SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 12, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

In this, the day that the Lord hath made, help us, O God, to appreciate its beauty and to use aright its opportunities.

Deliver us, we pray Thee, from the tyranny of trifles. May me give our best thought and attention to what is important, that we may accomplish something worth while. Teach us how to listen to the prompting of Thy spirit, and thus save us from floundering in indecision that wastes time, subtracts from our peace, divides our efficiency, and multiplies our troubles.

In the name of Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 9, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 102) to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the World Telecommunications Conferences to be held in the United States in 1947.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 450) providing for the conveyance to the town of Marblehead, in the State of Massachusetts, of Marblehead Military Reservation for public use.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1098) to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2700) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KEEFE, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. HENDRICKS, and Mr. FOGARTY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 450. An act providing for the conveyance to the town of Marblehead, in the State of Massachusetts, of Marblehead Military Reservation for public use; and

H. R. 1098. An act to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations be permitted to sit during the session today and the remainder of the week.

I also ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is conducting hearings today on Senate bill 265, introduced by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], prohibiting the transportation in interstate commerce, either by public or private carrier, and including the Post Office Department, of alcoholic-liquor advertising. I ask unanimous consent that the committee be permitted to continue in session this afternoon. There are 50 to 75 people from out of town who are here to testify, whom we desire to accommodate as far as we can.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the committee is authorized to sit this afternoon.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

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	Ecton	Lodge
Baldwin	Ellender	Lucas
Ball	Ferguson	McCarran
Barkley	Flanders	McCarthy
Brewster	Fulbright	McClellan
Bricker	George	McFarland
Bridges	Green	McGrath
Brooks	Gurney	McKellar
Buck	Hatch	McMahon
Bushfield	Hawkes	Magnuson
Butler	Hayden	Malone
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Martin
Cain	Hill	Maybank
Capehart	Hoey	Millikin
Capper	Holland	Moore
Chavez	Ives	Myers
Connally	Jenner	O'Conor
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Donnell	Kem	Overton
Downey	Kilgore	Pepper
Dworshak	Knowland	Reed
Eastland	Langer	Revercomb
Robertson, Va.	Taylor	Wagner
Robertson, Wyo.	Thomas, Okla.	Watkins
Russell	Thomas, Utah	Wherry
Smith	Thye	Wiley
Sparkman	Tydings	Williams
Stewart	Umstead	Wilson
Taft	Vandenberg	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on public business.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

CONSTITUTION OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION INSTRUMENT OF AMENDMENT

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States' share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PERMANENT COMMISSIONED PERSONNEL STRENGTH OF COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to integrate certain personnel of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation and the Bureau of Customs into the regular Coast Guard, to establish the permanent commissioned personnel strength of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the appointment of one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Senate of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Senate Resolution 79

"Resolution relative to Federal ownership of property within States and local governments

"Whereas the problem of the acquisition and ownership of Federal lands in the several States is causing considerable concern because of the reduced evaluation base upon which local property taxes can be levied; and

"Whereas such lands are and have been acquired for game reserves, forest reserves, public parks, public monuments, mineral reserves, Federal building for governmental purposes, expanding military facilities, property acquired and used in a proprietary sense, and land remaining in public domain; and

"Whereas the accumulation of land for governmental purposes in the heart of metropolitan areas of large cities has substantially

reduced the tax base used in the determination of the ad valorem tax; and

"Whereas the accumulation of land for these several purposes has increased in 10 years from 37 percent to 46 percent of all the lands in California; and

"Whereas such accumulation has extended to 50 percent of all the lands in 17 counties of said State; and

"Whereas in all the 11 Western States, 47 percent of the land is owned by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas such large accumulation of land by the Federal Government in California and the other 10 Western States has been destructive to the fiscal structure of local government; and

"Whereas the withdrawal of such large amounts of land from taxation has left local government without adequate revenue for its support; and

"Whereas this loss of revenue cannot be supplanted by other sources; and

"Whereas it is necessary for local government to provide protection of life and property, the maintenance and construction of streets, roads, and highways, and other local facilities to service the properties acquired by the Federal Government and the people living thereon: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, as follows:

"(1) That the Federal Government assume its financial responsibilities in relation to local governmental jurisdictions where such property is located; that Congress immediately enact legislation to this end;

"(2) That said legislation provide that local government be reimbursed in amount equivalent to taxes lost by virtue of such acquisitions by the Federal Government; or that such property as is owned by the Federal Government be permitted to be taxed locally in the same manner and to the same extent as other local property;

"(3) That property now held by the Federal Government which is not clearly necessary for a public purpose be disposed of in order that it may be returned to the local tax rolls for the purpose of local taxation and support of local government; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Treasury, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States, and that the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States are respectfully requested to urge such action."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Joint Resolution 27

"Whereas the United States Marine Corps has protected and defended American interests in all parts of the globe ever since its inception; and

"Whereas in every military venture which the United States has undertaken the achievements of the Marine Corps have always typified the ultimate in heroism and self-sacrifice; and

"Whereas it would be a shocking travesty for the people of the United States to sound the death knell of an institution which has served them so nobly; and

"Whereas legislation pending before the Congress of the United States, if enacted as presently constituted, would bring to an end the existence of the Marine Corps as an independent unit: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That we urge the Congress of the United States not to approve any legislation unifying or merging the armed forces unless there is contained therein assurance that the Marine Corps will be retained in its present form; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be prepared and forwarded by the Secretary of State to the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Illinois.

"Adopted by the house, April 29, 1947."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to extend the right to become a naturalized citizen of the United States to persons whose sons or daughters have served honorably in World War II and who themselves have not been disloyal to the United States of America

"Whereas the twenty-third session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, by Senate Joint Resolution 2 duly enacted into law, memorialized the Congress of the United States of America to extend the right to become naturalized citizens of the United States to all those persons whose sons and daughters served honorably in the late World War and who have not themselves been disloyal to the United States and who, except for race and nationality, complied with the naturalization laws; and

"Whereas the injustice of denying to such persons the privilege of citizenship, which they have earned by the devotion which they and their children have displayed for the United States, becomes constantly more apparent: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, earnestly and respectfully requested to extend the right of naturalization to all persons whose sons or daughters have served honorably in any branch of the armed forces, merchant marine, the Army Transport Service, and other like services of the United States of America and who themselves have not been disloyal to the United States and who, except for race and nationality, comply with the naturalization laws.

"SEC. 2. That duly authenticated copies of this joint resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"Approved this 2d day of May A. D. 1947.

"INGRAM M. STAINBACK,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"House Concurrent Resolution 37

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act by reducing the residence qualification in divorce proceedings from 2 years to 1 year

"Whereas the Hawaiian Organic Act provides that no divorce shall be granted by the courts of the Territory unless the applicant therefor shall have resided in the Territory for 2 years next preceding the application; and

"Whereas by said Hawaiian Organic Act all citizens of the United States who reside in the Territory for 1 year are declared to be citizens of the Territory; and

"Whereas the restrictions in granting of divorces thereby deprives persons otherwise bona fide citizens of the Territory from the operation of the divorce laws of the Territory; and

"Whereas it is desired that all citizens of the Territory may have full access to the relief granted by the laws of the Territory in matters relating to domestic relations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-fourth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, respectfully requested to amend section 55 of the Hawaiian Organic Act by reducing the residence qualifications in divorce proceedings from 2 years next preceding the application for divorce to 1 year next preceding the application for divorce; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, the Secretary of the Interior, and to each of the two Houses of the Congress of the United States of America."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Society of St. Ann, Branch 37, of the First Catholic Slovak Union of the United States and Canada, New York City, N. Y., relating to the political status of Czechoslovakia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by Post No. 24, the American Legion, of Columbus, Ind., favoring the enactment of legislation to give veterans of World War I the same benefits, pensions, and relief as the Spanish-American War veterans are now receiving; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Veterans' Action Committee, of Denison, Tex., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 595) to provide that the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred in active military or naval service other than in a period of war service shall be equal to 90 percent of the rates payable for similar disabilities incurred during active service in time of war; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

A petition signed by 23 citizens of the State of Colorado, 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. CAPPER:

A petition signed by 51 citizens of Wellington, 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.

PROHIBITION AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a petition signed by 250 citizens of Blacksburg, Va., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce. I request that the petition be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the petition will be received, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ECONOMY VERSUS WESTERN DEVELOPMENT—LETTER FROM MONROE SWEETLAND

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD a letter published in the Washington Post of Friday, May 2, 1947, from Monroe Sweetland, editor of the Molalla Pioneer, Molalla, Oreg.,

and request that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMY VERSUS WESTERN DEVELOPMENT

This letter is an appeal across the country, in the hope that even yet something may be done to salvage a little from the wreckage committed last week by the eastern Republicans. As it looks from here our Columbia River Development in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho has been set back a decade.

The Northwest cannot adequately defend itself politically, since our congressional and electoral college strength is small. Apparently GOP Chairman Reece and his man, Congressman TABER, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, have cold bloodedly decided to sacrifice the Northwest to show something for their campaign pledges to eastern finance and capital that there would be tax cuts. The letter is an appeal, over their heads, to the fair-minded people of all regions who place national interest above sectional or corporate interests.

These projects are not tax burdens. All of them are self-liquidating, and greatly increase the total national wealth by developing our unused land and waterpower and natural resources. Bonneville Dam, whose budget was cut 47 percent and whose growing usefulness was halted where it is, is repaying the Federal Treasury well ahead of schedule. If this is Republican economics, its folly will lose that party the Northwest region again in 1948, as in the last four Presidential elections, in spite of basic Republican majorities at least in Idaho and Oregon.

For months threats and indecent proposals of compromise have alternately been made to the Northwest. Most specific of these, which Secretary Krug properly rejected, was that Bonneville power rates (the lowest in the Nation) be doubled, so that eastern industry could compete with its expensive Diesel plants. This public-be-damned proposal, put forth by GOP Congressmen JONES and JENSEN on behalf of eastern industry, reflects the hostility of some elements to the rapid industrialization of this area.

And when we protested through Senator MORSE and others Chairman TABER, speaking for the Republican majority, dismissed our pleas as (according to an April 22 Associated Press dispatch widely published here) "the squeal of a stuck pig."

Already we are drawing up our battlelines to do the best we can with our limited regional strength. Through Americans for Democratic Action, and our regional Grange Farmers Union, and labor groups, we will try to see to it that Senators MORSE, TAYLOR, and MAGNUSON have solid congressional support next time. But our ultimate appeal has to be to fair-minded people everywhere who view this as a national, not a sectional, problem—and with them we rest our case.

From the earliest days, when Thomas Jefferson was opposed in his request for funds for the Lewis and Clark expedition which made this region part of the United States, every step in its development has been aided by forward-looking Americans from all sections. To them we appeal for help again now, knowing that they will see in our case more than, as Chairman TABER put it, "the squeal of a stuck pig."

MONROE SWEETLAND,
Editor, Molalla Pioneer.

MOLALLA, OREG.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 1081. A bill to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 161).

By Mr. CAPEHART, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1154. A bill to amend the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946; with an amendment (Rept. No. 162).

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 1073. A bill to extend until June 30, 1949, the period of time during which persons may serve in certain executive departments and agencies without being prohibited from acting as counsel, agent, or attorney for prosecuting claims against the United States by reason of having so served; without amendment (Rept. No. 163).

FEDERAL COURTHOUSE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably with amendments the bill (S. 450) to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction, equipment, and furnishing of a building thereon for the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and I submit a report (No. 164) thereon. The accompanying report pertains to the amendments made by the committee. I request that the bill as amended by the committee, and the report, be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the report and bill will be printed as requested by the Senator from Washington, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1265. A bill to amend sections 1301 and 1303 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, relating to liability for causing death by wrongful act; and

S. 1266. A bill to amend section 1064 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to admissibility of testimony by a party to a transaction when the other party is incapable of testifying; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1267. A bill for the relief of Eleonore M. Hannon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1268. A bill to amend subsection 200 (c) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. LANGER introduced the following bills, which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and appear under a separate heading:

S. 1269. A bill to subject Indians of the State of California to the laws of that State; and

S. 1270. A bill to provide for the distribution of certain funds of the Indians of California held in trust by agencies of the Department of the Interior or in the Treasury of the United States, and for other purposes.)

PROPOSED CALIFORNIA INDIAN PROGRAM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference, two bills relating to Indians of the State of California. I request that a statement in connection with the bills be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bills will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from North Dakota will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bills were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands, as follows:

S. 1269. A bill to subject Indians of the State of California to the laws of that State; and

S. 1270. A bill to provide for the distribution of certain funds of the Indians of California held in trust by agencies of the Department of the Interior or in the Treasury of the United States, and for other purposes.

The statement presented by Mr. LANGER was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREFACE TO STATEMENT OF DELEGATES, ALTERNATES, AND SPECIAL DELEGATES REPRESENTING INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the House Committee on Public Lands: we have been officially advised that the Indian Bureau has been for some time negotiating with the Governor and members of the State Legislature of California to the end that the Indians of California may be transferred from Federal to State supervision, or perhaps it would be more correct to say, to joint supervision to be provided by a specially created board of managers, the cost of such board to be paid for jointly by the Federal Government, the State of California, and the Indians of California out of their $5,000,000 now in the Treasury of the United States to their credit. We understand that at least two officials of the Indian Bureau are now in California for that purpose.

We are confident that our Indian people are definitely and unalterably opposed to the creation of a new Indian Bureau. For many years our people have asked that they be freed from Indian Bureau supervision and that they be accorded full citizenship, including the right to manage their own property now held in trust by the Indian Bureau. Our people are qualified to manage their own affairs without cost to the Federal Government.

The Indians of California desire to be accorded the same rights and privileges as other citizens. They desire to be freed from Federal supervision by the earliest date possible. We feel that unless a definite program is adopted by Congress, with the aid of the Indians of California, the unnecessary cost of their supervision will continue as heretofore, years without end. We are relying on you, as Members of Congress, for remedial legislation. There is no other tribunal from which the relief we need can be secured. We need, among other things, legislation that will permit our people, by the process of delegates in convention, to reach conclusions whereby our people will be vocal, and recognized by Congress, as to their recommendations. A bill for that purpose, S. 1102, is now pending before the Senate Committee on Public Lands.

For several weeks, beginning January of this year eight Indian delegates representing Indians of California conferred in Washington with each other and with officials who

could furnish them with information. They had before them the recommendations of Mr. Zimmerman, Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs, which he presented to the Senate Civil Service Committee on February 8, 1947. A copy of his recommendations and tabulation of amounts now being expended by the Indian Bureau through its agencies in California—a total of more than $1,000,000 annually—is attached to the statement handed to you, entitled "Statement of Delegates, Alternates, and Special Delegates Representing Indians of California."

In order for you to get the picture clearly before you, I shall first read the statement of Mr. Zimmerman, followed by the statement of the delegates.

PROPOSED CALIFORNIA INDIAN PROGRAM

Objective: Orderly withdrawal of Federal service and supervision over the affairs of California Indians.

Joint Indian Welfare Board: Obtain congressional and California State legislative authority for the establishment of a joint State-Federal Indian Welfare Board of five members, two Indians appointed by the governor from a list recommended by the organized California Indians, two State officials, one Federal representative appointed by Secretary of the Interior.

Transfer to this board the following:

Any service, guidance, and supervisory functions deemed essential for Indian welfare and the proper use and protection of Indian property during the existence of the board.

The administration and disposition of the California Indian judgment fund of more than $5,000,000 and of any other compensation which may accrue to the Indians of California.

Finance the operation of the board by Federal and State contributions and from available judgment funds.

Law enforcement: Transfer to State and counties.

Trust lands: Retain title of present Indian lands in the United States in trust for a definite period.

Approve fee patents to public domain allotments and homesteads upon application by the owners and recommendation by the board.

Require from fee patent applicants a waiver of right to any special Federal Indian gratuity services for himself and family.

Tribal lands and allotments: Authorize the organization of Indian cooperative associations and/or corporations under State or Federal law to manage tribal lands and personal property under proper safeguards with the consent of a majority of the adult members of the group and the approval of the articles and bylaws by the joint board. Organized groups may, upon application by the allottees, undertake management of individual allotments. Applications for removal of restrictions or fee patents for allotments must have approval of the joint board. Organized tribes and groups may make contributions to counties and school districts in lieu of taxes while land remains in trust.

Potential reductions: Reduction in Federal personnel and expenditures will depend upon two factors: The availability of a substantial part of the $5,000,000 judgment fund for use through the proposed board for constructive purposes and administrative costs; the willingness of the State to contribute personnel and funds; the rate of fee patent applications for public domain and other allotments. If the State of California will participate and the Indians of California will approve an act of Congress for the cash distribution of one-half of the judgment fund and authorizing the use of the remaining part of the fund for defraying the cost in whole or in part, of the management of the fund, it should be possible substantially to reduce Federal Indian expenditures in California within 2 years after the enactment of the legislation and the establishment of the board. Within 10 years after the establishment of the board, the State assuming the financial responsibility, Federal expenditures could probably be cut to 25 percent of the 1947 level, and within 25 or 30 years they could cease entirely.

Sherman Institute: The cost of operating the Sherman Institute at Riverside, Calif., is considered separately. That expense may be eliminated entirely at any time if Congress so ordains.

1947 Federal expenditures: The Federal expenditures in California during the present fiscal year are as follows:

(1) Reservation administration, including construction and maintenance of buildings and utilities	$153,170
(2) Education, including State contractual subsidy	181,729
(3) Health service, including cost of State medical contract	239,037
(4) Welfare and relief	23,533
(5) Forestry protection	31,393
(6) Agricultural extension and credit	20,841
(7) Irrigation, M & O	37,241
(8) Roads	110,000
Subtotal	839,344
(9) Sherman Institute	253,324
(10) Allotted to Yuma from Colorado River (Ariz.) Agency (estimated)	30,000
Total expenditure in California	1,122,668

The personnel at the agencies consists of 104 full-time classified employees and of 73 unclassified employees, principally Indian aides and part-time employees.

Th California Indian roll lists some 23,000 names. The total Indian holdings of trust land in California are 605,000 acres, of which 415,000 acres are in tribal status and 190,000 acres are in individual allotments and homesteads. Most of the Indian land is in the mountains and deserts.

STATEMENT OF DELEGATES, ALTERNATES, AND SPECIAL DELEGATES REPRESENTING INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

The Indians of California should be freed from all supervision by the Federal Government and the Government should be freed from its total cost of such supervision. The Indians should be treated the same as other citizens of the State. As far back as 1916, in a test case (Anderson (an Indian) against Shafter Mathews, county clerk of Lake County), the Supreme Court of California found and declared that the Indian is a born citizen, entitled to all the privileges and amenable to the same laws as other residents and citizens, including the right to register and vote (174 Cal. 537).

The Indians are required to pay for hunting and fishing licenses the same as other persons within the confines of the State, when hunting or fishing off the reservation. The majority of the Indians do not have any connection with any reservation, and are therefore required to secure licenses. They are assessed taxes in all cases, the same as other persons residing in California, including automobile and gasoline taxes, sales, property, and school taxes. Under the laws and the Consitution of California, the Indians are entitled:

(1) To vote.

(2) To attend public schools. (Whether the Indian has taxable property or not, he is not required to pay any tuition, and his school books are furnished free. In 1929, the Supreme Court of California declared unconstitutional, null, and void, the act of the State legislature intended to bar Indian children from attending public schools if the Indian resided within 3 miles of a Government school) (193 Cal. 664).

(3) To receive old-age pensions when they are 65 years of age, or over.

(4) To receive monthly allowances for the care of orphan and half-orphan children.

(5) To receive monthly and temporary allowances when blind or in indigent circumstances, also to be admitted to county hospitals and alms houses, under the same circumstances as any other resident of the county; also free care in State institutions.

(6) To social-security benefits when unemployed.

Notwithstanding these facts, the Indians of California are treated by the Indian Bureau as wards of the Federal Government, which involves many thousands of dollars each year for the maintenance of Indian agencies. According to Mr. Zimmerman's report to the Senate Civil Service Committee recently, the Interior Appropriation Act for the year ending June 30, 1947, appropriated for California a total of $1,122,668. We believe this total is in error.

PROPOSED PROGRAM FOR THE INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

We recommend:

A. That item 9, page 3, of Mr. Zimmerman's advice to your committee, entitled "Proposed California Indian program," regarding cost of maintaining and operating "Sherman Institute" at Riverside, Calif., *be discontinued as of June 30, 1947*, thereby saving the Federal Government an annual cost of	$253,324
B. That item 2, page 3, of Mr. Zimmerman's proposed California Indian program, "Education, including State contractual subsidy," *be discontinued as of June 30, 1947*, thereby saving the Federal Government annually the sum of	181,729
C. That item 3 of Mr. Zimmerman's proposal, page 3, "Health services, including cost of State medical contract," *be discontinued as of June 30, 1947*, thereby saving the Federal Government annually the sum of	239,037
D. That item 4, page 3, "Welfare and relief," *be discontinued as of June 30, 1947*, thereby saving the Federal Government an annual cost of	23,533
E. That item 5, page 3, relating to "Forestry protection"; item 6, relating to "Agricultural expenses and credit"; and item 7, relating to "Irrigation, M & O," and item 8, "Roads," *be discontinued as of June 30, 1947*, or transferred to the appropriate department of the State or Federal Government having facilities and appropriations to absorb these activities, thereby saving the Federal Government for these four items an annual total of	199,475
F. That item 1, "Reservation administration, including construction and maintenance of buildings and utilities," *be discontinued as of June 30, 1947*, thereby saving the Federal Government annually a total of (or as much of that sum as may not be needed for an orderly liquidation and a readjustment that may be found to be advisable)	153,170
Grand total	1,050,268

W^ are not sufficiently familiar with item 10, relating to the amount, "Allotted to Yuma

from Colorado River, Arizona, Agency (estimated), $30,000," to make any recommendations.

Undoubtedly a large number of the "104 full-time classified employees" and "73 unclassified employees" can be reduced as to their numbers.

While it is a fact that as of May 18, 1928, there were in round numbers 23,000 Indians of California enrolled as such, according to the Census Bureau's vital statistics figures this number has been reduced by deaths to approximately 17,000. The children born since May 18, 1928, are not classified by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as Indians of California, due to the fact that they have not been identified as qualified enrollees.

We also recommend:

G. That in fairness to the State of California (in view of the fact that a total of "605,000 acres, of which 415,000 acres are in tribal status and 190,000 acres are in individual allotments and homesteads" and "most of the Indian land is in the mountains and deserts" and are therefore held in trust by the Government and are exempt from taxation) Congress authorizes the payment to the State of California an amount equal to the tax levied by the State of California on similar properties.

A large portion of the Indians of California do not reside on restricted land. Many of them have acquired land and homes of their own. They are enterprising and self-respecting citizens.

H. The Court of Claims records show that more than 611,000 acres of restricted lands have been charged against Indians of California at $1.25 per acre, as an offset in their judgment which resulted in a net recovery of $5,000,000. The Indians have therefore paid for such lands. No title of any kind or description has been accorded to the Indians for these lands for which they have paid. The Indians should be given titles to these lands, thereby freeing the Government of further personnel and cost of supervision.

I. That (1) allotments and tribal lands held in trust, retain their present status until the trust period has expired, or until Congress has otherwise directed: Provided, That the allottee may make application to the Secretary of the Interior for fee patent at any time, and that such application, if not granted, may be presented to the appropriate committee of Congress for such action as it deems appropriate, and that the Indians concerned shall be fully advised as to any and all actions contemplated; and (2) that fee patents to public-domain allotments and homesteads be approved upon application by the owners.

J. That Indians concerned with tribal property be authorized by Congress to submit, to the Secretary of the Interior and to the committees of Congress concerned with Indian affairs, recommendations as to the use and final disposition of tribal property.

K. That the rancheria lands, now held in common for Indians of California in trust by the Federal Government, be subdivided and assigned as equitably as possible to individual Indians, and that immediately, or as soon as Congress may deem proper, the Indians concerned be given a fee patent to their individual holdings. The present uncertain tenure of holding of lands does not create initiative or encourage the development of the lands and improvements thereon.

L. That no waiver would be necessary by an Indian who was freed from Bureau control in the State of California to the effect that he would not assert a "right to any special Federal Indian gratuity services for himself and family." No other citizen or alien who acquires citizenship is called on to make any such waiver.

M. That the roll of Indians of California be revised to remove from it all persons who have died since May 18, 1928, and by adding to that roll all Indian children and their descendants, now living, born since May 18, 1928, and by adding the names of such persons who can establish that they are descendants of Indians residing in California on June 1, 1852, and their descendants now living. There were a few Indians who happened to be living in adjacent States on May 18, 1928, but, although they could establish themselves as being Indians of California, were deprived of enrollment at that time because they were not living "in said State." Therefore, they are not classified as beneficiaries in common with other Indians of California.

N. That $4,000,000, and accumulated interest on the net judgment of $5,000,000 now in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California, be paid (to all who are now or may hereafter be enrolled) on a per capita basis, and that $1,000,000 be retained in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California as a reserve fund, subject to the wishes of the Indians of California and subsequent authority by Congress.

O. That law enforcement be transferred to the State and counties of California, thereby relieving the Federal Government of any cost or responsibility for that purpose. Federal policing of reservations would not then be necesssary.

P. That a Joint Indian Welfare Board is not necessary or advisable. The Indians of California should be treated in the same manner and not different from any other citizens or residents of the State of California.

Q. That Congress establish a committee of five members to be selected from the Indian Affairs Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, to work out the details of the complete surrender of the Federal Government over the affairs of the Indians of California.

R. That the individual Indians of California concerned be given a full and complete accounting of their individual, tribal, and community funds now being held by the Department of the Interior or any of its agencies, and the source of such funds, giving name and last-known address of each such person, and the names and locations of the depositaries of such funds, and that such report be filed with the Civil Service and Public Lands Committees of the United States Senate.

S. That the dual system maintained by the State and Federal Governments be discontinued. The present system makes the Indian a shuttlecock between the two Governments, resulting in grave perplexity as to where the Indian should look for relief accorded to other citizens and residents in similar circumstances.

INQUIRY

We would like to know if the Indian Bureau, under the provisions of the Interior Appropriation Act for the year ending June 30, 1947, is authorized to use as much as $50,000 of money now in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California, and can a portion of that sum be used to pay the expenses of the undersigned delegates, alternates, and special delegates representing the Indians of California, from their respective homes to Washington, D. C., and return, including a per diem comparable to that allowed delegations of Indians from other States. The provision referred to is found on page 12, Public Law 478, Seventy-ninth Congress, and reads as follows:

"MISCELLANEOUS INDIAN TRIBAL FUNDS

"Administration of Indian tribal affairs (tribal funds): For expenses of administering the affairs and property of Indian tribes, including pay and travel expenses, $278,170, payable from funds held by the United States in trust for the particular tribe benefited; not to exceed $50,000 for any one tribe."

Sincerely yours,

Delegates, Alternates, and Special Delegates Representing Indians of California: Clyde F. Thompson, chairman; Herbert A. Bellas; Manuel C. Cordova; Alfred C. Gillis; Mrs. Frankie Moorhead; Dewey Conway; Hathaway L. Stevens; Adam Castillo, President, Mission Indian Federation of California.

FEBRUARY 12, 1947.

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF DELEGATES, ALTERNATES, AND SPECIAL DELEGATES REPRESENTING INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

There are many instances in California where Indians have acquired trust patents under authority of Congress to lands occupied by them. The trust provides that the lands shall be held for the allottees and delivered to them or their heirs at the expiration of the trust period, free of all encumbrances.

Through executive orders of the President and special acts of Congress some of the Indians have acquired vested rights in certain other lands in California. By agreement Congress has created in the Indians concerned a vested right. The courts have repeatedly held that—

"Wherever the rights are vested, it is the duty of the courts to protect such rights against the executive officers of the Government, even to the head of the Department, the Secretary of the Interior, for he, like all others, is subject to congressional legislation."

The courts have also held repeatedly that a vested right is a sacred right and should be protected. A selection made at a time when the rights exist to do so, creates an interest or right so vested that it descends to the heirs and fixes the right of property. We therefore doubt that there exists any right for the transfer of the trust holdings of Indians of California from the Federal Government to the State. Furthermore, the Indians do not want to be so transferred. They have sought for years and earnestly plead now that they be accorded their full rights, and freed from all governmental supervision, Federal or State, that in any way treats them apart from or in a different way from other citizens.

Former United States Senator Burton K. Wheeler, who acquired a thorough knowledge of the Indians of California by his many visits to all parts of the State as chairman of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, on April 30, 1934, said to his committee colleagues:

"There is not any more reason why those Indians out there (in California) should not handle their own affairs than any white man. Hardly any of them are more than quarter-breeds, and most of them are eighths. They are white people. And this Government of the United States is handling their affairs. In my judgment, those Indians ought to have that land allotted to them. They ought to run their own affairs. They ought to come under the laws of the State of California, and the guardianship over those Indians ought to cease completely." (Senate hearings on Wheeler-Howard bill, p. 151.)

The Indians of California do not owe the Government of the United States anything for services heretofore rendered to them.

The Indians of California have the distinction of having repaid the United States Government all it claimed to have expended for their benefit through the years from 1850 to 1944—a total of more than $12,000,000.

Furthermore, although they have been allowed a settlement for the claims of only from one-third to one-half of the Indians of California (as shown by the records of the Court of Claims), the Indians of California have repaid the Government the total

amount claimed to have been expended by it for *all* of the Indians of California. It is our contention that this was not an equitable settlement.

Now the Indians of California ask for their freedom from the Bureau of Indian Affairs. They desire to control their own money and property.

The Indian Bureau's answer to us and to our people is a proposal, now being negotiated with the Governor and other officials of the State of California, whereby the more than $5,000,000 now in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California may be controlled by a new board or Indian bureau. Is that the kind of a real estate deal our people merit? We want our freedom. We want to be treated as other citizens. We appeal to this committee and to the Congress for just treatment.

LABOR RELATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted five amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REDUCTION OF INCOME TAX—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina 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.

TRIBUTE TO ANNA JARVIS, FOUNDER OF MOTHER'S DAY

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, yesterday the Nation paused to recognize the first Mother's Day since the official end of hostilities following World War II.

Even in this era of atomic energy it is probably still true that "the hand that rocks the cradle is the hand that rules the world." A very great amount of power has been placed at the hands of humanity and we are becoming more and more aware of the importance of the kind of guidance which shapes the character of the people placed in charge of this and other responsibilities.

In this connection, I should like permission to print at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an excerpt from an article which appeared in the Mentor magazine in May of 1928. While the article is somewhat historical in nature, it is also very much in the form of a tribute to Miss Anna Jarvis, founder of Mother's Day.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As a tribute to her mother, Miss Anna Jarvis, a native of West Virginia but now of Philadelphia, resolved to set aside a day in May of each year as a memorial to her. On that day she selected a white flower and wore it—fitting emblem, she thought, of the love and devotion between mother and child. When her friends learned about it she told them she was going to observe the same day each year. They too become interested and asked her to arrange a service in which their entire community might have a part. While planning this memorial meeting to her own mother the thought came to her: Why not make it a national celebration in commemoration of the debt owed to mothers—a tribute of deference and respect not only to absent mothers but to all mothers and the home?

Thus out of Miss Jarvis' own personal sorrow came the idea of Mother's Day. The first observance was in Philadelphia. The day soon became recognized by other cities in the State of Pennsylvania and elsewhere. In 1912 Governor Colquitt, of Texas, inaugurated the custom of pardoning a number of prisoners on Mother's Day. In 1913 it was made a State flag day by the Nebraska Legislature.

In 1914 Miss Jarvis called on a Member of the House of Representatives and requested him to introduce a resolution providing for a day to be known and observed as Mother's Day. In May of the same year a resolution passed the United States House of Representatives and the Senate commending Mother's Day for observance by the House and Senate, by the President of the United States and his Cabinet, and by other heads of Government departments, pursuant to which President Wilson issued a proclamation setting aside the second Sunday in May as a national day of remembrance.

Since then the observance of Mother's Day has spread to all parts of Europe, to Japan, China, Africa, Palestine, and other countries.

Churches of every denomination hold special services on the second Sunday in May. Many business houses and organizations observe the Saturday preceding the second Sunday in May. Schools celebrate on Friday.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—THE YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish briefly to address myself to the subject of the penny-wise and pound-foolish type of economies indulged in by the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, and by the House of Representatives itself, in reducing by approximately 47 percent the appropriations recommended by the President for the Department of the Interior. The Department of the Interior is the agency of the Federal Government charged with conserving and developing the natural resources of our country. Its expenses are in many cases to be classed as capital investments, rather than as running expenses.

With the help of one of my Idaho constituents, Mr. S. E. Brady, an official of the Tri-State Yellowstone Park Civil Association, I have found a case in which even in appropriating for running expenses, the Republican majority in the House of Representatives has indulged in very shaky economics. Mr. Brady has written me that it is regrettable that the Park Service does not receive for the operation of Yellowstone Park an amount even equal to the fees paid by visitors to the park. He points out that if larger appropriations were made, it would be possible to keep the park open for longer seasons, thus increasing the number of visitors and actually increasing the amount of revenue which the Government receives from the park.

Mr. President, I have found it difficult to believe that the United States Government, committed as it is to a policy of providing the people of the country with great recreation areas such as Yellowstone Park, is not providing some public moneys for the operation of those parks. I have found it even more difficult to believe that the Government is actually making a profit on that operation.

So I checked on the matter with the officials of the National Park Service, and I found, surprisingly enough, that in the 1947 fiscal year Yellowstone Park received approximately $572,000. In the period from July 1946 until April 30, 1947, Yellowstone Park revenues—that is, fees paid by visitors to the park—totaled $534,059. On the basis of those receipts, the Park Service estimates that the revenue during May and June will be $105,000.

Thus, the revenue for Yellowstone Park during the 1947 fiscal year would be $639,059. So the Federal Government will make a profit of more than $50,000, on the basis of present operations.

It would seem, Mr. President, that the Republican economizers have overlooked something. If they would merely arrange to build a few more national parks, and to keep the seasons open for a longer period each year, they might be able to pay off the national debt, on the basis of profits like these.

The Budget Bureau recommended an appropriation for the 1948 fiscal year of $562,248. The House committee completely ignored this situation, since their bill has cut the National Park Service appropriations by 28 percent, recognizing, as it did so, that all-time peaks in the number of visitors to national parks were to be expected this summer, and excusing its action by saying that it has thus made a smaller reduction than it otherwise would have made.

Mr. President, in order to make entirely clear to Members of the Senate this ironical situation I should like to have incorporated in my remarks at this point the lettter which I received from Mr. Brady, of Pocatello, Idaho.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POCATELLO, IDAHO, *April 18, 1947.*

Senator GLEN H. TAYLOR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The citizens of Montana, Utah, and Idaho, the States which surround Yellowstone Park, have banded themselves together under the Tri-State Yellowstone Park Civic Association, for the sole purpose of promoting and developing Yellowstone Park and in aiding the Park Service officials in securing sufficient appropriation to properly carry on the park service and improvements.

I regret to say that in recent years, and particularly during the war, the service in Yellowstone Park has been very inadequate, due in part to lack of personnel from the fact that the wages paid were so much less than wages outside the park. As a result concessions have not been kept up to standard and the park roads have not been kept in proper care. This is regrettable when one realizes that the entrance fee paid at the gates of Yellowstone Park are sufficient to pay all operating expenses and improvements of roads in the park, but this money goes into the general fund and Congress in voting the appropriation seems to feel that they are voting millions of dollars for park purposes with no, or little return being received.

One thing that our association has been harping on for years is the inadequacy of the information folder that is given at the gate when visitors enter. The supply is so meager that they cannot supply all visitors, and they often run out before the season is

over. This publication has been the same for years, with very little improvement.

Another thing that we feel would be of great advantage to the tourist is to have an earlier opening of the park and a later closing. This could be done without too much extra expense, and, we feel, would relieve a great deal of congestion during the peak season. This information should be given greater publicity than is being given at the present time. The folder I mentioned above leaves the information that the park is only open while the hotels are open, from May 20 to September 15, when even now it is open much longer and there are ample facilities for the tourist in the cabin camps and the Hamilton stores. You will note on the envelope that encloses this letter it states that Yellowstone Park is open to auto tourists May 1 to October 15 of each year. While I have just been informed that the road will not be open to Old Faithful until May 10 and that the other roads through the park will not be open until May 20, this is due to lack of personnel for handling the public. It seems that they will not open the park until they have a full crew.

There has been appointed a committee on concessionaires for the national parks, with Mr. Clem Collins, chairman. This summer this committee will investigate all concessionaires in all national parks and recommend to the Interior Department the necessary improvements and changes, if any.

The facilities in Yellowstone Park for housing and feeding tourists is very inadequate, and there should be improvements of these facilities, opening of other facilities in new locations to accommodate the public, and many facilities should be located where they can be used for winter sports and provided with steam heat, for there is a great demand for winter-sport facilities in Yellowstone Park and ski slopes have been developed in the northern part of the park in the past.

Pardon my taking so much of your time, but I have just scratched the surface. I wish that you would give the Park Service appropriation of the Interior Department careful scrutiny when it comes before you and see that adequate appropriations are made.

Sincerely yours,

S. E. BRADY,
Managing Director.

ADVERTISEMENT BY AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR—EDITORIAL FROM PITTSBURGH PRESS

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hit Dogs Always Howl," published in the Pittsburgh Press of April 29, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] for himself, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], in the nature of a substitute for Senate bill 1126.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I think it would not be charged that Life magazine is a Democratic journal, but in the last issue of Life there appears a commentary about the pending legislation, which, in view of the known friendliness of that publication to the majority party, I thought it not inappropriate to read. I read from the editorial:

> Take the labor bill. The House got to work promptly on a labor bill and adopted a very tough one—too tough. But its best features were readily adopted by the Senate Labor Committee, which reported a bill with these main provisions: (1) It bans the closed shop and restricts the union shop; (2) it excludes foremen from rights under the Wagner Act; (3) it grants free speech to employers (which the Wagner Act has limited); (4) it separates the prosecuting and judicial functions of the National Labor Relations Board; (5) it defines unfair practices of unions and authorizes NLRB to enjoin jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts; (6) it makes unions suable and subject to financial accounting; (7) it gives the Attorney General special powers against strikes in interstate transportation, communications, or utilities.
>
> Instead of settling for these reforms, however, the Republican leadership has stalled and higgled over amendments which are for the most part either unnecessary or merely punitive. Some Republican Senators support these amendments on the ground that they will make it easier to get together with the House. But others, and Senator TAFT seems to be their leader, are less concerned with getting a good labor bill on the statute books than they are with a primitive political game known as "putting the White House in the hole." They expect, nay, invite, a White House veto of their measure. Thus, unless they can override the veto, we may get no labor reform this session. The onus, these Republicans hope, will be on the President.

Mr. President, those are the words of a publication which, as I said, has not been identified with the Democratic Party, and it is an editorial, so it reflects the deliberative judgment of this publication respecting the pending measure. Everyone knows, therefore, that there is a serious improbability of any labor legislation whatever being enacted at the present session of the Congress and becoming law, due to the nature of the position taken by the majority in the House and in the Senate. Therefore, Mr. President, several members of the minority in the Senate, thinking that, certain things along the line of proper labor legislation might be accomplished by this session of the Congress, offered a substitute proposal which was presented to the Senate on Friday evening by the able senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and by him briefly described.

In short, the substitute bill provides for improved mediation, conciliation, and arbitration machinery in the Department of Labor. That is in conformity with the recommendations of the Labor-Management conference held in Washington in 1945. It will be recalled that the pending bill takes the Conciliation Service entirely out of the Department of Labor and organizes it as a separate and distinct institution. The substitute bill provides a fact-finding board, if requested by management of labor, analogous to the fact-finding board authorized by the Railway Labor Act, which has received general approval from the country and from management and labor, as well as from Members of Congress. This fact-finding board, of course, would be appointed by the President.

The substitute bill also provides for a labor-management advisory committee. In other words, it gives statutory reality to the labor-management machinery which was established during the war and which contributed so much to the minimum number of work days lost by work stoppages during the war, and the unparalleled production record we made during that period.

The substitute bill does not grant industry-wide bargaining unless the employers involved agree to associate themselves for industry-wide bargaining. In that respect the substitute bill is analogous to the bill of the majority.

The substitute bill provides that supervisors—and we generally call them foremen—may belong to a union, provided that union is not affiliated with the rank-and-file of the employees in the plant where the supervisors are engaged. In other words, the substitute recognizes the wisdom of the Wagner Act as it exists at the present time. It embodies the ruling of the National Labor Relations Board and the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, which gives to supervisory employees—generally meaning foremen—the right to work together to better their wages and working conditions and to achieve recognition as a bargaining unit.

The substitute proposal does not permit supervisory employees to belong to the same union with the rank and file of the workers. I think a ready analogy which occurs to our minds is that the noncommissioned officer in the Army is like the foreman in a factory, and the private in the Army is like the rank-and-file employee in a manufacturing plant. We have recognized the desirability of the two groups belonging to separate unions or bargaining groups. But we do not believe it to be fair or right to deny to foremen or supervisory employees the privilege of associating themselves together in a separate and distinct union to try to better their own working and living conditions.

The substitute bill protects the right of the employer in the practice of free speech, but makes it clear that free speech on the part of the employer does not mean the right to intimidate or coerce or otherwise improperly to influence employees in the exercise of their democratic right to join a union or not to join a union, according to their privilege and pleasure. Fundamentally, and speaking for myself, I believe that an employer has no more right to try to influence his employees in associating themselves together in a labor union than he has to intimidate them from joining a church or fraternal organization of their choice. But in view of the misunderstanding of the Wagner Act and

the decisions of the National Labor Relations Board, as well as the adjudications of the courts, that employers do not possess that privilege today, we have tried to make it clear that the employer has the right and privilege of free speech, provided it is fair free speech.

In the substitute bill we have provided for certain unfair labor practices. Generally speaking, they are some of the unfair labor practices which are included in the majority bill. For example, if a union should attempt to induce an employer to recognize a union which was not the one certified by the National Labor Relations Board, that would be an unfair labor practice. If the union were to make an effort to determine who should be the bargaining representative of employers, that would be an unfair labor practice. There are some others; but we have not adopted the stringent, severe, and repressive provisions of the majority bill which make so many legitimate activities on the part of employees unfair labor practices. In no case do we allow an injunction in respect to the exercise of those privileges on the part of employees.

We have made another concession. In the substitute bill we have authorized employers to deal with individual workers in the expression of their grievances. We have also authorized employers to petition for elections, provided there is a conflict between unions or between respective groups claiming the right to be the duly chosen bargaining agent.

The substitute bill authorizes the National Labor Relations Board to delegate certain of its powers to State boards.

The substitute deals with the boycott and the jurisdictional strike. It makes a boycott in aid of a jurisdictional strike an unfair-labor practice, as the President recommended. It was felt that there should be some method by which work stoppages caused by jurisdictional strikes might be peacefully prevented.

It was recognized, as was recommended by the President, that the boycott in aid of the jurisdictional strike might be made an unfair-labor practice; but I wish to emphasize that there is no right of injunction, either by the employer or by a representative of the National Labor Relations Board, against any of the unfair-labor practices provided for in the substitute bill. On the contrary, authority is given to the National Labor Relations Board to hear and adjudicate the dispute and, of course, under appropriate circumstances, to issue a cease-and-desist order and apply to the courts for the enforcement of such order, as can be done today.

The substitute bill also gives the National Labor Relations Board authority to appoint an arbitrator, and gives the arbitrator the right of process, to subpena witnesses, documents, and records, but it does not give any coercive power to the arbitrator in the adjudication of a dispute.

The substitute requires both employer and employee to disclose certain information in the form of certain reports, as for example, the number of collective-bargaining contracts, the awards which have been made in labor-dispute cases, and to disclose certain other information. I emphasize that it applies to employer and employee alike, not merely to the employee, as does the majority bill.

The substitute provides for the temporary investigating commission recommended by the President. That commission, as the Senate will recall the President's recommendation, is to consist of representatives of management, labor, and the public; and we believe, Mr. President, that such a commission, widely representative as it would be, could ascertain the real causes and the real cures for industrial strife in the land.

The substitute bill also authorizes the union to sue in its union name or to be sued by its union name in the Federal courts, provided that Federal jurisdiction is otherwise satisfactory, namely, that there is diversity of citizenship, and the amount in issue is at least $3,000.

Some will say that those provisions are meaningless and that they will accomplish nothing. Mr. President, if one means that labor legislation must effectively strangle or destroy the labor-union movement in America, they are correct in that description of the substitute bill. It will not do that. It was not intended to do that. It is not the belief of the sponsors of the substitute that such a policy is good for employers or for the American public generally.

On the contrary, it is the belief of the sponsors of the substitute and of others who are in opposition to the committee bill that that bill will not stop strikes; it will cause them. It will not minimize work stoppages; it will exaggerate and increase them. It will not achieve labor rest; it will stimulate labor unrest. It will provoke discord instead of bringing an era of peace and harmony in the industrial life of America. Not only that, Mr. President, but the pending bill, if enacted into law, will contribute to another depression, and many a member of the National Association of Manufacturers will suffer probably the loss of his business, and surely the loss of his profits, which are now at an all-time high. Many who today are advocates of this legislation will regret their part in it economically, if not politically, in the days and years ahead.

Mr. President, the public has wanted some kind of labor legislation. The pending legislation is supposed to be in response to the public demand. I hear Senators in the majority party saying it is in response to a mandate of the people of America; that the Nation demands that there be the kind of repressive legislation which is embodied in the bill. In reality, what the American public wants is something which will prevent work stoppages, something which will stop strikes, because, Mr. President, it is the strike that inconveniences the public. It is the strike which interrupts American production. It is the strike which impairs general prosperity, and therefore it is the strike which the American public is trying to prevent.

What is the principal cause of strikes? I have before me some figures which I think may be of interest. For example, in the year 1946, 82 percent of all time lost by strikes was due solely to disputes over wages and hours; and 95 percent of the working time lost in 1946 by strikes was due to disputes over wages and hours or recognition of the union. Not only that, but 75 percent of all workers involved in strikes in 1946 were on strike solely because of disputes over wages and hours, and 85 percent of all the workers on strike in 1946 were on strike because of disputes over either wages and hours or the recognition of the union. Furthermore, only 7½ percent of the time lost was by reason of disputes in connection with the closed shop or the union shop or related issues; and 13½ percent of the time lost involved wages and hours and union organization questions.

That shows, Mr. President, that unless the legislation enacted by the Congress is able to provide a means for bringing about a meeting of minds between employer and employee as to wages and hours, the overwhelming majority of the strikes in the past will be repeated in the future—unless we so strangle the worker that he does not have the power effectively to strike. I must say that that is the way the pending bill attempts to solve the problem of labor unrest. It simply proposes not to make the employer pay a fair wage or to grant fair working conditions to the worker. It proposes to achieve industrial peace at the price of the wage level and the living standards of the American worker and his family. That is the price of peace which is provided for in the pending bill. It is taken out of the living level of the American worker. That is how industrial peace is to be obtained. The worker is to be prevented from striking; he is to be made incapable effectively of bargaining collectively with the employer.

Let us consider one illustration. The committee bill provides that there may be an injunction brought at the instance of the Attorney General in cases where it is believed that the health and safety of the Nation are involved. Such an injunction against a work stoppage or so-called strike may last up to 80 days. That is 80 days of involuntary servitude, Mr. President, by American men and women. Are they working for the Government? No; they are working for a private employer who today is making the highest profits he has ever made in America, including wartimes.

Yes, Mr. President; this bill would make it possible, at the instance of the Attorney General, to chain the American worker in the industrial dungeon in order that a private employer might make the highest profits he has ever made in all past years. I have not yet seen a case in which the United States Supreme Court, as presently constituted, has upheld the validity of the injunction to make a man or a woman work for a private employer for the employer's own profit. I am not talking about a case in which the employee is working for the Government. Under the Smith-Connally Act we allow the Government to take over an enterprise, a mine, a factory, or a mill. But what further did that act authorize? It authorized the Government to fix wages and working conditions, and even to provide for a welfare fund.

Mr. President, the basis of the decision in the Lewis-United Mine Workers' case

was, if I correctly understand it, that the miners were working for the Government of the United States. Mind you, Mr. President, they were working under a contract entered into with a representative of the United States Government, the Secretary of the Interior. In that case the Secretary of the Interior had fixed the wages in the contract or had agreed to the wages fixed in the contract. He had even gone so far as to agree, for the first time in the history of the mining industry, to the establishment of a welfare fund. But that is not this case, Mr. President. I am not going to discuss that case. It has already been adjudicated by the Court.

Mr. President, I am saying that in the present case it is proposed to go far beyond the Lewis-United Mine Workers' case, because in that case at least the Court held that the workers were working for the Government, under a contract, entered into with the Government, which fixed the wages and the working conditions of the employees.

But this bill would for 80 days chain the workers to their jobs and force them to make further profits for a private employer; and during those 80 days the Government would have no power to make the employer raise the wages, shorten the hours, or grant more favorable working conditions. Is that one-sided, or is that impartial legislation on the part of the Congress of the United States?

Mr. President, what to do about work stoppages in the public-utility field is a very difficult question. The solution of it has not yet been found, in my opinion. Of course, we do not want work stoppages to occur in Nation-wide industries which affect the health and safety of the land; but if we are to achieve peace in the public-utility field, it must be done by requiring concessions on both sides, not by the exaction of a concession only on the part of the workers.

I have previously referred on this floor to the recommendation of a distinguished citizen of my State, a former governor of Ohio for three times, and the Democratic nominee for the Presidency in 1920, with Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt as his running mate—the Hon. James M. Cox. Respecting the question of what to do in order to avoid a Nation-wide work stoppage respecting an essential commodity or service, Governor Cox recommended that there be created something like a TVA Authority to regulate such an industry, to determine wages, and working conditions, and profits, and, if need be, to give general direction to that industry, so as to assure that it would perform its maximum public service. Of course, he contemplated that the board would not be a group of political appointees, but would be composed of businessmen capable of operating the industry wisely and well, with due regard for the public service.

Others have suggested compulsory arbitration; but management and labor have opposed such a plan.

In England, the remedy has been the nationalization of the mines. That may sometime become necessary in the United States; I do not know.

I am saying that when we find the solution, if it is to be representative of American democracy, it will be a solution that in the public interest will require concessions on both sides, and will not require sacrifice from the workers alone. Yet that is what this bill does by authorizing the issuance of an injunction for as much as 80 days, without requiring any concession whatever on the part of the management involved, at a time when the workers are working for the private profit of a private employer.

I have previously stated, Mr. President, that in the hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Governor Stassen of Minnesota, whom I think we all greatly respect, testified that a stern and repressive and strangling labor bill adopted now would have the same effect as that which flowed from a similar labor policy after the last war. What was that policy, Mr. President? He said that the labor legislation and labor policy adopted by the Government in that period weakened the labor unions of the United States from their wartime strength. Being weakened, they had less strength to bargain for the workers' wages, and the workers' wages therefore dropped; and when the workers' wages dropped—the workers being essentially the people of America—the purchasing power of the American public was diminished, and the diminished purchasing power of the American public contributed to the greatest depression which, until that time, we had ever experienced. Many of those—I say it with some regret, Mr. President—who probably favored that kind of labor policy, later on jumped out the windows of some of the citadels of finance in the great financial capital of the United States.

Governor Stassen declared that whenever the corporations begin to get a disproportionate share of the national income in relation to other income groups, that is a danger sign for American prosperity, a red light warning that a depression, an abysmal cataclysm, lies ahead.

Mr. President, do we find those conditions existing today? Let us see what now exists. From 1945 to 1946 the national income increased $4,000,000,000. During the same period the net profits of agricultural proprietors increased $2,400,000,000. The net corporate profits of the corporations of America increased $3,000,000,000 during that year. The net profits of nonagricultural proprietors increased $2,200,000,000. But what happened to wages and salaries? They declined $5,000,000,000. In other words, in the same year in which net corporate profits were increasing $3,000,000,000, wages and salaries went down $5,000,000,000. In a year when the national income increased, when the income of agricultural and nonagricultural proprietors increased, in a year when corporate profits increased, wages and salaries declined $5,000,000,000. That is what happened last year, and today that trend is being accentuated.

Mr. President, when I last spoke in the Senate, I said that the way that procedure worked out was that between January 1945 and December 1946 there was a diminution of 22 percent in the real wages of the workers of the United States. In other words, the real wages of the workers had diminished more than one-fifth between January 1945 and December 1946. Of course, that was due to the fact that the workweek was shortened and prices increased between January 1945 and December 1946.

So we are already in that very trend; we are already in that very downward spiral of wages and salaries and public purchasing power which led us in a toboggan slide to the last depression, after the last war.

I have already mentioned, for example, that in respect to corporate profits, 625 companies earned $950,000,000 in the last quarter of 1946, or about twice their earning rate during the war. In other words, total corporate profits increased about $3,000,000,000.

Mr. President, what has the Congress done since the war, or since the late days of the war, for the corporate group in America as compared with the ordinary men and women of the Nation? Let us see what the Congress has indicated as the national policy in legislation in the last 2 years, let us say. One thing we did for the corporations was the repeal of the excess-profits-tax law. We also passed legislation popularly known as the carry-forward-carry-back law. Let me indicate, first, the effects of the latter legislation upon the corporate financial position.

In 1946 there were paid out of the United States Treasury $3,119,000,000 to enterprises which came within the carry-forward-carry-back tax law. I have instances of what was paid under that law to a good many corporations. For example, in 1946 General Motors got back $83,000,000 under that law. The Aluminum Co. of America got back $47,000,000. The American Rolling Mills got back nearly $7,000,000. The American Viscose Co. got back in excess of $6,000,000. The Cramp Shipbuilding Co. got back nearly $10,000,000. The Du Pont enterprises got back more than $6,000,000. The General Electric Co. got back $6,250,000. The Shell Oil Co. got back more than $9,000,000. Standard Oil Co. of California got back nearly $6,000,000. The Standard Oil Co. of Indiana got back nearly $7,000,000.

Credits allowed on the balance sheets of these companies for tax adjustments were the following amounts for the companies named:

Allis-Chalmers	$25,400,000
Bell & Howell	500,000
Borg-Warner	294,000
Consolidated Vultee	765,000
General Electric	24,000,000
General Motors	82,820,000
Packard Motors	5,650,000
Westinghouse	62,289,000

And so forth. That was money paid out of the Treasury of the United States to these large corporations in 1946 under the carry-forward-carry-back tax law.

I am not saying that that was unfair as related to those recipients, but I am saying—and I shall continue saying—that we have not done comparably for the small taxpayer in the United States.

I said that we repealed the excess-profits tax law. Naturally, who got the

benefit of the repeal of the excess-profits-tax law? It was the individuals and the companies paying excess-profits taxes.

In 1947 corporate profits were estimated at $16,100,000,000. Let me state the effects of the repeal of the corporate excess-profits-tax law.

In 1943 corporate profits, before taxes, amounted to $25,000,000,000. In 1946 they amounted to $20,000,000,000. So it will be seen that the amount made by the corporations, before taxes, was $5,000,000,000 less in 1946 than in 1943. But on account of the repeal of the excess-profits-tax law, the corporate profits, in 1946, after taxes, amounted to $12,000,000,000, whereas in 1943 they were only $9,900,000,000. In other words, the corporations gained $2,100,000,000 by virtue of the repeal of the excess-profits-tax law.

I have heard, by rumor and report, that the loss to the Treasury was far in excess of the figures I have given today. Whether that law cost the United States Treasury $2,100,000,000, as I have said, or $6,000,000,000, as I have heard said, I am asking the Senate, have we done anything for the workers of America comparable to what we did for the corporations and for those who had made large excess profits?

Let us look at the corporate savings of the country as well. In 1943 corporate savings were at their all-time peak of $5,700,000,000. But in 1946, the year when the repeal of the excess-profits tax was bearing fruit, corporate savings reached $7,000,000,000, or $1,300,000,000 more than in the peak year, 1943.

What about corporate dividends? In 1945 there was the all-time peak up to that time of $4,500,000,000 in corporate dividends. In 1946, corporate dividends had increased to $5,000,000,000, or an increase of $500,000,000 in the year 1946.

Let us take the figures respecting net returns on investment of nonfinancial companies. In 1945 the return was $7,700,000,000, but in 1946 the return was $9,500,000,000, or nearly $2,000,000,000 more. That was after taxes. So we can see the direct effect of the repeal of the excess-profits-tax law.

Mr. President, let us look at the people of America and see how they fared. Two-thirds of all the families of America have an annual gross income of less than $2,000. That is a little less than $40 a week. We hear talk about rich Americans. Yes; there are many rich people and many rich corporations, but there are also many poor folks in America.

Two-thirds of all the families of this land have, for total living allowances, gross incomes of less than $40 a week. Ten dollars a week is all the individual in two-thirds of all American families has to live on, gross, with the high cost of living we have at the present time.

It is said the people who worked in the plants and on the farms got rich during the war. It will be recalled that a little while ago the Federal Reserve Board made a study of savings in America, what they were in amount, and who had them. They reported that two out of five of the families of America had total liquid savings of less than $40. That is America, Mr. President; that is Main Street; that is the suburbs; that is the country; that is the people.

Remember that during that time we did not make any appreciable reduction in the taxes of those people, while we were giving more than $3,000,000,000 in refunds to the large taxpayers during the war days and adding more than $2,000,000,000 to the net corporate profits of the corporations by repeal of the excess-profits-tax law. Yet, Mr. President, we did not increase the social-security benefits of those who are the beneficiaries of that legislation, except—and I should emphasize this—we raised old-age pensions $5 a month. It will make a fine record, will it not, when we look back and consider it? Yes; we raised old-age pensions $5 a month, and we provided a small increase for those covered by the railroad retirement law. But, Mr. President, we did not increase the wage rate under the minimum-wage law. How much is it now? Forty cents an hour. We were not able last year to get through the Congress legislation raising the minimum wage. No; that would be "uneconomic"; that would be "unwise"; we could not agree on that. But I dare say the two Houses of Congress will be able to agree in conference on severe antilabor legislation. They were able to agree on repeal of the excess-profits tax; they were able to agree on the carry-forward and carry-back legislation; and, Mr. President, they were able to agree on legislation providing favorable conditions for the termination of wartime contracts by those who generally made a profit out of the war.

What I am saying, Mr. President, is that the record of our last few Congresses shows that we have given greater consideration to the "haves" than to the "have nots." Now, what do we propose to do? At a time when wages and salaries are forward in respect to the other income groups of America, we propose legislation, the design and effect of which will be, by weakening the labor unions, to diminish the bargaining strength of the workers of America, to lower wage levels, to lengthen hours, to diminish public purchasing power not only to the injury of the worker but of the general public. Is that wise legislation? Is there any emotional justification? To put it another way, does the animosity that anyone may feel towards certain labor abuses justify a national policy which will have that national effect? I do not think so. I think that this is a matter that is not any more important to the labor unions than it is to the American public generally; and by the American public I mean everybody in America—the banker, the manufacturer, the farmer, and every other segment of our American economy.

In the first place, Mr. President, what are the effects of low incomes on the American people, if that is to be the inevitable effect of the pending legislation? I have before me a report of the very committee which was the predecessor of the committee which has reported favorably the pending legislation. It was then called the Committee on Education and Labor. It is part 2 of Report 1012, which was filed March 14, 1946. It is on the minimum-wage legislation which was pending before that committee. Here are a few excerpts from the report. Quoting from page 26:

> Substandard wages exact a heavy toll on all low-income people in broken health, high mortality—

That means that more people die—

> limited education, poor housing, and high taxes. In short, substandard wages create a degradation of our people and stunts their lives in a manner that is a festering sore in our economic, social, and political existence. Such items as lack of savings, poor housing, lack of adequate educational opportunities, juvenile problems—

I might have added criminality—

> and inadequate health care are the concomitants of low wages.

That is what the pending bill is designed to achieve.

> Savings: As family incomes decrease, savings decrease and deficits rise. In 1935–36, families with incomes below $1,000 and large families with incomes below $1,750 accumulated debts instead of savings. A study of savings for a southern and a midwestern area made in 1945 shows a concentration of savings in higher-income groups.

Let us now take housing, Mr. President; and I am quoting again from the report, at page 27:

> The low-income workers cannot afford good housing and this condition causes overcrowding. Overcrowding in existing housing facilities bears a direct relation to family incomes and contributes greatly to poor environmental and health conditions among low-income families.

Let us take education, Mr. President, quoting from page 28:

> It has been evident to many educators and to many citizens that children withdraw from school at an early age because their parents cannot afford their continuance at school. Of the 1,000,000 young people who drop out of school each year about one-third do so because of economic necessity.

Let us take selective service. That is the defense of America, Mr. President; that is the defense of democracy. That is to save our country's security and freedom. What is the effect of low income upon the ability of the citizen to defend his country? I quote again, from page 29:

> There is a significant relationship between income and physical fitness as indicated by records of Selective Service and per capita income payments by States. The failings of our economic and social organization are reflected in Selective Service rejection rates. Table 11 shows that in general States with the lower per capita incomes are those with the higher rejection rates. For example, South Carolina, Arkansas, and North Carolina—

Let me interpolate—States which were among the very leaders in the number of volunteers; so the rejection had nothing to do with the response of the people to the country's need—

> For example, South Carolina, Arkansas, and North Carolina, which were among the lowest per capita income States, had the highest rejection rates. Rejection rates when analyzed by occupations were highest for do-

mestic-service workers, unemployed persons, farm laborers, and general laborers.

The people who get the lowest share of the national income.

Mr. President I come now to speak of life itself. I read from page 30 of the report:

Disability and death: The record of the hearings shows that families of low incomes have more illnesses and receive less medical care than high-income families.

The national health survey of 1935–36 shows that families with incomes of $1,000 or less had nearly 40 percent more total illness than families with incomes of $2,000 or more and they had 75 percent more chronic illnesses. Among low-income families, the proportion of workers prevented by disability from earning any livelihood or even seeking work was three and one-half times greater than that among families with incomes of $2,000 or over.

Mind you, Mr. President, even now, with all the pressure labor unions can apply through collective bargaining, two-thirds of the families of America have a gross income of less than $2,000 a year, less than $40 a week.

Furthermore, families with incomes under $1,000 in 1935–36 lost nearly twice as much time from work because of illness as did the average individual in the higher income groups.

Again I am going to interpolate: We become excited about a few million hours lost in strikes, Mr. President, but we have not so far been able to have a bill passed which would diminish illnesses suffered by the workers of America, although the man-days lost through illness are many times more than the man-days lost through strikes in the land.

I read further from the report:

Many studies have emphasized the coexistence of high infant and maternal mortality with low incomes.

I emphasize that statement. All it means, in substance, is that in families of low incomes a greater number of mothers and children die. That is all that language means. They die; there are more of them who do not live in those income groups.

In 1940 the six States with the highest infant mortality rates were New Mexico, Arizona, South Carolina, Louisiana, Texas, and Alabama. All were in the lower half of the States ranked according to their per capita income.

The deaths of mothers in the child-bearing process bears a direct relationship to the per capita incomes of the respective States. In 1942 the maternity mortality rate for the country as a whole was 2.6 maternal deaths per 1,000 live births. Of the 15 lowest income States, 14 had maternity mortality rates higher than that of the country as a whole.

Mr. President, is not a Senator within his rights in opposing a policy which he believes will cost more mothers and children their lives, more children their education, more people decent homes, and will result in less prosperity for America?

I shall read one more excerpt from page 32 of the report:

8. Effect of raising incomes on health: Improvement in the wage status of our low-income families contribute to the better health status of the Nation and those underprivileged groups and areas, although it is recognized that a high minimum wage policy is only part of a national program to contribute to better health among our people. It is well established that high-income families buy more fruits, meats, dairy products, vegetables, and other items than do low-income families. Low-income families depend primarily on bread, beans, potatoes, and other inexpensive foods. With a rise in the income of low-wage groups, such families can be expected to buy products which contain minerals and vitamins essential to good diets and health.

As I stated, Mr. President, I have been reading from a report of the Committee on Education and Labor, as it was called in 1946, now the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I have been speaking about the effect of low incomes upon the people who have such incomes. Now, I want to turn it around and see whether higher purchasing power which is achieved by higher incomes benefits other groups of people. The same report bears on that question. I turn now to page 38 of the report and call the attention of the Senate to these words:

4. Farm and other purchases by low-income groups: The importance of increasing incomes in low-wage groups is shown by the following: In 1944, 32,500,000 persons had annual incomes under $2,000, or a total consumer purchasing power of $45,700,000,000. Their total income is three times greater than the total income of all those with incomes of $10,000 a year or more and they are the major consumers of our farm and factory products.

Mr. President, I pause in my reading to say that those who buy the produce of the farms and the products of the factories are the masses of the people, not those who have higher incomes. I repeat the last sentence I read:

Their total income—

Meaning that of the people making less than $2,000 a year—

Their total income is three times greater than the total income of all those with incomes of $10,000 a year or more and they are the major consumers of our farm and factory products.

Mr. President, I do not know of any fallacy which is more prevalent than the belief propagandized by some that if a man in public life advocates policies designed to lift up the masses of the people, he is either a demagog or a scoundrel; that he is either trying to steal from the rich their money or deceive the people who vote. I affirm that Franklin D. Roosevelt will stand in history as the best friend big business in America ever had. Why do I say that? Because he did more for the people of America than any President ever did. When those people had money they bought the commodities the farmers grew on their farms and the articles the manufacturers made in their plants and the services which were made available by other segments of our people.

There is only one recipe, Mr. President, for prosperity and that is the welfare of the people. America cannot be made well off by providing large incomes for the few people at the top. An edifice of national prosperity is not built the way a bottle is filled—from the top; it is built the way a house is built—from the foundation up. Why it is that so palpable a truth is appreciated by so few people is beyond my comprehension.

I am basing my opposition to the bill today primarily upon the fact that it is a disservice to the American public, not merely to labor. It is unfair to labor, I believe. That is my own private opinion. I am not disparaging the sincere beliefs held by other Senators. I believe that this proposed legislation is not properly balanced. It imposes no obligation on the employer to meet the worker halfway in his wage demand. As I have shown already, that was the reason for 82 percent of the man-days lost by strikes in 1946. The principal cause was disagreement over wages and hours. Yet this bill does not provide any machinery to make adjustments of wage and hour disputes, except mediation and arbitration. It takes those agencies out of the Department of Labor, where the labor-management conference held in Washington in 1945 recommended that they should be. I do not know what is to be gained by taking them out of the Labor Department, where they are already functioning, where there are experienced personnel and a competent Secretary in charge of the whole department, where they are correlated with all the other activities of the Department, and yet have a splendid record of impartiality in dealing with industrial disputes, and putting them in in a separate agency which will cost a great deal of money to establish. Yet, so far as I can see, that is the only provision in the bill which has any relation to the fundamental problem of industrial peace, the attainment of which requires that in some way management and worker should get together on the question of wages, hours, and working conditions. The sponsors of the pending bill provide a way to do it. They simply do not let the worker strike in certain cases. In other cases they make it hard for him to strike. They destroy the strength of the union by giving the employer opportunity after opportunity to undermine the union by calling for elections, or in some instances by getting rid of the union entirely through replacing the workers who are on strike with other workers, and then calling an election so that the new workers will displace the workers on strike in the selection of their bargaining agent.

The report to which I have referred shows that three times the purchasing power of all the people making $10,000 a year or more is in the hands of the two-thirds of American families making less than $40 a week, less than $2,000 a year.

By the way, sitting in the Chamber at the present time is the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. He has been making a fight in which I hope he will be successful. I hope the Senate will agree with him. He contends that if we are to reduce taxes they should be reduced primarily upon the lower-income groups. The figures which I have just given substantiate the position of the Senator from Illinois. If we want

greater purchasing power in America we can get it by reducing taxes on the lower-income groups, rather than on the people in the higher-income brackets, because if we lump together all those making $10,000 a year or more, they buy only a third as much as do the rest of the people. So if our friends really mean to try to preserve our present prosperity and to give our farmers, our manufacturers, and our service industries a market in the first place, they will do better by the rest of the people through reducing taxes primarily upon those who deserve it, and in the second place will do the most good to the Nation as a whole through such a reduction.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In line with what the able Senator has said, I may point out that the evidence before the Committee on Finance shows that those who have incomes of less than $5,000 are now paying 60 percent of the individual income taxes.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; and every time the people in that group pay their money in taxes, it is taken out of the purchasing power of the people to buy commodities from the farm and the factory.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct. Every time we help those in the lower-income brackets we place the money in circulation. It is the velocity of money that makes the mare go.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator for that observation.

I read from page 38 of the report:

> The Commissioner of Labor Statistics in testifying before the Temporary National Economic Committee established by Senate resolution pointed out that if families earning less than $1,200 a year in 1938 had their income raised to $1,500—

I want Senators to listen to these figures—

> they could have bought $800,000,000 additional in food; $416,000,000 additional in clothing; $613,000,000 in housing or rentals; $215,000,000 in fuel, light, and refrigeration; $385,000,000 in transportation; automobiles, and the like; $234,000,000 in recreation; $208,000,000 in medical care.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. If they had had that extra amount of money to spend, that would have been only the beginning, because if they could have bought more goods, that would have meant more jobs for other people, who would have had more money to spend, and they could have spent it. That would have provided jobs for still others. Such a process works on the affirmative side in increasing prosperity. On the other hand, reduced purchasing power works to bring on a depression. It is like knocking down tenpins.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator very much. What the Senator is emphasizing is that by legislation such as this we are risking having to pay relief benefits to people who have their incomes lowered below a subsistence level, or who lose their jobs altogether because of the declining economy, to which legislation such as that proposed would contribute.

I continue to read from page 38 of the report:

> Before World War II, there was inadequate feeding of low-income families and a need for larger markets of agricultural products.

Let me interpolate again. In the days of the depression we were giving away farm products. Farmers had surpluses which they could not sell, and the people were hungry. They could not buy. They did not have jobs, or they did not get sufficient money from their jobs to buy a decent portion of food.

Reading further from the report:

> In 1941, the average expenditure for food by urban families of two or more persons was $706 and the minimum adequate maintenance diet for a family of four cost $518. Had those below the $518 been brought up to that level, it would have increased food product sales by three and one-third billion, or 23 percent. A similar increase would have caused a rise of 30 percent in the consumption of clothing.

Mr. President, I emphasize these figures to Senators who come from farm States. To my mind the greatest tragedy today, aside from some of the hysteria now prevalent, is the animosity which has been built up—and in some cases played up by selfish groups—between the workers and the farmers, between industrial employees and agricultural employees or proprietors. They are as much a part of the same body as the mouth and the eyes. They are inextricably interrelated one to the other in our national life. If the wages and the purchasing power of the workers decline, the sales of the farmers fall. It works the other way as well. If the farmer is not prosperous there is a great loss in the national market for manufactured goods, and the workers lose their jobs. How pitiful it is that there has been built up a misunderstanding and, in many cases, a bitter prejudice, between those two essential elements of the economic body of America. They are together in destiny and in duty. They will live together or they will starve together. Farmers ought to be opposing the pending legislation, Mr. President, just as they should be supporting the minimum wage law which some of us are endeavoring to have enacted by the Congress. They should be in favor of national health legislation, involving whatever is the best plan that will give the people the best health. Anything that will give a larger purchasing power to the American people is of vital interest to the American farmer. I am rather happy that I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I think those two committees represent the two great segments of the American economy, and I hope to be able to make some contribution to a better understanding by each of the other's position, point of view, and interest.

I was saying, Mr. President, that the effect of the pending legislation will be to diminish the market and the prices of the American farmer. I wish to make one further reference to a matter of that character, and to read a paragraph from page 43 of the report to which I have alluded. I have already read portions to indicate that declining wages have a deleterious effect upon our national life; that increasing wages have a beneficial effect upon the living standards of the people and the purchasing power of the people. Just a word about productivity; and I shall read as I have said, from page 43 of the report:

> An examination by the committee of the relationship of wage raises and the long-run productivity of labor shows that the productivity of labor in manufacturing industries increased fairly steadily from 1909 through 1944. However, during the years 1919 to 1923 productivity increased more rapidly than in any preceding period and a similar sharp advance is anticipated in the next few years. This expected rise accounts for the reason why prices probably will not swing up sharply as a result of the passage of this bill.

That has reference to the minimum wage bill. I read further, as follows:

> Between 1921 and 1929 the average output per man-hour rose about 43 percent whereas average hourly earnings in these industries rose about 12 percent. The lag of the increase in wages behind productivity is regarded by many economists as a major reason for the financial and economical collapse between 1930 and 1933. Had wages increased to such extent in that period that it could have absorbed the productivity of labor during that period, it is quite probable that the depression of 1930-33 would not have taken place. Between 1937 and 1939 output per man-hour rose roughly 11 percent, whereas average hourly earnings remained about the same and prices fell sharply.

Mr. President, what is the effect of that? It is simply this: Our technology has been improving so rapidly that we have had a pretty constant increase in productivity in our American economy. That means greater output, which in turn means a larger income to be divided. But if we give more of it to the entrepreneur, to the manufacturer, to the proprietor, and a less amount to the worker than he deserves, it means putting more money into the speculative stock market, which happened in the days of the boom in 1929, or in some other wild ventures that involve hoarded savings which do not contribute to the purchasing power or prosperity of the country; and we take money away from the workers who would pour it into the stores, into buses, into trains, and a few, into airplanes, and into farm commodities and manufactured goods which contribute to the prosperity of a great and powerful land.

If those, who have the matter at their disposal, are too selfish, if they put too much into the hands of the proprietor, like the fabled Midas, who could not be satisfied with enough but had to have all, with the result that he lost all, they, too, will lose all. Some of the manufacturers, some of the financiers, and some of the others who spoke for them robbed the rich of America as well as the poor by such policies, because the depression cost this country, it is estimated, in excess of $300,000,000,000. The depression cost more than the cost of the war. If the last war cost that much—and we can take the cost of the next depression in relation to that of the last one, as the cost of the First World War in relation to the cost of the last war—the cost of the next depression will be simply astronomical, Mr. President, not only in dollars and cents but in what it will take from the people of America and in the

contribution it will make to World War III.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] will bring up the relief bill after the pending measure has been disposed of. I am for it, not only for $200,000,000 for relief, but for $350,000,000; and that does not touch the surface of need. Furthermore, I am in favor of there being international collaborative effort to try to save the world's economy for free enterprise. I want to save the world from being engulfed by communism, but I think the best way to do it is to try to build up the economies of the other countries, and not to send them swords, bayonets, artillery, and tanks. I ask leave to insert that interpolation in my remarks. I am saying that if America collapses economically we shall drag the world down to a level which will make the virus of communism become a contagion which will engulf all of us. Anything which tends seriously to weaken the American economy contributes to war and to communism. It contributes to international chaos because it diminishes our ability to help. It was out of chaos in Germany that Hitler came; it was out of chaos in Italy that Mussolini came, and with them came the evil winds of war.

Senators may think that all they are doing is voting for a labor bill; all they are doing is putting the screws on what they call the labor leaders who have abused their power; all they are doing is bringing about a balance in the National Labor Relations Act between employer and employee; all they are doing is righting injustice to the employer. I say here, Mr. President, on the floor of the Senate, with my own responsibility to back it up, that this bill, if enacted into law, will contribute to depression, chaos, anarchy, communism, and war. It is inevitable that they will follow in the wake of a weakened American economy. I venture to let time be the judge of my prediction.

I have only a little more to say, Mr. President.

It is rather singular that this legislation comes at a time when not only profits but monopolies in America are at an all-time high. For example, in 1909, 200 nonfinancial corporations owned one-third of our national assets. In 1929, 20 years later, 200 nonfinancial corporations owned 48 percent of our national assets. In 1946, 200 nonfinancial corporations owned 60 percent of our national assets. See what has happened between 1909 and 1946: 200 nonfinancial corporations in the United States have increased by more than double their ownership of the national assets; I mean in respect to the proportion of the national assets of which they owned one-third in 1909. Today they own nearly two-thirds—60 percent.

In 1880, the four largest steel rolling mills controlled 25 percent of the productive capacity in that industry in the United States. In 1938, they controlled 64 percent—a great deal more than double.

Two-thirds of the usable manufacturing facilities in the United States are controlled by 250 corporations.

One hundred of our largest corporations are controlled by eight groups of banking industries.

In 1940–41, one one-thousandth percent of our people owned one-fourth of the corporate stock of United States concerns, and six one-hundredths percent of our people owned 50 percent of the corporate stock of the United States concerns. To state it in another way, Mr. President, as I recall, 10,000 people in the United States own one-fourth of all the corporate stock outstanding in the United States, and 75,000 people own 50 percent, or one-half, of all the corporate stock, which means the control of all the corporations in the United States of America. Think of that. Ten thousand people own one-fourth of all the corporate stock in the United States, and 75,000 people own one-half of all the corporate stock in the United States—which means all the corporate assets in this land.

Mr. President, that is monopoly. Not only is monopoly something of great power and danger, but I should like to read a little of what was said by the Federal Trade Commission about monopoly in the United States. The statement I shall read was made in response to an inquiry last year from the House Committee on Small Business, and it is to be found at page 144 in the committee print of a report entitled "United States Versus Economic Concentration and Monopoly, a Staff Report to the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Pursuant to House Resolution 64":

In the opinion of the Commission—

In other words, the Federal Trade Commission—

the present, and still growing, concentration of economic power in the United States constitutes today's greatest domestic challenge to the American theory of competitive enterprise, and, along with it, all that is embodied in the meaning of the somewhat intangible, but nonetheless real, meaning of "the American way of life" and "freedom of economic enterprise."

Concentration of economic power, as here used, may be accomplished either through the familiar methods of corporate consolidations and acquisition of properties that bring a large part of an industry, or line of trade, under a single management (i. e. true monopoly), or by the more subtle, and less well understood, means of cooperation among a relatively few strongly intrenched but (corporately speaking) mutually independent managements. These corporately separate managements may work together through any or all of a myriad of means and methods to accomplish group monopoly restraints and control both within and without the cooperating group.

Mr. President, I skip now to page 147, and read the following:

The ultimate alternative to such reasonable control is the end of free competitive enterprise, either through private monopoly which runs the government or government monopoly which runs business. Nothing in past history indicates that either—

Meaning either monopoly or governmental control of everything—

will serve consumer interests more economically than a fair competitive field for private initiative.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEM in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield to the able Senator from Wyoming.

MEN WITHOUT PROPERTY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to note that the Senator from Florida has read that particular extract from the Small Business Committee report. It strikes me, if the Senator will pardon me, that it bears a little amplification in connection with the nature of the bill which is now before us.

To me the most significant factor about the increase in the concentration of economic power is the effect it has upon employees. The truth of the matter is that the further the concentration proceeds, the greater is the—I hesitate to say the word, but, nevertheless, it is the correct word—the greater is the number of those who may be classified as members of the proletariat. The proletariat is that group of our population which has no opportunity to own property, which cannot own a business, and which cannot own the means of livelihood. Labor trouble arises from the fact that a large proportion of our people are no longer able to own and control the means of production. Revolutions have been caused all through history when people have been unable to control the means of production. It was the ownership of land by the feudal overlords that provoked the conditions which overthrew the feudal system, because the people would not tolerate conditions by which they were deprived of the right to own the only means of production.

The characteristic of the industrial revolution is that the land is no longer the principal means of production. The huge tools which modern industry needs now constitute the principal means of production.

What we fail to observe, Mr. President, is that the employees in these great national industries no longer have any opportunity to own the means of production, and a great number of workers, as a consequence, are dependent solely upon their organizations to defend their economic interests. Therefore, when Congress, in the midst of this concentration of economic power, with the multiplication of the workers who cannot own their tools, undertakes to weaken the means of the organizations for collective bargaining, then Congress, by passing such laws, is increasing the danger of the creation in this country of a proletariat.

We talk about the conflict of ideologies that is appearing in the world now between the American idea and the communistic idea. We shall never understand that conflict unless we realize, first of all, that the American idea is based soundly upon the theory that the people have the right to own the means of production. When they do not own the means of production, then they lose the very basis of what we call the American way of life.

The Communist theory is that the people, in the modern world, cannot own

the means of production, and that therefore there should be arbitrary state control. If the United States of America is to defend the American way of life, which is the system of private property, then it must make sure that nothing shall be done to increase the number of people without property. When the proletariat is created and permitted to expand, the very foundations of the American system are weakened. Let us never forget that the Soviet system is also called the "dictatorship of the proletariat." The best antidote for communism is the wide distribution of property.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for what he has said. It is recognized by the Senate that he is the best-informed man on this subject of all the Senators, due to his magnificent work as chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee, which made the best survey that has ever been made in this field.

I happen to have before me portions of the report, Document No. 206, entitled "Economic Concentration and World War II, Report of the Smaller War Plants Corporation to the Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business, United States Senate," submitted to the Senate June 14, 1946. This is what it says about the subject the able Senator from Wyoming was just mentioning:

It will be noted—

Referring to a chart on the adjoining page—

It will be noted that there has been a steady and continuous decline in the relative importance of the self-employed members of the working community. Self-employed enterprisers constituted 36.9 percent of all the gainful workers in 1860, but their proportion had fallen to 30.8 percent at the turn of the century, to 23.5 percent in 1920, and to 18.8 percent in 1939.

In other words, Mr. President, the percentage of gainfully employed, self-employed, workers in America decreased from nearly 37 percent of the whole in 1880 to a little less than 19 percent in 1939, or a loss of 20 percent in the period of 59 years.

The chart clearly shows that the greatest decline among the self-employed workers occurred in the farming community. In 1880, 27.8 percent of the workers were independent farmers; but by 1939 this group had decreased to only 11.8 percent of the total. Professional practitioners likewise declined from 1.1 percent in 1880 to 0.9 percent in 1939.

Then it goes on to show that nonfarm business enterprisers declined from 8 percent of all gainful workers in 1880 to 6.1 percent in 1939.

Mr. President, as the Senator from Wyoming has emphasized, America is gradually gravitating into the hands of the few. Not only that but the doors of opportunity are steadily being closed to the many. Instances like the Horatio Alger story, From Rags to Riches, are diminishing to a very small number in America today, because how can a man start out and hope to build a business which will compete with the great industrial and financial giants, which have monopolies in nearly every field of American economy?

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to cite many instances showing four corporations, or three corporations, or two corporations, controlling the whole or nearly the whole of the national output of some commodity. For example, three or four automobile concerns control 70 percent of all of the automobile market. There are many instances of the whole output of a commodity being controlled by one corporation or two corporations. The public says, "I do not see that I have any interest in that. If they can produce goods more cheaply, perhaps that is to the public interest."

Let me illustrate what the monopolies use their power for. I have here a quotation from the report to which I referred a minute ago, United States Versus Economic Concentration and Monopoly, Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives. On page 92 I find this:

Monopoly means high prices. Competition means low prices. A statistical study of 37 census industries made by the National Resources Committee revealed that the dominant factor in making for depression, insensitivity of prices, is the administrative control over prices which results from the relatively small number of concerns dominating particular markets.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As we analyze what is now going on and relate what has taken place with reference to the political and economic control of the Nation to the efforts which are being made, for instance, by the pending legislation, does it not seem that we are returning to the philosophies of an earlier day in the history of the country? If we believe in the American way of life, we should study what has happened in the past. For instance, what is the difference between the philospohy of Alexander Hamilton, in the early days, and what is going on now? Is it not a conflict between concentrated wealth on the one hand and the people on the other? Who should be concerned?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I think the Senator put his hand right on the matter. I will comment further, in a moment.

Mr. President, the Bible says, "Ye cannot serve God and mammon." I lay it down as a political axiom, it is impossible to identify oneself with the welfare of the masses of the people of America and at the same time advocate policies that foster and protect corporate monopoly. A man must take one side or the other in a fight; and in the political life of the country, I believe the two interests are irreconcilable, and a man is forced to a choice.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The political history of the country corroborates what the Senator says; it is necessary to take one side or the other whether it be for economic betterment or not. The political history of this country indicates that it is just as necessary today to take sides as it has ever been. Jefferson was a philosopher. The philosophy that is now the Republican philosophy existed even in the early days. There was a practical application of the philosophy of a government by the people, under the Jacksonians. What is the situation today? It is exactly the same. The issue is clean cut between the power of wealth, the power of might, the power of industry, the power of monopoly, on the one hand, and the people on the other hand.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I was very much interested in the Senator's comment on the concentration of economic power. I wondered whether or not the Senator had any figures showing to what extent the concentration of economic power had increased during the last 12 or 14 years?

Mr. PEPPER. The process has been going on continuously in American life, at least I will say, ever since 1880, when there really began what we might call the industrial revolution in this country. It has received a great acceleration in recent years. I can save the Senator the statement of his conclusion by stating it for him. He wants me to note the fact that in the last 13 or 14 years the Democrats have been in power, and Franklin D. Roosevelt failed to break up this monopoly. I will say to the able Senator from Maine that in my opinion he is also forgetting that Franklin D. Roosevelt said, in his inaugural address, or in a campaign speech of 1936, "It is my hope that big business will say that in my first term they met their——

Mr. BREWSTER. "Match."

Mr. PEPPER. "Match." And in the second term——

Mr. BREWSTER. In the second term, "their master."

Mr. PEPPER. "Their master." I thank the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. I know it a little better than does the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator. It is natural for a Republican, when he reaches the "master" part of it to think of that, without having to think of it very reflectively. But the Senator will recall, I think, if he will examine the records of the Congress, that the failure to break the stronghold of monopoly upon the throats of the American people was not the fault of Franklin D. Roosevelt but of the Congress, who would not support him.

I will go further and say that President Truman has made a recommendation on the same subject. I read from the address delivered by the President in January of this year:

Second, restriction of monopoly and unfair business practices; assistance to small business; and the promotion of the free competitive system of private enterprise.

In his message, the President goes on to say:

Restriction of monopoly and promotion of private enterprise: The second major policy I desire to lay before you has to do with the growing concentration of economic power and the threat to free competition in private enterprise. In 1941 the Temporary National Economic Committee completed a comprehensive investigation into the workings of the national economy. The Committee's study showed that, despite half a century of antitrust law enforcement, one of the gravest threats to our welfare lay in the increasing concentration of power in the hands of a small number of giant organizations.

During the war, this long-standing tendency toward economic concentration was accelerated. As a consequence, we now find that to a greater extent than ever before, whole industries are dominated by one or a few large organizations which can restrict production in the interest of higher profits and thus reduce employment and purchasing power.

In an effort to assure full opportunity and free competition to business we will vigorously enforce the antitrust laws. There is much the Congress can do to cooperate and assist in this program.

To strengthen and enforce the laws that regulate business practices is not enough. Enforcement must be supplemented by positive measures of aid to new enterprises. Government assistance, research programs, and credit powers should be designed and used to promote the growth of new firms and new industries. Assistance to small business is particularly important at this time when thousands of veterans who are potential business and industrial leaders are beginning their careers.

We should also give special attention to the decentralization of industry and the development of areas that are now underindustrialized.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate the frankness with which the Senator anticipated the trend of my queries, and I wondered whether he would go along similarly with equal frankness to recognize, in the light of what President Truman, as I understood him, said, that today we face a greater concentration of economic power than ever before in our history. Was not that the substance of it?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. And that is at the end of 14 years of the absolute control of this body by a group other than the Republican Party. I appreciated, however, the Senator's suggestion that President Roosevelt still held this lofty goal, and that he put the responsibility on the Congress. Would it not also be pertinent to observe that throughout that entire period the Congress was controlled by overwhelming majorities of the party represented by Senators on the other side of this aisle, and that apparently they, even under the leadership of President Roosevelt had been entirely unable to cope with this situation. What assurance can we have, then, that a restoration of that control, so eagerly sought by the Senator from Florida, would give us any more hope in another 14 years.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Maine that there is certainly no hope in giving the Republican Party a majority of the Congress. That is not going to help any. The record of the Republican Party thus far this year affirms that to be a fact. I will say to the Senator that this country is not controlled by the Congress; it is controlled by the corporations. As a general rule, politicians are but puppets of corporate dominance, and the reason of it is, if we strive to do right, in many instances we are thwarted from doing so by their control of the press, and the radio, and the other media of communication. So that, generally speaking, the man elected to office does not have free access to the public mind, and the people do not have free access to information respecting the truth and the facts about their country and their government.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield again to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am much interested in what the Senator has had to say. I came here 14 years ago, after coping with the alleged power of monopoly which was personified by the person of Samuel Insull in my State. I came here by the voice of those who said the forgotten man would have to be remembered. I came here with high hope of continuing here the same crusade for what I conceived to be the interest of the common people that we had conducted in my own State. I found here a curious thing, that throughout the earlier stages of the New Deal, the first 5 to 8 years, the policies which were pursued seemed to be nicely calculated to make it impossible for the smaller businessman to survive. We saw more and more of the concentration of power here with which the little businessman was entirely unable to cope. Unless one had the affluence to hire a Philadelphia lawyer, the requirements for filing of returns and the constant passing of new legislation made it absolutely impossible for the small businessman even to stay out of jail. At first I thought this was inadvertence. As time passed on, it seemed to be part of a calculated plan that would result exactly as it has resulted, in a greater and greater concentration of economic power.

Whether or not that was with the idea that the achievement of the socialistic dream of expropriation of all American industry would become simpler, I began to ponder. I have not yet reached a conclusion, but the only two things which have emerged clearly from the 14 tragic years through which we have passed have been, on one hand, what was apparently a design for chaos, and, on the other, a design for the concentration of economic power which has certainly been achieved. Whether that may serve the purpose of any of those who believe that such a condition would simplify the nationalizing of our industry along the English or the Russian pattern, I do not say. I say simply that it seems to be a most interesting coincidence. Whether it has been planned that way I leave to those subtle minds that have conceived the various measures by which the American people for the last 14 years have been bemused.

Mr. PEPPER. That is an unworthy comment for a man of the intelligence of the Senator from Maine to make. If he has an innuendo, as he has calculated to put it in his assertion, that Franklin D. Roosevelt was striving for a form of communism or something along that line, the facts speak so much more loudly than anything the Senator from Maine can intimate that it is, in my opinion, unworthy of the Senator. If it had not been for the Republican corruption and the Republican policies which thrust us into the depression, it would not have been necessary to impose the restraints and regulations which it was required that the New Deal establish. I said awhile ago, and I reaffirm, that Franklin D. Roosevelt gave America the best record of service to American business that it has had, and I certainly do not consider that there has been anything to the contrary of that statement.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment more?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I trust that in his calmer moments the Senator from Florida will read with some care precisely what I said, in order to be quite clear that I did not lay responsibility for what had transpired in the course of the 14 years on the doorstep of Franklin D. Roosevelt. I neither condone nor condemn. I think our Government is something far vaster. I think he was subject to many influences and forces. No man in the White House can control the situation. It is something which transcends him, as the Senator from Florida has pointed out. There were many influences operating. I do think there were groups more or less consolidated that had definite ideas as to how America could be improved and that "would make America over." I think they were in contact with President Roosevelt. I think to some extent President Roosevelt accepted their advice. I certainly charge no deep and dark plot to President Roosevelt. I think it was utterly beyond the comprehension of any single man to determine the trend of all these forces. But I state the net result of 14 years, and "by their fruits ye shall know them." The Senator from Florida admits that at the end of 14 years of other than Republican administration—I will leave it there—other than Republican administration of the Congress and the executive branch, we had the greatest concentration of economic power this country had ever seen. Then what use is it for the same people to ask to be entrusted again with power?

Mr. PEPPER. In the first place, I will say to the Senator from Maine that in every depression the big monopolists and the powerful come out the winners. The Republican Party thrust this country into a depression which ruined the ordinary American citizen and the ordinary American businessman. The few that survived were the strong and the powerful monopolies which were able to buy up for nothing at bankruptcy sales the business enterprises of America which went through the Hoover wringer.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I will yield in a moment. That is the first aspect of it. That is what Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Democrats inherited from 12 years of corrupt and colossally ignorant Republican rule. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries will be in order. They are admonished that no manifestations of approval or disapproval are permitted under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Then came the other period, Mr. President, when Franklin D. Roosevelt was struggling not only for recovery but for reform, thank God. I never knew of a Republican ticket contemplating reform. One does not ordinarily think of reform, for it means taking money out of the monopoly pocket, as being associated with Republican policy, but Franklin D. Roosevelt, thank God, believed not only in recovery, but in reform. Thank God, he did try to make over America, the America the other group had stolen from the people, and if he had had an opportunity to have effected such reform, if it had not been for the Liberty League crowd that conspired against him, if it had not been for the monopolistic controls of 90 percent of the press that lied about him, if the people had understood the facts, we would have had a better America today and a wealthier and a happier and more prosperous citizenship than we have.

Yes; then we had a war, Mr. President, and the great acceleration of this concentration occurred in the war. We all know that to be so. The major part of the contracts went to the large corporations, but, Mr. President, that was wartime. Then we were thinking not so much about the nature of the economy as to get war materials and other products to the men overseas. We know that for those purposes monopoly may serve the public interest, because great corporate enterprises do have the capacity to make goods. So America allowed that concentration of power—or it occurred in spite of the people, who preferred not to see it—because it was an inevitable part of the war itself, and a part of an all-out effort to build up productivity in America which would help win the victory with the least possible loss of life of our boys and girls and men and women who were fighting the war.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I will yield in a moment. Now that the end of the war has come, now that we have achieved a recovery from the depression days, and the Republican Party finds itself in power in the Congress, and the President recommends legislation which will do certain things in the labor field and try to break the stranglehold of monopoly on American trade, all we find from the Republican Party leadership is a bill to strangle labor. One could not get a bill to strangle monopoly 3 inches on the Republican side of the aisle, Mr. President. So I say that if we will put the Democratic Party in power, and if the Democratic Party will achieve its mission in American political life, which is to be the champion of the people, and if it can break the stranglehold of the monopolists upon American opinion, we may be able to get something done. But all I see so far is an antilabor bill, totally ignoring the President's recommendation that we approach the subject of monopoly.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Florida is entirely correct. It was not the Roosevelt administration which brought about the control of monopoly by a few. It was the times. We were in war; and of necessity everyone has to serve as best he can in war. That is what brought about monopoly in many instances. Possibly we should have gone back to the days of Jackson; but on whom could we depend? Americans—be they monopolists, so-called, Socialists, Communists, Democrats, or Republicans—were in control. There is no question whatsoever in my mind that the same monopolists who are now controlling the country took advantage of the emotions and the loyalty and patriotism of the American people to increase the hold of monopoly.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I wish to press on to a conclusion. I believe that when the record of this Congress is written in legislation enacted while the other party is in power, it will be found that taxes have been reduced to prefer the rich against the poor. It will be found that public money has been spent so as to strangle the development of public power and public improvements in the West and on the Pacific coast. It will be found that the favors of the party have gone to the faithful, who are the big financial entrepreneurs, the manufacturers, and the great business groups of America. I leave the record to speak for itself. In time the people will, of course, be able to see it.

I was saying a while ago that the report to which I was then referring showed what the monopolists do to the people when they have monopolistic power. I read from page 92 of the report:

A few cases of price changes during the depression from 1929 to 1932 illustrate the point.

Only slight price declines occurred in concentrated industries.

Single producers controlled all the output of nickel and aluminum. Nickel prices remained unchanged, while aluminum declined 4 percent.

Two producers in each field controlled the markets for sulfur, plate glass, and bananas. Sulfur prices showed no change. Plate-glass prices decreased 5 percent, while banana prices dropped only 2 percent.

That was during the depression.

Three top producers controlled automobile production and the potash market. Auto prices fell 21 percent. Potash prices fell only 9 percent.

One company produced about 41 percent of the agricultural implements and the largest four producers produced 72 percent; prices declined only 15 percent.

Yet look at the farmers—having their farms sold under the hammer at foreclosure sale, losing the savings of a lifetime, yet farm machinery declined, even in the pit of the depression, only 15 percent. The monopolists had control of it.

On the other hand, price declines during the depression were made sharper in concentrated industries:

Lumber, where the largest four producers account for only 5 percent of the output, prices fell 36 percent.

In cotton textiles, where the top four concerns produced 8 percent of the total, prices declined 42 percent.

Wheat and corn, highly competitive fields with thousands of independent producers, experienced price declines of 56 percent and 66 percent, respectively.

The farmers were not organized into monopolies, and their prices went down more than 50 percent.

I could show, for example, with respect to flashlight bulbs, that the General Electric Co. reduced the life of lamp bulbs and discouraged bulb testing by purchasers, trying to give the user less than he was entitled to have in a common light bulb. In connection with fluorescent lamps, General Electric Co., Westinghouse, and public utilities delayed the introduction of fluorescent lamps and sought to prevent their use on any basis that would reduce the consumption of electricity.

In connection with synthetic rubber, the report tells the story of how the great Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey blocked the development of synthetic rubber in the United States by suppressing the development of butyl, the best of the synthetics, cheaper than natural rubber and superior to natural rubber for inner tubes.

In connection with 100-octane gasoline, the Standard Oil Co., under a cartel arrangement with I. G. Farben, a German company, blocked the commercial development of 100-octane gasoline in the United States, and withheld technical information from the Army Air Corps.

In connection with military optical glass, by cartel agreement between Bausch & Lomb and Carl Zeiss, German firms, the heads of the Bausch & Lomb department responsible for military research were to be appointed only with the agreement of the Zeiss firm, a German firm.

The Germans had pretty good information as to what we had on our ships and in other parts of our defense because of this cartel agreement with American firms. Not only was there control of our economic welfare, but the security of America was jeopardized.

Bausch & Lomb maintained artificially high prices on spectacles by controlling patents and withholding supplies from concerns attempting to reduce prices.

The same situation was true of plexiglass, tungsten carbide, magnesium, dyestuffs, vitamin D, which affects health, synthetic hormones, quebracho extract for tanning leather, titanium, and so forth.

So, Mr. President, the record speaks for itself as to what the effect of these monopolies is upon the American people.

I should like to mention one other thing. I hold in my hand a letter to which I wish to call the attention of the press, because it deals with newsprint. I hold in my hand a letter with the name

"Scankraft" at the top of the letterhead. Its headquarters are in Stockholm, Sweden. Under the name appears the following:

The Price-Quoting Association of the Swedish, Norwegian, and Finnish kraft paper manufacturers.

In other words, the Finns, the Swedes, and the Norwegians have got together and, through a single company, have fixed all prices on kraft paper which they produce. They do the same thing with respect to newsprint. The cartel agent in respect to newsprint is called Scannews. I hold in my hand a secret document taken from the files of the secret council of the Finnish newsprint cartel, showing for the first time the working together of the Finnish newsprint cartel with the Canadian newsprint cartel, the effect and design of which was to limit the amount of newsprint that goes on the American market, and to keep up the price to American publishers. Those in America who are participating in that price-fixing and quantity-limiting program from Finland and Canada, in my opinion, are violating the laws of this land.

At present there is under way an investigation, and a grand jury will sit in New York on the 26th of this month in the Federal court to hear information possibly leading to the indictment of persons who are operating in this field. I shall lay that document before the grand jury and see if there cannot be some criminal prosecution of those participating in the criminal cartels in violation of our antitrust laws. The effect of such operations today is to starve the American press of necessary newsprint and to make it pay higher prices than it should pay for that commodity. In my State there are many weekly newspapers which use only one roll of paper every 2 weeks. They are having to close because they cannot get newsprint. Yet giant international cartels limit the quantity of newsprint production on the American market and make American publishers pay exorbitant prices for it. That is an exploitation of the American people.

Mr. President, I have only one thing to say in conclusion. In yesterday's New York Times there appeared an article by Mr. James Reston, the title of which was "Europe's Broken Economy Challenges United States—More Aid To Rebuild Continent Held Necessary To Block Communism."

I have already adverted to the necessity, in my opinion, of the United States working with the other economies of the world to rebuild the war-broken economy of Europe and the world.

I think we cannot do that merely by pouring American money into other countries—certainly not for military purposes—but I believe that through the United Nations and its many instrumentalities for international collaboration and cooperation we can find a basis upon which we can maintain in Europe, and in most of the world, the free American way of life and the private enterprise economic system.

After all, Mr. President, here in America is the most assured market for American production.

Mr. Reston points out in the article to which I have referred that we are now sending abroad $16,000,000,000 worth of goods and services a year and are getting back from abroad about $5,000,000,000 worth of goods and approximately $3,000,000,000 worth of their savings. He emphasizes that their savings are rapidly running out; they will be exhausted by the middle of 1948. Mr. Acheson said the same thing when speaking to the Delta Council in Mississippi a few days ago. Europe needs $16,000,000,000 a year of goods and services from America. She is able at the present time to send us only $5,000,000,000 worth of goods and she has no prospect of sending more in the future. That means that every year we shall have to give Europe $8,000,000,000 worth of goods and services if we are to keep the people alive. Can we do that, Mr. President, except with a strong America, with manufacturing, labor, and agriculture and everyone working together? Can we do it with industrial and economic strife and strikes in America? No, Mr. President. Not only that, but we can have no assured market for the productivity of our factories and farms unless the masses of the American people are able to buy our goods to the very maximum.

Mr. President, the design and effect of the pending bill are to diminish the power of the people, to contribute to the weakening of the American economy at home, the production of chaos abroad, the encouragement of communism and, Mr. President, war itself.

Therefore it is my earnest hope that the Senate will not pass this bill, that, if any legislation is to be passed, Senators will be satisfied to have it strike specifically at certain abuses, but that we will not crucify the American workingman upon the cross of hate which anyone has in his heart, and that we will adopt the American policy of passing legislation for the benefit of the prosperity and well-being of the whole people. If we do so, Mr. President, we shall repudiate this vindictive bill which is now before us.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

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 May 8, 1947, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 591) to amend the act of January 5, 1905, to incorporate the American National Red Cross.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President may from time to time when he deems it in the interests 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 person 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: *Provided, however,* That no civilian personnel shall be assigned to Greece or Turkey to administer the purposes of this act until such personnel has been approved by the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(3) by detailing a limited number of members of the military services of the United States to assist those countries, in any 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;

(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; and

(5) by incurring and defraying necessary expenses, including administrative expenses and expenses for compensation of personnel, in connection with the carrying out of the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. (a) Sums from advances by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under section 4 (a) and from the appropriations made under authority of section 4 (b) may be allocated for any of the purposes of this act to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government. Any amount so allocated shall be available as advancement or reimbursement, and shall be credited, at the option of the department, agency, or independent establishment concerned, to appropriate appropriations, funds, or accounts existing or established for the purpose.

(b) Whenever the President requires payment in advance by the Government of Greece or Turkey for assistance to be furnished to such countries in accordance with this act, such payments when made shall be credited to such countries in accounts established for the purpose. Sums from such accounts shall be allocated to the departments, agencies, or independent establishments of the Government which furnish the assistance for which payment is received, in the same manner, and shall be available and credited in the same manner, as allocations made under subsection (a) of this section. Any portion of such allocation not used as reimbursement shall remain available until expended.

(c) Whenever any portion of an allocation under subsection (a) or subsection (b) is used as reimbursement, the amount of reimbursement shall be available for entering into contracts and other uses during the fiscal year in which the reimbursement is received and the ensuing fiscal year. Where the head of any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government determines that replacement of any article transferred pursuant to paragraph (4) (A) of section 1 is not necessary, any funds received in payment therefor shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(d) (1) Payment in advance by the Government of Greece or of Turkey shall be required by the President for any articles or services furnished to such country under paragraph (4) (A) of section 1 if they are not paid for from funds advanced by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under section 4 (a) or from funds appropriated under authority of section 4 (b).

(2) No department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government shall

furnish any articles or services under paragraph (4) (A) of section 1 to either Greece or Turkey, unless it receives advancements or reimbursements therefor out of allocations under subsection (a) or (b) of this section.

SEC. 3. As a condition precedent to the receipt of any assistance pursuant to this act, the government requesting such assistance shall agree (a) to permit free access of the United States Government officials for the purpose of observing whether such assistance is utilized effectively and in accordance with the undertakings of the recipient government; (b) to permit representatives of the press and radio of the United States to observe freely and to report fully regarding the utilization of such assistance; (c) not to transfer, without the consent of the President of the United States, title to or possession of any article or information transferred pursuant to this act nor to permit, without such consent, the use of any such article or the use or disclosure of any such information by or to anyone not an officer, employee, or agent of the recipient government; (d) to make such provisions as may be required by the President of the United States for the security of any article, service, or information received pursuant to this act; and (e) not to use any part of the proceeds of any loan, credit, grant, or other form of aid rendered pursuant to this act for the making of any payment on account of the principal or interest on any loan made to such government by any other foreign government; and (f) to give full and continuous publicity within such country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts, and progress of United States economic assistance carried on therein pursuant to this act.

SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, to make advances, not to exceed in the aggregate $100,000,000, to carry out the provisions of this act, in such manner and in such amounts as the President shall determine.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed $400,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this act. From appropriations made under this authority there shall be repaid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the advances made by it under subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 5. The President may from time to time prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this act; and he may exercise any power or authority conferred upon him pursuant to this act through such department, agency, independent establishment, or officer of the Government as he shall direct.

The President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein under any of the following circumstances:

(1) If requested by the Government of Greece or Turkey, respectively, representing a majority of the people of either such nation;

(2) If the President is officially notified by the United Nations that the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of any veto) or that the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable;

(3) If the President finds that any purposes of the act have been substantially accomplished by the action of any other intergovernmental organizations or finds that the purposes of the act are incapable of satisfactory accomplishment; and

(4) If the President finds that any of the assurances given pursuant to section 3 are not being carried out.

SEC. 6. Assistance to any country under this act may, unless sooner terminated by the President, be terminated by concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress.

SEC. 7. The President shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures and activities which shall include uses of funds by the recipient governments under authority of this act.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. WILEY, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. GEORGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 102) to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the world telecommuncations conferences to be held in the United States in 1947, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 12, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 102) to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in the United States in 1947.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILEY obtained the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATKINS in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator to yield the floor, for the purpose of permitting me to submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, with the understanding that the Senator from Wisconsin will resume the floor after the proposed agreement has been acted upon.

Mr. WILEY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska withhold the suggestion for a moment?

Mr. WHERRY. I do.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall have to absent myself from the Chamber for the remainder of the afternoon, but I desire to give my acquiescence to the unanimous-consent agreement which the Senator from Nebraska is about to propose.

Mr. WHERRY. That being the case, I should like to say that unanimous consent proposal is that when the Senate takes a recess tonight no further amendments shall be offered to the bill, and that at 12:30 tomorrow the Senate shall proceed to vote upon whatever amendment is pending to the bill, which is the amendment in the nature of a substitute, and then on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. That proposal will be reduced to writing and will be submitted later.

I believe that the absence of a quorum should now be suggested, because, inasmuch as the proposed agreement relates to the final passage of the bill, it is necessary to have a quorum present.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct. The proposed agreement has been discussed, and I feel that the suggestion is agreeable.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Gurney	Moore
Baldwin	Hatch	Myers
Ball	Hawkes	O'Conor
Barkley	Hayden	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hill	Overton
Bridges	Hoey	Pepper
Brooks	Holland	Reed
Buck	Ives	Revercomb
Bushfield	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Smith
Capehart	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capper	Knowland	Stewart
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lodge	Taylor
Cooper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McCarthy	Thye
Downey	McClellan	Tydings
Dworshak	McFarland	Umstead
Eastland	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Wagner
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	Wiley
Fulbright	Martin	Williams
George	Maybank	Wilson
Green	Millikin	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Chair understands the Senator from Nebraska has a unanimous-consent request in writing to submit.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we have not yet reduced it to writing. The quorum call proceeded a little more rapidly than I had anticipated, and if there is nothing to come before the Senate, I should like to ask for a brief recess, of 5 minutes, perhaps, if that is satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he will not proceed un-

til we get the unanimous-consent request prepared.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the event the Senator from Maryland should offer a small amendment, about which I think there is no controversy, and the Senate should act on it, would that make it necessary to have another quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, it would not be necessary.

Mr. TYDINGS. I did not want to interfere with the unanimous-consent request. If the Senator from Wisconsin will yield to me, I should like to submit an amendment.

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 10, after the comma, it is proposed to insert the following: "or any corporation or association operating a hospital, if no part of the net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, this amendment is designed merely to help a great number of hospitals which are having very difficult times. They are eleemosynary institutions; no profit is involved in their operations, and I understand from the Hospital Association that this amendment would be very helpful in their efforts to serve those who have not the means to pay for hospital service, enable them to keep the doors open and operate the hospitals. I do not believe the committee is opposed to the amendment. I do not believe the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], is opposed to it, and I hope there will be no objection from any quarter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator move the adoption of the amendment?

Mr. TYDINGS. I move that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The committee considered this amendment, but did not act on it, because it was felt it was unnecessary. The committee felt that hospitals were not engaged in interstate commerce, and that their business should not be so construed. We rather felt it would open up the question of making other exemptions. That is why the committee did not act upon the amendment as it was proposed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I appreciate the reasons given why the committee did not act on it. I think we all realize that hospitals that are working on a nonprofit basis are not engaged in interstate commerce, but I know they are having a hard time to keep going, and I think it would be very helpful if the committee would put the specific language in the bill. They serve all mankind. I move the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

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

Mr. WILEY. For what purpose?

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to address an inquiry to the Senator from Maryland about the proposed amendment.

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. What does the amendment do, may I ask the Senator from Maryland? Does it prevent hospital employees, particularly nurses, from organizing? Is that the sense of the amendment?

Mr. TYDINGS. It simply makes a hospital not an "employer" in the commercial sense of the term. It is not a business operating on a profit basis. It is a charitable institution which is kept open, and it is to lift it out of the category of ordinary business, and is to except such charitable institutions. It is, rather, to relieve them from the pressures that normally go with business. Such institutions cannot keep open, in certain cases, I may say to the Senator, unless relief is afforded. The people who are affected are the poor people of the country. The amendment affects only charitable institutions, which do not derive a cent of profit, but are maintained by donations almost entirely, except for a small amount of revenue received for services rendered.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator has made that clear, but I wanted to know what would be the effect if nurses in a hospital should decide to organize. Would it prevent their organization?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think it would.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is all I wanted to know.

Mr. TYDINGS. They should not have to come to the National Labor Relations Board, as in the case of ordinary business concerns. They are not in interstate commerce. A hospital is a local institution, quite often kept up by the donations of benevolent persons. I hope the Senate will let the amendment go to conference. Employees of such a hospital should not have to come to the National Labor Relations Board. A charitable institution is away beyond the scope of labor-management relations in which a profit is involved. No profit is involved in this work.

Mr. TAYLOR. That may be true, but nevertheless I have in mind that nursing is one of the most poorly paid professions in America; outside the profession of school teaching it is perhaps the poorest paid, in proportion to the service rendered to humanity. I do not want to place the nursing profession under any handicap in their efforts to obtain an improved standard of living.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think the amendment will affect them in the slightest way as to salaries. I will say to the Senator they can still protest, they can still walk out. The only thing it does is to lift them out of commercial channels of labor-management where a profit is involved. The most of these institutions are maintained by the benevolence of thousands of people who contribute to community funds and so on, to keep them going. I am told it will be a big aid to the community if they are not brought in under the strict scope of labor-management commercial relations where profit is involved.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand the Senator. These may not be profit-making institutions, but even so I feel that, simply because an institution, even one like the Red Cross, is kept up by popular subscription, the professional workers, even employees of the Red Cross, should be permitted a decent living and should not be hamstrung in their efforts to obtain it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. TAYLOR. With that assurance, I shall not oppose it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I wanted to ask the Senator from Maryland a question. Is the amendment so worded that it applies only to hospitals not operated for profit?

Mr. TYDINGS. Absolutely.

Mr. KILGORE. There are hospitals that are highly profitable.

Mr. TYDINGS. The specific language is, "that are operated with no effort to make a profit." The amendment applies to completely nonprofit organizations. There is not a penny of profit in it for anybody.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator from Maryland to tell us at what point the amendment is to be inserted?

Mr. TYDINGS. On page 4, line 10, after the comma.

Mr. DONNELL. What is the language, please?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not have the language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will again state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 10, after the comma, it is proposed to insert "or any corporation or association operating a hospital, if no part of the net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual."

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I send to the desk the unanimous-consent request which I said I would propose. It has been reduced to writing, and I now ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the unanimous-consent request.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That on the calendar day of Tuesday, May 13, 1947, at the hour of 12:30 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed, without further debate, to vote upon the pending amendment to the bill, S. 1126, the Federal Labor Relations Act of 1947, after which the third reading of the bill shall be considered as ordered; that immediately thereafter the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3020, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947; that the said bill be considered as amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of the Senate bill, as amended; that the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the House bill be considered as ordered, and that a vote be immediately taken upon the final passage of the House bill, as amended: *Provided,* That after the adoption of this order, no amendment that is not germane to the bill or substitute shall be received.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest that there be added the last paragraph which was in the original draft which would prevent any amendments at all being offered tomorrow, so that the Senate will be fully advised tonight of what the amendments are.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that it be read at the desk.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Ohio if there is any virtue in fixing the hour at 12:30. I have consumed no time discussing the pending measure. I wish briefly to comment upon it. Would 1 o'clock suit as well as 12:30?

Mr. TAFT. We have worked it out with great difficulty, to accommodate Senators, and I hope we shall not have to change it. We should be glad to give the Senator from Kentucky plenty of time tomorrow, or today.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not sure I can speak on it today, but would the Presiding Officer give me his moral assistance in an effort to obtain recognition tomorrow?

Mr. TAFT. How much time does the Senator from Kentucky wish?

Mr. BARKLEY. I would require 30 or 40 minutes, probably.

Mr. TAFT. I am sure we could give the Senator from Kentucky certainly 45 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. I would like to suggest to the minority leader that we will recess until 11 o'clock, if agreeable to the Senate. That will give us from 11 until 12:30 for final consideration of the bill, and I would like to say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that I will give him my moral support to see that he is given an opportunity to speak, if it is agreeable to other Senators, and I feel it will be.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator. As the former Senator from Alabama, Mr. Heflin, used to say, "Under those heads, I have no objection."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the agreement proposes that no amendment shall be submitted to the bill after the agreement is entered into?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to read an additional part of the unanimous-consent agreement which should have been incorporated in the agreement and read at the desk:

Ordered further, That after the recess of the Senate today no further amendment shall be received either to the bill or the proposed substitute.

I will read the proviso which was read, which appears at the end of the agreement, and the clause following the proviso, as follows:

Provided, That after the adoption of this order, no amendment that is not germane to the bill or substitute shall be received.

Ordered further, That after the recess of the Senate today no further amendment shall be received either to the bill or the proposed substitute.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my inquiry was prompted by the statement of the Senator from Ohio because at the very moment that the unanimous-consent agreement was being proposed I was reading the bill reported by the committee, and I found therein on page 8 what appears to be an obvious oversight, which ought to be corrected by amendment. It occurred to me that if the committee, which had reported the bill, has made such an obvious oversight as the one I am about to point out, there may be many others found on examination.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a statement?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will permit me merely to state the oversight. Section 3 (a) on page 8 reads as follows:

There is hereby created a board, to be known as the "National Labor Relations Board" (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"), which shall be composed of seven members. Of the four additional members, whose positions on the Board are established by this amendment, two shall be appointed for terms of 5 years, and the other two for terms of 2 years.

I read on then to find out by whom it was proposed that these appointments should be made. The original Wagner Act provides that the three members on the existing Board shall be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. For some reason or another that phrase apparently has been dropped from the bill. So we now have reported by the committee a measure which proposes to increase the membership of the National Labor Relations Board from three to seven, which contemplates the appointment of these additional members but which provides no method for the nomination, and no procedure for confirmation by the Senate. I am sure that the committee in charge of the bill will want to propose an amendment to correct this obvious error.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me there is enough in the agreement at the present to make it clear that amendments of any character are in order all afternoon. The only restriction is that they shall be germane to the bill, in order that after we enter into the unanimous-consent agreement all sorts of amendments may not be proposed. Any amendment germane to the bill may be offered all afternoon. The only other restriction is that tomorrow there shall be no amendments offered, so that when we recess tonight we shall know everything we are going to vote on, and amendments of which we have had no knowledge will not be offered tomorrow.

If the provision referred to by the Senator from Wyoming is a mistake, and I do not think it is, it can be corrected by amendment at any time during the afternoon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In the copy of the bill before us there is obviously this mistake, since when I rose to call attention to the matter I sent for a copy of the Wagner Act, and I find that the first sentence of section 3 (a) of the Wagner Act, which is proposed to be amended by the pending bill, reads as follows:

SEC. 3 (a). There is hereby created a board, to be known as the "National Labor Relations Board" (hereinafter referred to as 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.

That phrase has been omitted from the bill before us. Therefore, Mr. President, if it is in order at this time, I move that the bill be amended on page 8, line 13, by striking out the period after the word "members," and inserting a comma and the words "who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] temporarily has the floor, and yielded to the Senator from Wyoming, and therefore the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming would be in order after the unanimous-consent agreement is entered into.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to say that it was my desire to call the attention of the Senate to the oversight.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to ask a question. Assuming that no amendments may be offered after today, if the unanimous-consent agreement is entered into, does that mean that any amendment which has been sent to the desk and has been printed for the information of the Senate, which would not be voted on today, cannot be offered tomorrow? We can only have one amendment at a time before the Senate, and usually there are three or four amendments which have been proposed, and which are printed and are lying on the table awaiting an opportunity to be offered. Does the unanimous-consent agreement mean that if there is no vote on any amendment by the time we recess today, although it has been printed for the information of the Senate and lies on the desk in contemplation of being offered later, it cannot be offered tomorrow?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that we have concluded action on all amendments

which have been offered, with the exception of the pending substitute. That is the only amendment left to the bill, and that is the pending question.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that if an amendment were offered this afternoon and not disposed of by the time we recess today, it would not be in order to dispose of it tomorrow?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct; if it is not offered when we recess tonight, then we proceed, at 12:30 o'clock tomorrow to vote on the bill and all amendments thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair may say for the information of the Senate that there are no amendments at the desk.

Mr. BARKLEY. Some amendments might be offered. Some Senator might offer an amendment this afternoon, and it would have to be disposed of under this unanimous-consent order by the time we recess today.

Mr. WHERRY. By the time we recess tonight.

Mr. BARKLEY. If an amendment were offered and were pending at the time the Senate takes a recess today it could not be voted on tomorrow?

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Before we recess I think we should vote on all amendments that are pending, provided they are offered today.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is what I am trying to clear up.

Mr. TAFT. The agreement may be modified so as to provide for that.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not object to the program, but it ought to be clearly understood that if any Senator offers an amendment this afternoon and it has not been disposed of by the time we recess, the Senate would not be barred from voting on that amendment tomorrow prior to 12:30.

Mr. WHERRY. The unanimous-consent request provides that at 12:30 the Senate shall proceed to vote on the bill and any amendments thereto, so that would take care of amendments offered today.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the interpretation?

Mr. WHERRY. That is the interpretation of the order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the unanimous-consent request submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], as modified. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is agreed to.

The agreement, as modified, is as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Tuesday, May 13, 1947, at the hour of 12:30 p. m., the Senate proceed, without further debate, to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, or that may be submitted on today—Monday, May 12, 1947—as intended to be proposed, to the bill S. 1126, the Federal Labor Relations Act of 1947, after which the third reading of the bill shall be considered as ordered; that immediately thereafter the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3020, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947; that the said bill be considered as amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of the Senate bill as amended; that the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the House bill be considered as ordered, and that a vote be then taken upon the final passage of the House bill as amended.

Ordered further, That after the adoption of this order, no amendment that is not germane to the bill or substitute shall be received, and that after the recess of the Senate today no new amendment shall be received either to the bill or the proposed substitute.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should now like to offer the amendment I had previously referred to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the Senator from Wisconsin has the floor. He has yielded to the Senator from Wyoming. The Senator from Wyoming has submitted an amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the amendment is to correct what appears to be an obvious omission in the first sentence of section 3 (a) of the bill as it is reported. It will be understood that the first title of the bill is an amendment of the National Labor Relations Act. There was no intention on the part of the committee to eliminate the portion of the present National Labor Relations Act providing for the appointment of members of the Board by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. My amendment is to add to the first sentence the clause which appears in the National Labor Relations Act, section 3 (a), and which I think was omitted from the bill by mere oversight. After the word "members" at the beginning of line 13, on page 8, I propose to strike out the period, insert a comma, and the words "who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have no objection to the insertion of the words omitted by error, but I think they should be inserted at another place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is proposed to insert the words after the word "members" at the beginning of line 13 on page 8.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator will find that that is the correct place.

Mr. TAFT. At any rate, it is satisfactory to me for the present. We can straighten it out in conference.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator from Wyoming whether he thinks his amendment is necessary, in view of the fact that the Constitution provides, in article II, that the President "shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law"?

Does not the Senator believe that that is a self-executing clause? Although there may be no objection to the amendment, after all, is it not an omission of language unnecessary in this act rather than an erroneous omission?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Knowing the tendency of courts and others who read the law to ascribe particular motives and reasons when specific language is inserted or omitted, I propose the amendment merely for the purpose of removing all danger of misconstruction, so that no one will wonder why the clause was omitted.

Mr. DONNELL. I have no objection whatever to the insertion of the amendment, but I undertake to say that, under the language I have read, the amendment is unnecessary. Perhaps it is advisable from the standpoint of ultracaution, but it is unnecessary. Therefore, there has been no error in the bill arising from the fact that the language was not therein included.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I never rise in the Senate, after listening to my distinguished friend from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], but I wish that his great abilities and great fecundity of expression were devoted to what I call a little more level-headed thinking.

I do not rise in order to pose either as a prophet of evil or a prophet of good. I feel that the American people should have faith in this Congress. I want to say that in reply to what has been said in relation to power that develops because of the accumulation of wealth, I can agree with that; but I also want to say, as one who has gone into the proposition that under our antitrust laws there is adequate remedy, that we cannot turn to any antitrust law on our books including the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act, with amendments without finding that from the very start there is power in the Federal Government and there has been power there for years and decades with which to handle the evils resulting from monopoly. The question is whether the administrative branch or the executive branch, whose duty it is to carry out the intent of the law, will carry through.

But, Mr. President, I did not rise to reply to the Senator from Florida; I rose to give my own views in relation to the pending measure, the bill which has been before the Senate for quite a number of days. I am sure that everyone who listens to me can appreciate the fact that America stands for the rule of law, not the rule of the racketeer or the rule of violence; it stands for the rule of democracy, not the rule of labor-boss dictatorship, management dictatorship, or dictatorship by monopoly; it stands for the rule of equality, not the rule of inequality of treatment of either labor or management; the rule of public

welfare, not the rule of special interests. Above all I hope America will return to the rule of self-help, not of reliance on Washington, D. C., to legislate the millennium into labor-management relations.

Mr. President, we shall shortly complete our work on the pending bill. I call it a bill restating sound American principles. I have refrained thus far from expressing my views on the measure, largely because I am not a member of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and did not have the opportunity to examine in the closest detail all of the provisions of the bill. I have, however, followed the arguments very closely and would now like to express some general thoughts in summary on the nature of this legislation.

I shall not attempt to review all of the specific phases of the amendments which we have enacted, the provisions of the Senate bill itself, or of the House bill, but shall confine my remarks to the principles underlying our action here.

As I see it, the basic purpose of the legislation we are enacting is to protect the public welfare from the arbitrary abuses of power by labor monopoly and racketeering. Our basic purpose is to halt the callous and wanton frittering away of America's values over the last decade and more. Too long have we ignored the termite process on America's Constitution, on her Bill of Rights, on the basic liberties of our people in the field of labor.

We cannot in this critical period overlook much longer this unhealthy condition in the ranks of labor, which is just one phase of the unhealthy condition in the world. Concentrated power corrupts and destroys, whether it be in politics, in capital, or in labor; and that is especially true when men do not appreciate what they are doing to the American way of life.

Ordinarily, I would be among the last persons to state that any legislation is necessary along this line, if it were at all possible to get labor and management to clean their own houses. But we have seen years and years of industrial chaos, with resulting economic loss to the Nation. What is worse, we find a growing disrespect for law and the rights of man. We have seen strikes halt production and bring closer the menace of inflation. We have seen Congress enact a constructive labor bill, only to have it vetoed by the President, with the result that we were plunged back into the same sort of chaos that existed before. I trust that that will not occur again.

There are, as I see it, four parties involved in any labor-management controversy. They are:

First. Management, representing the investors, stockholders, bondholders, and the actual management personnel.

Second. The union, represented by its officers, and supposedly speaking and acting for the best interests of the workingman.

Third. The workingman himself, the honest rank and file of American labor, 95 percent of whom, as I have stated again and again in the Senate, are honest, law-abiding, hard-working citizens who ask only for their right to work, and that Congress does not fail to protect their inherent American rights.

Fourth. The fourth party in any dispute is the most important party—the general public, meaning all segments of our society. Heretofore, we have legislated segment-wise, bearing in mind only the first two parties, organized management and union organization. Congress enacted antitrust laws to curb management monopoly. Congress enacted the Wagner Act in order to establish a firm bargaining position for unions. But we in Congress have neglected the rights of the public and the individual, with the result that a condition which now requires a remedy has arisen.

We have allowed some labor organizations to degenerate to such a point that in many instances they are used as personal instruments for power and wealth of a few racketeering bosses. We have allowed some labor organizations to become cesspools of corruption that smell to high heaven and cry for correction in the public interest and in the interest of the individuals belonging to them.

If the wrongs existing in labor organizations here and there affected only those organizations themselves, we would not be enacting such comprehensive legislation as this. We do so only because we recognize that these wrongs are sabotaging the American public's basic interest, because they are sabotaging the very foundations of the Republic and the inherent rights of the individual man.

Mr. President, our purpose now is to restore the conditions of freedom for American labor, and to provide equality with American management, so that this land of freedom and opportunity may realize its tremendous potentiality in this Atomic Age, rather than to go the European way, torn by internal conflicts, by organized brigandage, and by starvation. We are confronted with a situation in which the American Garden of Eden has been invaded by the serpent of racketeering, which threatens to make of this earthly paradise a European-like scene of chaos and conflict.

I have spoken of the menace of the undermining of basic American values. Let me illustrate:

First. We have allowed farmers and other producers bringing their produce to market to be forced by union racketeers to pay toll, as if the highways of America were tollgates for a class.

Second. We have allowed Americans who want to work and have the ability to work in many crafts and occupations to be denied work solely because they could not or would not pay the cost of entering a union which had a closed-shop agreement with management.

Third. We have allowed union organizations virtually to become courts, exercising in some instances brutal discipline and punishment and taking away from man his inherent right to work.

Fourth. We have permitted the power of taxation by what might be called a government within a government, in spite of the constitutional provision that the Government alone can levy taxes.

Fifth. There are instances in which unions, because we have allowed them to do so, have imposed fines upon their members up to $20,000 because they crossed picket lines—dared to go to the place of employment.

Sixth. We have allowed labor groups during the war to require of free American citizens payments up to hundreds of dollars to be permitted to work on Government war projects. Others, who would not pay, were denied the right in wartime to work for Uncle Sam.

Seventh. We have allowed the heads of unions to discharge members who, under subpena, testified in court to the truth when the subpena of the court required them to appear and testify.

Mr. President, that directly interferes with the judicial process.

Eighth. We have allowed "goon" squads to terrorize and assault, and secondary boycotts to operate to the detriment of the public interest.

Ninth. We have allowed communists and foreign-minded men to dominate some American union labor and threaten the economic life of American communities.

Tenth. We have allowed monopoly power to be vested in the hands of some labor leaders, which power has threatened the very life of the Nation. Illustrations have been cited on the floor of the Senate.

It must be clear to everyone that these powers border on pure fascism. Bad men make bad conditions. All we do here is to provide a way to stop bad men. That is our job.

Ninety-nine percent of the working men in America—and I am speaking from knowledge of many of them—together with their wives, want the Congress of the United States to get rid of the men who make bad conditions.

Many of those who defend these fascist practices are the very same ones who:

(a) Denounce the poll tax, claiming that it infringes upon the right of a citizen to vote. I am not in favor of the poll tax; but they do this at the very time they deny a man his right to earn his daily bread which seems as important, if not more important, than a man's right to vote.

(b) They want legislation which would attempt to prevent discrimination in employment against persons because of race, color, creed, or national origin. Yet they are the very same men who would discriminate against workers, denying the right to work simply because they refuse to pay a toll to a union which they do not want to join.

I have voted for all of the amendments which in my belief will strengthen this labor legislation and enable it to better protect the public interest and the interest of the individual working man. Among those amendments have been provisions giving employers their rightful voice in the administration of union welfare funds and limiting the uses for which the money may be spent. Other provisions permit employers to secure injunctions against jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts which crucify the public interest as well as the interests of management and the working man. I voted also for the Ball amendment and for the Aiken amendment which would have granted injunctive relief in cases in which there is interference with the farmer and others using the highways by

requiring them to pay tribute for the conveyance of their products.

It must be clearly understood that purely from the viewpoint of labor itself, as indicated by the mail from union men and their wives and others, there is a demand for Government to take a firm hand that will result in doing no man harm, but in preserving the rights of the individual citizen and the public. I personally feel that there is need for intestinal fortitude in the administration of law on a local level and if this were adequately looked after, then I would be willing to leave the entire enforcement of an American citizen's rights to the cities and counties and States. But we have waited a long time for this adequate law enforcement. The attitude of the Federal Government has caused this laxity. It has now become apparent that the Federal Government must step into this picture and in no uncertain terms restrain not only the foreign elements which have infiltrated the Republic, but many of our own citizens who have been perverted in their thinking and who will not respect the rights of others.

I have urged my colleagues on the Labor Committee, who will take this bill to conference, to insure the concurrent jurisdictions of State labor boards and the National Labor Board, so that insofar as possible each of the State boards may handle problems at the State level, rather than attempt to send all of the problems to Washington to be decided far from the scene of the dispute.

I have pointed out some of the amendments for which I have voted. Let me point out some of the things that neither these amendments nor the Senate bill nor the House bill will do. Thus, for example:

First. None of the provisions impairs the original intent of the Wagner Act or infringe upon any of labor's legitimate rights thereunder.

Second. None of these provisions establishes standards on unions which are not already established on management. These provisions simply make for equality before the law—a basic American principle for labor and management. After all, we are proud of the fact that we are a Nation of laws.

Third. None of these provisions interferes unduly with union affairs, except to the extent necessary to protect the individual rights of employees. I stress individual rights—the individual rights of the employee who also is an American citizen, and who, even if he gets mixed up with racketeers, is entitled to our consideration and our defense.

Fourth. None of these provisions repeals the Norris-LaGuardia Act or restores the abuses which prevailed prior to the establishment of that act, though I would have given injunction relief in certain cases.

Fifth. None of these provisions destroys the right of collective bargaining or the right to peaceful picketing or any other peaceful or lawful persuasion.

Sixth. None destroys the right to strike but merely makes it consistent with the public interest and the rights of the individual employees.

Seventh. None of these provisions permits the interstate transportation of strikebreakers or any other condition which existed prior to the Byrnes Act.

I know that in spite of the fact that this legislation does not do any of these things, there will be those who will attempt to smear it as antilabor, as they have already attempted to do. But I submit that this bill is for the best interests of labor, the rank-and-file of labor.

Let labor remember that the committee sat week after week and asked the so-called leaders—that is what they are; merely so-called leaders, because they did not show leadership—to submit to the committee their ideas as to how to remedy the situations because of which America is getting pretty much "het up" and which I have enumerated. Not one suggestion was given. So, Mr. President, the problem is in our laps.

I repeat that this bill is in the best interests of labor. It harms no one but the union racketeer who has been abusing the rights of labor as well as the rights of the public and of management. In other words, it restates what have always been the rights of an American citizen.

I reaffirm the basic thesis that I stated at the very outset. The purpose of this legislation is to put a halt to the "termiting" of American values which we have tolerated for over a decade. It is to vitalize the constitutional freedoms and liberties of every American worker, not only the 15,000,000 organized workers, but the 45,000,000 of unorganized workers, and the rights and liberties of one-hundred-and-forty-odd-million Americans as a whole.

We remember the advice of the period of the American Revolution: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." For over a decade we have been asleep at the switch. We have not been vigilant. Now is the time to stand up and be counted in vigilant defense of liberties which have been so long abused.

Is there anyone who will say, after listening to the 10 or 11 or 12 abuses which I have enumerated and which have become so prevalent in America, that such conditions do not interfere with the personal liberties of the individual citizen?

America has always had as its chief cornerstone "the rights of man"—the individual man. We all remember that it was Thomas Payne who wrote that famous book entitled "The Rights of Man," and it was that bit of human wisdom which contributed much to making the American Revolution a success. Washington said that without that volume the American Colonists never could have succeeded. Why? Because in that volume are stated definitely the inherent God-given rights of man; and the right of man to work, to make his own living, and not be required to pay toll and tribute for that privilege is one of those rights.

Elsewhere in the world these rights are being dissipated. The biggest job of us legislators is to see that these rights are not dissipated here in America.

While the doing away with strife and misunderstandings—nationally and internationally—is not primarily a political job—rather, it is a spiritual undertaking—nevertheless, in the affairs of mortals, we, as the representatives of this people, must in the field of the political define and protect the rights of our fellowman—seeing to it that fetters which interfere with man's progress are stricken from him.

This, Mr. President, is what we have been talking about; this is what this proposed legislation does.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of an article which I wrote for the magazine Public Service on this subject be reprinted following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LABOR PROGRAM FOR THE ATOMIC AGE

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

America is living in a new age, and she needs a new labor program for that age. With 58,000,000 of her people employed, with all America hungry for goods, with great unfulfilled needs throughout the world, with technological miracles available to us through full production, we must get out of the labor-management ruts of the preatomic age.

Those ruts—ruinous, prolonged strikes, paralyses of whole communities and the Nation, bitter feeling between employees and employers—must not continue in this new age.

What is it then that America does not need to get out of these ruts?

AMERICA DOESN'T NEED THESE ITEMS

1. We don't need any foreign "isms" or ideologies in the picture. That means we don't need the phony solutions of communism or fascism. We don't need and don't want their provocation and incitement, their alien spirit of hatred, their venom in setting class against class, race against race.

2. We don't need name calling, bitter prejudices and anger. We need a calm, reasonable, peaceful approach to our problem.

3. We don't need segmented thinking—the sort of thinking that is concerned only about the welfare of one segment of our population. We've got to think about all segments—about the public interest, most of all the interest of 140,000,000 Americans—labor, management, farmer, housewives—all of us.

4. We don't need backward thinking that would try to make us turn back the clock to the days before there were unions, before there was collective bargaining. Unions and collective bargaining are here to stay, but collective bargaining must become a two-way street. Union busting, antiunionism are not American any more than management busting or antimanagement are American.

WHAT AMERICA NEEDS—IN PRINCIPLE

Well, if this is what America does not need, what does she need? You can summarize what she needs in these few words:

(A) The rule of law—not the rule of racketeering or of violence.

(B) The rule of democracy—not the rule of labor boss dictatorship or management dictatorship.

(C) The rule of equality—not the rule of inequality of treatment of either labor or management.

(D) The rule of the public welfare—not the rule of special interest.

(E) The rule of self-help—not reliance on Washington, D. C., to legislate the millennium in labor relations.

WHAT AMERICA NEEDS—IN SPECIFIC ACTION

Now, these are just five principles, and they are useless unless we apply them. Let's do just that. Let's list the specific, concrete

actions which every one of us—labor, management, Congress must take—to realize the fine possibilities of the atomic age.

Here we go:

1. Labor must take steps to clean up its own house. This is labor's most important job—to do for its own good and the good of the Republic. This self-help, this self-reliance can be as important to labor as anything else Congress can do.

Labor must purge itself of the Communist cells and Communist leadership that has taken over so many unions. Labor must eliminate its racketeers—the vermin who want to play the industrial game only for their own profit and only their own way—breaking all rules. Labor must oust the bosses who control crooked union elections. Labor must take an interest in union affairs; it must not cast ballots for union officers who are America-breaking, who do not respect the rights of the public.

2. The primary action for cleansing unions must come from labor itself, but Congress can help by passing legislation to insure secret union elections and for publicizing of union finances.

3. The abuses of the closed shop should be outlawed. We should protect every American's constitutional freedom to work wherever he pleases and under what conditions he pleases, in a union or outside a union. Many folks have objections, as I do, to a poll tax on voting which prevents a man from balloting if he doesn't pay a certain fee. These folks say such a tax is unconstitutional. Isn't it then, unconstitutional if a man is required to join a union and pay what the union says in order to get his job and hold his job?

4. Mass picketing, violence at the plant gate and within a plant, threats or other strong-arm tactics must be outlawed.

5. Slow downs and other limitations on production must be barred.

6. Bona-fide supervisory employees are members of management and should therefore not be organized into the same unions as rank and file workers, lest the conflicting loyalties of these foremen between labor and management ruin their effectiveness.

7. Unions should be made liable for damages if they break contracts just as businesses are liable.

8. Jurisdictional strikes between unions should be outlawed, as well as secondary boycotts. In these actions, one union boycotts an employer simply because his products are in part made from or use another union's materials.

9. No union should be allowed to impose a tax levy or royalty on an employer's products. This infringes on the taxing power of the State, it increases cost of the product, impedes commerce and forces private, unregulated monopoly.

10. Employers should be given the right of free speech under the National Labor Relations Act. They should be given the right to petition for union elections just as unions have that right.

11. Machinery for conciliation, mediation and voluntary arbitration should be strengthened so that collective bargaining can settle disputes peacefully.

12. Where all other efforts fail and wherever the public interest is threatened by a proposed strike in a public utility like electricity, transportation, telephone, gas, or a key Nation-wide industry like coal or steel, Congress should set up means for compulsory arbitration of disputes. This means that the settlement of the dispute should be made by an impartial arbitrator or board of arbitrators which would hand down the decision which would then be binding on both management and labor. Strikes in utilities and key Nation-wide industries must be outlawed. The public welfare must be protected.

No one regrets more than I do the need for Government compulsion in settling labor disputes, but the public interest requires such compulsion if all other settlement means fail.

13. Congress, labor and management should take steps to promote industrial safety. Factory accidents last year cost over sixteen thousand lives and countless more losses of limbs and of working time.

14. Congress should stimulate voluntary profit-sharing plans in industry—employees' bonuses and other incentives to encourage full production wherever these plans are feasible.

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

These are but 14 points. Many more could be added. Their total goal is the same: to give the laboring man a break; to give management a break; most of all, to give the public a break; so that America can have full production and industrial peace. With full production, the supply of goods can be increased and when that happens, when supply catches up with demand, the high cost of living will come down.

Production means work, honest work, effective work. There is nothing wrong with this Nation that honest work cannot cure—in the atomic age or any other age.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to address myself to the pending so-called labor bill. This bill reminds me of one of the more popular ditties that used to delight us back in the prewar thirties. As I recall it, the refrain went something like this: "Oh, the music goes round and round—round and round—and it comes out here." Over 12,000 words and 59 pages of tricky, legalistic clauses go round and round—and come out with no answer to the vital problems facing our country today in regard to how to maintain industrial peace, full production and employment under a democratic, free-enterprise system.

The bill declares it to be the policy of the United States to encourage collective bargaining and self-organization of our Nation's wage earners in order to reduce industrial strife, protect the free flow of commerce, and promote economic stability. But its provisions have the effect of weakening the ability of the American wage earner to act together with his fellows to obtain a decent living for himself and his family.

The bill talks of "restoring equality of bargaining power between employers and employees". But its technicalities tie the employees and their unions up in such knots as to leave the giant corporations and monopolies which dominate our economic life even more powerful and better able to grab an increasing share of the pie.

The distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] pointed out earlier today that wages, the take-home pay of workers, have decreased during the last year approximately $5,000,000,000 from what they were during the war, but that corporation profits have increased approximately $3,000,000,000.

I am convinced that the inequalities and insecurities which are the cause of most of our industrial unrest would be aggravated rather than alleviated by Senate bill 1126, because it would make the industrial and financial giants stronger, and would weaken the labor unions which protect millions of Americans. It would do that at a time when the welfare of the Nation demands that the growing disparity between prices, profits, and wages be reduced, not increased.

Everyone knows that since the end of the war, prices and profits have far outrun wages. Prices and profits are higher than ever before in our history, while real wages have actually fallen. Consumer prices have risen more than 25 percent since the end of the war, and food by more than 43 percent. At the same time, the total paid out in salaries and wages in 1946 actually fell, even though the number of employees increased. This means that the average share of labor in the national income was smaller than in 1945.

But corporate profits in 1946 hit an all-time high of about $12,000,000,000 and now are running at a rate of about $17,000,000,000 a year for 1947. Basic to all this is the fact that today 250 large corporations control two-thirds of the manufacturing facilities in the entire United States, and more than 100 of the largest corporations are controlled by 8 groups of banking interests. But under such circumstances at this time, the Congress sets out to atomize labor unions and break them up into small constituent parts.

I fear that a continuation of this condition can only lead to the most disastrous depression this country has ever suffered. The lesson of 1929–33 is there for all to see. Gross maldistribution of wealth and excessive concentration of economic power once led us to the edge of the abyss. Do we want to risk that terrible experience again?

Have we forgotten that we cannot enjoy prosperity for long if millions of workers and their families do not have enough money to purchase the products of our farms and factories?

Already we see signs and hear talk of an approaching recession. Inventories are piling up and retail sales are dropping.

In terms of the average American family, all of this adds up to a lower standard of living—less food, less clothes, less recreation, and postponement of the purchase of a long-awaited new car, radio, washing machine, or refrigerator.

As for housing—if I may digress—it looks as if the people of America may never get an adequate number of houses. I was on a radio program a few evenings ago debating with a lobbyist for the real-estate interests, and about the only solution he had to the question of the housing shortage was to tear down the slums, just tear them down, he said, as we get the old cars off the road. He did not say what the people who lived in the slums would do after their houses were torn down.

All this means a dwindling market for the farmers of my State and the other great farm areas of the country.

It has led to a return of a sense of insecurity and anxiety as to the future in millions of American homes.

I urge you to consider the merits of this bill against that background. It is a background depressingly similar to the situation that obtained after World War I. Such a background of increasing monopoly, higher profits, higher prices, lower wages, and attempts to weaken the labor unions can only lead, as it did be-

fore, to another smash-up. Think of what that would mean in terms of human suffering—unemployment for millions of workers; poverty for their wives and children; bankruptcy for thousands of farmers and small businessmen; demoralization of your youth; waste of human and material resources. Such a crisis, if it occurred again, would imperil the very foundations of our free enterprise system. It could breed hatreds and divisions destructive of our democracy. It might encourage the would-be dictators and war mongers in our midst. We cannot afford to take the chance that we shall get off this time even with the heavy penalty we had to pay in 1929–32.

The legislation we need today is legislation to remedy, not aggravate, the inequalities and injustices making for another depression. We do not need laws which will weaken unions and impair their ability to win a fairer share of the economic product for our wage earners and their families.

We do need a vigorous program to combat the trend toward complete monopoly. We need to revise our tax structure to relieve the burden on those least able to pay. We must extend our social-security system, provide more and better housing, establish a national health program, and raise the level of our minimum-wage laws.

I recognize the need for remedial legislation in the labor field. I support the recommendations for labor legislation made by President Truman at the opening of this Congress. I am proud to be cosponsor of the bill translating those recommendations into legislative terms, which was introduced last week by my distinguished colleague the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. That bill is a real labor peace bill. It is designed to achieve peace and equity in the field of labor relations.

It seeks to achieve that through strengthening of the mediation machinery, through improvements of the National Labor Relations Act, through elimination of unjustifiable secondary boycotts and work stoppages, and through the creation of a temporary commission to devise a long-range approach to the problem of eliminating the causes of labor disputes.

I sincerely believe that our bill represents the constructive solution to our present-day labor problems, and I greatly fear the results of the legislation now before us, which seems to approach present-day difficulties more in anger than in sorrow.

Organized labor is not perfect. Abuses have been committed both by labor and by management. I am anxious to correct the abuses. But I am unalterably opposed to the pending bill because it goes far beyond the treatment of these abuses. Indeed, it hits at the fundamental rights gained by labor at great cost over long years of bitter struggle.

Mr. President, I should like to refer back to the sentence I spoke earlier when I said that abuses have been committed by both labor and management. What has been our reward to labor? The repressive proposal now before us. On the other hand, for management, the big monopolies, we passed the carry-back tax provisions, which have netted them millions upon millions of dollars, we removed the excess-profits tax, which has netted them further millions, and now a tax bill is proposed which will save millions upon millions of dollars to the large taxpayers, and will buy the little man hardly a package of cigarettes. That is the way some propose to treat all Americans alike.

I oppose the committee bill, as amended, because it would impoverish and weaken the farmer's best customers—the American wage-earner and his family. I oppose it because it undermines the democratic rights and welfare of not only organized labor, but of the entire American people. It favors those who have most as against those who have least. It would increase the already dangerous maldistribution of wealth and further augment the power of monopoly.

I hope with all my heart that my distinguished colleagues on both sides of the aisle will vote on this bill, of all bills, in a spirit free from narrow partisan or class interest. We can ill afford to play politics with the prosperity and welfare of our country at this time.

Let us bear in mind the splendid example of fair play and reasonable give-and-take just displayed by labor and management in the steel, auto, and electrical industries. Let us not "rock the boat" by passing punitive antilabor legislation at this juncture.

Industry and labor have just given us a vivid demonstration of the power of genuine, free, collective bargaining to promote industrial peace and production. They have done so under rules long established and well known. Why change the rules of the game now? Why plunge industry and labor, and, indeed, the entire country, into the uncertainty and confusion bound to ensue pending judicial determination of the validity and meaning of those 12,000 words of new law?

I feel that now that immediate postwar tensions are over, we can expect labor and management to maintain industrial peace through the collective-bargaining techniques they had forgotten during the war.

Mr. President, I am deeply conscious of the importance and significance of this debate. The eyes of the world are upon us. They are watching to see if we can solve the problem of maintaining full production and employment in peacetime in a free society. They are asking whether we can provide a decent standard of living for all our people, and industrial peace, under our free-enterprise system. They are waiting to see whether we are once more going to place property rights above human rights. They are wondering about the stability of our democratic free-enterprise system.

These are questions that are also being asked by millions of Americans here at home. The continuation of our way of life depends on the answers to those questions. I declare with all the conviction at my command that the bill before us will not help us to answer those questions wisely and humanely.

On the contrary, passage of the bill will cause dismay to millions of liberty loving men and women here and abroad. It will signal the resurrection of Hooverism and reaction. It will dishearten our friends abroad. At a time like this, when the free-enterprise system is under attack throughout the world, we can ill afford the luxury of another postwar orgy of labor-baiting and boom-and-bust economics.

For all these reasons, Mr. President, I shall vote against the passage of S. 1126. I shall vote against it because I value human rights over property rights—and because I place the welfare of all the people above the narrow, selfish interest of a few monopolies.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Gurney	Moore
Baldwin	Hatch	Murray
Ball	Hawkes	Myers
Barkley	Hayden	O'Conor
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hoey	Overton
Brooks	Holland	Reed
Buck	Ives	Revercomb
Bushfield	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Smith
Capehart	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capper	Knowland	Stewart
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lodge	Taylor
Cooper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McCarthy	Thye
Downey	McClellan	Tydings
Dworshak	McFarland	Umstead
Eastland	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Wagner
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	Wiley
Fulbright	Martin	Williams
George	Maybank	Wilson
Green	Millikin	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I think it is pretty generally understood—at least it is here in the Senate—that for a long period of time I have advocated the enactment of reasonable legislation tending to correct defects in existing laws as regards the relations between labor and management, and also to provide substantial remedial measures which would help correct and adjust some of the differences which have long existed and have caused much loss to labor, management, and the country.

In advocating and even in sponsoring such legislation, it has never been my purpose to enact legislation punitive in character. Whatever evils exist, whether in the ranks of labor or in capital, they can never be corrected by any attempt to destroy either labor or capital by the force of legislative enactment. Any person who approaches the grave and serious problems which exist in this vast field of human relations in a spirit of antagonistic hostility or animosity kills his own purpose and is of no help, but, on the contrary, is a decided hindrance to the cause of both labor and capital.

Legislate as we may, restrict, hamper, and hamstring organized labor as much as we like, we can never kill or destroy

the fundamental rights of laboring men to organize and act together for the purpose of protecting and furthering their own cause. The welfare of the great masses of the laboring people is of such tremendous importance to the economy and welfare of the entire Nation that any harsh, rigorous, revengeful legislation which cripples and destroys the rights of organized labor would likewise injure all the country.

Similarly it is true that the force and power of labor itself has grown so strong that if reasonable, fair, and just legislation is not enacted and the great force of organized labor should be exercised without due regard for the equally fundamental rights of management or the strong interest of the public generally, the failure so to enact fair and reasonable legislation will be most injurious to management, the entire country, and, in my opinion, labor itself.

Therefore, Mr. President, when we approach the problem of enacting legislation of the nature and character pending before us, we in the legislative branch of the Government have a tremendous responsibility to all of these interests—labor, management, and the public generally. In the discharge of this responsibility, none of us is, I hope, and none of us should be swayed by any motive whatsoever, except what is fair, just, and reasonable for all the people—and all the people necessarily includes both management and labor. Certainly, no outside influence such as anger, prejudice, bitterness over past wrongs or fancied wrongs and, least of all, any partisan angle or aspect, should enter into our deliberations or our decisions.

Already during the course of the debate I have more than once stated my own desire to aid in securing the passage of that type of legislation which I have mentioned, that is, legislation which is fair and reasonable to all the interests involved, but I have realized that the enactment of such legislation is not by any means easy. As has been stated on the floor many times, we have not only to consider our own wishes and desires here in the Senate but we have to deal with the House of Representatives, equal with us in the constitutional processes of making the law of the land. Not only do we have to take into consideration the House of Representatives, but, also as a part of the constitutional process, the President of the United States, who must approve or disapprove any legislation we enact, must likewise be considered.

As I have stated before in consideration of all these things, I had believed that, if we passed the bill as reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and added no amendments to that measure, we would be in a much better position to secure the final enactment of a law. There are two things involved in this consideration. In passing the bill as reported by the Senate committee, there is left a wide area of compromise and agreement with the House of Representatives when the measure goes to conference, as I presume it undoubtedly will.

Moreover it was my judgment—and merely by personal opinion—that such a measure would have far better chance of securing Presidential approval. I said during the course of the debate that each amendment which was added to the Senate bill—and again giving my own personal opinion—decreased the chance or likelihood of that bill being approved by the President and likewise decreased the chances of overriding a Presidential veto, which situation could very well result in complete failure to pass at this session of Congress any legislation whatsoever. Entertaining these thoughts, I have steadfastly voted against amendments which were proposed and some of which I might have supported under other circumstances and conditions.

At the conclusion of these remarks I shall ask to have inserted in the RECORD a chart which bears out what I have said about the possibility of a Presidential veto. That chart shows the substantially similar provisions of the Case bill, which was vetoed on July 11, 1946, and the pending bill. It indicates that all the provisions which were objectionable to the President in June of last year are repeated in substance in the present bill, as it has been amended. True, the provisions of the so-called Taft bill differ in some respects from the Case bill provisions but they are substantially the same. In addition, the chart which I shall place in the RECORD contains a list of provisions in the pending bill, as it has been amended, which are even more restrictive than the Case bill.

The chart and list to which I have referred led me to the definite conclusion which I have expressed, that there is grave danger that neither the bill which the Senate is about to approve nor the one which passed the House of Representatives will ever become the law of the land. This is a most deplorable situation and one which, in my opinion, could and should have been avoided. There yet remains some hope that, when the measure passes the Senate and goes to conference, the conferees will realize the situation with which they are confronted and will report to the separate Houses a measure which will be so fair, reasonable, and just that it can meet with Presidential approval, or, in the event the President fails to approve, that it can be passed over his veto.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask the Senator whether in his opinion, from the parliamentary point of view as to their jurisdiction, it would be possible for the conferees to report a bill which would so vary from the bill passed by the House and the measure which has been reported by the Senate committee and thus far amended upon the floor of the Senate, as to meet the problem which he thinks ought to be met.

Mr. HATCH. Probably the Senator from Wyoming is correct in his statement as to the parliamentary situation. I was merely expressing the hope that such a bill, which the President could sign, could be reported from the conference committee.

I was about to say that in the event the President should, for reasons of his own, veto the bill, I have been hopeful that a measure could pass the Congress which could be enacted into law, even over the Presidential veto. Of course, such a bill would have to be so fair and just in its terms that the Presidential veto could be overridden.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me ask the Senator another question. What in his opinion would be the prospect of such a result if, instead of the bill as reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senate should enact the proposed substitute? Would that bring appreciably nearer accomplishment the preparation in the conference committee of a reasonable bill which would meet the situation?

Mr. HATCH. I think there is no question of it. Just as I stated with respect to the bill which was reported by the Senate committee, there would be such a wide area from a parliamentary standpoint in which the conferees could rightfully get together on new legislation that I think, without question, what the Senator has said would be correct. From that standpoint there would be greater opportunity for the conferees to agree upon a bill which the President could approve, or which could be passed over the President's veto.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I take it the Senator is of the opinion that there is a certain obligation upon the Congress to go as far as it can in meeting the opinions of the President with respect to this very grave problem.

Mr. HATCH. Before the Senator entered the Chamber I expressed the thought that we must consider the Senate a coordinate branch with the House of Representatives, because it has equal authority with us in enacting legislation. I also expressed the thought which the Senator has just expressed, that the President himself is constitutionally a part of the legislative branch of Government, and certainly we should act with full knowledge of the constitutional powers of the President.

Mr. President, I am stressing this point now as I have stressed it in the past, to place the responsibility in the first instance upon the Congress, for that is where it belongs now. It will be extremely unfortunate if policies of the majority party in the present Congress fail to provide such remedial measures so fair, just, and reasonable that the bill can become the law of the land even though the President should veto it.

In saying this and in placing the responsibility now upon the majority party in the Congress, I raise no partisan implication whatever. That is the situation as it exists in the legislative branch of the Government. The obligation in the first instance is ours and in accordance with long-established practices, customs, and uses, the responsibility first rests upon the majority party.

As I indicated in other remarks on the floor, it is my opinion that if political considerations which are currently referred to in the press of the country and elsewhere do enter into the passage of the law by the Congress or in its veto by the President, neither political party will gain any advantage by such action. The country will rightly place responsibility, in the first instance, in the majority party in Congress and its leadership and will say, "You were most unwise and ir-

responsible in passing legislation which you were bound to know or should have known the President would veto, unless you had the assurance that you could pass the measure over his veto." Likewise, the President would be subjected to criticism by some who want labor legislation of any kind, no matter how harsh or restrictive it might be.

Therefore it continues to be my judgment now, as it has been all through the course of this debate, that if we let this session pass without enacting fair and reasonable legislation—speaking only of the political angle—neither party will gain, and labor, management, and the country will lose.

Mr. President, after these general observations I want to discuss very briefly some of the provisions of the pending bill as it has been amended.

I have no argument with any of the changes which will be made in the definitions contained in section 2 of the Wagner Act.

I approve the changes made in the NLRB by sections 3 through 6. Trial examiners should be, I think, only examiners. I am in accord with the provisions of section 4 preventing them from acting also as prosecutors.

I have no argument with section 8 (a), which in effect does away with the closed shop and subjects union shop arrangements to rather close limitations, with one exception. It seems to me it might be well to permit unions, even in a union shop plant, to fix for their members certain standards of efficiency and to permit the unions to exclude members who fall below such standards.

I agree in principle with the provisions of section 8 (b) establishing a list of unfair labor practices for unions. I have some doubts, however, of the effectiveness of the amendment to subsection 1, which the Senate adopted on May 2. It appears to me that by prohibiting unions from interfering with the employees' exercise of their rights relating to the selection of representatives, and in the next sentence stating that such a prohibition shall not impair the right of a union to prescribe its own rules with respect to the acquisition or retention of membership, we are outlining the boundaries of a legalistic battlefield which may lead to unlimited argument.

I approve subsection 3 of section 8 (b) making it an unfair labor practice for a union to refuse to bargain collectively with an employer if the union is the authorized bargaining representative. The whole purpose of the Wagner Act is to bring about bargaining. A union certainly should not be permitted to thwart such a laudable purpose simply by keeping mum until an employer is financially exhausted.

I heartily endorse subsection 4 making secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes unfair union practices. Surely there is no justification for such activities. I believe that this subsection, together with the amendment adopted as section 303, authorizing actions for damages in such cases, will be effective in stopping such practices. No one will benefit more from this provision than will organized labor itself.

The unfair labor practice described in subsection 5 of section 8 (b) is also fair. A union should not be able to violate the terms of a collective-bargaining agreement with impunity.

The intention of section 8 (d) is admirable. However, I have some doubt that its intent will be realized. We can urge employers and unions to bargain collectively, but we cannot legislate good faith into such bargaining. I personally believe that the 60-day cooling-off period provided in this section is desirable, but let me mention here that a substantially similar provision was in the Case bill, and that the President in his veto message stated that in his opinion such a provision would increase rather than decrease the number of strikes.

With regard to section 9 (b), I agree with the principle that professional employees should be permitted to determine for themselves whether they wish to be included in a bargaining unit. I am skeptical of the provisions of this section intended to protect or advance the rights of craft unions. Will it not widen the abyss which now exists between our two great international labor organizations?

The purpose of section 9 (c) is undoubtedly desirable. My one question concerning this section is the efficacy of subsection 2, requiring the Board to accord equal treatment to independent unions. If such unions were independent in all cases, it would be a simple matter for the Board to administer this section. I feel, however, that by requiring the Board to recognize all so-called independent unions, we may be encouraging employers to set up controlled individual unions. If such is the effect of this subsection, it will undermine all of the protective measures contained in the Wagner Act.

I am in thorough accord with section 9 (e) requiring secret ballots. This is merely an extension of our general voting practices to the field of labor organizations. Were it possible to redraft this measure, I would recommend that we give the Board a more specific guide as to what is meant by the "substantial number of employees" whose petitions it must recognize.

I am in accord with the provisions of sections 9 (f), 9 (h), 10 (a), and 10 (b).

The amendments of section 10 (c) authorizing the Board to charge unions with back pay in the event the union is guilty of an unfair labor practice seem fair enough, although I anticipate some difficulty on the Board's part in assigning responsibility for the initiation of strikes in many cases. I foresee that they may be faced with many "chicken or egg" decisions.

I generally am opposed to the issuance of restraining orders or injunctions in labor controversies, such as those provided in section 10 (j), (k), and (i), no matter how grossly unfair the practice complained of may be. I cannot forget the harsh and indiscriminate use made of these remedies in the 1920's. To me a step backward in this particular area is fraught with peril. To avoid the perils the NLRB must remain liberal in its attitude. If so, these sections might not be objectionable. In this hope of a fairer and more liberal attitude than has been manifested by the Board in times past, I forego further discussion of these provisions now.

I am not favorable to section 14. I believe the practical result of this section will be to deprive millions of foremen of the right to bargain collectively. I would not advocate permitting foremen to join the same union with other employees of a plant, nor would I advocate permitting foremen to join pseudo-independent unions. I believe, however, that foremen should be permitted to organize in order to protect their own wage standards and working conditions if the union is absolutely independent of any other union. I am not here endorsing the Foremen's Association of America, but I feel provision could have been made in this bill for truly independent foremen's unions, perhaps by requiring certification of independence by the NLRB as a condition to their recognition.

Much could be said against that portion of title II which establishes the new Federal Mediation Service as an independent agency. The Secretary of Labor is presumably the President's expert in all matters relating to labor and the mediation of disputes.

The President is responsible to the people for the effective administration of the laws which Congress enacts. It is strongly urged that he should be permitted to control the Federal Mediation Service through the Secretary of Labor. If the hopes of the Republican Party should, by some mischance, be fulfilled in 1948, the majority party will quite possibly adopt a different view of an independent Federal Mediation Service. However, the independent agency may prove to have decided merit; and I see no harm in giving it a trial.

I favor those sections of title II authorizing the Attorney General to interfere when he deems a threatened or actual strike to be of such magnitude that the national health or safety is imperiled. However, in my judgment this is rather an innocuous and weak provision. It is not adequate to meet such situations. Stronger and better legislation is needed, but this is better than no legislation at all.

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

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. So far as I am concerned, the provision to which the Senator has referred is the most important one involved in the bill which is before us. The Senator says that it is rather innocuous, in his opinion. How does this provision of the bill intertwine with or relate to the present law which was used by the Government in the case against the United Mine Workers and John L. Lewis? Can the Senator tell me that?

Mr. HATCH. There is no intertwining.

Mr. LUCAS. There is no relation whatever?

Mr. HATCH. No; none whatever. Under the law to which the Senator refers the plants were under Government seizure. There is no seizure involved here.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that fact. Do I correctly understand that in the opinion of the able Senator from New Mexico this provision is much weaker, so far as the Government is concerned, than is the present law?

Mr. HATCH. Without question, I think it is. My ideas on this situation I have many times expressed. I think that Congress is under the obligation to substitute some means for the settlement of Nation-wide strikes where the public health and safety are involved, so that none of them can ever occur. I do not think this measure even touches that situation. I think it is rather weak. But I understand that the House bill contains practically no provision in relation to such strikes; and this bill is merely better than nothing, as I see it.

Mr. LUCAS. If I may add one word, I have always thought that that was the No. 1 labor problem of America, and I have so stated from time to time. It is difficult for me to understand why the committee did not consider that as their primary obligation to the citizens of this Nation. There are many provisions in the bill which are meritorious and some which are not, as I view it. If we can enact legislation which will prohibit a labor organization from paralyzing the economy of the country overnight we shall have settled the major difficulty of the labor problem.

Mr. HATCH. I may say to the distinguished and able Senator from Illinois that he is not alone in that thought. I think the anxiety of the people of America concerning strikes is directed to that one situation, as in the coal strike last fall which could have brought actual distress and suffering to the great body of the American people and the great transportation strike which could have brought hunger and want to many of the people of America. It is with regard to such a situation that the people are more concerned than with anything else. This bill is entirely inadequate, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not want to criticize the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare because the members of it have worked long and hard.

Mr. HATCH. And this is a most difficult problem to work out.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that it is. But I want to say to the able Senator from New Mexico that had I been the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, that is one problem, if no other, that I would have been working on continuously from the beginning of this Congress in an effort to place on the statute books a measure which would undertake to solve the problem the Senator is discussing. A strike that can paralyze the economy of the Nation overnight should be prohibited and the Government should have the power to intervene.

Mr. BALL and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HATCH. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is a great loss to the Congress that the two able Senators did not devote some of their talent to making such suggestions while the bill was being prepared. They might have even made suggestions by way of amendments.

Mr. HATCH. If I may be so immodest as to say so, if the Senator had read the bill which the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the then Senator from Ohio, Mr. Burton, and I introduced in the Senate, he would have found a provision far superior to this and one which was fair and just to labor and which I think would absolutely have prevented this type of strike.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the Senator introduce that bill during this Congress?

Mr. HATCH. No. I realized that it was useless.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the Senator make known his views to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare?

Mr. HATCH. Again may I say to the Senator that the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were fully aware of my views. I cannot think that the committee ignored the bill which was introduced nor the statements which were repeatedly made on the floor. I know that the Senator from Louisiana was familiar with it. It was unnecessary for me to appear before the committee because on that committee was the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who at that time entertained the same ideas that I did, but from which I fear he has departed.

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

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree with both the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] that the problems involved were many. Few were easy of solution and many were partially solved through compromise. I doubt that it would have been possible to report a bill which would have dealt with that subject more in detail, but I believe that the provisions which we have in the bill probably will assist in dealing with Nation-wide strikes.

If we had proceeded to draft a measure outlining a more detailed method of dealing with the problem, and if such a measure became law, it might be that either one side or the other would try to gain an advantage by means of its provisions. Senators know that it is almost impossible to pass a bill that could be interpreted so as to give both sides in a controversy equal advantage. Something always crops out wherein one side or the other gains some advantage over the other. The Smith-Connally Act was passed with a view of preventing or curbing Nation-wide strikes. It partially failed and the charge has been frequently made that its provisions have been so used as to assist management. As we have the bill now worked out, the injunctive process may be resorted to; a period of 75 days is required to elapse during which the strike may be settled. Both sides will be admonished to settle. Time and more effort on the part of the Mediation Service might bring the parties to their senses. At the end of 75 days, if it is not settled, the problem will be thrown back into the lap of Congress by the President. In short, a crisis will be declared to exist and the Congress, the representatives of the people, will be called upon to deal with the existing problem. Such action as might be taken may be drastic, depending on the seriousness of the situation. Such action will be directed solely to deal with the existing condition and the Congress will no doubt be in position to deal with the situation most effectively. During the committee hearings I felt that if the problem were left dangling, and if both sides realized that the Congress might deal with it, they would be more likely to compromise, inasmuch as they would not know what Congress might do. That is one of the reasons which prompted me to support the title dealing with the subject, as it is now incorporated in the bill. I am desirous of utilizing such a method instead of providing for a specific that may cause more strife and misunderstanding between labor and management.

Let me say to my distinguished colleagues that I realize some of the weaknesses of the proposal. It is my hope that the Commission to be established by the act will be able to find a more plausible solution to that, one of our most vexing management-labor problems.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Louisiana that I do not intend to be too critical of the committee. I appreciate what the Senator from Louisiana has said, and I hope the bill will have the effect for which he hopes. But I wish to have the people of the country know that I believe this bill will not cure or correct that situation. It may be helpful regarding it; and I would rather have it than to have nothing at all.

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

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The Senator from New Mexico is speaking of the effect of the industry-wide shut-downs which affect the entire national economy. Unfortunately, both the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from New Mexico voted against the one amendment dealing with that subject which was offered on the floor of the Senate—not an amendment trying to patch up the effects, but an amendment dealing with the cause, which is industry-wide bargaining, of course. The amendment dealt with that matter very mildly, simply attempting to give local unions some autonomy and freedom of choice as to whether they would bargain on an industry-wide basis, which is an opportunity that employers now have.

Both the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from New Mexico voted against that amendment. Although the amendment would not have cured the entire evil or difficulty, at least it went to the cause of it, and would have given to local unions the same autonomy and freedom of choice which employers have, and it might have arrested the trend toward industry-wide bargaining, which inevitably, if the disagreement continues, will lead to an industry-wide strike.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not know how the Senator from Illinois voted in regard to that amendment, but what the Senator from Minnesota has said

about my vote on it is quite correct. I voted against that particular amendment; and if it were to come before us again or were before us now, I would vote against it again. That amendment did not touch the problem I am discussing. It touched the entire field, and in my opinion it would have created more difficulties than it would have cured If that amendment had touched the particular problem I have been discussing, I would have supported it, because I was convinced, and I still am, that the present provision against Nation-wide strikes is totally inadequate.

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

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. During the debate, I have interrogated various Senators in regard to different provisions of the bill, and from time to time I have found that Senators disagree as to what the provisions mean. That situation has been clearly demonstrated only today. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who is an able lawyer, definitely states that in his opinion the bill is practically innocuous in regard to meeting the problem of stopping a strike which would paralyze the Nation overnight.

Mr. HATCH. Does not the Senator from Illinois agree with me as to that?

Mr. LUCAS. I certainly agree with the Senator from New Mexico as to that. However, the Senator from Louisiana disagrees; and, of course, I do not know what other Senators will say in regard to the position the Senator from New Mexico is taking.

But, Mr. President, all this only confirms my belief regarding the bill, and especially regarding the amendment which the Senator from Minnesota was discussing a moment ago. I have not had an opportunity to study this labor bill as much as I should like, in view of the fact that during the time the labor bill has been debated on the floor of the Senate, I have been engaged during the mornings and afternoons, and sometimes in the evenings, in studying a tax bill which is before the Committee on Finance, of which I am a member. Consequently, I do not have the completely detailed information on this bill which I should like to have.

But I doubt that anyone who has studied the bill from the beginning of its consideration to the present time has a thorough grasp and understanding of it and understands all its implications, and I believe I am justified in having that opinion after hearing Senators disagree as to what various provisions of the bill mean.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will permit me to interrupt him at this point, let me say that what he has said has been exemplified throughout the entire course of the debate, and notably during the debate indulged in by Senators on the other side of the aisle. The two Senators who perhaps are more familiar with labor matters than any other Members of this body, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], have continually disputed with their own leaders as to the meaning and effect of certain provisions of this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct; and those able Senators were on the committee, and heard the testimony, and studied the bill and the amendments day after day.

In regard to what the able Senator from Minnesota has said about my vote against the amendment which he offered, I simply wish to observe that it is correct. I voted against the amendment, and I wish to say that I voted against it for practically the same reason for which the Senator from New Mexico voted against it, namely, it was a Nation-wide proposal with no teeth in it. I submit that it not only reached the few labor organizations which have control of the economy of the Nation, but it touched every segment of our labor society, insofar as the workingman is concerned. In my humble opinion, instead of clarifying or helping in that situation or doing something constructive for labor and management, that amendment would have brought on chaos and confusion throughout the country. It would have added to the labor difficulties which exist in the United States today, instead of reducing the number of them. For that reason, if for no other reason, I could not support the amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to continue with my discussion of the various sections of the bill, and I desire to mention section 302, relating to union welfare funds. I was necessarily absent from the Senate when that provision was considered. However, I have been against it, not because I think a union official or union officials should be permitted to use such funds as they see fit, but because, as I stated previously, I believe that every additional restriction lessens the chance of the bill's survival.

I neglected to mention title 3, which provides for suits against unions in their common name, for violation of collective-bargaining contracts. In my opinion, that is a salutary provision, provided the employers do not use it as a means of harassing unions and decreasing their effectiveness, by filing actions indiscriminately every time one member of a union deviates slightly from the terms of the contract.

I voted against section 303, authorizing damage actions for boycotts and secondary strikes, for the same reason that I voted against other amendments, namely, to prevent adding to the bill amendments which might lessen its chance of passage and finally becoming enacted into law. Moreover, there were objections to some of the language contained in that amendment. That language could have been greatly improved in ways which would have removed some of the legal objections. However, in principle I agree that unions should be held responsible for damages resulting from ill-considered activities. But what will it gain us if we add provisions like this to the bill, and only increase the chances of a Presidential veto?

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

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Apparently the Senator has made a close examination and analysis of each and every provision of the bill, along with the amendments which have been added to it. Did the able Senator, in his examination of the bill and the amendments, attempt to analyze what he would term "punitive measures"?

Mr. HATCH. I have not analyzed it from that standpoint. I am putting in the RECORD, or shall presently ask permission to do so, a chart showing the provisions of the Case bill, which the President vetoed. I have already said that practically all those provisions are included in the pending bill. I am also adding a list of other provisions which go even beyond those of the Case bill. They will be printed in the RECORD, if I can get permission.

Mr. LUCAS. My reason for propounding the inquiry was that many Senators have said that they would not vote for punitive measures, but that they would vote for a moderate labor bill, and that the dividing line could be found when the legislation reached the point where it began to discriminate against the laboring man, and showed that it became punitive in its nature. I just wondered whether the Senator had made that a matter of examination.

Mr. HATCH. I have not examined the bill from that standpoint, but from the standpoint of what I myself shall do in voting on the bill. I suggested in the very beginning of my remarks that I did not want to approach this important piece of legislation from any such standpoint as that of attempting to enact punitive or revengeful legislation, to enact something to punish someone for some past or fancied wrong. I have reached my own conclusion, which I shall presently state, but it is one which I really would not want to endeavor to persuade any other Senator to adopt, because it is a matter about which each individual Senator must make up his own mind. I would not even argue or persuade on that point. I shall presently say what I myself intend to do.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the statement last made by the Senator from New Mexico. Whether or not he wants any Member of the Senate to be persuaded by his arguments, I may say to him that frequently Senators are persuaded by his logic and his eloquence on the floor of the Senate. Knowing the Senator, as I do, as one of the most able lawyers in the Senate, and knowing his qualities of fairness and understanding in connection with problems like the one we are considering, I was hoping he might have made an examination of the bill section by section from the standpoint I have suggested, because that is something I wanted to do, and I just have not had the time to do it.

Mr. HATCH. I deeply appreciate the Senator's kind remarks, and thank him for them. But I prefer not to discuss the bill from that standpoint.

I must add, Mr. President, that during the course of the debate I have been disturbed and am now disturbed by what appears to me to have been a total disregard of fundamental causes of labor-management difficulties. In the pending

as well as in all similar legislation, we are not meeting at all the deep-seated causes which give rise to the pains and agonies about which we are endeavoring to legislate.

I agree that many of those fundamental and deep-seated causes cannot be reached by legislation. It is beyond the capacity of legislative bodies to correct injustices or right wrongs which are due to that selfishness and greed which places profits and gains over and above the welfare of human beings. Nor can we cure by legislative process all the evils which flow from ambitious thirst for power by irresponsible and unscrupulous men who would dictate to and dominate over industry, labor, and even government itself. But there are certain corrective measures we can and should enact, realizing full well, however, that peace and happiness in labor-management relations can only come through those advanced, progressive steps which must be taken by both sides to improve, expand and enlarge that area of agreement and understanding which comes, and can only come, through relations based upon mutual understanding, trust, and confidence. These can be inspired, and many companies are adopting means and measures which have so improved relations that when differences arise they are quickly and fairly adjusted to the satisfaction of both, and for the welfare of all, including the country generally.

Much as labor organizations have been criticized, I for one want to pay them a sincere tribute for endeavoring, as many of them now are, to promote annual wage plans throughout industry generally. I have long been an advocate of such measures, for I have felt that the welfare of the laboring man depends more upon the security of his employment than on increased wages or even shorter hours. It is in the knowledge that his employment is certain that he can buy a home, and provide it with necessary furnishings, even to the point of having some luxuries.

Why should not a laboring man have these simple things? Why should he not have that security of employment which will enable him to plan his way of life on an annual basis, rather than on an hourly wage arrangement, by which he cannot know from one day to the next how to plan, or whether he will even have a job? I think that if management and the responsible officials employed in activities of management would endeavor to place themselves in the shoes of the man who labors, realizing that he has his hopes for security and has the same desire to provide comfortably and adequately for his family that actuates every worth-while citizen, some of the bitterness and the causes of dispute might be quickly dissipated.

It is in these basic solutions that the answers to our problems will be found. Necessary as may be corrective legislation, harmony in this field will not come until both labor and management understand and respect the problems of each other. It is here in the broad area of mutual understanding, respect, confidence, trust, and good will that lies our chief hope of industrial peace. In this field only labor and management can participate. Into it, except by indirect ways, government cannot enter.

Title 4 of the bill provides some method for such indirect approach. Creation of the committee to study and report on basic problems may be the best feature of the whole bill. Should this measure become a law, I sincerely hope that both labor and management will cooperate with the committee in making a determined effort to find those means by which, as stated in the bill, "permanent friendly cooperation between employers and employees and stability of labor relations may be found throughout the United States." Even though similar methods may have been tried before, they still remain the chief hope of finding that accord, agreement, and cooperation so essential to the welfare of all industry, all labor, and all the people generally. It should at least be given an earnest and an honest trial.

I have tried to speak without vindictiveness or animosity. I have not been severe in any criticism of the bill, or how it originated, or the way it has been handled. I have wholly disregarded the charge currently made that the majority party seeks political advantage alone, and does not expect any legislation to be passed. I hope that no person has such a hope, and that no one could be so unmindful of the country's welfare as to approach this grave problem with such an attitude, and especially with the desire, the intention, and the purpose to place the President of the United States on the spot.

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

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator knows the President was placed on the spot by some members of the majority party when they told him definitely, in advance, that unless he signs the pending bill there will be no labor legislation at this session.

Mr. HATCH. I expect to comment on that presently.

Mr. LUCAS. It needs comment. If that is statesmanship, then I do not understand the term. It sounds more like politics.

Mr. HATCH. If that be true, Mr. President, if it be the purpose of anyone to deal with the proposed legislation from a strictly political, partisan standpoint, with the sole purpose of putting the President of the United States on the spot, not only will he miserably fail in his efforts but he should fail.

Mr. President, the people of the United States are not so easily deceived; they are not easily misled. Let a bill come out of conference, so harsh in its terms and so contrary to the well-known views of the President, and the people will rightfully reach the conclusion that the legislation is not desirable; that unworthy political ambitions have influenced Members of Congress rather than a genuine purpose to serve the country through the enactment of sound legislation. If anyone thinks political advantage can be gained by such procedure, he deceives himself and misleads no one. I make these remarks solely in the hope that they may be in some way persuasive to conferees and others to endeavor to agree upon provisions so fair and so just that the President can and will sign the measure; but if he does not, for reasons of his own, that the measure will still be so fair and so just that it could be rightfully passed over his veto and still become the law of the land.

Arrogantly, as I thought, Mr. President, leaders of the majority party issued in the press of the country a defiance, a challenge, a threat to the President of the United States, when they said, or were quoted as saying, "Mr. President, take this bill or nothing; you will have no other chance of securing labor legislation at this session of the Congress."

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

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. There was also a threat that if the President did not sign the pending bill, he would be given no assistance in case a coal strike occurred again.

Mr. HATCH. O Mr. President, I hope that is untrue.

Mr. MURRAY. Such a statement was in the press.

Mr. HATCH. I did not see it. I do not know which branch of the Congress it was in, and I do not want to be unduly critical, but I certainly hope no Member would ever voice such a thought as that. In so doing, he would be saying to the President and to the country, "I think more of the political welfare of my party than I do of the safety and welfare of the people of America."

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

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. What would have been said had the President of the United States issued an ultimatum to Congress demanding that we pass the kind of labor legislation he suggested or he would veto the bill? Would the Senator care to elaborate on that?

Mr. HATCH. Words are inadequate; my imagination is not sufficiently vivid to permit me to attempt to express the angry protests which would have gone up from this body.

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

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BALL. It seems to me that through the various spokesmen of the President on the Senate floor we have been receiving exactly that kind of ultimatum for the last 2½ weeks, that if we change the pending bill in one respect or another, regardless of what we thing of its merits of it, it will be vetoed, because the President will not take it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have the utmost regard for the Senator from Minnesota. I do not question his motives. He is one Senator who cannot be charged with partisan desire, or with a desire to gain advantage through partisan activities in this regard. I say that with utmost sincerity and truth. But, Mr. President, I defy the Senator from Minnesota to search through the statements which have been made in the RECORD and find where any Senator has ever said or intimated that he would not vote for adequate legislation to protect against a coal strike, or anything of the sort. I have said that I might vote

to override a Presidential veto, but it was the statement of a fact based upon the record, and a thing which I thought the Congress should take into consideration. Never was it said by way of an ultimatum, never was it said by way of a threat. If the Senator will read my remarks, he will find that each time I stated that, I also said, "While we must consider it, let us be so sure of our ground, so sure that we are right, that if the President should veto it we could pass the bill over the Presidential veto."

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

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, the Senator from Minnesota is absolutely wrong in the statement that he made. The point I made a moment ago was that certain leaders in Congress have definitely served notice on the President of the United States what he may expect, unless he does certain things with the labor bill. Everyone has a right to reach a conclusion as to what he thinks the President of the United States will do; and Senators have a right to reach that conclusion, primarily on what he did with the Case bill last year. One of the first things I asked the able Senator from Louisiana when he opened the debate, was whether or not the provisions of the pending bill were more stringent than the provisions of the Case bill. I had in mind the veto of that bill. But the point I make is that the President of the United States himself has never to my knowledge given to a single Senator any indication of what he will do in connection with the pending bill. Obviously he could not, until the bill is amended and agreed upon by both Houses and properly before him, and has been analyzed by him in the careful and conscientious way he always considers measures of such national importance. Let it further be said that in my humble opinion any threat of that kind made to Harry Truman will have no effect upon him whatever; and certainly those who served with him in the United States Senate should understand that better than anyone else, because whatever Mr. Truman finally does will be in line with the dictates of his own conscience and what he believes to be for the best interests of the greatest number and for the general welfare of the country that he loves—the country for which he fought in World War I—the country for which he is doing a great and magnificent job under the most trying circumstances that any President has ever experienced in the peacetime history of this Nation.

Mr. President, I have no fears as to what any kind of intimidation or coercion or threat addressed to Harry Truman will do, because they simply make no impression on him. It would have been better had they been left unsaid in the trying period through which we are passing, when we are endeavoring to solve serious problems for the benefit of the Nation and for the benefit of the world.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, agreeing with everything said by the Senator from Illinois, I should like to add that in consideration of the dignity of Congress, in consideration of the high dignity of the office of President of the United States, regardless of who may fill it, it ill becomes any Member of Congress to resort to threats or intimidation. Like the Senator from Illinois, I served with the President when he was a Member of the Senate. I know that when he acts on this measure he will consider it in the same careful manner as he considers every measure, and that he will not be influenced by promises, on the one hand, nor will he be deterred by threats, on the other. That is exactly the way the President of the United States should discharge his duties, and it is the way the President will discharge his duty in this respect.

I realize full well that in the case of legislation of this kind it may come to the pass that the President may disagree with me or with the Senate as to the type of legislation that is proper and just, and he may in the exercise of his duties see fit to veto a measure for which I may have voted. If he does so, he will merely discharge the obligation which the Constitution of the United States places upon him. And even though he disagree with me, and I may be completely opposed to what he does, I shall still respect and honor the man who discharges his duty as he sees it.

Mr. LUCAS. May I add one more observation? I want to say in conclusion in this debate, so far as I am concerned, that those who have made these so-called threats in attempting to intimidate the President of the United States apparently forget his fight with John L. Lewis, when the President did not choose to run.

Mr. HATCH. The country has not forgotten that incident.

Mr. President, I say that if this measure is passed by the Congress and fails to become law, either by Presidential veto or for some other reason, we have no right to say that we will abandon our efforts to secure some legislation. Petty spite, ill will, partisan political influence, must not enter into the consideration of the measure. There would be ample time, after the bill is vetoed and after the veto is sustained, if that should come to pass, for the passage of some legislation upon which the committee members on the other side, the full committee for that matter, could agree which would be helpful and beneficial to the entire country. I say to them they have no right to deny the country such a measure.

Mr. BALL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BALL. From the Senator's phraseology, "after the bill is vetoed," I gather he thinks the veto is foreordained.

Mr. HATCH. I do not think that would be a very violent assumption in view of the record which has been made, and with which every Senator ought to be familiar. I feel in my own mind that the measure will be vetoed. But that is only my opinion. So if the Senator wants to assume that I entertain that belief, he has a perfect right so to assume, because I do entertain that belief.

Mr. LUCAS. But that does not mean that the Senator from New Mexico is quoting anything that the President has said.

Mr. HATCH. No. I have repeatedly said that, Mr. President.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the implication which it seems is constantly desired to be left in connection with this debate.

Mr. HATCH. I have previously said, and I now repeat, lest someone may misunderstand me, that I have not discussed labor legislation with the President or with any member of the executive branch of the Government. The opinions I have discussed are my own, but I think they are based upon rather substantial grounds.

Mr. President, I have pointed out what appear to be some of the better features of the bill, and I have pointed out some of its defects. From what I have previously said, it is now needless for me to say that the measure does not meet with my complete approval. In some respects it is weak where it should be strong. In other respects it is strong where it should be weak. It is far from being a first-class piece of legislation.

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

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. In line with the thought previously expressed, and with the thought just now expressed by the Senator, is it not correct to say that labor legislation, if it is to be curative, must necessarily impinge upon a number of congressional acts?

Mr. HATCH. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it really possible, in the heat and fervor of debate, and under pressure, now properly to go into that subject without a thorough study of all the congressional acts involved, because while Senators may think they are curing something in one congressional act which it may be thought needs to be cured, something in another act may be wrecked, as I think happened in connection with the portal-to-portal measure which is now on the President's desk. In going after portal-to-portal pay we got so far away from portal-to-portal pay as to deal with child labor and minimum wages. I believe a thorough survey should be made of what is needed to cure industry-labor troubles so as to determine what subjects are proper for Congress to pass upon, and that Congress should not attempt to write a contract between the employer and his employees.

Mr. HATCH. What the Senator has just said is something I casually mentioned in connection with the title proposing to set up a committee to survey the whole field. I expressed the hope that such a survey might be made, and I stated that when we have the report of that committee, if the committee is authorized, and if it does its work, we may find that practically everything we are now proposing to do is wrong, and we may want to go back and undo it all.

Mr. President, finally, I think the country expects, nay, more, it demands, that the Congress enact some labor legislation. Therefore, notwithstanding what I consider to be some of the weaknesses of the bill, some of its defects, and without any enthusiasm and with many misgivings, I have determined that on

the final passage I shall vote for the measure in the hope that somehow, some way, we may eventually secure some legislation. As to what I shall do after the Presidential veto, I have not yet come to any conclusion, and I shall not do so until I see what type of bill comes out of conference and what are the grounds of the veto.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the record as part of my remarks the chart and the list to which I referred earlier in my remarks.

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

SUBSTANTIALLY SIMILAR PROVISIONS OF CASE BILL AND TAFT BILL

These provisions in the Case bill are substantially repeated in the Taft bill, S. 1126.

Case bill	Taft bill
Sixty-day cooling-off period (sec. 3).	Section 8 (d).
Creation of Federal Mediation Board (sec. 4).	Sections 201 through 205.
Limitation of public utility strikes (sec. 6).	Sections 206 through 211.
Welfare-fund limitations (sec. 8).	Section 302.
Excluding supervisors (sec. 9).	Sections 2 (11) and 14.
Union contracts binding (sec. 10).	Section 301.
Secondary boycotts (sec. 11).	Sections 8 (b) (4) and 303.

PROVISIONS OF TAFT BILL MORE RESTRICTIVE THAN CASE BILL

Section 2 (11): The definition of "supervisors" who are to be excluded from the Wagner Act is appreciably broader than in the Case bill.

Section 2 (12): Professional employees are excluded from the Wagner Act. No such provision in the Case bill.

Section 2 (3) and (13): The definition of persons exempt from the provisions of the Wagner Act as agricultural employees is appreciably broadened. No such provision in the Case bill.

Section 8 (a) (3): Closed shop is abolished. Union-shop agreements are restricted by requiring prior approval of a majority of employees in the plant. No such provision in Case bill.

Section 8 (b) (3): Unions are compelled to bargain with the employer. No such provision in Case bill.

Section 8 (b) (4): Jurisdictional strikes are made unfair labor practice. No such provision in Case bill.

Section 9 (f): Unions are required to submit financial reports to Secretary of Labor and all union members. No such provision in Case bill.

Section 10 (b): Charges of unfair labor practices must be filed within 6 months after occurrence. No provision in Case bill.

Section 10 (c): Unions may be made responsible for back pay in certain cases. No such provision in Case bill.

Section 10 (j), (k), and (l): NLRB is authorized to seek injunctions prior to a full hearing if unfair labor practices are complained of, and is required to obtain an injunction if a secondary boycott is charged. No such provision in Case bill.

Section 208: Injunctions may be obtained by the Attorney General in case of strikes affecting the national health or safety. No such provision in Case bill.

Section 302: Unions will be unable to request employers to check off dues unless each member agrees in writing. No such provision in Case bill.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I want to state briefly why I shall vote against the omnibus labor bill.

A detailed discussion would be burdensome at this time. The Congress and the public have heard all the detailed arguments—many times, and over many years.

My objections to the bill rest upon general principles. As I see it, the bill is untimely, trouble-making, reactionary, unfair, and unduly political.

It is an untimely bill because we are now in a period of good relations between management and labor. The transition from a controlled war economy to a relatively free peacetime economy has posed enormous difficulties. Measured against these difficulties, management and labor have made their adjustments with surprising rapidity. Compared with the period after the First World War, the results have been remarkable. This bill would disarrange the relationships between management and labor just as they are settling down. It would establish a new basis of operations, far less sound and far less safe than the basis already tested by experience.

This bill is a trouble-making bill. It would generate friction over the interpretation and settlement of new and untried definitions of rights and duties. It would provoke and instigate unnecessary conflicts, both in the courts and in the collective-bargaining process. It would do this at the very time when we most need smoothness and stability.

This bill is a reactionary bill. It seeks to strip workers of hard-earned rights which are at the core of industrial freedom. With a few spectacular instances as pretext, the bill brands all of labor as a culprit. It diminishes the rights of all unions and all labor leaders. Yet, all experience shows that the exercise of these rights has resulted in a more productive, more prosperous, and more just America.

The proposals in the bill, directed toward these backward-looking purposes, are not novel proposals. They have not been developed to meet novel situations. They are a resurrection of proposals which were advanced by the opposition from the beginning of the effort to afford legal protection to the industrial rights of workers.

This bill is an unfair bill. It singles out workers and their unions for harsh and punitive treatment, at the very time when the wrongs which need to be corrected are elsewhere in our economy. It is based upon the idea that unions have acquired too much monopolistic power. But the truth is that business monopoly—the concentration of economic power in finance and industry—is now, even more than before, the real evil. Today, the whole country recognizes that workers, even with the help of their unions, cannot keep pace with the increasing cost of living caused by excessive prices and exorbitant profits. It is not labor, but the opponents of labor, whose greed is endangering our prosperity and threatening a depression. It is not labor, but the opponents of labor, who have too much power. Who are these overly powerful people of whom I speak? Look to the organizations backing this bill, and there you will find them.

That is why I say that this bill is unfair from beginning to end. One illustration will be ample proof. In matters relating to the organization of workers into unions, the bill would impose the same restraints upon labor organizations that the National Labor Relations Act imposes upon employers. To call this equality or fairness is a grievous error.

This grievous error was exposed when the National Labor Relations Act was under consideration in 1935. At that time, it was proposed that employees and labor organizations, as well as employers, should be prohibited from interfering with, restraining or coercing employees in their organization activities or their choice of representatives.

The report of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor in 1935 rejected this erroneous argument as follows:

> The argument most frequently made for this proposal is the abstract one that it is necessary in order to provide fair and equal treatment of employers and employees. The bill prohibits employers from interfering with the right of employees to organize. The corresponding right of employers is that they should be free to organize without interference on the part of employees; no showing has been made that this right of employers to organize needs Federal protection as against employees.
>
> This erroneously conceived mutuality argument is that since employers are to be prohibited from interfering with the organization of workers, employees and labor organizations should also be prohibited from engaging in such activities. To say that employees and labor organizations should be no more active than employers in the organization of employees is untenable; this would defeat the very objects of the bill.

I say also that this bill is a political bill, because narrow political considerations have played an excessive part in its formulation. I do not mean to say that everyone who votes for or against this bill is guided by narrow political considerations. But I do say that political jockeying for position has had so much to do with the formulation of this bill at every stage as to discredit it on its face.

The present Congress is the first one elected since the close of World War II. It has been confronted with an opportunity, unique in our history, to help build a stronger and better America—to expand social legislation, to provide better housing for the people, to maintain economic stability, and to protect and advance the welfare and contentment of the average American family. But the record of the present Congress on all these fronts is as barren as the sands of the Sahara. The present Congress has not only stood still; it has moved steadily backward. New pages in this record of reaction are being written every day.

This bill is the foremost example in this record of reaction. If it should become law, which I hope it never will, it would foment and augment industrial strife. It would soon incur the just resentment of management and labor alike, both of whom would be vexed and frustrated by its unworkable and ill-considered provisions. Serving no useful public purpose, it would weaken the exercise

of fundamental rights which have long been proved beneficial to the whole country.

No group is perfect, and no one group is exclusively charged with the welfare of the American people. But every Member of the Congress knows this: The working people of this country, through their organizations, have been the strongest and most consistent fighting force for economic progress and human betterment. Without their sustaining efforts, we would be back in the dark era of the longer day's work for the shorter day's pay, back in the dark era of neglected unemployment, lower productivity, more widespread poverty, and much lower national income. Today it is these same workers who through their organizations, are the strongest single fighting force for greater economic stability, for a lower cost of living through curbing excessive prices, and for a better distribution of the national income to provide more buying power. In these efforts the workers and their organizations are acting in the best interests of the whole American people.

This bill is not in the best interests of the whole American people. On the contrary, this bill seeks to repress, to reprove, to demoralize, and to weaken the workers and organizations whose welfare is a part of the national welfare. This bill seeks to weaken them, with the avowed purpose of giving relatively more strength to those very employer organizations whose selfish policies are threatening our prosperity and blocking our progress. And all this the bill does in the name of greater equality between employers and workers. I say that if the intentions of this bill were carried out, they would result in an even greater inequality between employers and workers than now exists or than existed before the National Labor Relations Act became law.

This bill, if it became law, would be an antidemocratic step. There are some people in other lands who say that America will lose its democracy when it loses its prosperity. This bill goes further than that. It commences to throw away our democracy while we still have our prosperity.

That is why, I repeat, that this bill is untimely, troublemaking, reactionary, unfair, and unduly political.

Viewing the record, it is too much to expect that a majority of the present Congress will bury this bill. But I earnestly hope that the President vetoes it. Such a veto would, I believe, be sustained here. Certainly, it would be sustained by the liberty-loving, forward-looking, fair-dealing American people.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I do not want the debate on this bill to close without making a few remarks on the overall issues involved. Personally, I have been so occupied with the amendments proposed that I have not devoted any of my time on the floor to a discussion of the general issue.

I listened with a great deal of interest, during the colloquy between the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], to the talk about threats of a Presidential veto and the so-called ultimatums delivered to the President in connection with the pending legislation—all of which sounded quite familiar. We have heard it on the floor of the Senate, and also in a little different form in the cloakrooms.

However, there is one point in this situation which I do not think has been brought out clearly. That is the fact that if the President wanted to get together with Congress on the shape and form of labor legislation he could do so very easily by becoming a little more specific and telling us exactly what he would like and what he would oppose.

All we have to go by in the current session of Congress is a few paragraphs in his state of the Union message, and the message in which he vetoed the so-called Case bill a year ago. Personally, I have not considered the veto message as much of a guide. I read it very carefully at the time. In that message he opposed and found fault with virtually every section of the bill. Yet, obviously, if we are to do anything constructive in labor legislation we must do some of the things that were done in the Case bill; and a great many of the provisions are in the current bill.

But I question whether the President would stand on every single phrase in that veto message, because, as I recall, one of the sections in that bill was the so-called Hobbs antiracketeering measure, which the President opposed just as strongly as he did any of the other sections; and yet when we passed it separately he signed it.

Mr. President, one of the fields in which the President recommended legislation in his state of the Union message was legislation to deal with secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes. As I recall—I would not attempt to quote his exact language without having the message before me—he said that there were some secondary boycotts which were justified and that a distinction should be drawn. The Secretary of Labor was before our committee twice. I would assume that he could more or less speak for the President on this type of legislation. We did our best to get him to describe, in terms which we could define in legislation, what he considered to be a justifiable secondary boycott. We never got any kind of definition from him. The only kind of action in regard to secondary boycotts which the Secretary was willing to recommend was one dealing with secondary boycotts in jurisdictional strikes where the boycott was directed against a specified union. That would not touch at all one of the worst situations which has arisen, such as that in New York where a local of the IBEW is using the secondary boycott to maintain a tight little monopoly for its own employees, its own members, and a few employers in that area. The Secretary admitted that he had nothing further to offer.

Mr. President, not only could the President of the United States be a little more specific about what he is for and what he is against, but if he really wanted to cooperate with Congress in writing legislation in this field he could very easily indicate that he would like to have those in the executive branch who are most directly concerned in writing this bill come to the Capitol and confer with Members of the Congress in an effort to see if there could not be a meeting of minds. He can still do that. I think the initiative in that kind of cooperation must necessarily come from the President. It is not our province as Members of Congress to try to put him on the spot. He has a perfect answer, which I understand he has made to newsmen, to the effect that he cannot pass on legislation until he knows what it is going to be. If the President in such a conference took the position that he would like to have this or that or he would veto any bill which contained any provision dealing with other problems which Members of Congress considered equally urgent, then, of course, we could not have cooperation on that kind of a basis, as we have found out in certain international negotiations.

I listened the other night to a very prominent union leader describing on the radio this legislation and what its effect would be on unions and the men and women who work. I must confess that, although I have spent most of the last 6 months working on and studying this type of legislation, and I think I know the pending bill almost by heart, I certainly should never have recognized it from the description which I heard of it over the radio from this union leader. I got the impression that he thought it was a bill which repealed all laws requiring duties of employers and imposed a great many harsh duties on the men and women who work. Apparently, judging from the line that leaders of unions are taking both on the radio and in their full-page advertisements, they have not learned a thing from the election last November, from the nearly three-to-one vote in the House for what is admittedly a pretty tough bill, or from the fact that the pending bill is certain to pass the Senate. They are as arrogant as they were before the committee when, one after another, they refused to admit that there was anything at all wrong which should be corrected, and they refused consistently to make any kind of constructive suggestion to the committee. Perhaps they have been somewhat encouraged by the fact that two or three amendments which a substantial minority of the committee thought should go into the bill have been defeated on the Senate floor. But, for their information, I think the opposition and lobbying of certain employer groups probably had as much to do with the defeat of those amendments as did the opposition of the union leaders. I have been reliably informed, for instance, that Big Steel, certain lumber groups, and the glass industry were all represented in Washington by persons lobbying in opposition to the amendment to give autonomy to local unions, which was defeated last Wednesday by one vote. If the union leaders have regained their arrogance as a result of those votes of the Senate, I think they have somewhat misread the signs.

Mr. President, I have had printed and had intended to offer another amendment dealing with the problem of industry-wide bargaining and industry-wide strikes. After the defeat of the first one I did not offer it, but I ask unanimous

consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment prepared by Mr. BALL for himself and Mr. BYRD was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 54, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

"SEC. 304. The provisions of this act shall not be construed to prohibit any one or more labor organizations from acting jointly in bargaining collectively with the representatives of two or more employers whose respective employees they represent; but, unless the principal places of employment of such employees are within the same metropolitan district or county, the provisions (except section 7) of the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, as amended, shall, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 6 and 20 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended, and the provisions of 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, be applicable, in any proceeding instituted by the United States, with respect to any agreement entered into pursuant to such bargaining and to any concerted action by employers or labor organizations bringing about a simultaneous stoppage of work among the employees of two or more employers, other than employees whose principal places of employment are within the same metropolitan district or county."

Mr. BALL. Very briefly, Mr. President, the amendment simply provides that whenever unions and employers beyond the limits of the metropolitan district or county decide to bargain in groups, regional or industry-wide, thereupon the immunities and special privileges conferred upon labor organizations and collective bargaining negotiations by sections 6 and 20 of the Clayton Act and the Norris-La Guardia Act shall no longer apply either to the agreement reached or to any concerted action by either the unions or the employers to stop production.

I myself am convinced, from my discussions with various employers although admittedly we did not have any evidence of it in the committee, but that some of the industry-wide bargaining is clearly monopolistic. For instance, I have good reason to believe that one reason the captive coal mines, which are controlled largely by Big Steel, are insisting on splitting in the Southern group of operators to bargain by themselves with representatives of their own employees, is that those big concerns rather like the idea of dominating the negotiations and, in effect, determining the terms and conditions under which their competitors operate. I am not so sure that there is not a great deal of that going on in so-called regional and industry-wide bargaining. However, it became obvious from the rejection of the mild little amendment which we offered, which gave the employees of a single employer, or employees organized into a local union, the right to determine for themselves what terms they were willing to accept or reject in a proposed contract with employer, that the Senate was not yet prepared to deal with the real cause of industry-wide bargaining and strike situations in the way which I have proposed. Therefore I decided not to take up the time of the Senate by offering the amendment.

I should like to make this observation: The people and the Government of the United States have grown great and powerful. We have achieved a standard of living and a volume of production unequalled anywhere in the world, because in the United States generally opportunity has been open on equal terms to all, whether they worked for wages, whether they had a little capital and wanted to start a business, whether they were professional men, or were engaged in any other line of endeavor. It is because we have kept that door of opportunity open to individual initiative and individual ideas that we have grown great, that our production has been so tremendous, and that our standard of living is still almost unbelievable to many millions of people in other parts of the world.

Mr. President, today, by means of the strangle hold which, through the devices of industry-wide bargaining, regional bargaining, the secondary boycott, and the closed shop, union leaders have obtained on both workers and small employers and new enterprises starting out, the doors of free opportunity are fast closing in the United States.

There are many communities, one in the Pacific Northwest, where any person who wishes to start a business, to ascertain whether he "has what it takes" to succeed, does not dare begin it unless he first gets the permission of the labor-union overlord in the particular district. I think most Senators know the particular union about which I am talking.

In one city after another, merchants are not free to do business in the way that they decide is best.

Farmers are not free to sell their produce where they wish to sell it; they must do what the business agent of the teamsters' union tells them they can do, "or else."

Mr. President, I think that before many years have passed Congress will move in the general direction in which my thinking has been going, namely, to break up and diffuse and restore to the people directly concerned this monopolistic power, in order to solve this problem and situation, and once again to have equal freedom of opportunity in these United States. Clearly we are not ready to do that at this time.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] said that he did not think this bill contained any provision for dealing effectively with industry-wide strikes. True, it does not go to the cause of such strikes. The provision in title II which authorizes the Attorney General to enjoin and stop such strikes for a period of 80 days, while there is mediation and fact finding, and finally, if those do not result in the settlement of the dispute, providing for a secret ballot by all the employees affected as to whether they wish to accept the best offer made by the employers or go on strike, is admittedly not an absolute cure; and, as I say, it deals with the effect—the industry-wide strike—and not with the cause, which is the concentration in labor unions of control over employees in great industries and in their associations with employers. The proper solution would be to place those relationships back on a realistic basis, in which the employees would really have a voice in determining the conditions under which they would work.

However, I think the bill will be an effective deterrent to industry-wide strikes, will at least provide a period during which mediation will have a chance to work, and will give the men themselves a chance to think over the situation. Above all, the bill will give them, finally, a chance to vote in regard to what an impartial board of inquiry will determine are the best terms offered by the employer; and in voting on that question, the employees will have an opportunity to vote whether they wish to accept those terms or to strike.

I think that some day we shall have to deal directly with the matter of the concentration of power, which is really the root and cause of the problem. But obviously we are not ready to do so yet.

Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico has referred rather insidiously to statements made by some of the leaders on this side of the aisle that in their opinion if the President vetoes this bill and if Congress does not override the veto, that will end the possibility of the enactment of labor legislation at this session of Congress. It seems to me that is simply a plain statement of fact. In view of the amount of legislation that has been piling up on us, I do not see how we could possibly devote another 3 weeks to the consideration of labor legislation, and finally pass another labor bill. If the Senator was referring to the possibility of having the Congress do once again what was done during the war, namely, to pass a hurriedly drafted measure granting to the Executive vast, undefined powers to deal with a crisis, instead of trying to get rid of the causes of the crisis, I say, as one Senator, that I will oppose such legislation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Minnesota is known to his colleagues as a man of very studious temperament; and I know from what he has said on the floor that he has given a great deal of consideration to all phases of the proposed legislation. So I desire to ask him about some of the differences between the bill as it is now written and the measure which was passed by the House of Representatives. I propound this question because it is perfectly obvious that the bill which will finally go to the President for signature will be a bill which will come to us from the committee of conference.

The Senate committee has declined, so far, to report the House bill. Therefore, I feel that the members of the Senate committee have the feeling, which has been generally expressed, that the bill passed by the House of Representatives is considerably more drastic than the bill now before the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. BALL. That is correct. I have not studied the House bill in detail. I may say to the Senator from Wyoming that it is not still in the committee; it is

on the calendar. I believe that after the Senate disposes of the bill now pending, the intention is to have the Senate take up the bill passed by the House, and to substitute for the text of that bill the bill now before the Senate, and send to conference the House bill thus amended.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes; that is a regular parliamentary procedure.

Mr. BALL. But I say to the Senator from Wyoming that the House bill lists certain major activities which in that bill are defined as unlawful and are made subject to severe restrictions and penalties. The Senate bill does not contain such a list. The principal difference between the two is that the House bill contains what it calls a bill of rights for union members, and in it an attempt is made to regulate in some detail the internal affairs of unions, requiring reports, giving each member a right to have a secret ballot in regard to certain issues, if that is desired, and so forth.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that I have only hurriedly examined the House bill, for my attendance upon other committees has prevented me from giving detailed attention to it; but I was impressed by the fact that the bill which was passed by the House of Representatives would create a new, independent office, namely, the Office of Administrator, as I understand the bill.

Mr. BALL. That is correct. The House bill has separated completely the judicial and the prosecuting functions of the National Labor Relations Board, whereas the Senate bill contents itself with trying to cure two of the worst defects which have grown out of having those two functions handled jointly. I refer to the central review section of attorneys, which tends to centralize the making of decisions, and the lawyers—rather than the Board members—write them; and second, the practice of permitting the trial examiner to argue, ex parte, before the Board, in defense of his findings, after the open hearing.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. By the creation of that special new official, the Administrator, who would not be a part of the National Labor Relations Board or a part of the Department of Labor, but would be completely independent, and by clothing the Administrator with what amounts to the power of prosecution, it has seemed to me that if that provision finally were incorporated into the bill, it would create the danger of setting up special machinery which could be used by such an official, if he were so minded, utterly to destroy the entire labor-union movement.

The Senator from Minnesota has been very patient with me in yielding; but what I have said thus far is preliminary to the question. In view of the fact that there must be a conference, and that the conference committee will have to adjudicate between the drastic House bill and the bill which the Senator believes is a more-or-less moderate one, does not the Senator believe that there is, therefore, a great danger that the conferees on the part of the Senate may be compelled to yield upon matters which the Senate committee refused to write into the bill?

Mr. BALL. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] will head the Senate conferees, and I expect to be one of them, and I think the Senator can depend on the Senate conferees fighting pretty vigorously to come out with a bill about as near the Senate version as possible. I have hope that we can talk the House conferees into our viewpoint on a great many of the issues. In fact, I am quite confident we can. I know there are many provisions in the bill as it passed the House which I think wolud be very wrong and bad, and do more harm than good. I rather expect the bill which comes out of Congress to be very much closer to the Senate version than to the House version, although obviously we will have to make some concessions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is one of the reasons why so many Senators, at least on this side, have the apprehension that with so many provisions in the Senate bill which have been subjected to criticism, we are likely to end with a bill which will be used as an instrument against the entire labor-union movement, instead of a measure designed to reform abuses and defects which should be abolished or corrected.

Mr. BALL. It is always possible that the House will be very insistent on the provisions of its bill. However, I recall that last year, when the Senate rewrote completely the so-called Case bill, the House did not even send it to conference, but took the Senate version, and I am hopeful they will feel somewhat the same this year.

Mr. President, I think the most serious criticism that could be made of the pending bill—at least the most serious in my judgment—is that it tries to do far too much of the job which needs to be done by the administrative-law approach. In other words, the bulk of the bill is in the form of amendments to the National Labor Relations Act. Under that act, of necessity, it is necessary to delegate a great deal of discretion and power to an appointive board, which in this case has administrative, quasi-judicial, and, to a degree, prosecuting functions.

As I have said on this floor, the rights guaranteed to employees in the National Labor Relations Act could be made a complete dead letter overnight by a National Labor Relations Board that was so inclined because no employers, employees, or unions can possibly get into court to protect their rights without first getting the National Labor Relations Board to enter a complaint in the case, and get a decision from the Board.

Mr. President, I think that is the wrong way to legislate in a free society. It seems to me one of the fundamental differences between a free democratic government and a totalitarian government is that in the latter all power is delegated to administrative tribunals—what they say is the law—and the courts have little authority to pass on the questions submitted or define the rights of citizens, whereas under a free democratic system the rights, duties, and responsibilities of the people individually are written into the law, and any individual can go into court to see that his rights are protected. I think we have gotten away from that principle, in expanding rather than contracting the field of administrative law, in our approach to the problem in the pending bill.

For that very reason, Mr. President, although I think we have in the pending bill covered the major problems, outside of industry-wide bargaining, in my opinion, three-fourths of its effectiveness will depend entirely on the way in which it is administered. The National Labor Relations Act in the beginning was administered by a Board whose bias was so terrific that they made a mockery of the guaranties which the sponsors of the act had intended. So at least half—and I believe 75 percent—of the effectiveness of the proposed law will depend on the spirit and effectiveness with which it is limited to the new seven-member National Labor Relations Board which is to be set up. If they want to make it a bad law, if they want to pervert the clear intent of some of the new language we have written in, I know of no way to prevent that. We have provided for a little better court review of findings of fact, but it is not much better than the present rule.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. In line with the thought of the Senator from Minnesota, which is so well expressed, I should like to raise the question whether our real purpose in what we are doing is not to pave the way for the day when no labor law and no labor board will be necessary, and all the difficulties will be settled by the voluntary approach, by which, by the way, more than 90 percent of them are handled at present.

Mr. BALL. In the hope that we can eventually get rid entirely of this administrative-law approach, I am entirely in accord with the Senator from New York. I doubt if we can do it without legislation entirely, but I hope that some day we will know enough about the issues involved so that we can write directly into the law the rights, responsibilities, and duties of the various parties and individuals, and let them go directly into court, instead of routing them through another bureau.

Mr. IVES. I merely wish to point out again what I think should be our objective in all we are doing, that is, to pave the way in the legislation we are supporting and which we seek to have enacted, so that ultimately, and as soon as possible, the day will arrive when no such statute will be required, when men will understand one another sufficiently so that there will be no requirement for laws of this nature. I believe that day can come. Unfortunately, it has not yet arrived.

Mr. BALL. I hope the Senator is right, but I think that day is somewhat distant.

As I said, I believe the pending bill does deal with all the most urgent issues, outside of industry-wide bargaining, on a substantially sound and fair basis. Contrary to the charges made against it, it is not an employer's bill. As a matter of fact, very few of the provisions give any additional rights to employers. The

great bulk of them are designed either to protect the public, which in recent years has become the major victim of industrial strife, or to protect the rights and freedoms of individual employees.

I realize that some of them, when they do protect the rights and freedoms of the employees, inevitably will decrease somewhat the powers which union leaders have usurped for themselves. I say "usurped"; the Supreme Court has ratified them, I think; but I still think they are illegitimate powers, at least. But if it is necessary to give to individual employees the freedom and rights to which they are entitled under section 7 of the bill, I think it is about time we did that. I think we must make a decision in this country as to whether we want a labor movement in which an oligarchy of leaders dictate the terms and conditions for the millions of employees and members of their unions, with the individuals having their little voice, or whether we want a labor movement which reflects the wishes and the needs of free American workers who voluntarily choose the union they want to represent them.

Practically all of title II of the bill, which sets up a new Mediation Service, with improved procedures, and provides for the 80-day period in industrial disputes, when the Attorney General thinks the national health and safety are threatened, and can convince the court of that fact, is primarily to protect the public, which is always the secondary sufferer in strikes, no matter how small they may be, and in the industry-wide strikes often becomes the major victim.

The provision in the National Labor Relations Act defining collective bargaining, and providing that where a contract between a union and an employer is in existence, fulfilling the obligation on both sides to protect collectively means giving at least 60 days' notice of the termination of the contract, or of the desire for any change in it, is another provision aimed primarily at protecting the public, as well as the employee, who have been the victims of "quickie" strikes. I do not think that is taking away any rights of labor or of unions either one; it is simply saying that they should all follow the sound, fair, and sane procedure which a majority of the good ones now follow.

So far as employers are concerned, I think it should be emphasized that the pending bill makes absolutely no change in the unfair practices which may be charged against employers under the National Labor Relations Act. All five of them, now in the law, are contained in the pending bill in exactly the same language, with one addition: it is made an unfair labor practice for an employer to violate the terms of an agreement with the union representing his employees.

A few additional rights are given to employers. I think that is done on the basis that if a free economy and a free enterprise system are to be maintained, employers as well as employees must be entitled to the same rights and to equal justice under the law. One such right is the right to petition the National Labor Relations Board for an election to determine the bargaining representative of an employer's workers, whenever one or more unions present to the employer a demand for recognition as representing the employees. When an employer becomes the innocent victim of a jurisdictional strike, when two unions become involved in a dispute over who shall control his employees, he is not only given a chance to have an election to determine that issue, but, when he is presented by a union with a demand for recognition, I think the employer is also entitled to know, through the secret ballot provided by the bill, whether the union really represents and is the choice of the majority of his employees.

Second, there is a provision covering the issue respecting foremen. All Senators know that both the National Labor Relations Board and the United States Supreme Court—by split decisions, I might add—have held that foremen are employees within the meaning of the present act, and that therefore if the foremen join a union, the employer is compelled to bargain with the union, even though it be the union of the rank-and-file employees whom the foreman is supposed to supervise. The committee took the position that foremen are an essential and integral part of management, and that to compel management to bargain with itself, so to speak, by dividing the loyalties of foremen between the union and the employer, simply did not make sense, and inevitably would prove harmful to the free-enterprise system. It might be stated that both the House and Senate bills deal with that subject in substantially the same way.

A third right given to employers is the right to file an unfair practice charge against unions that refuse to bargain collectively in good faith. That would not mean very much to General Motors or Big Steel or any of the great corporations; they do not have much trouble getting the unions to bargain with them; but it is going to mean a good deal to the smaller employers who, time and again, in recent years have had a contract laid on their desk with an ultimatum from the business agent, "Take it, 'as is,' or else." How much good the filing of an unfair practice charge is going to do to such employers is problematical, but at least it gives them some psychological leverage to induce the union agent to sit down and talk over the special problems of the small employers.

Fourth, we give to employers the right to sue a union in interstate commerce, in a Federal court, for violation of contract. It does not go beyond that. As a matter of law, I think they have that right, now, but because unions are voluntary associations, the common law in a great many States requires service on every member of the union, which is very difficult; and, if a judgment is rendered, it holds every member liable for the judgment.

The pending measure, by providing that the union may sue and be sued as a legal entity, for a violation of contract, and that liability for damages will lie against union assets only, will prevent a repetition of the Danbury Hatters case, in which many members lost their homes because of a judgment rendered against the union which also ran against individual members of the union.

Finally it is supposed that in the pending measure employers who are the victims of secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes are given the right by petition to file charges with the National Labor Relations Board, to seek relief, if they can get the Board to go into court to enjoin the practices. "Secondary boycotts" and "jurisdictional strikes" have been defined by me on the floor of the Senate, and I think the definitions are substantially correct. It is the attempt by the employees of employers A, B, and C, through their union, to dictate, not to employer X, but to his employees, the terms and conditions of the union under which they shall work. Basically, the primary objective of the majority of jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts is not the employer but the employees, over whom control is sought. I think the secondary boycott provisions of the pending bill even more fully protect the right of employees to choose freely the union they want, rather than having a union foisted upon them by the economic force of a secondary boycott. The provisions protect the employees more than they do the employers, although obviously employers often are the innocent victims, the secondary victims, so to speak, of such practices. There is also given the right to file charges and to sue for damages.

The majority of the provisions of the measure—and I am going over them very briefly—further protect the rights and freedoms of employees. In that respect, I think the two that are most important are the provisions relating to the secondary boycott, to which reference has just been made, and the provisions of the so-called union-security clauses—the closed shop, the union shop, preferential hiring, and maintenance of membership. The closed shop as now practiced gives to the union complete control over the individual's right to work, his opportunity to earn a living in his chosen occupation. There are no limits on it.

I cited on the floor of the Senate the case of two veterans who were expelled from a union in Missouri because they refused to buy raffle tickets, whom the union caused to be discharged from the job, under a clause that goes into a majority of contracts today.

The bill outlaws completely the closed shop under which an employee must become a member of the union before he can be employed. It permits the union shop under which the employee must join the union within 30 days after going to work. It permits maintenance of membership only when it is voted by a majority of all the employees affected, and even when it is negotiated on that basis the employer cannot fire a man if he is denied membership in the union or expelled from the union for any reason other than nonpayment of regular dues and initiation fees. Mr. President, I think that that is the real Magna Carta for the American working men and women.

I object to the whole basis of compulsory membership but I think the bill is largely going to eliminate compulsory membership unless the union leadership is so good that a majority of all the employees want it and will get out and vote for it in a secret election. Obviously the union leaders—and I heard one of them the other night make his major argument against this provision—are quite sure that a majority of the employees are not going to want it, and I agree with them. So this provision, in my opinion, is far more the Magna Carta of American working men and women than is the present so-called Wagner Act. This measure will really make the labor movement of America a voluntary movement, voluntarily supported by the working men and women who belong to it.

The amendment the Senate adopted on the floor gives employees protection against coercion and restraint by unions or business agents, in exercising their rights freely to choose their representatives under section 7 of the measure. They are protected now against coercion by the employer, but as all of us know from our mail, many more of them are worried today about coercion from the unions than they are about coercion from the employers.

With respect to the amendment adopted by the Senate dealing with welfare funds which under any kind of construction are contributed by the employer out of earnings of his employees, all that amendment does is to see to it that the benefits to which employees are entitled shall be spelled out in the agreement setting up the fund which they pay for with their labor, and that it shall be in the nature of a trust fund so that the employees cannot be arbitrarily deprived of the benefits.

The amendment, as Senators know, grew out of the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] last year to the Case bill at a time when John Lewis of the United Mine Workers was demanding a royalty of 10 cents a ton, as I recall the figure, on all coal mined, to be paid over to the union to establish a welfare fund, without any strings whatever being attached to it. Having listened to the explanation by Mr. Lewis himself of the way his union functions, I can imagine how many rights in such a fund an employee who had the temerity to oppose anything the leadership of the mine workers wanted would ever have. So all that provision really does is to protect the rights of employees to benefits out of these funds which are created by their own labor.

In the revision of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act which sets forth the procedure in holding elections to elect bargaining agents, we have again, I believe, made a number of provisions to assure the employees of really full freedom of choice by providing, for instance, that members of genuine crafts or genuine bona fide professional workers, shall have a separate vote, if they want it, to determine if they want to go into a plant-wide union or whether they want a separate unit of their own. It requires that independent unions and unions affiliated with national or international organizations must be treated the same way by the NLRB, which now is so biased in favor of the two great federations that it has one rule for unions belonging to those federations and a completely different and much harsher rule for dealing with independent unions.

Another provision requires that when the NLRB holds a run-off election, the election must be between the top choices in the first election. That is necessary again to correct an arbitrary decision by the Board which actually deprived large minorities of employees of their freedom of choice.

Finally, we provide that not only may employees file a petition for election to determine a representative, but they may also file an election for the decertification of a representative.

Mr. President, I have not paid much attention to the substitute offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and his colleagues. As I have glanced through it, it seems to be made up of all the completely innocuous provisions of the pending bill, and nothing else. It would not cure any of the really serious problems we are facing today in this field. In my opinion, to pass such a measure would be to perpetrate a fraud on the American people, who would think that Congress had done something to meet these problems, when in reality it had not.

I repeat, Mr. President, that it is perfectly understandable that union leaders who have heretofore, I say, usurped powers which were granted to the employees themselves, who heretofore have used the closed shop and the secondary boycott and provisions they have wangled into their international constitutions and bylaws to secure a stranglehold on whole communities and whole industries, and all the men and women who work in them—it is natural that they should oppose the pending bill, which merely seeks to restore to individual employees and to the small employers who have been the major victims of that concentration of power and its ruthless use by some union leaders, a reasonable equality of rights and freedoms and responsibilities under the law.

Mr. President, I hope that if the bill encounters a veto we will be able to override it both in the House and in the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the hour is getting late and I will not detain the Senate very long. I had hoped to be able to speak at some length on the bill, as I consider it to be one of the most important bills to have come before the Congress in many years, but pressure of other work has made it absolutely impossible for me to prepare the material which would adequately express my opinion on this legislation.

In my opinion the bill as it came from the Senate committee was a fair bill, a just bill, and as good a bill as it was possible to bring out of any committee. It was in truth a committee bill, because little help was received in writing it from anyone outside the committee. Labor took simply a negative attitude and said that it wanted no legislation whatsoever. So no help was received from labor in writing the bill. The leaders of industry, who gave the committee members all kinds of advice, were for the most part vindictive, and it was clear to me, at least, from their attitude that their principal desire was to destroy labor organizations completely. So I say that the bill as it came from the committee was a just bill. It is neither satisfactory to the leaders of labor, who want no legislation whatsoever, nor to the leaders of industry, who want no labor unions or collective bargaining whatsoever.

In my opinion the amendments which have been made to the bill since it has come to the floor of the Senate do not warrant a vote against it. I think it would have been a better bill if they had been left out. However, the first amendment, which was offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], was so changed as not to do any particular damage to labor. The second amendment was defeated. The third amendment, relating to welfare funds, will undoubtedly put a greater burden upon employers than upon unions. So unless it is further amended to make it unfair in some way, I expect to vote for the bill.

It is a wonder that Members of the Senate can hold their tempers and vote on the bill according to their best judgment, because we have been subjected to the most intensive, expensive, and vicious propaganda campaign that any Congress has ever been subjected to.

I do not refer to the propaganda campaign of the labor unions, although I hold no brief for that. I refer to a propaganda campaign which has cost well into the millions of dollars. I should not be surprised if the total amount spent in this campaign would amount to at least $100,000,000. I told the Senate last spring that the single March advertising campaign in the newspapers against labor by the National Association of Manufacturers cost $2,000,000, and that statement has not been contradicted as yet, although it was made a year ago.

This propaganda campaign has been conducted through letters to the press; it has been conducted through radio commentators whose services have been for hire by various organizations. It has been conducted through speakers sent everywhere in the United States where they could get an opportunity to expound the antilabor doctrine. One town in my State engaged a speaker to speak to the combined service clubs of that town, and he was so utterly antilabor in his remarks that I was asked to find out something about the organization which he claimed to represent. I enlisted the aid of the Library of Congress. The Library could not find that any such organization as he claimed to represent even existed.

The campaign had been conducted through newspaper advertising. Even today both labor and industry are carrying large advertisements in the daily newspapers. It has been conducted through circulars, and it has been conducted by Nation-wide organizations which ought to know better than to employ the methods which they have used.

I have before me circulars from one of the biggest organizations representing

commerce, the United States Chamber of Commerce. This is a sample: In a special issue of Governmental Affairs published under date of April 16 there was an obvious effort to get members of the various chambers of commerce throughout the United States to favor a destructive labor law. The circular tells them what to do. Let me read the language of the circular, under the heading "What to do":

The enactment of a program for industrial peace depends upon two things. First, there must be a widespread public understanding of the legislative proposals, subject by subject. Second, an informed public must be quick to express its convictions to its Senators and Representatives.

Use this special number as a basis for radio programs, public forums, membership meetings, and committee study. Give it generous circulation with the urgent request that those who receive it make their views known now.

The issue of April 18 appears to carry a comparison of the two bills, the House labor bill and the Senate labor bill. While it carries all the provisions of the House bill, it fails to mention many of the provisions of the Senate bill. The chamber did not place the truth before its members.

I ask unanimous consent to have the comparison of the two bills, as distributed over the country by the United States Chamber of Commerce, printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the comparison was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR BILLS

Here is a comparison of the House and Senate labor bills:

1. Both ban the closed shop, but permit the union shop if it is approved by a majority of the employees. New employees would be required to join the union within 30 days. The House bill, however, forbids unions to strike for the union shop.

2. The House bill bans industry-wide bargaining except for plants employing fewer than 100 persons and located within a 50-mile radius. It also forbids competing employers to get together on a wage scale to offer unions. The Senate bill does not mention industry-wide bargaining.

3. The House bill prevents the NLRB from recognizing unions having officers who are now, or ever were, members of the Communist Party. The Senate bill as yet does not touch on the Communist issue.

4. The House bill would deprive unions of their Wagner Act privileges for 1 year if they engaged in jurisdictional strikes or secondary boycotts. Some organizational strikes are made "unfair labor practices" and the NLRB is permitted to seek injunctions against them. The House bill also forbids Federal employees to strike against the Government.

5. Both bills would permit the Government to obtain injunctions to enforce a cooling-off period before strikes could be called in transportation, public utility or communications industries. The House bill calls for a 75-day cooling-off period and the Senate for an 80-day.

6. Both bills would remove the Federal Conciliation Service from the jurisdiction of the Labor Department and set it up as an independent agency. The House bill would replace the NLRB with a three-member Labor-Management Relations Board. The Senate measure would increase the NLRB to seven members.

7. Both bills would prevent unions from refusing to bargain or from trying to coerce an employer into accepting a particular union as bargaining agent for the employees.

Mr. AIKEN. The inference is given that the Senate bill does nothing whatsoever about jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts.

This propaganda campaign has been carried on through corporations which have circularized their stockholders, asking them to write to Members of Congress favoring the House bill and opposing any mild bill. We have all received many such letters. They have asked for drastic and restrictive labor legislation. The two words most frequently used are "drastic" and "restrictive." This is a sample of the manner in which corporations have circularized their stockholders. This happens to be from the Fruehauf Trailer Co., of Detroit, Mich. It begins:

DEAR STOCKHOLDER: If you've had enough of radical labor leaders, if you feel that their monopolistic powers need to be destroyed or drastically curbed, then now is the time for you to write your United States Senators and urge them to pass a labor bill at least as strong as the one just passed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. Fruehauf says further:

You know I have opposed the Wagner Act from the start because it has given too much power to one segment of society. Under its protection, radical labor leaders have demanded raise after raise, privilege after privilege, from employers, threatening, "Come across, or else."

We have a better name for collective bargaining. We call it collective "bludgeoning."

I submit those quotations from the letter from the Fruehauf Trailer Co. to its stockholders simply as a sample of the manner in which people have been misinformed or given half truths and urged to write Members of the Senate and of the House.

I have one other exhibit showing the absolutely vicious propaganda campaign which has been conducted by certain segments of our society. I have before me a letter which has been widely distributed by the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc. This letter is signed by Sumner Gerard, treasurer. I do not know who he is, but I do know of the organization known as the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc. That organization has recently been in trouble with the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House. As Senators may recall, its director was cited for contempt by the House committee, but escaped punishment by reason of a technicality.

Let me quote from this letter. Speaking of the labor bills, it says:

Senate Labor Committee members, either because they believe it is good politics, or because they shrink from facing the hard fact that swollen union powers must be curbed, will probably fail to do anything effective against (1) closed shop; (2) industry-wide unionization and Nation-wide strikes; (3) mass picketing and violence; (4) bill of rights protecting workers from internal union abuses; (5) compulsory welfare funds; (6) labor monopolies' special privileges and exemptions under Wagner, Norris-LaGuardia, and Clayton Acts.

So far as I know, this organization never did a single thing to retract the inference that the Senate bill does not carry any provisions in regard to those matters.

Then they go on and say, in regard to the House Committee on Labor:

House: Labor Committee—15 Republicans, 10 Democrats—is a much stronger group, and nearer the people. Its leaders are trying to do a real job. They need your help. They have built into their hearings a shocking record of labor-union abuses, but the record has not been given the publicity it deserves.

Then it goes on to tell what the House labor bill will do for them. On the next page it says this:

Write to your own Senators and Congressmen today. Send carbons to all committee members. Better still, write to every Member of your State's delegation. If you can, relate briefly experiences you have had (or of which you have accurate information) with labor-union abuse, why not address your letter to every Member of Congress? Congress must be made to know what the country is thinking.

What Congress does now will depend on what you and others tell your Representatives. What it leaves undone at this session must be taken up again—on whatever foundation of education is laid now.

Then it says:

Therefore, use the best educational tool at your command. It is the little book, Labor Monopolies—or Freedom, by John W. Scoville. The complimentary copy sent you with this letter is a gift from individuals responsible for a Nation-wide crusade for real labor-law reform.

Please read your copy tonight and put it into circulation tomorrow. Buy 5, 10, 50 copies or more, yourself, and put them to work. Have your firm buy 100, 200, 500, or more.

Incidentally, the price is given as $1 for one, and it goes down to 50 cents, I think, for 100 or more.

The letter continues as follows:

Two hundred and fifty thousand have been distributed, and wherever they go they create demand for action by Congress.

This is both an immediate and a long-term fight to restore and save our freedom. Books have swayed the thinking of nations. Help us project Scoville's penetrating analysis of the menace of labor monopolies to 1,000,000 thought leaders who must guide our Nation in this critical period.

Here are the people to whom they want to send a million copies:

Ten thousand editors and publishers of rural weeklies.

Sixty thousand farm leaders.

One hundred thousand business leaders, large and small.

One hundred and sixty thousand lawyers.

One hundred and thirty thousand clergymen.

One hundred and ten thousand physicians.

Sixty thousand dentists.

Twenty thousand heads of women's clubs.

Forty thousand directors of chambers of commerce service clubs.

Forty thousand college presidents, school superintendents, and educators.

One hundred and forty thousand important stockholders.

One hundred and thirty thousand miscellaneous, making 1,000,000 in all.

We might think that this is the work of a crackpot organization until we read in their report—I think it was in yesterday's newspapers—that they have spent $150,000 to $160,000 already this year to influence this Congress, and are soliciting $750,000 more in order to put the heat on Congress to break labor unions. That is only one organization that is doing this kind of work.

As I have said, the House Committee on Un-American Activities had before it this organization either last fall or the early part of the winter. They could find out little about the manner in which the organization was financed or the manner in which it spends its funds. But it is a well-financed organization.

I am not going to bring in the names of those who I understand are backing it, because I think some of them are real Americans who do not know what they are doing.

I have here the little book to which they refer as the best tool to use against labor unions. It is entitled "Labor Monopolies—or Freedom," by John W. Scoville. I found this book on my desk this morning. As I understand, it has been sent to all Members of Congress. Two hundred and fifty thousand copies of the 167-page book have been distributed by this organization, and they are contemplating distributing one million more to the professional people of this country.

The book reveals the real purpose of the people who are asking this Congress today to pass a law which would have the effect of destroying labor organizations in this country, and I am equally sure—there is not a shadow of a doubt in my mind—that these same people, and others like them in other organizations, are equally determined to destroy the farm organizations of this country as quickly as they can get Congress to destroy labor organizations.

I have not read the entire book, but I have read the last few pages of it to see what their conclusions are, and I wish to quote from it. I read from page 152:

> What should we do?
> What can we do?

Here is the real purpose, as set forth in the book:

> What we should do is to repeal all Federal labor laws on wages, hours of labor, collective bargaining, minimum wages, etc., and abolish all boards, bureaus, and commissions that result from these laws.

I turn to page 153 and read as follows:

> There should be no laws which would recognize strikes as legitimate and lawful, such as legal cooling-off periods, posting of intention to strike, etc.

Reading further from page 153:

> A strike should be considered as an offense against society, rather than an offense against the employer.
>
> It is true that the strikers suffer losses, but they strike because they expect their ultimate gains will exceed their losses. The employer has no expectation of gain.

They plan to distribute 1,000,000 copies of this book. Many Members of the Senate probably know some of the people connected with the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc. We have seen them around here for years, spreading their poison propaganda.

Let me turn to page 154 of their "bible" and read further:

> We are told that workmen have a right to withhold their labor until they can get the price at which they are willing to sell it. But does this right exist for a combination of workmen?

I turn to page 57 and quote further from the book distributed by the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.:

> Collective bargaining and the formation of monopolies should be unlawful, whether the purpose be to raise the price of wheat, of steel, or of labor. An employer who signs a collective bargaining agreement or a closed-shop agreement should be considered equally guilty with the officers of the labor union who sign the agreement. The fact that the agreement is desired by the employer as well as by the employees should have no weight, for the offense is against society.

Reading from farther down on the same page:

> It would probably be desirable to make it illegal for an employer to grant a wage increase to any employee who had been on strike during a preceding period, say 6 months.

Finally, I turn to pages 158 and 159, and read further:

> For some years, perhaps for many years, we will struggle to eliminate the abuses of collective bargaining. Some day it may dawn on the majority of our citizens that the abuse to be eliminated is collective bargaining itself—that competition is superior to monopoly—and that economic freedom is better than compulsion.

It is evident from this statement that the present labor bill is just the beginning of the campaign to destroy labor itself.

I now turn to the last page, 164, and read this:

> To think is difficult. Most people have neither the capacity nor the inclination to think deeply on any subject.

Evidently they do not have a very high opinion of the intelligence of the average American.

Mr. President, this is an alien doctrine, which is being distributed, unhampered, by an organization supposedly financed by respectable publishers, businessmen, and commodity exchange people in the United States. The material it is distributing is a sample of the material that millions of dollars are being spent to distribute all over our land, to poison the minds of our people against the working classes of America. I do not see why the Columbians were prosecuted in Georgia, if this group goes free—as it has thus far, even after having shown contempt for the House Committee on Un-American Activities, by refusing to answer their questions and tell about their affairs, where they get their money, and how they spend it. But that is a fact.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this situation involves something more than labor legislation, and that it is time for the FBI or the Attorney General, or any other governmental agencies which are concerned with inquiring about organizations in the United States which preach Nazi or Fascist doctrines to look into this matter. I am sorry to have to take the time of the Senate this evening to mention it; and I am sorry to have to mention it at all, because I know some of the people who are engaged in that work. I think some of them who are helping to finance it and carry it on do not know what they are doing. But if such activities are carried far enough, the final result will be the destruction of democracy in the United States and the prohibition of the right to organize on the part of any group. Under such a program, there is no doubt that workingmen will come first, and farmers will come next.

Mr. President, in relation to the bill now before us, let me say there is no question that it will pass, and will go to the House of Representatives, and a committee of conference will take it up. If the conference committee is willing to accept the bill about as it now stands, it can become law. If the conference committee undertakes to do to the bill what certain organizations, including the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., wish to have done to it, such a bill should not become law, and the President would be fully justified in vetoing it; in fact, it would be his duty to veto any bill which forbids any group in America to work together to promote the mutual welfare of their members, so long as they do not threaten our form of government itself.

Mr. President, I do not believe it does any good to threaten the President that if he vetoes any bill which the Congress sends him for his signature, the Congress will get even with him by refusing to enact any legislation whatever on the subject, no matter what happens to the country as a result.

I wish to say that although this bill is not as I would have it—it was at its best when it came from the committee, and it should have been passed just as it came from the committee—nevertheless, it has not been amended sufficiently to warrant a vote against it on my part.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the McClellan amendment, on page 25, was adopted. That amendment deals with the question of Communist officers of labor organizations. I ask that the motion be entered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JENNER in the chair). The motion will be entered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to know whether those who are interested in that amendment are aware of the motion of the Senator from Ohio to reconsider the vote by which it was adopted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have simply filed the motion. I do not ask for action on it at this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JENNER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which nominating messages

were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Public Lands:

William E. Warne, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior, vice Warner W. Gardner.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Owen McIntosh Burns, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania, vice Charles F. Uhl, term expired;

Otto F. Heine, of Hawaii, to be United States marshal for the district of Hawaii; and

Luis Negron Fernandez, of Puerto Rico, to be attorney general of Puerto Rico, vice Enrique Campos del Toro, resigned.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. If there is nothing further to come before the Senate at this time, Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 13, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 12 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Christian M. Ravndal, of Iowa, for promotion in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, from Foreign Service officer of class 1 to Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Frank B. Potter, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Texas, vice Clyde O. Eastus, term expired.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate May 12 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

POSTMASTER

William P. Heath to be postmaster at Esmont, in the State of Virginia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 12, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Father Thomas C. Donlan, Order of Preachers, director of the Nazareth Conference, Fenwick High School, Oak Park, Ill., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

O Almighty and Merciful God, we beseech Thee to enlighten the minds of our lawgivers that they may know the ways of truth in directing the citizens of our Republic. Enkindle in their hearts an ardent desire for justice that they may deal with each according to his rights and obligations in promoting the peaceful conduct of the affairs of our beloved Nation.

We pray Thee also to strengthen in the minds and hearts of our legislators the virtue of prudence, without which the works of charity, justice, and peace cannot flourish in our land. Enkindle in their memories the grateful recollection of Thy past benefactions, and inspire them to repent sincerely and to make amends for any past offenses. Instill in their minds a clear understanding of present affairs and in their hearts the humility necessary to share in the wisdom of others. Arm them with vigilance in crises and with clear reasoning in every situation. Make them provident in carrying out Thy holy will, circumspect in judging all things, and cautious and courageous in facing dangers.

Grant us all, most merciful Father, the wisdom to respect and obey the laws that they frame. Guard and protect us, that in unity of purpose we may lovingly and prudently pursue the paths of justice to that tranquillity of order which is the peace Thou hast promised to men of good will.

Grant us these favors, O loving Father, through the merits and intercession of Jesus Christ, Thy only Son our Lord, who with Thee and the Holy Spirit reignest now and forever throughout eternity. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 9, 1947, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 338) entitled "An act to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. WILEY, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. GEORGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947, SENT TO CONFERENCE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2700) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KEEFE, H. CARL ANDERSEN, SCHWABE of Oklahoma, CHURCH, ROONEY, HENDRICKS, and FOGARTY.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a certain statement made by Carl H. Wilken before the Committee on Agriculture on May 8.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address made by him on the Greece-Turkish loan.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain editorials.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times entitled "Air Power at Stake."

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include an article from the New York Times.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include four resolutions by the Izaak Walton twenty-fifth annual conference.

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two petitions.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a column.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

A PLAN FOR A PERMANENT FARM PROGRAM

Mr. HOEVEN. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very comprehensive statement made by Carl H. Wilken, of Sioux City, Iowa, economic analyst of the Raw Materials National Council, before the House Committee on Agriculture on May 8, 1947.

Mr. Wilken presents a plan for a permanent farm program for agriculture which is worthy of our serious consideration. His statement is doubly important at this time in view of the fact that the 90-percent-parity formula under the Steagall amendment expires December 31, 1948. Mr. Wilken points