlawful."

And to protect the people of the United States he proceeded to stop it. There was a different conception of the public interest in the White House then.

I speak of this to call the attention of the House to the difference between any kind of a combination whose purpose is to tie up or obstruct the commerce of the United States and the attempt to make every petty dispute between an employer and an employee in local production the ground for a complaint to a Federal Board. Surely no Member of this House who has regard for the oath which he took to support the Constitution can fail to have a doubt as to the validity of this legislation. If he does have such a doubt, then he ought to resolve it before he acts, for I distinctly repudiate such statements as are made by Mr. William Green that Congress ought to act and then let the Supreme Court determine the constitutionality of our acts. We are agents with limited powers, and the Court gives every reasonable presumption to the constitutionality of what we do, because it believes that we have settled our own doubts and not passed them up to the Court.

I read the other day the statement of our congressional obligation by one of the greatest American judges in his work on constitutional law, and I venture to call it to the attention of this House, because too many of us have forgotten its nature.

"Legislators have their authority measured by the Constitution; they are chosen to do what it permits, and nothing more, and they take solemn oath to obey and support it. When they disregard its provisions, they usurp authority, abuse their trust, and violate the promise they have confirmed by an oath. To pass an act when they are in doubt whether it does not violate the Constitution is to treat as of no force the most imperative obligations any person can assume. A business agent who would deal in that manner with his principal's business would be treated as untrustworthy; a witness in court who would treat his oath thus lightly, and affirm things concerning which he was in doubt, would be held a criminal. Indeed, it is because the legislature has applied the judgment of its members to the question of its authority to pass the proposed law, and has only passed it after being satisfied of the authority, that the judiciary waive their own doubts and give it their support." (Thomas M. Cooley, Principles of Constitutional Law.)

Let me give you a test for this bill. Suppose there was a labor dispute in the Schechter Poultry Corp., the company which appealed the case in which the Supreme Court just decided. Suppose a complaint is made to the Labor Board you propose to establish charging that this man Schechter committed an unfair labor practice by attempting to interfere with the self-organization of his employees or refused to bargain with their representatives. Would that be a case for this Board? Here, of course, Mr. Green—or Mr. Connery—would say "Yes." Why? Because it would be a "labor dispute," under paragraph 9 of section 2 of this bill, and under paragraph 7 of the same section, it would affect commerce, because it might be "tending to lead to a labor dispute pertaining to or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce." Would the proposed Labor Board take jurisdiction? Of course it would; but if it did, it would plainly be dealing with an employment relation which the Supreme Court says is local. But, although it is local in every circumstance, this bill is drawn so as to drag it by definition into commerce. Are the gentlemen of this House fooled into believing that by calling a thing "commerce" they can make it so? I do not have to be a lawyer to know better than that.

Referring to the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Connery] that this legislation has been sent down here by the administration—and when anything is sent here by the administration we are supposed to be gullible enough to accept it as it is forwarded to us without amendment—I think it is an imposition upon the membership of Congress, and I want to read at this juncture where Mr. Green, of the American Federation of Labor, threatened a general strike. This is in New York, under date of May 23:

"NEW YORK, May 23.—Labor stands ready to tie up the Nation's industry by throwing down its tools in a general strike if Congress fails to grant its basic demands, William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, warned today.

"CROWD ROARS APPROVAL

"The crowd roared its approval as the labor leader threatened:

"'If Congress fails us, labor has its economic strength. If it comes to the point, we can mobilize our complete strength and refuse to work until we get our rights.'

"And when the applause had thundered away, he added grimly:

"'That is no idle threat. I mean just what I say.'

"In addition, he told the audience, labor must be ready to mobilize its political strength to defeat unfriendly Congressmen when they run for reelection."

I want to say to Mr. Green and I want to say to anybody in this land of ours, whenever I cannot use that God-given right of mine to think, I do not want to be in the House of Representatives. I would not be here, and if Mr. Green or anybody else thinks he is going to domineer me when it comes to using my best judgment in trying to legislate, then God forbid that I be a Member of Congress. This is intimidation of the worst sort, and that is what radical labor men resort to, to coercion and force to meet their own selfish ends, whether it is the best thing to do for the greatest number or not. I personally must try to make laws for all and for their best interest, not for any particular minority when it does injury to a greater number.

Now, when you examine this bill you can see that is precisely what is proposed to be done, for we propose to create a permanent labor board to entertain complaint with respect to what are called "unfair labor practices." These are five in number, and they can be committed only by an employer. The same things may be done by an employee, but they are not unlawful. Now, what are these things? They are to restrain or coerce employees in self-organization or forming, joining, or assisting labor organizations, or bargaining collectively through representatives of their own choosing. A little later we will see that this is precisely what the bill will not permit, but for the moment let us see what the labor practices are. I have said that they are interference, restraint, or coercion with the above rights by an employer, or domination or interference by him or the contribution of financial support to any labor organization. Of course, under the rules established by the Board an employer may be permitted to allow employees to confer with him during working hours without loss of pay, but it is very interesting to observe that he is not to be permitted to allow the employees to confer among themselves without loss of pay. Yet how can they prepare to confer with him if they may not confer among themselves? Of course, the purpose of that is to permit only one kind of a labor organization to function.

The remaining unfair labor practices are to discriminate in employment so as to discourage or encourage membership in any labor organization or to discriminate against an employee because he files charges under this bill or to refuse to bargain with the representatives of employees. The employer may make an agreement with a majority of his employees to make it a condition of employment that the employee shall join the majority organization. That, of course, means the establishment of the closed shop.

Now, what do these terms mean? What is interference? Is it discussing with employees the merits or demerits of any particular organization? Is it refusal to deal with a Communist organization? Because Communist organizations, under the definition of this bill by paragraph 5, section 2, have exactly the same standing as any reputble labor organization. So long as part of its purpose is to deal with an employer respecting working conditions, he is just as much obliged to deal with its representatives as any other kind of organization and thus encourage the very type of organization that is constantly denounced on the floor of this House. Moreover, it does not make any difference what the reputation of any organization that seeks to deal with the employer is. It may not keep its contracts, it may have bad leadership, but it will be an unfair practice not to recognize its representatives and deal with them. If the employer discusses these things with his employees, is he interfering with them? Is he discriminating in employment when he refuses to hire men of bad reputation, or is he dominating and interfering with the formation of a labor organization if he undertakes to discuss the number of apprentices that ought to be permitted, or any one of the numerous questions that arise in the normal relations of employer and employee by means of which they live in peace and amity?

Walter Lippmann severely criticized this measure, because he said that in a field where clear definition was most inportant this sloppy measure presented vague and indefinite definitions of unlawful conduct that would constantly multiply disputes and litigation. In other words, it encourages by its bad draftmanship exactly what it claims to minimize.

That is what they call a penal statute. The courts have again and again said that if

such statutes are ambiguous and do not clearly tell us in advance what we can do and what we cannot do, they are bad laws. In this field they make worse policy because they breed discord and bitterness and afford to the man who is looking for it the chance to make unfounded complaints. What this bill will do is to create a gigantic police court, for employers may be summoned from every part of the United States on any kind of a petty dispute, and if the Board constituted is no more impartial than the one which we have witnessed in action or the one over which the sponsor of this bill presided, it will breed strikes as fast as a fish lays eggs.

Perhaps the worst feature of this bill which carries the intrinsic evidence of this unfairness is the declaration that only the employer shall be prohibited from intimidation, coercion, and restraint. The President of the United States, when he settled the automobile dispute, March 25, 1934, made a notable declaration. He said:

"The Government makes clear that it favors no particular union or particular form of employee organization or representation. The Government's only duty is to secure absolute and uninfluenced freedom of choice, without coercion, restraint, or intimidation from any source."

The President was not talking about his opinion. He was talking about what was the Government's duty. Now, by giving his approval to the measure before us he has abandoned his conception of public duty and substituted for it his endorsement of tolerated coercion by one class of citizens, while condemning the same kind of coercion by another class of citizens. I know of no greater injustice than to say that it shall be unlawful for one group of our people to do that which other groups are permitted to do. It is a distinct encouragement to lawlessness. In this case it is not secret, occasional, or sporadic lawlessness.

It is notorious, customary coercion which accompanies every kind of a labor dispute of any proportions with which we are familiar. Every member of this House knows it as well as I do. I have no use for boycotts or blacklists or intimidation by employer or by employees, corporations, or by labor unions. The corporation and labor union which hires thugs or tolerates or condones violence ought to keep the lock step of fellow convicts. I know it will be said that labor unions condemn lawless acts, but I have yet to hear of any labor organization that has ever suspended or expelled any member for engaging in such conduct of which it was the beneficiary. Yet this House, in the face of the declaration made by the President of the United States as to what the duty of government is, is asked to write into this bill a prohibition of coercion against employers on the ground that they alone interfere with self-organization or the selection of representatives. Every one within the sound of my voice knows that closed-shop unionism is determined to have no representatives except those of its own selection. It has not accepted the outcome of any election that went against it under elections supervised by the Labor Board, no matter how great the majority. Mr. Green has said, in an interview with the American Magazine for May, that he never will accept the results of such an election, save temporarily, and under compulsion.

I have always thought that the most elementary right of an American is that of selecting and pursuing the employment of his choice. In that right he is to be free from molestation or intimidation by anyone. This House is asked to write in the law the proposition that he shall be free only from employers and that the equally notorious coercion of labor organizations shall be ignored. How long do you think that kind of arbitrary classification will stand in a court? You also propose to give to this Labor Board, with only the guidance of your vague definitions, the power to determine what constitutes these unfair labor practices. You give that Board a jurisdiction and an authority greater than is possessed by any of our courts. Without rules of evidence it is to make findings of facts and they are to bind the court which reviews them. It is to have the power to have its orders enforced by the courts, and how? By injunctions. The American Federation of Labor has fought in Congress for years to destroy what it called government by injunction. Now it is asking for it and asking you to govern the employment relations of the United States by injunction. But this time it is the conduct of employers, not their own, that is to be subjected to injunction.

All that I have said about the unconstitutionality of this bill is emphasized by what the Committee on Labor has done with it. Since it passed the Senate, they have rewritten their report and brought in 21 amendments for the purpose of trying to save it from the condemnation of the courts, but no trick of theirs can save it from its fundamental defect, and that is the attempt by the Federal Government to take control of and regulate the relation of employer and employee entirely within the States, and while engaged in acts of manufacture, construction, mining, and service. They still think that a dispute in a factory, a restaurant, a barber shop, or a pants-pressing establishment might lead to a dispute that might lead to a strike that might threaten our commerce. The more I have read this bill the more I am inclined to think that the gentlemen would pass a bad bill and have it overthrown in order that they may find a new reason for criticizing the Court which will be compelled to condemn this flagrant violation of constitutional authority.

But are the gentlemen gaining new rights for labor? On the contrary, I think they are inflicting new wrongs upon the worker, for, if this bill is enacted, his right of self-organization and association will not be enlarged—it will be contracted. First of all, the Labor Board, not himself, will determine the unit of employment which is to select representatives. Unless he is a part of the majority in that unit he will not be represented by an agent of his own selection. As an individual, whether he is in a big or little unit of employment, he cannot make his own contract and sell his own labor if a majority of his fellow employees want to sell it collectively. This is not enlarging the right of self-organization or association. This bill gives fellow employees the right to coerce and intimidate their fellows in the exercise of every one of these rights. It destroys individual bargaining, takes away the right to determine their own unit of employment, and, unless you are part of a majority, the worker will have to let someone whom he did not select sell his labor for him. I predict with confidence that, if this measure is enacted, it will have a short life but an unhappy one, for it will breed strife and bitterness, as it is neither practical nor effective to protect the rights it pretends to safeguard. On the contrary, it is defective, biased class legislation and deserves from this House the condemnation it will receive from the courts.

I cannot conclude my comments on this measure more appropriately than by quoting the characterization which it received from the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] who, pointing to the lopsided, arbitrary, and unjust provision approving coercion by one group and tolerating it when committed by another, said:

"As I see this particular section, it looks to me like an effort to force every man in America to join a certain kind of union, whether or not he wishes to join that union; and the coercion and intimidation features are not to be inserted in this section because a certain union desires a free hand to take the workers from the groups in which they now belong into groups into which they may not wish to go.

"That is the naked fact back of the opposition to this amendment. It is an amendment to force all working people into a particular union, and every Senator on this floor knows that to be the truth." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 16, 1935, p. 7671.)

The Wagner Act will work in the interest of only a small minority of workers represented by professional labor leaders, will promote industrial strife, will bring about an epidemic of labor disputes, will drive employers and employees apart, and will substantially impede recovery.

It will in practice tend to make a closed shop of every plant and to make every employee carry a union card if he is to earn a living.

It penalizes employers for so-called unfair practices but will leave the agents and organizers of labor unions, or the labor unions themselves completely free to use violence, intimidation, and other coercive methods which they may seek to employ.

Every employer is compelled to report in detail every dollar of money received and how every dollar is expended, so why not compel labor unions to give a strict accounting of the money that they receive, and above all, how same is spent? [Applause.]

On page 9718, I offered an amendment to the bill with comment by me and Chairman Connery, which I insert:

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: Page 4, line 16, insert, after the word 'states', the following:

" 'To make effective the policy declared by the President of the United States the Government makes clear that it favors no particular union or particular form of employee organization or representation. The Government's only duty is to secure absolute and uninfluenced freedom of choice without coercion, restraint, or intimidation from any source' "

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to state to the membership of the House, that if this amendment is adopted it will only make effective the President's declared policy which he has advocated and I hope the membership of the House will see fit to adopt this proposal of the President. If you adopt it, you are then advocating the principles which he has enunciated with respect to justice to labor and to capital and the free will to join any organization. If you do not adopt it, then you turn down his expressed request insofar as handling the affairs of capital and labor, in my judgment, is concerned.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I will simply say in answer to the statement of my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, this bill as it is now drawn up and as it has been reported to the House by the Committee on Labor, is the bill which the President approves.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes; certainly.

Mr. RICH. Is it going to be the practice that any amendments that are presented here are not going to be permitted to be considered by the membership of the House because of the fact that this is a cut-and-dried or dyed-in-the-wool bill and we must accept it as is?

Mr. CONNERY. I may say to my friend from Pennsylvania that we have no idea whatever of saying that an amendment offered by any Member here should not have consideration, but the gentleman in his address mentioned the President and I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that this bill, as reported by the Committee on Labor to the House is in the form in which the President would like to see it passed. This is all I said.

The gentleman is entitled to his view of the matter, but I hope the gentleman's amendment will be voted down.

On page 9721, I offered an amendment which was voted down. If it had been adopted we would not need this legislation today and our labor relations in the meantime would have been more pleasant:

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: On page 6, line 9, at the end of the last paragraph, insert the following:

"'The term "labor organization" shall not include any organization defined in the preceding paragraph unless said organization files with the National Labor Relations Board its acceptance of the following conditions of operation:

"'(a) That all elections and votes on strikes shall be by secret ballot.

"'(b) That a reliable accounting system will be maintained, and will be audited at least annually, with reports promptly and duly made to a meeting of the members, and a copy filed with the National Labor Relations Board.

"'(c) That its membership books, or rolls, will not be closed to new members, and all applicants will be admitted to membership, except for good cause shown relating to the individual applicant.

"'(d) That all of its objects and purposes are lawful.

"'(e) That it will not instigate, maintain, or support any strike for an illegal purpose.

"'(f) That it will not instigate, maintain, or support any strike in violation of any collective-bargaining agreement, or in opposition to any arbitration award rendered pursuant to an agreement to submit to arbitration.

"'(g) That it will not instigate, maintain, or support any strike to further any issue which the employer offers to submit to arbitration pursuant to section 12 hereof.

"'(h) That it will not instigate, maintain, or support any strike, except as a last resort after making all reasonable efforts to settle the issues by direct negotiation and governmental mediation.

"'(i) That it will agree to submit all jurisdictional disputes to arbitration pursuant to section 12 hereof, and will not engage in any jurisdictional strike, in cases where other organizations, parties to such dispute, likewise agree to submit to arbitration.

"'(j) That it will not instigate, maintain, or support any strike designed or calculated to coerce government or any agency thereof either directly or by inflicting hardship upon the community, against any action on the part of the State or Federal Government, or any of the agencies or political subdivisions thereof.

"'(k) That it will not instigate, maintain, or support any strike except in furtherance of a trade dispute within the trade or industry in which the strikers are engaged.

"'(l) That it will not coerce, or attempt to coerce, any worker to join any particular labor organization.'"

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to this section of the bill. It introduces the subject of strikes, and the bill is dealing with the subject of what are labor organizations.

Mr. LESINSKI. It looks like a bankers' bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that the amendment itself does its own speaking and it is not necessary for any Member of Congress to make any comment on it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ARNOLD). The Chair is inclined to think that the amendment is not subject to the point of order. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The amendment was rejected.

"I told you so."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] complains about having had no opportunity in the committee to present his amendment. I sat with the Republican members of the committee, and I thought everything from sunrise to sunset was in order. If I remember correctly, we agreed to report this bill out and reserved the right to offer amendments on the floor. I also understood that this amendment was proposed to the Republican members of the committee and that the committee—that is, the Republican members—were not in favor of it, and the gentleman reserved the right to offer it here.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. You certainly are misinformed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That will not be the first time. But that is my understanding of it anyway, that everybody over there when the Republicans met together, not in secret sessions, but only when Republicans were present, had a full opportunity to offer any amendment he wanted to. I know that was the case with me and I reserved the right to offer an amendment and I am certain the gentleman aired his views on this several times.

As to the amendment, here is what it does, and do not make any mistake about it. If this amendment goes through, it opens wide the door for every union to demand that every employer contribute to a health, or welfare, or some other funds.

If you want to put through an amendment, and I do not know where the leadership is on this amendment which enables, for instance, Reuther, to say that the motor industry shall give to the UAW-CIO $5 on every car that is manufactured, or $1, or whatever the sum may be, on each unit, you will open the door; and, as one gentleman said, there will be a tax of 1 cent on every bottle of milk, a cent on every loaf of bread, some charge on every pair of shoes, on every hat.

Shall there be imposed on articles that are manufactured a tax for the benefit of the members of the union to be paid by the consumers?

What is the sense of the President talking about the high cost of living if we are going to turn over to the union or any other group outside the Congress the authority to levy and collect taxes? That is just what we are doing if we adopt this amendment.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment for this reason. When we seek to prohibit such things as have been in existence for years and have been practiced in certain industries, such as pension funds and certain proper welfare funds, I think we are doing a real injustice to large bodies of workers who have been dependent upon this type of thing in times of unusual stress. There are such funds as burial funds, for example. I think this is one of the many things in this bill that should be attended to. I think we should include a provision that where the employer permits it and where the employees want it, they should be permitted to set up these funds. And the check upon the undue cost is the fact that the employer is not going to agree to everything, but it will be what they can agree to voluntarily. Why should we try to stop it? We would be doing a sociological wrong. I think it is the proper thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, this complex and intricate bill is very puzzling to me. I think it is perplexing to most of the Members except perhaps those who have been on the committee and who have struggled with its preparation. I understand that it has been written and rewritten so that we may consider it the boiled down, concentrated judgment of the majority party on the Committee on Education and Labor, which has presented the measure. This is an able committee of 25 members, 15 of whom are Republicans, or of the majority party, and I assume that all members of the committee have given very careful study to its provisions.

When our great authority, the distinguished English author, James Bryce, wrote his monumental treatise on American Government entitled "The American Commonwealth," this outstanding scholar praised and criticized our Government in many respects. I distinctly remember that he criticized Congress because of our committee system of legislation, which seemed to him to divide the work of law making up among too many almost independent compartments, giving each too much authority and power to shape vital measures on which the very future of the country depended, or would depend. It may be that the present Congress, under the Reorganization Act, has improved the situation by reducing the number of committees and giving each more authority than former committees had. I think it is safe to say that through the close party organization which exists and the firm control of the majority party upon the legislative committees and upon the Rules Committee, as well as upon the legislative program of the House generally, we may properly assume that the majority party—including every member of it—has his share in the measures that we pass. This share seems to me to be greater than that of other Members not on the committee, for we who are not on the committee have so little time to give each of these intricate provisions full and careful thought.

This bill is an omnibus bill. It has some good features in it, I believe, but it has some questionable features. I do not know that the legislation could be brought before us otherwise, but I am going to be distressed to have to vote yes or no on this measure unless it is considerably amended. The gentleman

from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] has offered an amendment to section 14 on page 51, which would permit labor unions to have trust funds for the sole and exclusive benefit of employees. As I see it, that is a good amendment. Of course, I would not favor the building up of a great fund over which a labor czar might have exclusive control to divert it to some other than a beneficial use for the members who had contributed to it.

Of course, I believe in social security in general. I believe in various kinds of modern insurance. I think that industrial insurance, health insurance, accident insurance, and all such kinds of insurance are a great social economic function which permits large groups and numbers of human beings to mitigate the inevitable hazards of life by dividing the risks. Without discussing whether such social insurance should be public or private, I believe that American citizens, under right modern law, are thereby able to obey the Biblical injunction: "Bear ye one another's burdens." I am saying nothing about whether such insurance should be voluntary or involuntary, whether it should be private or public in its control, for these are points that may be in controversy, but in our modern industrial society it seems to me fair that the cost of the inevitable risk to life and limb and health ought to be borne by the consuming public and the cost of such insurance or security should be one of the costs reflected in the price to those who demand the service or the product. With some such thought, I approve of benefit funds for such organizations and other groups. If properly safeguarded and not subject to a wrongful use, I would not write the law banning them or outlawing such contributions and funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LANDIS) there were—ayes 107, noes 126.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. LANDIS and Mr. HARTLEY to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 117, noes 136.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY:

Page 24, strike out, in line 9, the word "or."

Page 24, strike out, in line 10, the words "other than" and insert in place thereof the word "including", so as to read:

"(6) to expel or suspend any member without affording him an opportunity to be heard, on any ground, including (A) nonpayment of dues; (B) disclosing confidential information of the labor organization; (C) participating in a violation of a collective-bargaining agreement to which the labor organization was a party; (D) being a member of the Communist Party, or actively and consistently promoting or supporting the policies, teachings, and doctrines of the Communist Party, or advocating, or being a member of any organization that advocates, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or other illegal or unconstitutional methods; (E) conviction of a felony; or (F) engaging in scandalous conduct tending to bring the labor organization into disrepute or in other conduct subjecting it to civil damages or criminal penalties."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANDIS: Page 31, strike out lines 7 to 23, inclusive, and renumber the remaining paragraphs in the subsections accordingly.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, this is the most vicious part of the bill, and is the most important amendment that will be presented to the House, and that is the amendment to leave industry-wide bargaining in the bill. We see eye to eye on many of the reforms that would help balance labor legislation. It should be easy to find a common ground for a measure that will end secondary boycotts, jurisdictional disputes, wildcat strikes, mass picketing, elimination of Communists and subversive individuals from labor unions, and make possible the settling of strikes in industries essential to the health and safety of our citizens.

My main objective is to eliminate strikes and to create better labor-management relations; not outlaw unions. This is a tough labor bill, very much tougher than the Case bill of last year. Why not be consistent in this bill? You control industry-wide bargaining among industries in America, but you are not consistent, because the railroads do not come under the act; that is, you leave industry-wide bargaining free among the railroads but you will control the coal, the steel, the amalgamated clothing workers, the longshoremen, the rubber, pottery, and many other industries in America. If industry-wide bargaining is good enough for the railroad workers, then it is good enough for the steel workers and the automobile workers and the other workers of America. If it is good enough for management it is good enough for labor. Under the antitrust laws they have taken care of the corporations through the administration of prices but not in wages, and if you let the corporations and big business of America bargain industry-wide, then why not let the employees bargain industry-wide?

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman knows that there is a price-control system set up by the Government on railroad rates.

Mr. LANDIS. We are not talking about prices. We are talking about wages and bargaining.

Mr. PLOESER. All right, but wages and prices have a very definite relationship. Would the gentleman therefore advocate that the Government set up a bureau to control all prices and wages?

Mr. LANDIS. No. I want to get rid of bureaus.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. OWENS. Is it not true that in committee when that was urged the gentleman from Indiana said the railroads should be left out?

Mr. LANDIS. Sure the railroads should be left out and so should the other industries be left to bargain industry-wide. If the employer and the employees want to bargain industry-wide, I think they should have the right to do so.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. KELLEY. If you destroy industry-wide bargaining you destroy labor unions, because you will have made them so weak they will not be able to function.

Mr. LANDIS. There is no question about that.

Mr. KELLEY. There will be no bargaining at all; there cannot be.

Mr. LANDIS. You hit right at the fundamentals of the labor unions. If you are against unions, of course, you are against industry-wide bargaining, but if you are trying to get rid of labor abuses, then do not try to create chaos in the steel industry, automobile industry, the rubber industry, and all the rest of them. Let us not tear up the unions and create chaos all over America. I am for taking care of every labor abuse in America, the secondary boycott, the wildcat strike, all abuses, and all racketeering, but why tear up industry-wide bargaining? Why hit at the fundamentals of the labor unions of America?

Mr. Chairman, I present this amendment, and I hope it is adopted.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let us take a look at the consistency of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS]. Just a few moments ago when I asked the House to write into this bill following the declaration that a man had a right to join a union and to participate in union activities the further statement that a man had a right not to join, oh, no, we could not have that, and the gentleman insisted it would be detrimental to the union.

Now he comes along and praises the Railway Act. That is a fine act. As a matter of fact, the Railway Act has written into it in express words the open shop. It says that a man shall not be discriminated against because of nonmembership in a union. How is that for consistency?

When a few moments ago I was endeavoring to have written into the bill, at the end of subdivision (a), section 7, which declares that "employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, joint or assist any labor organization and to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing and to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining and other mutual aid or protection," the simple declaration that they should also "have the right to refrain from any or all of such activities," the argument was made that I was attempting to destroy the unions and that such declaration

was unnecessary and would serve no useful purpose.

The opponents of that provision and, in particular, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS], were vigorous in their opposition, but now the gentleman from Indiana, as just stated, praises the Railway Act and, if you will read it, you will find the following provision there in subdivision 5 of section 152 of title 45 of the United States Code:

No carrier, its officers, or agents shall require any person seeking employment to sign any contract or agreement promising to join or not to join a labor organization; and if any such contract has been enforced prior to the effective date of this chapter, then such carrier shall notify the employees by an appropriate order that such contract has been discarded and is no longer binding on them in any way.

There is another statute which contains a similar provision. Take a look at the so-called Norris-LaGuardia Act, title 29, chapter 6, section 123 of the United States Code.

There you will find a provision that "every undertaking or promise hereinafter made, whether written or verbal, express or implied, constituting or contained in any contract or agreement of hiring or employment between any individual, firm, company, association or corporation, and any employee or prospective employee of the same, whereby (a) either party to such contract or agreement undertakes or promises not to join, become or remain a member of any labor organization or of any employer organization," is declared to be contrary to public policy and not enforceable in any court of the United States and shall not afford any basis for the granting of legal or equitable relief by any such court.

What is he talking about now? He is talking about industry-wide bargaining. You take industry-wide bargaining—and remember that industry is regulated by the laws against trusts and monopolies and labor never has been—and General Motors or any other industry which has subsidiaries all over the country can bargain with the union on an industry-wide basis and impose on the employers in the smaller towns the same conditions and the same wages they have in the large cities.

With automatic machinery costing sometimes more than a hundred thousand dollars for one installation, with almost mile-long assembly lines, Detroit or Pittsburgh or any of these places can produce much more cheaply than can the industries in your city or my city. Yet the purpose of this industry-wide bargaining is to impose the same wages, the same working conditions, the same hours upon the people in the small places that obtain in the larger centers.

It means the lessening of industry throughout the smaller communities. It means the wiping out of a small businessman engaged in industry. It means bringing everything to the city and forcing the workers to go to the cities where they live in coops such as we put chickens or other domestic animals in. Where the children are forced to play in the streets.

If that is the kind of America you want to build up, we have the power to do it, but if you want to protect small industry and if you want to protect the worker who prefers to have his job out in the country where he can have a garden and his wife can have a flower bed and his children go to school and have a yard to play in, if you believe in that kind of America, then do not let these unions force industry-wide bargaining upon us and deprive the fellow in the small town of his job. Let them bargain on a company-wide basis as the bill provides.

This law as it is written permits company-wide bargaining. All you need to do is go along as the committee voted and not permit industry-wide bargaining which fastens the bad results and the competition of a monopoly upon all the small industries and upon the employers in the smaller cities.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are here dealing with a subject that is extremely difficult. Every expert who appeared before our committee and every witness had a different idea on this subject of industry-wide bargaining. We all, of course, fear the possibility of a labor leader declaring a strike throughout an entire industry. The bill seeks to deal with that situation in various ways. It provides at the end that in the case of an emergency the President can ask the Attorney General to procure an injunction. It also democratizes unions so that strikes may not be so readily called.

But this proposition of outlawing industry-wide bargaining is mighty serious. I want to point out one grave, and I think vital, defect in the way the bill is drawn. It prohibits employees or their representatives from bargaining where more than one competing employer is concerned. It limits it to a company level so far as the employees are concerned, but it does not limit the employer in the matter of getting together and entering into a contract, one with the other.

On wages the bill is silent. As I understand it, that is not against the antitrust laws. The antitrust laws forbid the fixing of prices. They do not forbid the fixing of wages. That is apparent because of the fact that we have had industry-wide contracts on wages for years and nothing has ever been said about it. But now we are striking down the employees, but are not dealing with the employers. We are not forbidding them from getting together where company A and company B and company C might enter into an agreement in an industry and say, "All right, boys, this year we will knock off your union in company A. Next year we will take care of company B, and the third year company C." The employers can do that under the language of this bill.

So therefore the provision pertaining to industry-wide bargaining whereby we do not permit employees to go beyond one company, I think is vital, and must be remedied. Otherwise, we will then really be putting into the hands of the employers in competing industries the power to strike down unions one after the other.

I have a substitute amendment, if this amendment is not agreed to, which is quite similar, but I favor the general proposition that something has to be done about industry-wide bargaining as far as the provisions of the present bill are concerned.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Would not the answer be to amend the antitrust laws to take care of the industries or corporations, rather than to go ahead and perpetuate another evil?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Yes. I think the antitrust laws should be dealt with in a great many ways, because the reports are that there are many mergers among the large companies. We are getting larger and larger cartels. But if we are going to forbid the employees from bargaining beyond the company level, and permit the companies to agree one with the other, we are really putting it into the hands of the employers to do away with unions. Do not forget this: When we put it on the company basis, and take away industry-wide bargaining, we are then making wages the subject of keen competition among competing employers. As an example, the amalgamated clothing workers in New York will return to the sweatshop pay if we permit this to go through in this fashion. It is a fatal defect.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MACKINNON. I think the gentleman has an excellent proposal along this line and I wish he would explain to the House.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. As I understand it, it will be out of order. It cannot be offered as a substitute amendment. It will have to be offered as a separate amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that this is a very serious situation which we are discussing. You have heard me speak before about the fact that the other body sometimes expresses itself. We have heard prominent Members of that body express themselves with respect to this very situation. In view of that fact, it behooves us to move slowly. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] and I, and several others, sitting together and discussing this matter, drew an amendment about which the gentleman spoke a moment ago, which we feel will take care of it when it is presented to the conference. It is an amendment which will permit the various unions to reach out and bargain with companies which are united, for the purpose of fixing wages. As the bill stands at present, unions are able to bargain with all of the utilities because they are not competing. For instance, they are able to bargain with the Steel Trust, because in holding companies there is no competition. But where a group of employers, through an association, had merged and decided that they are going to oppose certain wage rates or the fixing of certain wage scales,

I believe it can easily be arranged in conference by this amendment to take care of that situation. I believe it would be a mistake at this time to vote for the pending amendment and thereby vote against the committee.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If this has merit, why should we postpone the period to adjust it? Is that not what we are here for today? If this is the right kind of amendment, why should we not adopt the Landis amendment?

Mr. OWENS. Striking out that entire paragraph would not be proper, because it would give too much leeway. Just because we want to cure a cut is no reason why we should cut off the entire arm.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. How are you going to get it into conference if it is not in the bill?

Mr. OWENS. That provision is in the bill, and, therefore, it would be comparatively simple to amend it.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. If we abolish industry-wide bargaining, how do we comply with the Republican platform pledge which reads:

The Republican Party has always protected the American worker. We shall maintain labor's right of free organization and collective bargaining.

Mr. OWENS. I can answer that, for when it comes to a situation where we know that because of industry-wide bargaining one man at the head of one union can say the word and close down the industry of an entire nation at a time when our Nation could be attacked by an enemy, which is very likely at any time, we would be in a sorry state. It is up to us to be mighty careful to prevent that. By not voting for this amendment but by changing it in conference to remove any slight error that might arise I think would be the best step to take.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield.

Mr. DEVITT. Why would it not be well to read to the Members the amendment the gentleman proposes, what the gentleman has in mind?

Mr. OWENS. I see no objection to that. I believe the difference could be taken care of in conference. The amendment reads:

Page 31, line 23, add the following:

"*Provided, however,* in every instance in which such competing employers may lawfully engage in any concerted activities among themselves in the formulation of a common or agreed policy for collective bargaining with their respective employees or any of them whereby such competing employers are subject, directly or indirectly, to common control or approval, the representatives of such employees as may be affected by such concerted employer activities may likewise formulate a common or agreed collective-bargaining policy that is coextensive in every legal effect with the policy of such competing employers.

I believe that takes care of it equitably for both the employees and the employers. It could also be reached by forbidding concerted action by competing employers to fix wage rates.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield.

Mr. DEVITT. If the Landis amendment is voted down, will we not have an opportunity to vote on this in the House rather than wait until the bill gets into conference?

Mr. OWENS. Yes; I believe that would be the proper step to take, and it would be excellent if the Committee on Education and Labor, in conference, can agree to adopt the amendment as a committee amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS], and in line with the thought expressed by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Let us see what we do with this particular provision. As we know, many of the necessities of life are manufactured by corporations and are distributed on a Nation-wide basis. Let us take any of the famous-brand names, whether it be in food, clothing, or whatnot; the article, whether it be a Firestone tire or a Stetson hat, is priced nationally; in other words, that organization has the privilege of pricing in thousands of stores throughout the United States the same article at the same price. They manufacture and distribute these articles in many different plants throughout the United States.

Let us take the General Electric Co., for instance. They have 96 different factories. This provision of the bill would force upon General Electric and upon their employees the necessity of having 96 different bargaining contracts unless the plant has less than 100 employees, as I understand it. If I am not right I should like to be corrected. I ask the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LESINSKI. And less than 50 miles apart.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In other words, it would be on a regional basis.

Mr. BREHM. If the gentleman will yield, that is not correct; a company would be permitted to bargain all over the country.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is not true.

Mr. BREHM. That absolutely is true according to our legal counsel.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HARTLEY. Do I understand the gentleman to make the statement that under this bill General Electric would have to have 90-odd contracts?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Let me ask the question: If General Electric had 96 plants would they have to have 96 different bargaining contracts?

Mr. HARTLEY. The gentleman is entirely in error in his understanding of the bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to be corrected.

Mr. HARTLEY. Under this bill we ban industry-wide bargaining, but we do not bar company-wide bargaining; so General Electric could bargain for the employees in all its plants in one contract.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Let me pursue the question further and ask the meaning of the provision with reference to the 50-mile area and the 100 or less employees in a plant. What would that have to do with it?

Mr. HARTLEY. That would not interfere with it in any way.

On page 31, line 7, the language is as follows:

(1) A representative that has been designated or acts as the representative of employees of any employer shall be ineligible to be certified as the representative of employees of any competing employer, unless the employees of such employers whom the representative seeks to represent are regularly less than 100 in number and the plants or other facilities of such employers at which the representative acts and seeks to act as such are less than 50 miles apart, but nothing in this paragraph shall prevent any representative from being affiliated or associated, directly or through a federation, association, or parent organization, with representatives of competing employers, if the collective bargaining, concerted activities, or terms of collective bargains or arrangements of such representatives are not subject, directly or indirectly, to common control or approval.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As I understand it, then, if the General Electric through its board of directors would say: "We will not pay over 75 cents an hour as a maximum for a certain job throughout all of their plants" there would not be any necessity in a local area for bargaining on that?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The provision simply brings bargaining down to the employer level, not the plant level. Having regard to the General Electric, with whatever number of plants it may have, each of those plants could bargain with the unit of that plant, the representative unit, if that were the arrangement agreed upon. The employees of General Electric being in one over-all union or being made up of the locals in the different plant unions could bargain with the management of General Electric for contracts covering all of the plants.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. On what basis could they secure that right of bargaining on consent of General Electric?

Mr. HALLECK. It is left to agreement. There is no prohibition in the law as far as General Electric is concerned or the employees of General Electric.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is the situation as it exists today.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes. The situation of the 100 employees within a 50-mile radius is designed to take care of, oh, say, little foundries in a community employing less than 100 men, fabricating plants and things of that kind, where a general over-all bargaining operation is

the desirable thing. That sort of situation does not give rise to the monopolistic practices that are sought to be reached by this provision of the bill. So I think very rightly the committee exempted employers having less than 100 employees and within a 50-mile radius.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] brought up one of the basic factors behind this particular provision when he mentioned the city of Pittsburgh and spoke of the economic competition between the large cities, mentioning Pittsburgh specifically, and small communities, and mentioned that competition in respect to this particular provision on the ban on industry-wide bargaining. That brings me to my feet because while we have five Congressmen from Allegheny County, there are two of us on the floor of this Congress who have the majority of their districts in Pittsburgh, that great industrial area. I represent the southern industrial area of Pittsburgh consisting of shipbuilding, mines, mills, factories, and I am glad to say such industrial areas have Republican Representatives as well as Democratic Representatives.

The position I would like to bring out is this: If we people in the cities are put into competition with people in small communities and in farm areas where those people can work part time in factories, and then get part of their food and their living from the soil, we are going to be in a bad competitive bargaining position. We have the highest wages in the world in our Pittsburgh industrial area, and we pay the highest prices for food because we have to buy it in city stores. The food has to be shipped in, and we pay freight costs on top of production costs. Because we live in the city we pay the highest taxes of any type community in the whole Nation, and in addition we have this competitive disadvantage because we have to buy all of our food at the city stores. We cannot raise any of it, yet they tax our real estate high, they tax our income high, and Pittsburgh does pay as high an income tax as any city in the country.

Now, if you look at it on that particular basis, I think it is unfortunate that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] brought it up. I had not intended to speak, but let me tell you this: I am here to protect the city of Pittsburgh. If it is really on that basis as the gentleman from Michigan states, I am in there fighting, and I think some of the people from the cities better wake up. I do not want to put the city against the country, but if that is the basis that this provision was drawn on, I think it is a very unfortunate basis.

May I say, however, that I do think there are logical reasons outside of competition between urban and rural areas, which can be cited on both sides of this question. The logical reason which impresses me is this, that once your industries have grown up beyond an agricultural economy, until you have industries that distribute Nation-wide and produce Nation-wide, and when you have groups of employers and associations acting together, it is only natural that on the other side there should develop joint action, group action, through collective bargaining. We have had that development here in this country. I, too, think it has become lopsided and that certain things have to be corrected.

But let me warn you, industry is the heart of this country. We cannot afford, without looking into it closer, to go too deeply into probing the heart, because you may stop the whole thing in these trying times. If we are going to correct abuses, let us correct the abuses. Let us not change the entire structure, because in changing it you may have a transition such that ends you up in a controlled economy. I think there is too much Government control now, and I am against this prohibition of free agreements by labor and management arrived at by collective bargaining between the parties, because this is a further Government control of contracts, and I hope the Republicans will support me on it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I can understand and appreciate the gentleman's position and I respect his views. My point was this, that while you in the cities are compelled to pay more for the food and the clothing and the things you use, would you deprive the small employer who is out in the country and who can get, as you stated, competitive workers for a less wage, because they do live in the country and raise a part of their food—would you deprive him of his business by forcing him to pay a wage on a product where he cannot meet the city price in competition?

Mr. FULTON. Yes; he can meet the city price.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How?

Mr. FULTON. Because we had that argument proved out in the southern and northern coal operators' fight. We have been up against that in Pittsburgh all along, where the southern operators wanted to pay the miners less. They were able to deal with local employees because the employees were not apprised of their rights of collective bargaining and they did not have the representation that was as experienced as they had in the northern fields. We paid a higher wage rate in the northern fields, and then it was always a fight. First there was the fight between the mine operators and the unions, and then the unions would join up with the mine operators in the North and fight the southern operators to get their wages higher. That is the way it has been all along. There is no doubt that both the northern and southern coal mines are operated successfully under better working conditions than previously but it has been a long, uphill climb.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last seven words.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the discussion between the majority leader and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. The simple matter is that bargaining has been surrounded by so much prohibition that you would not have any collective bargaining. You would break it down, you would destroy it. Let us not kid ourselves about that.

The gentleman from Pittsburgh [Mr. FULTON] raised the point about the coal industry, as to the difference between the coal operators in the South and the coal operators in the North—I will say the operators in southern West Virginia and those in Pennsylvania. I know something about what happened in years gone by when they did not have industry-wide bargaining in the coal industry. The gentleman said the southern operators wanted to pay a lower wage. Well, they did. They did for years, until the industry-wide bargaining brought about a level that they both paid. So it helped the coal industry all over the country. So when you talk about industry-wide bargaining and try to surround it with all the prohibitions that this bill is trying to do, you might just as well quit kidding the people of the country, because you are destroying collective bargaining, you are destroying all bargaining, and you are destroying the unions.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The explanation that was given me was not wholly satisfactory to me, although it was partially. At the bottom of page 31, in subsection 2 appear these words:

> Upon application of any interested person or persons, the Board shall direct the Administrator to provide for a separate ballot for any craft, department, plant, trade, calling, profession or other distinguishable group within a proposed bargaining unit.

As I understand that, any interested party would be either a party on the part of management, a party on the part of the union, or an individual in a union. So it seems to me that certainly that would be a case where a ballot would be required on a much narrower basis than on an industry-wide basis. In other words, it seems to me this is breaking it down to individual plants. If that be the case, if the bill is as I interpret it on that point, it seems to me you are going back into the days of the sweatshop conditions in the clothing business in New York, when competing manufacturers had no obligation at all in the way of a minimum-wage law, when each one would compete with the other in the pricing of their articles in the market, and the only place that they could cut after they passed a certain point in materials and efficiency was in the wages of the individual worker. We know what resulted from that cutthroat bargaining back and forth. The whole industry went into chaos. In view of the latter part of this section on pages 31 and 32 it seems to me you are returning to that status of bargaining.

Mr. KELLEY. That is inevitable.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Whether it is a plant, a profession, a trade, or a calling, you break it down to the very lowest minimum industrial or manufacturing group. If my understanding is wrong,

I should like to have an explanation from the chairman on that.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HARTLEY. I think the gentleman's understanding is in error there, because the language the gentleman just read refers to a case where you find a craft union working with an industrial union. It is an endeavor there to protect the right of the craft union to bargain by itself and protect its own identity and not be gobbled up and lost sight of in the larger industrial union.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of course, in addition to crafts, it has many others—department, plant, trade, calling, and profession. I admit that is true in regard to the craft, but I think it goes further than that.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. In the case of the amalgamated clothing workers, where there is more than one employer, and there is more than one employer, they have to have a number of 100 or less employees before they can bargain in this 50-mile limit. There is no question about it, it will disrupt the whole amalgamated clothing workers' industry.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That was my interpretation. In other words, plants like Hart, Schaffner & Marx and Kuppenheimer and other national firms whose plants have from 500 to 5,000 workers in different cities could not bargain together.

Mr. LANDIS. That is correct.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

In outlawing industry-wide bargaining this bill disregards the fact that employers compete with one another, both as to the price and quality of their product and for labor. It is unthinkable, for example, that the large automobile manufacturers, all of whom compete for labor in any market, can pay a different wage scale. Yet, this provision would necessarily mean that the wage levels of entire industries would be forced down to the lowest level which any substantial group of employees were inclined to, or could, accept.

Under this subsection of the bill, a union that has been designated as collective-bargaining representative would be ineligible to be certified as the representative of the employees of any competing employer, unless the employees involved are less than 100 in number and the plants of the employers involved are less than 50 miles apart. A provision more inconsistent with the policy of the bill set out in section 1, to minimize industrial strife and to encourage peaceful settlement of labor disputes, could scarcely be imagined.

The impairment of industry-wide bargaining that might well follow from the enactment of this bill would upset existing collective-bargaining practices which have proved successful in many industries and made important contributions to industrial peace.

Employers as much as employees have benefited from this practice and have testified in favor of its continuance. Such widely varied employer groups as the men's clothing industry, the full-fashioned hosiery, shipbuilding, and the maritime industries have testified to the efficacy of industry-wide bargaining as a means of promoting stability and peace in industrial relations.

Experience has shown also that industry-wide bargaining has made a valuable contribution to the promotion and maintenance of fair standards in wages, hours and working conditions, to the benefit not only of the living standards of the wage-earners of this country but also the prosperity of the employers in the industry. The stabilization of wage rates through industry-wide bargaining has helped to discourage unfair competition with respect to wage rates and has enabled the great majority of fair-minded employers to operate at the American level of fair play and decency.

Although the sponsors of this proposal undoubtedly did not intend it, one of the significant effects of any weakening of industry-wide bargaining would be to seriously impair the bargaining power of many employers. Unions would be aided in a policy of picking off employers one by one. Employers who sought to protect themselves against such tactics by organizing and bargaining as a unit would be hurt by a limitation on industry-wide bargaining. On the other hand, unscrupulous labor racketeers or radical elements would be free to follow a policy of divide and conquer. That is the reason why small employers, particularly, look to industry-wide bargaining as their only hope of gaining some approximation of equality with large and powerful unions.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, if the people back home like the telephone strike and if you want John L. Lewis to continue to apply and tighten his noose around the country's neck and if you want James C. Petrillo to continue to dictate to every musician and every theater and every radio station in America and if you want the thugs in the teamsters' union to continue to control the small stores from coast to coast, then vote in favor of the Landis amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. KEATING. Are there not other provisions in this bill which go far toward taking care of those admitted abuses in the existing law without destroying industry-wide bargaining?

Mr. BUCK. They do help, but the prohibition against industry-wide bargaining, in my opinion, is the heart of the bill.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield ?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. McDOWELL. I would like to tell the gentleman that the major part of my district lies in the great industrial city of Pittsburgh and for the protection of the more than 150,000 breadwinners whom I represent, I am going to vote against the amendment and in favor of the bill.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is probably the most important provision in this bill which they are attempting to destroy. Make no mistake about it. If you eliminate this provision in the bill, you eliminate the principal bulwark that is provided here against a monopoly about which we have had complaints in the different fields that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] just referred to.

In the committee hearings we had many instances of how this thing works. It has practically destroyed industry-wide bargaining in its true meaning in this country. No longer do they sit down across the table at a plant or in the areas where the conditions exist and undertake to iron out their differences and agree upon the terms of the contract. No; it is handled now by absentee bosses who operate a thousand miles away writing out the pattern for a gigantic industry-wide situation.

Consider the United Steelworkers, for example. Phil Murray controls about 1,000,000 workers. Only a portion of them are actually in the steel industry. They are in many allied industries and many independent competing companies. Yet, when the strike order was sent out last January a year ago, all of these companies had to go out on strike. The employees in every one of the companies had to go out.

We had many instances brought to the attention of the committee where the employees did not want to strike. In some cases they even voted against going out on strike, but they were instructed that they could not settle and could not make a contract until they were given the word and the pattern from headquarters.

The result has been that collective bargaining is a mockery, as you can see. In the steel case, it was referred to as collective bludgeoning, and that is not an inapt description of it by any means. Therefore, strikes imposed upon the employees in many industries who did not want to strike. Why? Because they were ordered from headquarters of the international unions.

It is hard to believe what is going on, and it is not going on in isolated cases either. We had an instance brought to the attention of the committee where the companies of some of these concerns covered by the steel workers' union contract received a notice from the Labor Department of a strike notice because of a dispute in the plant and they then called in the officers of the local union and asked them about it because they had never heard about it. The local officers said, "We never heard about it either and perhaps you had better call the international office to find out what the trouble is."

Now, that happened in many, many cases. That is one of the byproducts of your industry-wide bargaining as it has grown up in this country. If you want to operate it that way then you should vote for this amendment. If you want to break it down and let bargaining be on the company level or on the plant

level, then vote against this amendment. There is no way of escaping the issue. It is purely a question of monopoly—a matter of control over tremendous industries that vitally affect the welfare of the entire Nation.

I recall very well a few months ago when there was a great clamor that went over this Nation about curtailing the monopolistic powers of John L. Lewis, who was able to pull a string down in the Carlton Hotel and with one fell swoop call out 400,000 miners and cause this Nation to get down on its knees. I think most of you remember that. Now, do you want to let him do that again? There is only one provision in this bill that will break down that concentration of power, and that is to prohibit industry-wide bargaining. Break down that monopolistic control over all of these men at one time. The coal industry is owned by hundreds and hundreds of different concerns, entirely independent of other concerns. It is an industry that is broken up into different groups and different ownerships. Each one has a local union. Let those local unions bargain with the local plants and you will break down this monopoly. You will restore collective bargaining as a real thing. You will perform a real service to the workers and to the public.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 10 words.

Mr. Chairman, just for the purpose of clarifying a statement made by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], wh'ch was completely in error, I wish to say that this bill, as presently drafted, permits employer-wide bargaining regardless of the size of the corporation. That goes for Hart, Schaffner & Marx, and it goes for the telephone company, and it goes for the United States Steel Corp., and it goes for any employer, regardless of size. However, it is not compulsory upon the employees. If the employees in any separate craft, plant, or otherwise wish to vote to have a different representative, then the provision that the gentleman referred to in section 9 (f) (2) is the provision that gives them that right. It does nothing more.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. In other words, all the employees of Chrysler, Ford, or General Motors, or the employees of any manufacturer of any automobile can bargain on that plant basis, but they cannot bargain over-all for the entire automotive industry?

Mr. MACKINNON. They can bargain at one sitting for the entire Ford industry.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As the gentleman explains it, is it not true that if any person in that bargaining unit, as outlined in section 2, requests individual bargaining on the basis of a certain plant, it would impose upon that plant the necessity for that single bargaining?

Mr. MACKINNON. No; if they petition for it this provision merely says there shall be a separate ballot of the employees of that particular unit to determine, by majority vote, who they want to represent them. It is a purely democratic procedure.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. Is it not a fact that in the bill as it now stands the only prohibition upon even industry-wide bargaining of a union is that it makes them eligible to be certified as the bargaining representative of the company? Aside from that, they have full right to go ahead and bargain industry-wide?

Mr. MACKINNON. That is correct in my opinion.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. Why allow General Electric and United Electric employers to bargain on wages and not the employees of those outfits?

Mr. MACKINNON. It does allow them.

Mr. LANDIS. The gentleman means United Electric and General Electric together?

Mr. MACKINNON. No; not together.

Mr. LANDIS. It depends upon what the employer does. You have different clothing employers bargaining separately. You do not bunch them together.

Mr. MACKINNON. That is correct but I am merely explaining the workings of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LANDIS) there were—ayes 71, noes 161.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the States of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3020) the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Sault St. Marie Evening News of Friday, April 11.

Mr. BRADLEY of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence published in the Long Beach Press Telegram, Long Beach, Calif.

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the Shore Breeze, Shore High School, Euclid, Ohio, telling of the exploits of William Crowell, who won the American Legion essay contest here in Washington, and also to include the essay that he wrote on the subject "Americanism Or."

Mr. KEARNS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington News of April 16, 1947.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on Pan-American Week.

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and to include with those remarks a table and a statement.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Boston Herald, and also to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include another newspaper item.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in five separate instances and include certain excerpts.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from today's Washington Post.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I asked and was given permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include certain information regarding the enforcement of cases by OPA. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $301.75. In view of the importance of this matter I ask unanimous consent that it be printed notwithstanding the fact it exceeds two pages.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from this morning's Washington Post.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CLASON (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement recently made by Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, which I consider to be a very courageous statement and one of a most constructive nature in the forming of a

sound public opinion in America at this time.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR HIGHWAY SAFETY

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H. R. 3042, referred by the Speaker to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the United States House of Representatives. A preliminary hearing on this measure has been scheduled for next week. I hope the committee will ultimately report it favorably to the House for consideration.

The purpose of H. R. 3042 is to reduce the accident toll on the Nation's highways by establishing and enforcing uniform regulations for the issuance of drivers' licenses, and requiring financial responsibility on the part of drivers, and thus to insure, so far as possible, that those operating motor vehicles are reasonably fit, competent, and able to do so. Few subjects would seem of greater importance than the safety of life and limb. Yet, the slaughter on the highways of this country is annually greater than American losses in the First World War and shows steady increase. Too many Americans apparently accept traffic accidents as inevitable. They do not see or possibly comprehend the tremendous daily toll of killed and injured and the vast property losses resulting from a sum total of many millions of individual acts of thoughtlessness and indifference. It is true, but difficult to believe, that while we have had the automobile for about 50 years, numerous States still permit anyone, regardless of his physical or mental fitness, to operate with abandon a killing machine capable of traveling up to 100 miles per hour and weighing thousands of pounds. Some of the States which do have license requirements for drivers nevertheless issue licenses cheerfully to lunatics, habitual drunkards, and narcotic addicts. Many drivers are more dangerous than a maniac with a meat ax. In my own State you can get a driver's license renewed for 25 cents and without a test of any kind. In many other States and numerous cities, the drivers' license is a revenue and not a safety measure.

Statistics gathered by various authoritative sources show that since the end of the war and the resumption of heavy motor travel, the death rate from automobile operation is again decidedly on the increase. This deadly killer now ranks tenth in the list of causes of death in this country, and no less a person than the President himself has publicly predicted that on the basis of known figures the automobile accident toll this year in this country will reach 30,000 fatalities. This does not even take into account the great loss and suffering from personal injuries not fatal, or the tremendous property damage resulting from motor accidents, or the inevitable business and financial losses accruing therefrom, or the delays and hazards created in travel and interstate traffic. A study of these accidents will demonstrate that many arise from the presence on highways of persons who are unfit or incompetent to drive an automobile.

Congress is properly giving much attention to prevention of accidents in the air. Yet, the proportion of air accidents is infinitesimal compared to auto accidents.

It is hardly arguable that something must be done to correct a situation which goes to the very heart of the well-being of the public and of business. Some States, of course, have adopted stringent measures for the regulation of motorcar operation and the careful examination of those who seek to drive. Others, unfortunately, have little real effective legislation on the subject and there is a general lack of uniformity in laws presently existing. A number of States do not even require an examination of a person's fitness or ability to operate a motor vehicle. Under present conditions, with heavy traffic between States and highway travel greater than ever before, and with more worn and unsafe automobiles on the road than ever before, the problem is no longer one of purely local concern. Intercourse between the States on the many highways of the country is now so great and so commonplace that States acting individually can no longer effectively cope with the situation confronting us.

The bill I propose represents the first step in securing effective Federal regulation as the only means whereby safety on the highways can now be promoted. The bill sets forth various regulations and restrictions for the issuance of operators' and chauffeurs' licenses, provides for an actual test of a person's ability to drive an automobile, provides conditions under which a license may be suspended, canceled, or revoked, and provides for an office of Commissioner to administer the law and keep the necessary records. The modest fees which the bill requires to be paid are not onerous but will assist materially in defraying the cost of administration. No one dislikes to see additional Government bureaus any more than I do. But Government has its obligations to the people. The time is here when we should have bureaus to help the citizen protect his life and property instead of taking it away from him. We have too many of the latter kind and not enough of the former.

My bill incorporates many provisions recommended in the model code approved by the National Conference on Street and Highway Safety and thus reflects expert consideration as to what is necessary for effective examination and control of those who operate motor vehicles.

The objection will doubtless be raised, as it has in the past, that highway safety is a matter of purely local concern, that States' rights must not be interfered with and that such a bill is not within the constitutional power of Congress to enact. I submit that States' rights are of little interest or value to a citizen who is lying crushed in the gutter, his brains mixed with blood and crankcase oil, the victim of a preventable motorcar accident. I want to do nothing which would take away from the States any power or responsibility they might have in the matter but I do wish to emphasize that the Federal Government has its responsibility, too, a responsibility that has been wholly neglected to the sorrow of countless dead and maimed. The Federal Government is annually contributing hundreds of millions of dollars to be supplemented by State funds for street and highway construction. Advocates of States' rights welcome this Federal aid with open palms. But, what shall it profit our people to have super-highways devoid of safety? You or a loved one may be killed just as dead on a United States highway in a State with drivers' license laws as on a road in a State which has no laws, but your risk is greater where such laws do not exist.

I believe that the power conferred by the Constitution to regulate interstate commerce affords a sound basis of constitutionality for my bill. The present climate of judicial opinion has broadened appreciably the concept of the commerce clause from earlier and more narrow views. The Supreme Court has ruled that interstate commerce embraces any sort of activity, commerce or traffic, which concerns more States than one and which substantially and economically affects interstate commerce. The Court has frequently upheld the regulation of purely intrastate activities which have had such an affect or which are so commingled with interstate activities that the one could not be regulated without the other. Even if an activity be local and not regarded as commerce, it may still, whatever its nature, the Court has said, be reached by Congress if it exerts a substantial and economic effect on interstate activities. Within the scope of the commerce power the use of the highways is subject to the imposition of legislative conditions having the character of police regulations, and regulations of this sort are based on the public interest. The operation of motor vehicles can no longer be separated into 48 distinct territorial compartments which function in isolation from each other. It is common knowledge that today there is a continuous and indivisible stream of vehicular traffic and intercourse betwen the States, and it cannot be determined where local operation ends and interstate operation begins. The Supreme Court has declared that the power to regulate under the commerce clause is to legislate concerning matters which, reaching across State lines, affect the people of more States than one. I submit that the operation of motor vehicles on our highways comes within this category.

For those who may be interested in this legal aspect of the matter I will include in the RECORD a brief I have prepared, listing the pertinent judicial decisions to substantiate my position.

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

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. I understand the gentleman's bill will be in the nature of a uniform Federal traffic code.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. RAMEY. I do not see why it could not be worked out. We have a uniform Negotiable Instruments Act. Prior to coming to Congress I was on the bench for a long while. Sometimes those who wanted to reform others were at the same time the greatest traffic violators. At one time I had on the bench with me a great minister from Kansas, the man who wrote the book In His Steps, Rev. Charles M. Sheldon. After the unfortunates were heard they reached the traffic cases, and found those that were self-righteous violating the traffic laws. He said, "I can see that the punishment of traffic offenders is much more difficult, because while in police court matters you have the publicans, in traffic court you have the Pharisees." This came from perhaps the world's greatest clergyman, who sat on the bench with me that day.

I believe the figures which no doubt will later be included in the gentleman's address show that even during the latest war more people were injured in traffic accidents, even though they could not drive so much, than were injured in the war itself. Is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Probably so.

Mr. RAMEY. In the First World War it was many times over.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. The gentleman from Ohio is a former judge, who while sitting on the bench handled many traffic cases. He is very well qualified, I think, to express helpful opinions on the subject. I am grateful for his contribution.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. I take pleasure in congratulating my colleague from the State of Missouri on his timely presentation. I am glad to see that he has taken the initiative on this legislation. I hope the committee considers it favorably, and I will be pleased to support the bill if and when it comes to the floor of the House.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish to also commend the gentleman for his efforts in calling the attention of the Nation to this very serious problem.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

It is a very serious problem and one that merits the attention and consideration of the Congress of the United States.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF BILL TO REGULATE OPERATION OF MOTOR VEHICLES

A bill which seeks to regulate the operation of motor vehicles by individuals must be sustained, if at all, under the power granted Congress by the Constitution to regulate interstate commerce. Other possibilities may be dismissed with brief mention. It is settled that the Congress has no general police power—*Speert* v. *Morgenthau* (App. D. C. 1940), 116 F. (2d) 301. Nor does the general welfare clause of the Constitution—article I, section 8, clause 1—empower Congress to legislate generally for the public benefit, but merely empowers Congress to tax and appropriate the moneys so raised for the purpose of paying the Nation's debts and providing for the Nation's welfare—*U. S.* v. *Butler* ((1936) 297 U. S. 1). Thus the clause is not an independent grant of power but a limitation on the power to tax—*John A. Gebelein, Inc.* v. *Milbourne* ((D. Md. 1935), 12 F. Supp. 105). While the taxing power may be the basis for regulatory measures which have the quality of police provisions, nevertheless, the bill at least on its face must be for revenue purposes and the Supreme Court in some instances has frowned on enactments which used the taxing power merely as a means of imposing police regulations. See Cushman, Social and Economic Control Through Federal Taxation, 1934, Eighteenth Minnesota Law Revised, page 759; Essert, What Is Meant by Police Power? Twelfth Nebraska Law Bulletin, page 208; Willis on Constitutional Law, 1936, 721–722. In respect to regulation of motor vehicle operation, the object of the taxing power would be difficult to define and, moreover, the measure would patently have as its object police regulations rather than the raising of revenue.

With regard to the constitutional power of Congress to regulate commerce among the several States, article I, section 8, clause 3, the climate of judicial opinion has broadened the concept of the power from earlier and more narrow views to that originally envisioned by Chief Justice Marshall in *Gibbons* v. *Ogden* ((1824) 9 Wheat. 1): that it covers any commerce "which concerns more States than one"—*Zehring* v. *Brown Materials, Ltd.* ((S. D. Cal. 1943) 48 F. Supp. 740); *Wickard* v. *Filburn* ((1942) 317 U. S. 111); *U. S.* v. *South-Eastern Underwriters Association* ((1944) 322 U. S. 533). Chief Justice Marshall also declared:

> The genius and character of the whole government seems to be, that its action is to be applied to all the external concerns of the Nation, and to those internal concerns which affect the States generally; but not to those which are completely within a particular State, which do not affect other States, and with which it is not necessary to interfere, for the purpose of executing some of the general powers of the Government. The completely internal commerce of a State, then, may be considered as reserved for the State itself. (*Gibbons* v. *Ogden*, supra.)

It is now recognized that the commerce clause must be fitted to the practical essence of modern life and that the dividing line between interstate and intrastate commerce is not immovable but must often be redrawn to conform to the changed conditions of the times—*U. S.* v. *South-Eastern Underwriters Ass'n, supra; Chicago Board of Trade* v. *Olson* ((1923) 262 U. S. 1, 35); *Pensacola Telegraph Co.* v. *Western Union Telegraph Co.* ((1877) 96 U. S. 1, 9). The expansion of our national economy has "inevitably been reflected in the extension of Federal authority over economic enterprise and its absorption of authority previously possessed by the States"—*A. B. Kirschbaum Co.* v. *Walling* ((1942) 316 U. S. 517). In this respect the congressional approach has been "strikingly empiric"—*A. B. Kirschbaum Co.* v. *Walling, supra.* From the practical standpoint, there can be no hard and fast rule, no rigid formula or dependable touchstone as to what is or is not interstate commerce. In construing the commerce clause, the Supreme Court acts in a gradual process of inclusion and exclusion: The criterion is necessarily one of degree—*Santa Cruz Fruit Packing Co.* v. *N. L. R. B.* ((1938) 303 U. S. 453); *Wickard* v. *Filburn, supra.* There is no controlling force to past nomenclature for formulae. "The precise boundary has never yet been, and doubtless never can be, delineated by a single abstract definition"—*U. S.* v. *South-Eastern Underwriters Ass'n, supra.*

The approach laid down by the Supreme Court today is whether the activity in question substantially and economically "affect" interstate commerce. If activities through intrastate have such an effect, they may be regulated—*Santa Cruz Fruit Packing Co.* v. *N. L. R. B.* ((1938) 303 U. S. 45); *Wickard* v. *Filburn* ((1942) 317 U. S. 111); *U. S.* v. *South-Eastern Underwriters Ass'n* ((1944) 322 U. S. 533).

> The commerce power is not confined to its exercise to the regulation of commerce among the States. It extends to those activities intrastate which so affect interstate commerce, or the exertion of the power of Congress over it, as to make regulation of them appropriate means to the attainment of a legitimate end, the effective execution of the granted power to regulate interstate commerce. (*U. S.* v. *Wrightwood Dairy Co.* (1942), 315 U. S. 110; see *Smolowe* v. *Delendo Corp.* (C. C. A. 2d, 1943), 136 F. (2d) 231.)

Moreover, it is no longer necessary to find that intrastate activities have a "direct" effect on interstate commerce. Even if the activity be local and though it may not be regarded as commerce, it may still, whatever its nature, be reached by Congress, if it exerts a substantial and economic effect on interstate commerce, and this irrespective of whether such effect is that what might at some earlier time have been defined as "direct" or "indirect"—*Wickard* v. *Filburn*, supra. Where intrastate activities are so commingled with or related to those of an interstate character, that all must be regulated if interstate commerce is to be controlled effectively, then Congress has the power so to do—*U. S.* v. *Darby* ((1941) 312 U. S. 100); *Currin* v. *Wallace* ((1939) 306 U. S. 1). Nor does the tenth amendment prevent Congress from resort to all means appropriate to the permitted end—*U. S.* v. *Darby*, supra. If Congress says in a statutory declaration that a particular activity affects interstate commerce, then the courts in passing on the validity of the statute have only the function of determining whether that activity is within reach of the Federal power—*U. S.* v. *Darby*, supra. And such validity is determined by what is regulated, not by what the regulation affects—*Enterprise Box Co.* v. *Fleming* ((C. C. A. 5th, 1942) 125 F. 2d 897).

The use of the highways is subject to the imposition of legislative conditions within the scope of the commerce power, and regulation of this nature is based on the public interest—*Transamerican Freight Lines, Inc.* v. *U. S.* ((D. Del. 1943) 51 F. Supp. 405). In light of the principles just stated, and adapting the language of the Supreme Court in *U. S.* v. *South-Eastern Underwriters Ass'n* ((1944) 322 U. S. 533), it is arguable that the operation of motor vehicles "is not separated into 48 distinct territorial compartments which function in isolation from each other." Rather there is "a continuous and indivisible stream of intercourse among the States" and it cannot be said with any exactness where local operation ends and interstate operation begins. It is a matter of common knowledge that with the improvement and expansion of the national highway system and the coming of the present-day automobile, rendering all points easily accessible to the traveling public, the operation of motor vehicles is no longer confined solely to local use. There is a vast stream of traffic between the States at all times, and much of this traffic partakes of or relates to matters of business and trade. Chief Justice Marshall said that commerce was "traffic"—Gibbons against Ogden, supra—and anything which interferes with or obstructs this traffic can be regulated.

Certainly, a State law which in some fashion unreasonably prevented the inflow of such traffic would be regarded as interfering with interstate commerce. Compare *Edwards* v. *California* ((1941) 314 U. S. 160). Similarly, accidents, with resulting delays, hazards, personal injury, and property losses, affect such traffic and materially affect the flow and economic aspects of interstate commerce. If these matters are to be regulated, then driving, even of a purely local nature, must also be regulated in order for congressional control to be effective. Within the principles stated by the Supreme Court, a good argument can be made that regulation of this sort is within the power granted by the commerce clause, as presently construed. Under modern conditions, it can be said that motor-vehicle operation is a matter which reaches across State lines, affecting the people of more States than one.—See United States against Southeastern Underwriters Association, supra.

It is no objection to the congressional assertion of power to regulate interstate commerce that its exercise is attended by the same incidents which attend the exercise of a State's police power—*U. S.* v. *Darby* ((1941) 312 U. S. 100). Congress can control interstate commerce to the extent of forbidding and punishing certain acts therein which spread harm to the people of other States from the State of origin. In so doing it is merely exerting the police power, for the benefit of the public, within the field of interstate commerce—*Kentucky Whip & Collar Co.* v. *Illinois Central R. Co.* ((1937) 299 U. S. 334); *Currin* v. *Wallace* ((1939) 306 U. S. 1).

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 15, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 731. An act to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 17, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

552. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 involving an increase of $564,000 and a proposed provision for reappropriation of an unobligated balance of $1,000,000 for the Federal Works Agency (H. Doc. No. 201); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

553. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation involving a decrease of $33,000 for the Council of Economic Advisers (H. Doc. No. 202); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

554. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed transfer of various equipment to city of Memphis, Tenn., town of Newfield, N. J., and Thompson Products Auto Album and Aviation Museum, Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on Armed Services.

555. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

556. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reenact and amend the Organic Act of the United States Geological Survey by incorporating therein substantive provisions confirming the exercise of long-continued duties and functions and by redeeming their geographic scope; to the Committee on Public Lands.

557. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate pertaining to the administrative expense authorization of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year 1947 (H. Doc. No. 203); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

558. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the withdrawal of a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $2,640,000 for the Federal Loan Agency (H. Doc. No. 204); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

559. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for the period July 1, 1945, to March 14, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 205); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 3072. A bill to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for the erection of an addition or extension to the House Office Buildings and the remodeling of the fifth floor of the Old House Office Building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 3073. A bill to amend 42 United States Code 253 (b) (the Public Health Service Act of July 1, 1944); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 3074. A bill to fix the rate of tax under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act on employers and employees for the calendar year 1948; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 3075. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification and compensation of employees of the postal service, so as to provide proper recompense in the form of compensatory time for overtime performed by supervisors; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 3076. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 3077. A bill to define partnerships and partners for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3078. A bill to permit certain employment by the United States to be included as employment under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 3079. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 3080. A bill to improve housing conditions in the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 3081. A bill to promote the national security by establishing a uniform ratio of officer and enlisted strength for all the armed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3082. A bill to provide for the presentation of a medal to the family of the late Patrick Rose, in recognition of his valor in saving the lives of fellow fishermen; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 3083. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make such act applicable to the officers and employees of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3084. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3085. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory

thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 3086. A bill to amend the act of June 7, 1897, as amended (30 Stat. 102, 103; 33 U. S. C. 158, 159), providing for the prevention of collisions on certain inland waters of the United States, to extend the provisions thereof to the Mississippi River below the Huey P. Long Bridge at New Orleans, La., to certain other rivers emptying into the Gulf of Mexico, and to the entire Gulf intracoastal waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3087. A bill to amend section 4233 of the Revised Statutes of the United States for the prevention of collisions on western rivers; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. Res. 184. Resolution to amend rule XI (1) (a) (16) of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for the necessary funds to meet all operating expenses of the public employment services subsequent to June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Federal legislation concerning income-tax discrimination; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3088. A bill for the relief of William Dudley Ward-Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 3089. A bill for the relief of Mississippi Central Railroad Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 3090. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Ridenhour, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3091. A bill for the relief of Ramon G. Hunter and Arthur Nancett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 3092. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ada Svejkovsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3093. A bill for the relief of Ernest Bernhard Jaffe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 3094. A bill for the relief of the Silver Fleet Motor Express, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 3095. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to George Estes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

335. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Passaic, N. J., memorializing Congress to withhold passage of the proposed legislation to change the basis of industrial relations, to call a meeting of management, labor, and the public for the purpose of deciding in what areas self-disciplinary measures can be applied, and to rededicate its purposes to the welfare and prosperity of all citizens; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

336. By Mr. CLASON: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact a Fair Employment Practices Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

337. By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt an effective permanent Fair Employment Practices Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

338. By Mr. MILLER of California: Senate Joint Resolution 14 adopted by California State Legislature, relative to appropriations affecting the United States customs service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

339. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of Slovak Catholic Sokol Assembly 124, of Racine, Wis., asking for a full congressional investigation of the whole Czechoslovak question; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

340. By Mr. PLOESER: Petition by the Senate and House, Missouri Legislature, concerning legislation permitting the division of income between husband and wife for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

341. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Transport and Quartermasters Department Servicemen of Spanish War, McKinley Fleet, No. 1, of San Francisco, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the endorsement of S. 340 and H. R. 886; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

342. Also, petition of members of St. Cloud Townsend Club, No. 1, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

343. Also, petition of the chairman, Board of Temperance, Southwest Missouri Methodist Conference, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

344. Also, petition of the Daytona Beach Townsend Club, No. 1, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

345. Also, petition of the delegates from the Townsend clubs of the Fifth Congressional District of the State of Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, in whom is our trust, Thou alone dost know the end from the beginning, and we, Thy children, must needs walk by faith. We are anxious about the consequences of what we do. May that concern restrain us in our private lives as it does in our public duty. In our troubled minds there is confusion and honest perplexity. But we know there is no confusion with Thee. Wilt Thou guide us, that we may do what is right; and if we suffer for it, we shall be blessed.

This we ask in Christ's name, who was crucified, having done nothing amiss. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 16, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, April 17, 1947, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 241. An act for the relief of Andrew Chiarodo;

S. 243. An act for the relief of Lillian M. Lorraine; and

S. 363. An act to amend section 3 of the act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 534, 79th Cong.).

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations may sit this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At the time of the recess last evening the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] had the floor, and under the unanimous-consent agreement he retains it this morning.

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States withdrawing the nomination of Louis L. Brown to be postmaster at Fort Valley, Ga., which was ordered to lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 151 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF FEDERAL SURPLUS COMMODITIES CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for the fiscal year