PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H. R. 3913. A bill for the relief of Willie Ruth Chapman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3914. A bill for the relief of James Leon Keaton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

653. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted by the Buffalo Council for a Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission, Buffalo, N. Y., urging favorable action on H. R. 2824 and S. 984, providing for a Fair Employment Practice Commission, in this session of Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

654. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of Publishers Printing Co. chapel, New York City, urging that Congress take immediate steps to amend the social-security law by reducing the retirement age from 65 to 60 and increasing monthly payments by 100 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

655. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary and president of the Triumvirate Friends Club, Mexico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing appreciation of the citizens of Cuautla for the honors paid to the Mexican people in the person of their ruler, Lic. Miguel Alemán Valdés; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 20, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

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

Rev. John E. Garvin, of the diocese of Bismarck, N. Dak., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, we adore Thee, and we promise obedience to Thy Holy Law.

We pray Thee, O God of might, of wisdom, and of justice, through whom authority is rightly administered, laws are enacted, and judgments decreed, assist, with Thy Holy Spirit of counsel and fortitude, the Members of the Senate of these United States, that their ministrations may be conducted in righteousness and be eminently useful to Thy people, whom they represent. Let the light of Thy divine wisdom direct their deliberations and shine forth in all the proceedings and laws framed for our rule and government, so that they may tend to the preservation of peace, the promotion of national happiness, the increase of industry, sobriety, and useful knowledge, and may perpetuate to us the blessings of equal liberty.

Grant to them this day the grace to work with gratitude and joy, considering it an honor to employ and develop the talents they have received from God; to work with order, peace, moderation, and patience, ever recoiling before weariness or difficulties; to work, above all, with purity of intention and with detachment from self, having always before their eyes the public good and the welfare of our country. Inspire them with Thy wisdom and strengthen them with Thy power, so that the results of their words and actions may be characterized by justice and prudence and the government of our great country may conform always to Thy holy will.

Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 19, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

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 following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 966. An act to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387);

H. R. 1389. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944; and

H. R. 2298. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR THE PROTECTION OF CHILDHOOD

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the joint resolution providing for the membership of the United States in the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

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

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 23

"Joint resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to the Federal income tax as it affects community-property States

"Whereas there appears to be a movement on the part of non-community-property States to secure the passage of Federal legislation which would deny to residents of California the right to file separate income-tax returns on community income or which would arbitrarily permit in every State the division of all income of one spouse with the other, without regard to the law of that State; and

"Whereas California, Arizona, Idaho, Louisiana, Nevada, New Mexico, Texas, and Washington are community-property States under the laws of which husband and wife are each the owner of one-half of the community property; and

"Whereas by reason of such community ownership husband and wife own all community property and all community income equally, for all purposes, including the responsibility of paying taxes thereon; and

"Whereas Federal income taxes are, and ought to be, levied against the owner of income as determined by law; and

"Whereas such proposed legislation would fictitiously permit persons who are the legal owners of income to avoid payment of Federal income tax thereon; or which in community-property States would force payment of a tax on income which is not legally owned by the husband, completely disregarding the bona fide and historic property laws of California and the several States relating to property and income acquired after marriage; and

"Whereas the community-property law was in effect in the western region of the United States prior to the admission of California into the Union, and the property rights then in effect were guaranteed to the residents of California by the treaty with Mexico under which California became a part of the United States; and

"Whereas such proposed legislation would thus, by indirection, destroy the property rights of citizens of California as guaranteed by said treaty; and

"Whereas these community-property rights are in jeopardy because of pending Federal legislation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to take such steps as may be necessary to defeat such proposed legislation as, in part, are represented by H. R. 1759, by Mr. REEVES; amendment to H. R. 1 (Knutson bill), by Mr. BUTLER; S. 626, by Mr. CORDON; S. 649, by Mr. TYDINGS; S. 550, by Mr. LANGER; H. R. 2219, by Mr. ANGELL; H. R. 2002, by Mr. ROBERTSON.

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California."

A letter in the nature of a petition from L. Graham Lehman, Washington, D. C., praying for the passage, over the President's veto, of the so-called Taft-Hartley labor bill (with

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

an accompanying paper); ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the members of the fourth division of the American Legion, Department of Texas, in convention assembled at Temple, Tex., June 8, 1947, favoring the prompt enactment of Senate bill 866, the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 8

"Whereas the huge reduction in the 1947 agricultural conservation program funds from $301,720,000 to $165,614,290, and the reduction in other agricultural appropriations, recommended by the House Appropriations Committee in Washington, has halted practically all Production and Marketing Administration (AAA) activities in Alabama. Preliminary estimates recently made by PMA show that funds already obligated will equal or exceed the $165,614,290 allowable by the Appropriations Committee recommendation; and

"Whereas much progress has been made in conservation during the past 9 years with the aid of AAA; practically one-half of Alabama farmers are now planting winter cover crops; terracing and other soil-conservation work is being carried on with great benefit to Alabama and the Nation; and

"Whereas there are now about 65,000 farmers in Alabama cooperating with and being directly benefited by this program; and indirect benefits are being derived by all the people of Alabama; and

"Whereas the conservation needs of Alabama are far in excess of what are now being met; we believe it is the responsibility of society to see that our soil resources are maintained and improved for future generations; and

"Whereas the proposed reduction in agricultural appropriations threatens to wreck the school-lunch program in Alabama unless the State greatly increases its funds of matching Federal money; and funds will be denied for farm-tenant loans to thousands of Alabama veterans, and small farmers under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Purchase Act; and

"Whereas we believe the farmers will be forced to exploit and drain the soil fertility if the agricultural conservation program is curtailed; much heretofore accomplished will be lost: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the State Senate of Alabama (the House of Representatives concurring)*:

"1. That the Congress of the United States be most respectfully urged to continue and not to reduce the appropriations for the United States Department of Agriculture to carry on the agricultural conservation program and other programs being put on by the Agriculture Department.

"2. That the United States Senators, Hon. LISTER HILL and Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN, and our Representatives in Congress, be asked to support the agricultural conservation program and to vote for and to lend their support for the continuance of the annual appropriation of $301,720,000, and other agricultural appropriations vital to the people of Alabama.

"3. That the secretary of state of Alabama be directed to transmit duly certified copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, chairmen of the United States Senate and House Committees on Agriculture, the United States Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, the Secretary of Agriculture in Washington, and to each Member of our congressional delegation.

"Approved June 13, 1947."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 18. A bill to establish uniform qualifications of jurors in the Federal courts, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 314);

S. 175. A bill to provide for the furnishing of quarters at Brunswick, Ga., for the United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia; without amendment (Rept. No. 315);

S. 179. A bill for the relief of Maj. Ralph M. Rowley and First Lt. Irving E. Sheffel; without amendment (Rept. No. 331);

S. 258. A bill for the relief of Troy Charles Davis, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 322);

S. 292. A bill for the relief of Samuel Augenblick; without amendment (Rept. No. 316);

S. 490. A bill to provide for the extension and application of the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to certain officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice; without amendment (Rept. No. 317);

S. 880. A bill for the relief of Rev. John C. Young; without amendment (Rept. No. 332);

S. 957. A bill for the relief of Col. William J. Kennard; without amendment (Rept. No. 333);

S. 1100. A bill for the relief of Frankie Stalnaker; with an amendment (Rept. No. 323); and

H. R. 1742. A bill for the relief of Mary Lomas; with an amendment (Rept. No. 318).

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 3791. A bill making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 319);

S. Res. 129. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Appropriations, in making investigations under the Legislative Reorganization Act, to employ temporary assistants and make certain expenditures; with an amendment; and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration; and

S. Res. 130. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Appropriations to make additional expenditures under section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; without amendment; and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 2276. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to pay certain expenses incident to training, attendance, and participation of personnel of the Army of the United States in the Seventh Winter Sports Olympic Games and the Fourteenth Olympic Games and for future Olympic games; with amendments (Rept. No. 328).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1358. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations, outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944; with amendments (Rept. No. 326).

By Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1375. A bill to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve; with amendments (Rept. No. 324); and

H. R. 2248. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to grant an easement and to convey to the Louisiana Power & Light Co. a tract of land comprising a portion of Camp Livingston in the State of Louisiana; without amendment (Rept. No. 325).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1845. A bill to amend existing laws relating to military leave of certain employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia so as to equalize rights to leave of absence and reemployment for such employees who are members of the Enlisted or Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, or the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 327).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 3629. A bill to authorize the transfer to the Panama Canal of property which is surplus to the needs of the War Department or Navy Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 329).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 3124. A bill to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the Eighty-first National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, August 10 to 14, 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 330).

By Mr. ECTON, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 402. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to James Black Dog a patent in fee to certain land; with an amendment (Rept. No. 334); and

S. 608. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Growing Four Times; with an amendment (Rept. No. 335).

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

S. 1361. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit capital grants for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs; with amendments (Rept. No. 336).

EXTENSION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ask unanimous consent to report an original joint resolution to extend temporarily the succession and powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and I submit a report (No. 321) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I ask unanimous consent to report adversely the concurrent resolution (H. Con. 49) against adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of May 1, 1947, and I submit a report (No. 320) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

INVESTIGATION OF OPERATIONS OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND SUBSIDIARIES

Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 132); which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete inquiry into the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date but not later than March 1, 1948.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. GURNEY (by request):

S. 1477. A bill to designate the Air University Library, Army Air Forces, as a public depository for Government publications; and

S. 1478. A bill to authorize the transfer of lands in the Fort Wingate Military Reserve, N. Mex., from the War Department to the Interior Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CAPEHART (by request) (for himself, Mr. MARTIN, and Mr. KILGORE):

S. 1479. A bill to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCK:

S. 1480. A bill authorizing the conveyance to the State of Delaware of a portion of Pea Patch Island; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. 1481. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1482. A bill for the relief of F. DuWayne Blankley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1483. A bill for the relief of Guy Cheng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE (by request):

S. 1484. A bill to continue temporary authority of the Maritime Commission until March 1, 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1485. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands heretofore acquired for the Albuquerque Indian School, New Mexico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. THYE (for himself and Mr. O'CONOR):

S. 1486. A bill to provide for payment of salaries covering periods of separation from the Government service in the case of persons improperly removed from such service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 1487. A bill to remove restrictions upon loans by Federal agencies to finance the construction of certain public works; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution providing for the proper observance of the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the signing of the Constitution of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. VANDENBERG (by request):

S. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution authorizing the President to accept on behalf of the Government of the United States the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION—AMENDMENT

Mr. McMAHON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL INSURANCE CONTRIBUTIONS ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. BALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3818) to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

H. R. 966. An act to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387); and

H. R. 1389. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944; to the Committee on Civil Service.

H. R. 2298. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DAVID I. WALSH—EDITORIAL EULOGIES

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials eulogistic of the late Senator David I. Walsh, the first from the Boston Herald of June 12, 1947, and the second from the Boston Globe of the same date, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE CLARK HILL PROJECT IN SOUTH CAROLINA—STATEMENTS BY HON. J. STROM THURMOND AND HON. BUTLER B. HARE

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD addresses by Hon. J. Strom Thurmond, Governor of South Carolina, and Hon. Butler B. Hare, former Representative from South Carolina, before the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, which appear in the Appendix.]

SOIL EROSION BY FLOODS—EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA EVENING BULLETIN

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Your Country's Soil Is Being Stolen," published in the June 15, 1947, issue of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] I ask consent of the Senate that the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare holding a hearing on the so-called Fair Employment Practice Act, now being considered by the committee, may hold a meeting while the Senate is in session today.

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

AID IN INDUSTRIALIZATION OF UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in connection with Senate bill 1452, to provide for aid in industrialization of underdeveloped areas, and for other purposes, introduced in the Senate on June 16, 1947, by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], several other Senators, and myself, I should like to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. W. W. Mims, editor of the Edgefield Advertiser, a newspaper which has been in operation for 111 years, longer than any other newspaper in my State. The editor of this paper has lived close to the soil, he has served his State well as a legislator and an editor. I believe he here grasps the significance of a situation which is the root problem in the South's relatively poor economy. I commend to the attention of the Senate his letter and two editorials from his newspaper, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the lettter and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EDGEFIELD ADVERTISER,
Edgefield, S. C., June 17, 1947.

Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: I am pleased to see that you, together with other Senators,

are seeking congressional aid in bringing industries to the South and West.

This problem which you are facing squarely is in reality a national problem. When the rural areas of the Nation with their proportionately large population lose their buying power it is impossible for the country as a whole to prosper.

If Congress could know the widespread poverty in rural areas even in normal times, a poverty not the result of thriftlessness, but poverty in spite of thrift and 10 to 18 hours a day of toil in all weather, it would consider the human side as well as the economic which itself is important enough.

We realize in the South that mechanization is on its way. We realize that when this postwar restrictive period is ended and machinery is available in any quantity the farm lands which are adapted to the use of machinery will be almost completely mechanized.

The result will be not only the displacement of farm labor, but this type of farming will offer such competition to the small farmer, whose lands are not so well adapted to machine operation and who for other reasons cannot make the best use of modern methods, that he will be thrown almost completely out of the economic picture.

It is important, I think, to keep in mind the fact that the South is the most purely American area of our whole Nation, and it is true that these small farmers are typical themselves of what America means. They have carried on through generations, frequently on the same lands, planting the same fields and taking great pride in the continuity of ownership and in their independence.

You know, Senator, that the southern farmer was taught by his father to work. You, as well as any southerner, can resurrect the picture of a typical small farmer laboring in his fields long hours, often with members of his family, including children, and in the fall these same children would not, from the harvest, have the money to buy adequate school clothes. And unfortunately college training seldom reaches into these families.

Through many generations our farms have been cultivated and exploited with small reward. Cotton at 5 cents to 12 cents cannot rebuild a depleted soil, or maintain it. The cash value of farm products in normal times is not such as to repair outhouses or build terraces.

Automobiles which now sell for $1,400 will not sell for $200 when and if cotton drops to 5 cents, as it has done in the past. Refrigerators, which are now accepted as standard household equipment, will not sell for $30 when and if corn and hogs drop back to their lowest level.

Whether farm prices will ever be normal again, or hit bottom in a period of slump, no one knows, but prices are likely to fall most in the class of products grown on the farm. Industrial sections can control the prices of their products: They shut down their plants and lay off their workers if necessary, but the farmer plants his crops with only faith and hope, and these have not been enough. The harvest floods the markets and the labors of the farm family have been in vain.

To avoid a relapse into an economic condition which led the late President to say "The South is the Nation's No. 1 economic problem," small farmers of the South must have means of employment to earn the necessary cash for a fair standard of living. Experience is showing now that they will remain on their farms and produce in their spare time home needs. They are more apt to leave the farm if they do not have other means to supplement their cash incomes.

The late Henry Ford's phrase "one foot in factory and one in the soil" patterned a hopeful way of life for the small farmers of rural America, farmers who will not be able to keep pace with modern farm methods.

Each town should be aided in the development of small industries. They need technical help just now more than financial aid. They cannot lift themselves by their boot straps. For example, Edgefield people have been interested in a pottery plant (Edgefield had successful potteries in years past). Even though they might raise the money, what steps would they take to establish a pottery not knowing the engineering requirements or what clays would be suitable? Edgefield people last year organized the Edgefield Industrial Development Corporation capitalized at about $20,000 inviting outside investments and offering to build a building, with especial interest in garment manufacturing. This has not yet succeeded, although many investors from other States have been here to discuss proposals.

Fact is that trained men who know how to set up plants for the manufacture of such things as pottery, clothing, canned goods and other food products and products from wood of which this section has a plentiful supply, are simply not available, and even though local persons organize and raise money, they actually have no point at which to make a start. They do not have what is commonly called the "know-how."

In a section which has been agricultural from the earliest times, industrialization with its skills and techniques will take a longer time than though technical experts could be furnished to communities to help in these problems.

Edgefield County has a large variety of minerals and clays which could be utilized. It has a plentiful supply of labor—people who don't mind working for fair pay. Citizens here are eager to provide industrial employment and are ready to invest their money in enterprises which are well advised and can be established on a reasonably sound basis.

American technicians have promoted industrial development in almost every country of the world. But here in large sections of our Nation there is almost a complete ignorance of industrial techniques and possibilities.

I think your work in connection with industrialization of rural sections will be a great boon to the South and to the whole Nation as well.

Nonindustrialization perpetuates nonindustrialization. Young students of engineering leave home to go where there is a progressive outlook and opportunity for lifetime success. If the South can make headway during this period when local citizenry has some capital of its own—when farm prices are at a very good level—the South stands a chance of establishing economic independence. If it loses the opportunity now, there will be another impending period of economic stagnation.

I want to thank you for your support of equalization of rail rates, and for your other efforts in behalf of the progress of this section.

Sincerely,

W. W. MIMS.

[From the Edgefield (S. C.) Advertiser of February 26, 1947]

ONE FOOT IN THE SOIL

The best defense developing against another serious depression is the coming of local industries to this section to provide pay rolls, or in simple phrase—spending money which is the life-blood of business.

While incoming industries are no certain guarantee against economic slump, which at its worst becomes a world-wide depression, they will help to brighten the business picture in dark days, as well as serving surely to make business better in normal times.

It is well to keep in mind that local industries drawing workers from surrounding areas, keeping "one foot in the soil" (the words are Henry Ford's), is an ideal situation. In case of temporary work suspension in times of economic stress, dependency is not shifted to government, as in case of the city worker whose environment leaves him so susceptible to communistic propaganda. With home and farm still intact, the family is still a functioning unit of democracy.

A friend, and a very solid citizen in our opinion who believes in his church and in his home and in his farm, told the writer one day this week that he had applied for a job at the new Johnston mill where he will make a substantial hourly wage. "I can make more cash there than on my farm," he said. "But I have no intention of giving up my farming operations entirely. The new mill has a revolving shift for all workers, which will enable me to get a lot done at home to boot, and I'll continue to raise grains and to provide home needs."

A better example of why the South is the Nation's most hopeful section we do not know.

[From the Edgefield (S. C.) Advertiser of May 14, 1947]

INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION IN LOW-INCOME AREAS ALTERNATIVE TO GOVERNMENT CONTROL

A slump and perhaps another major depression will be the result if the Nation reverts to a condition in which the industrial sections sell their products at industry-regulated prices while agricultural commodities go on the markets at whatever the market will pay.

In 1947, even more than in the nineteen thirties, a large portion of consumer spending goes for industrial products. This money spent for what other sections produce is siphoned off with a large degree of permanence; for there is nothing comparable in agriculture to the selling value of machine-made, industrial goods.

The alternative to Government extending control over production, marketing, prices and almost every other phase of business enterprise, at some future time, is industrial development in areas where the income of the people is lowest.

The most grievious fact of American economy for the past several generations is that large areas of the Nation have had an average per capita income of barely one-half that of industrial areas where wealth has been produced almost exclusively by machine mass production. This unbalanced condition in which southern States have lived on a mere subsistence basis, depleting much of their soils, timber, and other resources, drew the comment of the late President Roosevelt that "the South is the Nation's No. 1 economic problem."

Conditions in agricultural sections are better today, but it will take a long time to catch up.

The South now is definitely on the advance industrially. The war converted industry to armament-making, and in the postwar reconversion the chance to establish industrial plants in new locations has been the result. One major moving factor has been the opportunity of agricultural sections to build up cash resources and capital.

Congratulations to all who had a part in the fight for equalization of freight rates. This will be of incalculable benefit in the South's industrial advance.

SALARIES OF SCHOOL TEACHERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the Office of President in case of the removal, resignation,

or inability both of the President and Vice President, is the unfinished business.

Mr. CAIN obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum, or does he prefer to proceed?

Mr. CAIN. I think it might be well to have a quorum.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

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

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3611, the bill affecting school teachers in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill, H. R. 3611?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3611) to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk two committee perfecting amendments and ask for their consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 30, line 4, after "SEC. 21", it is proposed to insert "(a)", and on page 30, between lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to insert the following subsection:

(b) After the effective date of this act, the act entitled "An act for the retirement of the public school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved August 7, 1946, shall apply to employees of the Board of Education whose salaries are fixed by this act, and all references in said act to the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1945, as amended, shall be interpreted to apply to this act. Nothing in this subsection shall require the recomputation of the annuity of any person retired under the act of August 7, 1946, prior to the effective date of this act, or of any person retired prior to the effective date of the act of August 7, 1946, whose annuity is computed in accordance with the provisions of that act.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will not the Senator explain what the amendment would accomplish?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, some of the persons to be covered by the provisions of House bill 3611 appeared during the course of the committee's deliberations and expressed a feeling that some of their annuity and retirement and tenure rights might be held in jeopardy because of the provisions of the bill. The amendment is merely a clarifying amendment, which goes back to the basic law of 1906.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I send another amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, line 6, it is proposed to strike out the word "sick," after the word "cumulative", and on page 29, line 7, after the word "pay", to insert "because of personal illness, the presence of contagious disease, death in the home, or pressing emergency."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington on behalf of the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington explain the amendment?

Mr. CAIN. Indeed, sir. For a number of years, sick-leave benefits have been provided to employees in the attendance officers' section. The employee could avail himself of sick leave only if he was actually sick. As a result of full discussion, not only with the employees affected, but with the school administration and the school board, it was thought wise and proper to liberalize the restrictions presently found in the sick-leave provision so as to permit a teacher to be absent, at home, because of death in the family, serious illness of children, or other pressing emergency; a determination of the emergency to be made by the school administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, House bill 3611 does more than provide needed salary increases for the teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia. Its provisions, if adopted, will result in an improved school system. The bill recognizes and includes the progressive improvements developed within recent years by the foremost school systems of America.

H. R. 3611 is not the result of the thinking and work of any single individual. It was designed through the joint efforts and collective study by the District of Columbia fiscal subcommittees of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Washington, D. C., School Superintendent and his staff, the Board of Education, representatives of teachers' organizations, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. It is worthy of note that H. R. 3611 was not submitted for approval to the District of Columbia committees of the Senate and House of Representatives until its substance and details had been approved by the previously mentioned groups of codesigners. In their opinion, H. R. 3611 is an instrument which will advance the cause of modern education in the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3611 is possessed of both a philosophy and a tangible purpose. Underlying its five titles is an acknowledgement that the sole aim of the school system of the District of Columbia must be, and is, to provide the best possible education for children of the community. Every plan and every action of the Board of Education must be construed and thought of in the light of the resulting benefit to pupils and students.

The primary purpose of H. R. 3611 is to attract and hold teachers who are qualified and who want to instruct the youth of today, who are to become the citizens of tomorrow. If children are to be well educated, it is obviously essential that high morale and a reasonable sense of security prevail among educational officers and teachers. The pay bill before us provides teaching incomes which, without being extravagant, are high enough to make the District of Columbia teaching profession attracting and attractive.

H. R. 3611 accomplishes five major objectives:

First. The bill puts into effect the principle of the single salary schedule, which is that equal salary recognition will be given at all teaching levels for equal preparation. Every progressive school system in America recognizes this principle today. H. R. 3611 provides salary

recognition for the master's degree at the elementary school level as previous congressional legislation has provided such salary recognition for the same degree at the junior and high school levels.

Second. The bill provides for making permanent the $450 temporary salary increase which was granted by the Congress for 1946–47 only, and for an additional annual salary increase of $150. This will grant an increase in salary to all teachers in the system except for a group of slightly less than 1 percent of the total of teachers who number approximately 3,600. Teachers in this small group are already above the maximums of the classes to which they would be assigned under the bill. The recommended 1947–48 salary increase of $150 will cost $770,000.

Third. The bill establishes a salary range of $2,500 to $4,000 for teachers without masters' degrees and of $3,000 to $4,500 for teachers who possess masters' degrees. The present minimum teaching salary is $2,350; the maximum is currently $4,150. It is thought that the recommended salary ranges will induce capable young teachers to enter the teaching profession and to encourage those already in to remain. These salary ranges are properly in line with the upward trend throughout the Nation, though they are substantially below the highest comparable salaries being paid in some other large American cities. In addition, the bill establishes comparable increases in salary ranges for administrative personnel who worked on a 12-month basis.

Fourth. The bill provides for a program of in-service training to be established under regulations to be formulated by the Board of Education for teachers, school officers, and other employees in order to insure professional growth among these persons. The program will serve also as a means and standard for determining eligibility for additional salary increments at 5-year periods. This provision will make as certain as can be made certain that the teachers and employees within the system will keep pace with progress.

Fifth. The bill recognizes that the practices of the Board of Education to accomplish promotions to what has been known as the superior rating group are eliminated by the intended in-service training program. This change which will be readily endorsed and approved by most of the teachers, as it is by the Board of Education, will also materially simplify the whole salary schedule structure.

Mr. President, the many authors of H. R. 3611 feel little pride of authorship. They simply feel privileged in having had an opportunity to work toward improvements for their school system, out of which will come young graduates who are trained and ready and anxious to take their places in higher institutions of learning or in the outside world. A year ago the Congress directed the Board of Education to study its needs and problems. This examination was undertaken by conscientious and unselfish people. To my mind they did a competent job. Not all of their suggestions were accepted by the proper committees of the Congress and the District Commissioners but the excellence and imperative requirements of their recommended program are covered by the provisions of H. R. 3611. To pass the bill is to help in creating a school system to which any Member of the Senate could well afford to send his son or daughter. That is a very high compliment indeed. The junior Senator from Washington hopes that the bill will pass without material changes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 21, after the numerals "1946" and the period, it is proposed to insert the following:

> Any teacher, school officer, or other employee who, on June 30, 1947, under the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1945, as amended, was in group C or D of class 2, group A or B of class 3, group A or B of class 4, group C or D of class 5, group C or D of class 6, group A or B of class 7, group A or B of class 8, or in any one of classes 9 to 30, inclusive, irrespective of whether such teacher, school officer, or other employee possesses a master's degree, may receive the annual increases provided for in this act until the maximum salary of his class is reached.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina, for himself and other Senators.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, there are in the District of Columbia school system 196 school teachers who have been employed since 1933, whom the Board of Education has recognized as having the equivalent of a master's degree, although in fact they do not have a master's degree. The Board of Education has considered them to be in the same category with teachers possessing a master's degree. The Board of Education at the present time feels that it would not be treating those teachers fairly if at this time we were to say to them, after the Board had, during all this period, considered them as having the equivalent of a master's degree, some of the teachers having been with the system as long as 14 years, "You shall no longer be considered as having the equivalent of a master's degree."

This amendment will cost only a few thousand dollars, but it will probably amount to a great deal to the teachers as they retire in the future. It will not give them all of the increase at one time, but will allow them to take advantage of the increase gradually until they reach the maximum of $4,500. If we want to say to those teachers, "Yes; we employed you, and have employed you year after year, and have considered you as possessing the equivalent of a master's degree, but now we are going to block you out," that is what the bill would do. The majority of the committee, having sponsored this amendment, feel that it would do nothing but justice to those teachers to give them what the Board of Education has accorded them in the past. The amendment would have no effect on teachers to be employed in the future. It would have no effect on the standardization of the school system. As these particular teachers retire and new teachers are employed, there will be in the law the requirement of a master's degree. However, we feel that these particular teachers should enjoy the same privilege which they have enjoyed in the past.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina several questions.

First, is the Senator satisfied in his own mind that he and other Senators who joined with him in sponsoring this amendment have not merely read the amendment, but have studied it and know precisely, beyond question of doubt, what the amendment would do if translated into law?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think we all understand what it would do. The object is to take care of 196 teachers. Is not that what the Senator understands?

Mr. CAIN. I was directing the question to the Senator as to what the amendment would do if it were to become law. The Senator says it would take care of 196 teachers.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Only 196. That is the information which I have received from the Superintendent of Education. The amendment was prepared at his direction and suggestion, and I joined in sponsoring it.

Mr. CAIN. The second question is: Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that the Board of Education approves his approach to this problem through the amendment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Board of Education submitted the suggested amendment.

Mr. CAIN. If I may offer a suggestion, the Board of Education submitted it at the request of the Senator from South Carolina, did they not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator may recall that when the Superintendent was before the committee he stated that the amendment would be nothing but right and just.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, this is not an easy problem. If I may have the permission of the Senator from South Carolina, I should like to define as best I can the difference between a single-salary schedule, which we are endeavoring to devise for the teachers of this community, and the procedures which the school system has followed in the past.

Today there is a requirement for a master's degree if a teacher is to be engaged to teach in the senior-high schools. There is no such provision with relation to the junior-high schools, or the elementary schools. The single-salary schedule

merely provides that teachers shall receive equal pay for equal preparation, regardless of where the teaching is done, whether in the elementary schools, the junior-high schools, or the senior-high schools.

When the hearings on the teachers' pay bill were begun several months ago it was early determined that the school system wanted, above all else, a single-salary schedule to cover all its teachers. Members of the committees of both the Senate and House agreed, without argument, and almost without discussion, because we know what the progressive teaching and school trends are. We said, "We shall endeavor to give you what you request, a single-salary schedule. How are we going to do it?" The simplicity of the schedule was made clear to us. It was proposed to provide a minimum level and a maximum level for those who were possessed of master's degrees, regardless of the divisions in which the teachers might be teaching. We have laid down a dollar minimum and maximum for holders of masters' degrees, of $3,000 to begin with, going to a maximum of $4,500. That is the upper side of the single-salary schedule.

We have likewise agreed upon minimum and maximum salary levels for those within the system, in the senior high schools, junior high schools, or elementary schools, who are not possessed of master's degrees. We attempt to begin with a minimum of $2,500 and a maximum of $4,000. The difference, therefore, at all levels is $500. This is what the school system desires more than any other single feature to face its immediate and long-range future.

When we undertook to go from the system under which we had been working to a single-salary schedule we found certain obstacles. We found that in 1908 there had been established within the school system of the District of Columbia what was known as a superior-group classification. The school superintendent and his staff had authority under the Enabling Act of 1908—if I do not state it correctly the Senator from South Carolina can check me—to place within the superior group classification as many as 10 percent of the total number of teachers upon any level within the system.

That classification was designed, in a sense, to provide the very incentive which we hope to provide more properly in the years which lie ahead. Within the superior-group classification we find certain of the teachers to whom the Senator from South Carolina has referred. We do not find within that group 196 teachers, which was the number mentioned by the Senator from South Carolina. At one of our hearings Dr. Corning, of the school system, had given us the figure of 196 within the superior-group classification. I have since had that figure checked. I have a memorandum from Dr. Corning's office which states that the figure of 196 given by Dr. Corning at the hearing on May 28 included officers and instructors in teachers' colleges who do not enter the picture. At the present time there are 118 in the superior-classification group who have not reached their maximum and 27 who have reached their maximum, or a total of 145 in all, who do not possess master's degrees, but find themselves within the superior-classification group.

Mr. President, examinations are given each year to permit persons without master's degrees to go into this superior classification. If they pass the examinations and are accepted, then, with five annual increments of $100 each, in 5 years there has existed a differential of $500 between the superior-group classification salary rating and those who are not within that group. In the past, Mr. President, up until this moment, there has been a salary level, maximum-wise, of $4,150. Within the superior-group classification there are 27 teachers, who do not possess masters' degrees, who have already reached what has been the maximum for the highest paid teachers in this community. They have gone to $4,150. They are in the superior-group classification. They do not possess a master's degree. It is our intention and has been our recommendation that because we are providing what ought to be provided, namely, a single-salary schedule, there is, from the point of view of many who worked on this problem, no justifiable reason for making an exception in the case of those 27 teachers who have already reached the maximum. It has been our contention that they have within themselves the ability, the willingness, and the energy, in the interest of improving the school system, to secure a master's degree, as it can be secured by any excellent teacher any time, anywhere. It is our intention that they retain a dollar preferential of $150, as the Senator from South Carolina knows, over what we have laid down as the maximum level beyond which a nonmaster's degree holder should not go.

On the other side of the same picture referred to by the Senator from South Carolina, there are 118 now master's degree teachers presently within the superior-group classification, whose present annual incomes are below the maximum of $4,000 recommended for a nonmaster's degree holder. These are admittedly fine teachers. It is our intention and has been our very serious recommendation that those 118 teachers should be permitted, obviously, to go to the top of a new classification which is being established as the result, so to speak, of a "surgical operation." They are not being restrained from getting the $150 raise which is recommended in the bill. They are not precluded from getting their increments, so long as their increments and their raises do not at this time exceed $4,000.

From our point of view we should be doing an injustice to the system if, having granted what can be secured only through a major operation, we should make concessions in addition to the enlargements and the improvements which we have provided. I personally have a measure of sympathy for the proposition maintained by the Senator from South Carolina, but because the persons within the superior-group classification, if they have been alert—and I take it we all agree they have—have known beyond question that if the school system was to be improved a single salary schedule sooner or later had to come. They have had at least the opportunity, the time, the right, and certainly the brains, to have equipped themselves for this development, not from what has been an archaic system, for it has been in keeping with the times, but of a better system for which they could have prepared themselves.

One hundred and forty-five school teachers are involved in the only single controversy between the Senator from South Carolina and the junior Senator from Washington. Of the 145 we maintain that those who have already reached the maximum should not be granted an increase through increments totaling $500 to bring them to the level attained by those holding master's degrees.

I wonder if the Senator from South Carolina will respond to my approach to this problem.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Washington that the bill is an excellent piece of work. The only objection I have to it is in reference to one item——

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have to leave the Senate floor, but I want to say in connection with what the Senator from Washington has said and what the Senator from South Carolina has said that I think it is a matter of good faith that we should accord these teachers the same treatment that we are giving others who actually hold a master's degree. In saying that I certainly do not want to be understood as being at all critical of the Senator from Washington and the excellent work that he and his subcommittee did in preparing this bill and bringing it before the Senate. But the situation, as I understand it, is this: Back through the years these teachers have been hired. If I understand correctly, the Board of Education started the policy about 1932 of employing teachers, with the understanding that if they remained in a certain job for so many years—10 years, I think it was—they would be given a rating which would be the equivalent to that of teachers holding a master's degree. Those teachers were employed under that condition. I believe it would be a breach of faith now to say, "Even though you were hired under this condition we are now going to change it. We are giving to those who actually hold masters' degrees the opportunity of working up to the level of $4,500 a year, as maximum pay, but we are depriving you of that privilege, even though we have said that by your 10 years of work in a particular position you would be regarded as having the equivalent of a master's degree." I certainly believe that the Senate does not want to breach the condition which was made to them when they were employed. For that reason, Mr. President, I am heartily in favor of the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the amendment does not weaken the system at all. It has nothing to do with future employment of

those who may have a master's degree; it has to do only with those who have been hired with a certain condition in their contract.

Mr. CAIN. If the Senator will yield, we are not taking any rights away from this very limited number of teachers. We are changing an act which has previously been on the books and for which a good case could be made. If the Senator will understand that our position is that we are, in a very concrete way, changing the very foundations of the system which has previously prevailed within this community, I think he can only draw the conclusion that the teachers who have been without master's degrees in the past have been very well taken care of. They remain in a preferred position, if you please, because of the preference granted in the past and because of their mental attainments. Some of them may wish a master's degree, which can be obtained without very much trouble. It has been said that a good many teachers are in opposition to our insistence in endeavoring to put this bill through as it reads; but I do not think that is true. I have talked to as many school teachers as cared to see me during the past 3 or 4 weeks. I have been able, I think, to convince some of them that what we were doing for their ultimate and the complete good certainly justified their willingness to go along with the program, and a good many of them have done so.

I wish to say in all seriousness that I have constantly conferred and reconferred with the Board of Education and with the Superintendent of Schools and his staff, and I am of the very sincere opinion that they would prefer, for a reason which I have yet to mention, among other reasons, that this bill be passed by the Senate as recommended by those of us who have sponsored it.

I have a basic question to direct to the Senator from South Carolina. I know he feels that his amendment will do exactly what he wishes to have done, namely, provide an additional salary increase to only those nonmaster degree persons, regardless of their number, who previously have been benefiting from salary ranges paid to holders of a master's degree.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is the only purpose I have.

Mr. CAIN. Much as I oppose the principle of the Senator's amendment, which is completely apart from this contention, I wish to say that, for two reasons, the Senator's amendment cannot possibly accomplish his intention.

If the Senator from South Carolina and the junior Senator from Washington could get closer together in the Chamber, it would serve our joint purpose.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wonder whether the Senator would agree to have a vote taken on this matter at 2:30. Several Senators have to leave the Chamber to go to a conference meeting, and thereafter they will return; but they wish to be in the Chamber when the vote is taken. So I suggest that the vote be taken at 2:30, so that those Senators may be present when the vote is taken. I also suggest that we decide upon that now, so that the Senators to whom I have referred will know when to return to the Chamber. That is my only reason for making the request.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me suggest that such an arrangement would rather complicate the procedure. By unanimous consent, the measure now under consideration has been taken up, temporarily supplanting the succession bill. If the Senate wishes to proceed with the teacher's bill at this time, that will be perfectly agreeable; but if for any reason the Members of the Senate feel that they should wait until 2:30 before voting on the teacher's bill, such a procedure would involve having the Senate return to the consideration of the other legislation, and that would involve unanimous-consent agreements.

So I suggest to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina and the distinguished Senator from Washington that if they come to an agreement that the debate should continue, then let it proceed; but the Senate should conclude action on this proposed legislation, if possible, before returning to the measure which temporarily has been laid aside.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I was making the request only for the convenience of the Senators who have to leave the Chamber at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not make the request for my convenience, for I shall remain in the Chamber.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I think that in the next few minutes it will be possible to satisfy, in a sense, both the Senator from South Carolina and other Senators. I regard as very important the Senator's belief that his amendment will result in providing continued additional compensation for the 145 teachers who previously have been in a superior group classification. I call the Senator's attention to what appears to be an undeniable fact, on advice of the very best counsel we can obtain, namely, that as a result of the Senator's rearrangements of the classifications, the result has been—although obviously it is completely unintentional—that instead of covering the 145 teachers who the Senator thinks should be covered, and who I think should not be covered, the Senator's amendment would, in fact, as a study discloses to be the case, cover 311, many of whom have never been within the purview and consideration of our committee.

In the second place, the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina would do something crippling to the purpose which he has in mind. It is difficult to explain this matter, but I shall try. within the superior group classification there presently are 118 teachers without master's degrees who are receiving less than the recommended $4,000 for nonmaster's degree teachers. It is possible that some of those teachers teach in the senior high schools, although that is not likely, because for the most part in the high schools the teachers have the equivalent of a master's degree. It is more likely that those teachers teach in the junior high schools and in the elementary schools. The Senator's amendment, if adopted, would destroy something which all of us want destroyed; namely, the superior-group classification. That would mean that after that group had been dissolved the teachers would go back to their own A, B, C classifications, whatever they might be, and 81 of them would go back to divisions within the school system which do not presently require—nor is it contemplated that they will require—a master's degree as a requirement at entrance. Therefore, the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina would accomplish only a part of his purpose, and were the Senator's original intention to prevail, through this amendment, he would be causing a loss of preference to 81 of the 118 teachers whom the Senator from South Carolina seeks to assist.

Therefore, from my point of view, if I am correct—and I can only say to the Senator from South Carolina in good faith that I am completely satisfied that I am correct—the Senator from South Carolina would not want his amendment to be adopted.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Washington, let me say that the attorney for the Committee on the District of Columbia and also the members of the committee who drew up the amendment understood that it would cover only 196 teachers—the original number. Of course, that number has been changed since that time. But that would be the coverage of the amendment, so far as we understand.

Mr. CAIN. I am afraid they are mistaken because in my interest in determining exactly where we were going, and why, and in what fashion, I have found that those attorneys, among others, have ascertained that it is legally necessary to subscribe to the position which I have just advanced in the discussion with the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to repeat that this amendment was drawn at the suggestion of the Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Corning, and I point out that he marked on the bill what should be amended, stating that such amendments would care for the situation. He himself went through the bill and suggested these amendments.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as a result of this debate, I have two points to maintain. The first is that the Senator's amendment is not justifiable, in my opinion, in view of the fact that we are moving into a single-salary schedule. I think I have in support of my contention the Board of Education, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the Superintendent of Schools and his staff in considering the greatest good for the greatest number.

It should likewise be realized that the bill has already been passed by the House, which took affirmative action on it as it is now before the Senate, with the exception of two perfecting amendments which have been agreed to. As a result, if the amendments proposed by the Senator from South Carolina were now added to the bill, it would be necessary to have a

conference with the House, and in the conference the bill as thus amended would encounter considerable difficulty. Both the Senator from South Carolina and I realize that the end of June is fast approaching; and, of course, if considerable difficult were encountered in conference, the result might be that no legislation at all on this subject would be enacted. So I would resist the amendment for that reason, if for no other.

Moreover, in my opinion the amendment is not technically correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, we do not disagree with the bill as a whole, but we feel this amendment should be agreed to for the good of the teachers involved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Carolina for himself and other Senators. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Carolina wish to present his other amendment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, it is not necessary to present the other amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is still open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be presented, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3611) was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1346 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. CAIN, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. MCGRATH conferees on the part of the Senate.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

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

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

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 3020) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes effecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes, returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was—

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives agreeing to pass the same.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1230) to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3737, which is the revenue bill for the District of Columbia for the year 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to a consideration of House bill 3737?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I may say that, as I understand the parliamentary situation, the so-called succession bill is the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. If consent is granted the junior Senator from Washington, it is, as I understand, only for the purpose of considering the revenue bill for the District of Columbia for 1948, and with the understanding that when the House bill 3737 is disposed of, the Senate will revert to the unfinished business, namely, the succession bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Not only that, but the Senator may call for the regular order at any time he pleases. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3737), to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on the District of Columbia was, on page 11, line 9, to strike out:

(s) The word "resident" means every individual domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year, and every other individual who maintains a place of abode within the District for more than 7 months of the taxable year, whether domiciled in the District or not. The word "resident" shall not include any elective officer of the Government of the United States or employees of the United States Government, nor shall it include any officer of the executive branch of such Government whose appointment to the office held by him was by the President of the United States and subject to confirmation by the Senate of the United States and whose tenure of office is at the pleasure of the President of the United States. For the purposes of this act the domicile of such officer or employee shall be in the State in which he expressly declares to be the State of his domicile: *Provided*, That he shall have acquired a domicile in such State under the laws of such State prior to the beginning of the annual period for which the tax is claimed. Such declaration must be made in writing, under oath, to the Assessor and the time for filing such declaration shall not expire until 60 days after written demand shall have been received by such officer or employee.

And insert:

(s) The word "resident" means every individual domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year, and every other individual who maintains a place of abode within the District for more than 7 months of the taxable year, whether domiciled in the District or not. The word "resident" shall not include any elective officer of the Government of the United States or any officer of the executive branch of such Government whose appointment to the office held by him was by the President of the United States and subject to confirmation by the Senate of the United States and whose tenure of office is at the pleasure of the President of the United States, unless such officers are domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 21, after the word "including", to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$3,000."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am satisfied that many Senators are interested in this measure. I think a larger number of Senators should be present to hear the debate. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina suggests

the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the second committee amendment, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, line 21, after the word "including", it is proposed to strike out "$2,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think the bill should be thoroughly explained. This is a tax measure for the District of Columbia. I think we should know what is in the bill before we pass it. I should like to have it explained in detail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina desire the floor?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] has the floor.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I inquire if the junior Senator from Washington has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the junior Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. CAIN. I may say to the Senator from South Carolina that it is our intention at this time thoroughly to explore these figures.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is the reason I raised the question. Before we go forward with any amendments, I think we should have an explanation of the bill, and an understanding of how the amendments affect the bill.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I wonder if Senators who are present could see fit to accommodate their thirst for knowledge to my willingness to provide as much as I can by taking seats immediately in front of the charts which have been prepared and placed on easels on the Senate floor. The charts attempt to prove the need for additional revenue, and to show what members of a joint committee which designed the program think are reasonable figures.

About 4 months ago a joint subcommittee of both Senate and House was presented with the President's budget, a part of which covered the needs of the District of Columbia for the year 1947–48. That budget indicates a deficit of approximately $17,000,000.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia proposed to the joint committee a tax-revenue program which consisted in large part of the figures which appear on the first chart, covering sources of revenue which had not previously been tapped within the District of Columbia. I have placed the figures on this chart mainly to indicate that the committees which were charged with the responsibility of balancing the District of Columbia budget were not interested in merely recommending taxes for the sake of new taxes. As I present the recommended program, it will be noted that it does not include a majority of the taxes recommended by the Commissioners.

It was suggested by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia that we could best accommodate their need for additional revenue in 1948 by so increasing the income-tax coverage within the District that $2,250,000 additional would be raised.

It was proposed that the Congress impose upon the citizens of the District of Columbia a sales tax at the rate of 2 percent, which, in the opinion of the Commissioners, would raise as much as $9,000,000.

It was further suggested that unincorporated businesses, which have previously been exempt from taxation, be subjected to taxation, to raise an additional $900,000.

It was further suggested that the prevailing taxes on alcoholic beverages now being sold and dispensed within the District of Columbia be so increased as to benefit the District treasury to the extent of $2,800,000 additional.

It was further suggested that it might be advisable to place a tax on public-utility bills, the bills which the average housewife receives at least once a month, which tax would produce additional revenue approximating $1,000,000.

It was further suggested that a tax be imposed upon every package of cigarettes to be sold, dispensed, or given away within the District of Columbia, which would produce an aggregate tax revenue of $800,000.

An amusement tax was suggested which would be approximately twice the present tax. It was the expectation of the Commissioners that such a tax would produce an additional $1,000,000 of revenue.

The total amount of revenue to be produced would be approximately $17,000,000, to balance what was considered to be the deficit.

There was an obligation on the two subcommittees of the District of Columbia Committees of the Senate and House not to readily, carelessly, or thoughtlessly accept any suggestions which would further add to the tax liabilities of residents of the District of Columbia. We held rather exhaustive hearings. Certainly they were long drawn out.

In that connection I should like to pay my personal respects to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], who are jointly responsible with me for the introduction of this measure. I congratulate them because of their willingness to work upon an interesting but troublesome and rather difficult problem.

At the same time I should like to pay my respects to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative GEORGE J. BATES, chairman of the House subcommittee, and his several confereres, who worked very hard on behalf of a community in which they themselves had no particular interest, because their domiciles are in various other parts of the country.

As a result of our hearings, at which appeared every individual or representative of a group who was desirous of being heard, we arrived at a program which has already in part been accepted by the House, a program in which we did not think it necessary at this time to adopt some of the tax measures recommended by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

As most people know, there are three different categories of expenses and revenues in the average city. Washington, D. C., is a reasonably good example of a typical American city, so far as its tax and revenue requirements are concerned. Those three general classifications are, first, the general fund; secondly, the highway fund; and thirdly, the water fund. We have placed on different charts a break-down of the figures involved in each of those classifications for the years 1947, 1948, and 1949. I think it proper to advance our suggestions as to the water fund at the outset.

The figures for the various years in question, 1947, 1948, and 1949, speak for themselves. Our unobligated balances are the balances remaining in the water fund which are unobligated, and are considered available for obligation during succeeding years.

We brought over from the year 1946 $659,303 which sum has been used in large part or in its entirety during this year.

The next item on the chart is entitled "Lapsed Balances." It represents the balances of prior year appropriations which are unexpended and which may be available for reappropriation during succeeding years.

It will be noticed that in the year 1947 the water fund of the District sold of its own investment account $1,079,722 worth of securities. From these receipts in the year 1947 approximately $3,500,000 is anticipated. For the year 1947 it is anticipated that there will be a revenue availability of $5,300,000 with an estimated expenditure total of the same figure, leaving within the water fund of the District for the year 1947 a balanced operation, for the reason that the Commissioners and the Water Fund Superintendent, in the interest of economy, were willing to cut their own budget requirements by the amount of $708,000 which provides them with a carry-over

sum of the same figure for the year 1948, which we immediately approach.

I think it is unnecessary, unless some of the Senators want to ask me some question with reference to the revenue availability of 1948, to discuss it in detail.

I should like to suggest to the Senate what has already, as I understand, been adopted by the House, which is the recommendation that we authorize within the District an increase in the water rents of 25 percent and an increase in the assessment rates of 25 percent which, insofar as the year 1948 is concerned, would increase the water rents by $800,000 and the assessment rates by $31,250. I should like to say, with reference to our recommendation that the water rents be increased 25 percent, that they are and have been exceedingly low when compared with other comparable cities throughout the Nation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator have for the RECORD a comparative table showing the rates of other cities which he thinks are more favorable than the Washington rates?

Mr. CAIN. I do not have such a table with me. The figures are included in the hearings held before the committee, and I shall certainly make them a part of the RECORD.

The Senate will notice an item of new revenue to be made available to the District, in the sum of $1,000,000 as a Federal contribution. We are urging that the Federal Government increase its Federal contribution to the District of Columbia by a lump sum of $4,000,000 for the years 1947 and 1948. As nearly everyone knows, the Federal Government for several years in the past has given to the District a lump sum of $8,000,000. We are asking for $12,000,000 and we think we can justify it. If $4,000,000 is available we are asking that $1,000,000 of it be earmarked for the water fund as an offset or charge-off for an approximately equal sum from which the Federal Government is benefiting today through the water which it uses and for which it does not pay. It is hoped that in the matter of financing the needs of the water fund in the future, if we are permitted to increase the water rents and the assessment rates and to earmark a million dollars on a yearly basis, we shall enable the water fund of the District of Columbia to meet its minimum requirements, so far as we can see for the next several years ahead, without having to borrow any money from the Federal Government.

We are not certain that we can accomplish our objectives in this modest approach to a big construction problem and program, but the water superintendent and the District Commissioners and those who joined themselves in building this program think it deserving of an adequate and fair trial.

That is all I care to say at this time regarding our recommendations with reference to the water fund. I wonder if there are any Senators who have a further interest which I could attempt to satisfy.

The next topic is the financial condition of the highway fund during the fiscal years 1947, 1948, and 1949, based on both the present tax structure and the proposed gasoline tax and inspection fee increases. It will be noted that an unobligated balance of approximately $1,500,000 was carried forward from 1946 to the fiscal year 1947. This balance, plus cash receipts for the fiscal year 1947, amounts to a total revenue availability of $8,242,000 plus. The estimated expenditures for this year amount to approximately $7,800,000, which leaves an unobligated balance of $401,000 plus to be carried over to the fiscal year 1948.

Some Senators have asked me the question whether it was a fact that the highway fund within the District, the authorities having been unable because of the war and postwar conditions to spend moneys appropriated to them in years gone by, had a very large sum of what might be called free cash. I should like to say in that connection that, so far as I know, that is not true. The $401,000 represents the free cash which they moved forward to 1948 for expenditure reasons. This unobligated sum of $401,000, as we now approach the year we are trying to balance, as far as the budget is concerned, and the receipts during the year based upon the present tax structure, results in a total revenue availability of $7,482,000. Estimates for the fiscal year 1948 now before the Congress, amounting to $9,210,000, would result in an estimated deficit, as of June 30, 1948, of $1,727,000. The imposition, however, of the additional gasoline tax and inspection fee recommended, in connection with an estimated reduction in the 1948 budget of $100,000 will yield an additional $1,770,000 in revenue. This would eliminate a deficit of $1,700,000 and leave an unobligated balance of $42,000 plus to carry over to the fiscal year 1949. This unobligated balance of $42,000 plus from the fiscal year 1948, plus receipts during the year 1948–49 based upon the present tax structure, results in a total revenue availability of $7,222,000.

Expenditure estimates for the fiscal year 1949, amounting to $8,275,000, would result again in an estimated deficit, as of June 30, 1949, of $1,652,000-plus. The imposition of the additional gasoline tax and inspection fee will yield an additional $1,670,000. We are assuming that if the gasoline tax is placed in operation we will have the same new revenue availability that we anticipate getting in 1948. The imposition of the additional gasoline tax and inspection fee will yield an additional $1,600,000 in revenue. This would eliminate the deficit and would represent an unobligated balance of $17,192.35 to carry over into the fiscal years of 1950 and 1951.

As a result of the passage of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, the District of Columbia has received allocations of $2,974,000 and $2,889,000, respectively, for the fiscal years 1946, 1947, and 1948. The existing law does not make provision for Federal-aid allocation subsequent to 1948. These allocations would not be considered as revenue, in that the District must have revenue to finance Federal-aid work in its entirety before reimbursement of the Federal share can be requested. The net result is that Federal-aid allocations permit of more work being performed and not in adding to the revenue availability.

With reference to the gasoline tax, I should like to say that presently, as we know, the gasoline tax in the District of Columbia is 3 cents a gallon. As I recall, the gasoline tax in Maryland is 6 cents a gallon, and in Virginia is 5 cents a gallon. We are recommending an increase from 3 cents to 4 cents a gallon, which presumably will provide $1,600,000 of additional revenue. There is considerable opposition to an increase in the gasoline tax, as there necessarily is opposition to the imposition of any tax. However, insofar as the members of the joint committee are concerned, it is simply a matter of whether it is desired to maintain the streets and highways in this community and whether it is desired to take advantage of certain Federal-matching funds, in order that bridges and viaducts can be designed, constructed, and maintained, or whether we do not wish to do so. The committee is firmly of the opinion that the recommendation which it makes for an increase in the gasoline tax from 3 cents to 4 cents a gallon is most reasonable, and that it will encourage and permit this community, which is confronted with a tremendous maintenance and construction problem, to keep pace, in a relative sense, at least, with that problem.

The inspection fee for vehicles almost speaks for itself. A few years ago an automobile-inspection law was passed, and it requires that every District of Columbia vehicle be inspected annually, at a charge of 50 cents. We have found that that charge no longer pays for the cost of the inspection. Therefore, the recommendation is that the fee, in accordance with the basic law, be increased from 50 cents to $1. We think that increase will enable the inspection system and program to pay for itself as it proceeds.

Mr. President, let me say that I should like very much to answer any detailed questions in regard to how these revenue or expenditure moneys are to be spent. I shall be glad to answer such questions either now or later, if any of my colleagues have a particular interest in this branch of the problem.

We come now to the general fund, which for the fiscal year 1947–48, which begins on the first day of July 1947, is, on paper at least and in fact so far as we know, overdrawn, so that we are confronted with a deficit of approximately $10,494,000. It is safe to say that your joint committee could have approached this deficit problem from any one of a dozen different fiscal and financial points of view. Again, the committee has no particular pride of authorship in the plan it now suggests for consideration by the Senate in regard to balancing the budget for the District of Columbia. We think the plan we now present is sound and reasonable, and that with any good fortune insofar as

price structures are concerned, it will provide, maintain, and continue the essential services which are so badly needed and which are justified by the citizens of this very great community. So, to offset the deficit of $10,494,000-plus, we suggest that revenues within the District of Columbia, beginning next year, be increased in the following way: First, that the real-estate tax rate, which presently is $1.75, be increased to $2. Many people will not like that, and we can understand their point of view. But as best we could, we went back and analyzed the needs and requirements, fiscalwise, of this community over the past decade, and we went one step further and analyzed comparable situations in comparable cities throughout America. We now feel with reference to the real-estate tax that because the rate which we suggest will be based on a 70 percent assessment of a reasonable valuation, we shall not be imposing any undue or too heavy burden upon the citizens of the District of Columbia. It is our expectation that if this recommendation is followed, $4,000,000 will accrue toward balancing the budget of the District of Columbia. Those figures are shown just above the point which I have indicated on the chart which now is before us.

Our next suggestion is that we broaden the coverage of the Income Tax Act as it relates to the District of Columbia. At the present time, and for quite a long time past, the only persons in this community of more than 900,000 persons who have paid income taxes have been those domiciled in this community on the last day of the tax year. We are recommending—and this, in fact, is almost the basis of our approach to this community problem—that we provide within the law a provision that those who are to pay income taxes are those who are either domiciled in the District of Columbia on the last day of the fiscal year or those who live as a resident within this community for a period of 7 months within the year. It is my considered opinion, for whatever it is worth, that the income-tax law governing in this community in years gone by has been inequitable and unfair; that if the Senate and the House of Representatives cannot agree to the provision we are suggesting, it would be only proper and fit and, in fact, just honest, to encourage the Congress to get rid of the income-tax structure in its entirety in this community.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What provision would be made to prevent double taxation?

Mr. CAIN. Any person otherwise affected by this tax who pays an income tax in the State of his domicile will not pay an income tax of any kind within the District of Columbia, unless it so happens—and so far as I know, there is only one exception to this rule—that the tax rates charged in the State of his domicile are less than those in the District of Columbia. There is a possibility that in the State of Delaware—and perhaps the Senator from Delaware will confirm this—the rates are actually lower than those within the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. BUCK. In the event that this amendment is not agreed to, what is the next step that would have to be taken to increase the revenues of the District of Columbia?

Mr. CAIN. If the suggestion is not adopted, the District of Columbia budgets for both 1948 and 1949 will be in deficit. Then I should think the realistic approach to the problem would be, first, in the interest of fairness to get rid of the income tax entirely, and to avail ourselves of any of the other revenue possibilities which the District of Columbia Commissioners recommended to us when this problem first arose.

It is quite obvious to anyone that we could have taken an easier approach to this problem. For instance, we could have provided for the imposition of a sales tax, and at this time the imposition of such a tax would have very largely cured our problems on a temporary basis; but in the opinion of those responsible for presenting this program, it is felt that basic taxes, such as real-estate taxes and income taxes, should bear their proportionate share of the obligations of a community before recourse is had to what might be called extra taxes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, did the Senator from Washington study the matter of having the Federal Government pay more to the District of Columbia?

Mr. CAIN. Yes. As a matter of fact, we shall come to that point in a moment. We have a recommendation covering it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator think that $3,000,000 additional will be sufficient to pay the District of Columbia for the use or benefit the Federal Government receives from the District of Columbia?

Mr. CAIN. I can answer that question in two ways: I can say that if we obtain an additional $4,000,000 at this time from the Federal Government, on the basis of this tax program, it will be possible to balance the budget of the District of Columbia and to maintain minimum services; but in my opinion further thought and study are needed to determine whether the Federal Government is presently carrying and has in the past carried its share of this community problem, for the Senator is as aware as I am that years ago the Federal Government paid on the basis of 50 cents out of every dollar. Now it is paying on the basis of 8 and a fraction cents on the dollar. We would not have asked the Federal Government in this instance for any additional money, if we had not first turned to the field of real estate, to indicate to the Federal Government that this community, in the case of real property, was willing to stand on its own feet so far as possible.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In my opinion, the Federal Government should assume the responsibility of all the tax increase. It should take care of every cent of it.

Mr. CAIN. I am the last to say that the Senator has not a very good case, but it is a case which we endeavored to cover in a formula. We had about six different formulas presented to the committee, and after studying them as carefully as we could, we were by no means satisfied that any of the formulas actually gave the justice they intended to render.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. I wonder if the Senator from South Carolina knows that between the years 1922 and 1937 there was on the statute books a law which provided that the Federal Government should pay 40 percent and the District 60 percent of the expenses of the District.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I understand that to be the case.

Mr. BUCK. That was the law for 15 years, and that ratio was observed for 3 years. During the other 12 years the Government made a lump sum payment. If it had paid according to the act, which it did not, it would owe over a hundred million dollars more than it actually paid.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. My reason for raising the question a few moments ago was the report by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], which brings the amount much closer to twelve million, possibly eight or nine million.

Mr. CAIN. The formula of the Senator from Wyoming would have resulted in exactly the same figures we present, because this is new revenue we are asking the Federal Government to pay, $4,000,000, which, when added to what it previously has been giving, namely, $8,000,000, makes the $12,000,000 which the formula of the Senator from Wyoming would have given.

Being very frank about this discussion, and particularly with reference to the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina, we should not too hastily adopt a formula which restricts the contribution to a figure with which we are by no means satisfied. Perhaps it should be $20,000,000, or $25,000,000. Certainly if it were proper to make the contribution years ago in the proportion which has been stated, there is some reason to believe there should be a recalculation of the whole contribution.

To recapitulate we have asked for an increase in the real-estate tax of 25 cents. We also ask for an increase in coverage in the case of the income tax, which would impose a tax on all persons resident here for 7 months, and all domiciled here at the end of a taxable year. It would not require any individual who pays a higher rated tax in any other State to pay an income tax here. That individual would pay absolutely nothing in this District.

There are 32 States in the Union which have income-tax laws, and the chances are 10 to 1 that very few, if any, of those

domiciled in those States, presently living as residents in the District of Columbia, would pay any local tax at all. There are 16 States of the Union which have no income-tax laws, but some of those States have intangible tax laws, which would be an offset against any tax which the individuals paid here. But a resident of a State like my own, the State of Washington, which has no intangible tax law and has no income-tax law, living in Washington, D. C., for a period in excess of 7 months, would pay, as I am absolutely and sincerely convinced he or she should pay, a reasonable tax, toward the maintenance of the services which make their living, on the average, so happy and contented in a community which is so far away from home.

If those two suggestions are adhered to, we are recommending, as I have previously said, an additional Federal contribution of $4,000,000, $3,000,000 of which would be used in our general-fund operations, and a million would be earmarked for the water fund. These three items, however, amount to only $10,100,000. That means we are still a considerable figure short of balancing our budget.

So far as the general fund construction operations of the community are concerned, there has been a willingness evidenced by the authorities in charge to reduce their budget in the sum of $2,500,000, which means a slowing up of some of the improvements which they really want, but which, after a full consideration, we are inclined to think we can get along without for a reasonable length of time, hoping that prices will come down and that obstacles will be removed, and that by adopting an agreed-upon reduction of $2,500,000, we shall balance the budget in 1948, carrying over a very small sum of money, which will provide, at the end of the next 2-year period, a cash balance, however small it may be.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Can the Senator say what the rate of tax on real estate is in the District of Columbia, under the proposal he is presenting?

Mr. CAIN. Yes; $2 a hundred. It is presently $1.75 a hundred.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is much lower than it is in any other city in the United States. Is not that a fact?

Mr. CAIN. It is much lower than in most of the comparable cities we examined.

Everyone will agree with me that if it had been his responsibility, rather than the responsibility of the joint congressional committee, the approach to this problem might have been different. Perhaps we should have started out with a sales tax as our base, and gone on from there. We just did not think that was the proper way to proceed.

We have been extraordinarily conservative in forming this budget for the next 2-year period. It does not permit of any serious mishaps or unexpected events transpiring in this community. We are only anticipating an over-all cash balance of $17,000-plus at the end of fiscal 1949, and every Senator is as conscious as I am how easy it may be to turn that balance into a deficit.

I would not be embarrassed, or feel any need to apologize for myself and my colleagues, if we have fallen short of what we started out to do in achieving a sound balancing of the budget. I should merely re-present the problem to Senators on the basis of need, knowing before I did so that they would give me the hearing to which the subject is entitled.

Mr. President, I ask the approval of the Senate for this program, so that in the general fund our real-estate tax rate may go up 25 cents, and our income-tax base be broadened, though the rates will not go up. I likewise ask your approval for an additional Federal payment to the general fund of $3,000,000.

With reference to the water fund, we are asking for the authority to increase the assessments by 25 percent, to increase water rates by 25 percent, which rates are much lower here than throughout the country, and we are asking that of the $4,000,000 we are asking from the Treasury of the United States $1,000,000 be earmarked to the water fund.

Our third request covers the highway fund. We are asking for an increase in the vehicle-inspection fee of from 50 cents to a dollar, in order that the service may pay for itself. We are asking the Senate's approval of an increase in the gasoline tax of from 3 cents to 4 cents a gallon.

I think this budget deserves the consideration of the Senate, and I hope it will have Senators' approval.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed amendment in behalf of the committee, and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, line 20, it is proposed to strike out subsection (9), down to and including line 25, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(9) Payments made under laws relating to veterans: Payments of benefits made to or on account of a beneficiary under any laws relating to veterans.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3737) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. CAIN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. CAIN, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. MCGRATH conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 814. An act to provide support for wool, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3203. An act relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

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

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

MANAGEMENT AND LABOR RELATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.
June 20, 1947.

The House of Representatives having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 3020) entitled "An act 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," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives agreeing to pass the same.

MANAGEMENT AND LABOR RELATIONS—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 334)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read.

(For President's veto message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 7485.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The message of the President of the United States will be spread on the Journal as required by the Constitution.

The Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 3020) entitled "An act 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, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

The yeas and nays are ordered, under the requirement of the Constitution.

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

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

The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am sure Congress and the country have been impressed by the message of the President. I have heard it said upon the floor that Senators have never seen a veto message more comprehensive and more thoroughly penetrating than the veto message of the President which has just been read. Every aspect of this matter has been carefully analyzed and thoroughly surveyed in the veto message. The President has made it clear, as would be expected of the Chief Magistrate, that he is not speaking for a class, but for the country; for the President is trying to preserve the economic strength of America, at a time when even the strength of this giant is under momentous and serious challenge. The President has made it clear that he is defending our cherished system of private enterprise, at a time when private enterprise is under the most bitter assault of all times in the world. The President has rededicated himself to the instincts of democracy and to her preserving institutions, at a time when democracy is under its most dangerous attack. The President has made it clear that he is trying to preserve in America the kind of free give-and-take, the kind of bargaining together, which is characteristic of the traditional relations between labor and capital in our long past; that he does not propose to throw the settlement of labor disputes either into the halls of Congress or into the forum of the Nation's courts. The President realizes, as he has so clearly pointed out in his message, that this is a measure to promote and not to diminish industrial strife. Moreover, he has emphasized that this bill is an attack upon the masses of the people, upon the workingman, in his job and in his union, and that, by impairing the strength of the working people, it endangers the power of America.

The President has made it clear that this is a step backward and not a step forward in our industrial relations. He does not propose to become a party to an effort to wipe out the gains of decades of experience in finding ways to resolve and reconcile differences between management and labor, nor does he propose to strip from labor the gains which it has secured in our own time, under administrations chosen by the people of the United States and given their overwhelming approval.

The President recognizes that this is a very serious issue for the Congress and to the country. He knows, of course, the brunt of criticism and the spleen of bitterness and venom which will be heaped upon his head by this courageous step. He has not been afraid in the past to speak his sentiments; he has not been afraid or reluctant this time, Mr. President, to give his views to the Congress and to the country.

Considering the reports on the bill they had generally from the press, I believe the people who read the message will find that this is a kind of labor bill of which they never dreamed. The people never see this kind of criticism; they never had a chance to read this sort of message. The people have had a one-sided report upon this legislation. They have been of the impression and the opinion that this legislation was honestly and properly designed to bring about industrial peace in America, to strike down the exercise of tyrannical power, and to protect America in emergencies. Naturally, believing that it was legislation of that character, they have generally given it their approval. But, Mr. President, this analysis reveals that it is not that kind of bill. This analysis reveals that, instead of the bargaining power of labor and management being equal, we have weighted the scales on the side of management. The public discovers from this message that instead of labor and management being put in an equal position, in other respects, the scales have been weighted on the side of management, and the employee has been penalized.

Mr. President, the people will discover from this message, from the President himself, that the bill as passed is not effective as a measure which would protect the public interest in case of emergency; for he has pointed out in his message that it would require a great deal of exertion on the part of the Government, but prove inevitably ineffective and fruitless. Therefore, Mr. President, the President does not wish to see America rely upon efficacy of a remedy which does not exist. He quite naturally felt it his duty to call to the attention of the country those deficiencies of the measure.

Mr. President, now that the President has laid before the Congress and the country this comprehensive and clear treatment of the measure—which I believe cannot be questioned or denied—I hope there will be a different feeling about this proposal in the Senate. I shared the general desire of Senators that there might be some legislation in this field. As a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with some of my colleagues, I joined in a minority report, in which we set forth aspects of the bill which we thought were in the public interest, and we emphasized that we were willing to go even further than the President went in his recommendations to the Congress, in order to assure legislation in this field. But we refused to support this extreme measure. We knew that there were abuses. Even among the chosen Twelve, Mr. President, there was a traitor. In our churches, there are sinners. There are some who err unintentially, and some, intentionally. Of course, if in the field of labor relations there were some way by which those who erred could be restrained and circumscribed in their power, we were all disposed to apply those restraints and that curb to them. To put it another way, we were willing to prune the tree, but not to cut it down. But the bill did not satisfy itself by pruning the tree of the labor movement and removing the branches that should be pruned. It cut at the very root of the tree; it undertook to strike it down. Those who observed and appreciated its far-reaching import could come to no other conclusion than that it would have the effect, if it were not designed to accomplish that end, of strangling and destroying the organized labor movement of America.

Mr. President, I read a statement in a newspaper to the effect that a part of our program to give democracy to Greece, to whose assistance we have gone, was to require that Greece permit the organization of labor unions. I dare say we would make that a condition in any country in the world where we were laying down the criteria of democratic conduct. We say to Greece: "If you are going to prove your democracy, let the working people organize themselves into their own associations, so that they may bargain collectively with their employers." But here in the Congress, which was the fountainhead of the grant of power under which such conditions could be imposed, we adopt a measure which, I say, if not designed to destroy, would have the effect of destroying the labor movement in America. All that the President has set forth in his message. He has shown how the employer could break a union. He has shown how the employer could discharge an employee arbitrarily, but the employee in certain cases would have to work a minimum of

80 days for the employer. He has pointed out how, for all practical purposes, the right of collective bargaining would hereafter become impossible to the working people. He has emphasized in his message the case of the closed shop as it has existed in America.

During the course of our management and labor experience in our own American way of working out our problems by trial and error, we have found it to be in the public interest to give a free hand to management and to labor and to make their own contracts one with another where nothing contrary to the law or the public interest was involved. Under that American practice, in the exercise of that prerogative of economic and political democracy, millions of American working men and women—a number in excess, I believe of three-quarters of all the organized workers in America—have entered into collective bargaining agreements which provide for the closed shop or union security. Experience has shown that principle to be in the public interest and not contrary to it. It has shown that the exercise of that right has given job-security to men and women which they otherwise could not have had. Through the medium of the labor organization the employer has been provided with skilled and competent personnel which probably he could not otherwise so well or so immediately acquire. Experience, I say, Mr. President, has proved that it is not only in the interest of the working people but it is in the interest of a greater America that we have recognized the right of employer and employee to bargain together and by bargaining agreements to provide for the principle of the closed shop and union security.

But the bill intervenes. Here at the bargaining table is an uninvited guest, Mr. President, who lays down the prohibition, "Thou shalt not," to employers and employees who desire to bargain in respect to a closed-shop agreement. The President knows that to void the contracts under which millions of working people have been working satisfactorily for their employers would not only be a disservice to the employees, but to their employers as well.

Only a few weeks ago we read in the newspapers of Washington a statement by Mr. Cyrus Eaton, a distinguished businessman of America, denouncing legislation that would outlaw and prohibit the closed shop and interfere with free collective bargaining between employer and employee. I believe that, if the truth were known, it would be revealed that the majority of the far-sighted business leaders of America appreciate the wisdom—yes, the necessity—of freedom to contract with the employees, and feel that the experience of the past should not be discarded by this legislation.

Mr. President, the message of the President is a critical, carefully analytical, thoroughly comprehensive consideration of the so-called Taft-Hartley labor bill, and the conclusion of the President is that the measure, if enacted into law, would be contrary to the public interest.

The President has not, however, taken the time to go into the background against which this bill was passed. He might have said that it comes at a time when monopoly in America is at an all-time peak. He might have said that the employers who urge the legislation are seeking to cheapen labor at a time when their profits are swollen to an all-time high. He might have said that those who looked upon the bill as the panacea for all ills in industry, who believed it would prevent strikes, were only harboring a delusion, because last year 82 percent of all the man-days lost by strikes, 75 percent of all the men and women out on strike, were the result of disputes over wages and hours, and the bill does nothing to make the employer more disposed to agree to give justice to his employees in respect to wages and hours.

The President might have added that any industrial peace the bill would achieve would be reached and gained at the expense of the living level of the working men and women of America. Mr. President, I feel the President might have added that that is too high a price for industrial peace in our country.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. My purpose in asking the Senator to yield was to suggest to the Senate that there is some reason to believe that we might secure a unanimous-consent agreement with respect to the time at which to vote upon the pending question. In view of the fact that it is necessary to have a quorum call in order to propose such unanimous-consent agreement——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair might state to the Senator from Nebraska that it is not necessary under existing circumstances, according to the Parliamentarian.

Mr. WHERRY. Regardless of that fact, I believe that in fairness to the Members of the Senate we should have a quorum call, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for that purpose, Mr. President.

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

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it seems to be unnecessary to go into detail in proposing a unanimous-consent request to vote upon the pending question, so I shall bring it to the attention of the Senate as quickly as possible. We have been in communication with Senators who are vitally interested.

I now propose, for the consideration of the Senate, a unanimous-consent request that the Senate vote upon the pending question at 5 o'clock this evening.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think it is perfectly obvious that we cannot vote at 5 o'clock or any other hour today. A number of Senators on both sides are absent from the city, and are on their way back in order to cast their votes. So I am compelled to object to the request of the Senator from Nebraska that we vote at 5 o'clock or any other hour today.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the distinguished minority leader, if it is impossible to accede to the unanimous-consent request for a vote at 5 o'clock today, if he would be agreeable to a vote on the pending question at 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want to be in the attitude of objecting to every request, or seeming to be unreasonable.

Mr. WHERRY. The minority leader is always fair.

Mr. BARKLEY. There are Members who will not return to the city until after lunch tomorrow. We cannot tell whether there may be some delay in their arrival which would prevent them from arriving here before 3 o'clock. I am compelled to say to the Senator that I would object to fixing the hour of 3 o'clock tomorrow for a final vote; but I would be inclined to agree to 5 o'clock, if that is agreeable to the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am quite satisfied that the hour of 5 o'clock will be agreeable if we cannot have a vote at 3.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that I have been advised by several Senators that if it were at all possible they would like to vote on this question today; and if we could arrange an hour not later than 3 o'clock on Saturday, that would be acceptable, in the event we could not vote today.

I know how important this question is, and I know that the minority leader and the majority leader want the strength of the Senate to be present to vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may say to the Senator that no more important veto message has been before the Senate in a long time; and in my judgment no more clear-cut or logical veto. I feel that Members of the Senate ought to have an opportunity to study the veto message and analyze it paragraph by paragraph and point by point. Obviously, they have not had an opportunity to do so today. Those who are on their way back here will have to depend upon the newspapers for copies of it in order that they may study it. I do not think it would be practicable to vote at 3 o'clock tomorrow, or at any other hour earlier than 5 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. I do not know whether that hour will suit the Senate, but it is agreeable to me.

I have consulted with most Senators who have been active on the committee, and I think that hour would be reasonably agreeable, although there are those who feel that the veto message ought not to be voted upon even tomorrow. They are perfectly sincere in their position. The message is so comprehensive and goes into such detail with respect to this legislation that it is felt by some that further study should be given to it.

My own judgment is that between now and 5 o'clock tomorrow afternoon Senators will have ample time to study the message and will be in a position to determine how they will vote. I think that is not an unreasonable length of time to request, in view of the importance of the question and the critical effect upon the country which a decision one way or the other may have.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to make a few brief remarks upon the request.

In my opinion, the President of the United States has handed down a sound and unanswerable veto message on this bill. In fact, I believe it to be one of the most powerful veto messages ever handed down by a President of the United States in all our history. I think that on point after point the President has made very clear in his veto message the type of legal legislative monstrosity upon which the Senate of the United States is now asked to pass final judgment. Tonight the President is going to take to the air in a Nation-wide radio broadcast. He considers this question to be of such vital importance to the economic welfare of the Nation that apparently he believes it advisable and necessary to apprise the American people of the economic dangers inherent in this piece of legislation.

As a firm believer in representative government, Mr. President, I think sufficient time should elapse between this veto message and the final vote in the Senate to enable the people of the country to make their wishes known in regard to this legislation. I think the President has done a much better job than have any of us who have been opposing this legislation. I am pleased that the veto message covers the major points I made in my speech of June 5, in opposition to this bill. However, in addition the President has made many other salient points. I think he has very clearly stated in his veto message the reasons why we should not pass this legislation. I, for one, believe that an adequate period of time should be afforded to enable the people of the United States to be heard from in regard to the last step in the passage or nonpassage of this piece of legislation. I know there are arguments against it. I appreciate the fact that to object at this time might bring down upon me criticism that our best opportunity to sustain the veto might be tomorrow afternoon. Of course, Mr. President, that goes to the individual responsibility of each Member of the Senate to be here next week, and he will have to assume that responsibility for himself. I think that balanced against the argument that more men may be here tomorrow is the importance not only of Members of the Senate taking time to study the veto message—and let me say that it cannot be done in a very short period of time if what we are trying to do is a conscientious job of weighing the inherent merits of the objections which the President has raised—but I think it is likewise of great importance that American employers study it.

I am inclined to believe, Mr. President, that the industrial statesmen among American employers, once they come to comprehend what is involved in this message and what will be visited upon them if this measure becomes law, will be heard from early next week. I think it will be found that a great many employers will take the same position which a group of very impartial and distinguished experts in the field of labor relations has taken in a telegram which I wish to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. The telegram, which was sent to the leaders of the Congress yesterday or the day before, I believe, is as follows:

> We speak as economists, lawyers, and educators representing no organization or partisan interest. We are unanimous in the conviction that the Taft-Hartley bill should not become law. This omnibus bill includes many provisions which are extremely unwise, unfair, and unworkable. It goes far beyond the legitimate purposes of curbing union abuses or providing equality of bargaining rights and duties. It would seriously weaken protections of Norris-Laguardia Act and National Labor Relations Act. It provides no constructive solution to problem of national strikes. It would increase industrial unrest and strife.

Who are these men, Mr. President, who have seen fit to call our attention at this zero hour, so far as the legislative history of this legislation is concerned, to the weaknesses of this bill? Let us take a few names:

E. Wight Bakke, director of labor-management center, Yale University; Paul Dodd, director of Institute of Industrial Relations and dean, University of California in Los Angeles; Thomas Emerson, professor of law, Yale University; Nathan Feinsinger, professor of law, University of Wisconsin, formerly public member, National War Labor Board.

Senators need only to read some of the outstanding decisions of this distinguished labor-relations scholar to recognize that when he takes this position they are hearing from an expert in the field of labor relations.

Phillips L. Garman, associate professor of labor and industrial relations, Institute of Industrial Relations, University of Illinois; Lloyd K. Garrison, attorney, formerly Chairman, National War Labor Board and dean of law school, University of Wisconsin; Walter Gellhorn, professor of law, Columbia University; Charles O. Gregory, professor of law, University of Chicago; James K. Hall, professor of economics, University of Washington; William S. Hopkins, Director of Institute of Labor Relations, University of Washington; Mark De Wolfe Howe, dean of law school, University of Buffalo; Vernon Jennsen, professor, New York School of Industrial Relations, Cornell University; Clark Kerr, professor and labor arbitrator, formerly Chairman, National War Labor Board Meatpacking Commission; Harry A. Millis, professor of economics (emeritus), University of Chicago), formerly Chairman, National Labor Relations Board; Lloyd G. Reynolds, associate director of labor-management center, Yale University; William G. Rice, professor of law, University of Wisconsin; Harry Shulman, professor of law, Yale University, impartial umpire for Ford Motor Co. and United Automobile Workers, CIO; Edwin E. Witte, professor of economics, University of Wisconsin, recognized as one of the six outstanding scholars in the field of labor economics in the entire country.

There is a long list of additional signers, as follows:

Prof. Jacob H. Benscher, University of Wisconsin; Prof. Ralph S. Brown, Jr., Yale University; Prof. Henry T. Buechel, University of Washington; Prof. John Dunlop, Harvard University; Prof. J. B. Gillingham, University of Washington; Prof. Horace M. Gray, University of Illinois; Prof. David Haber, Yale University; Prof. Paul Hays, Columbia University; Prof. John P. Herring, University of Washington; Prof. Willard Hurst, University of Wisconsin; Prof. Abbott Kaplan, University of California at Los Angeles; Prof. Delmar Karlen, University of Wisconsin; Prof. Leonard Mathy, University of Washington; Prof. Addison A. Mueller, Yale University; Prof. Vernon A. Mund, University of Washington; Prof. Frank C. Pierson, Swarthmore College; Prof. Effey Riley, Cornell University; Prof. George J. Ritter, Yale University; Prof. Arthur Ross, Berkeley, Calif.; Prof. Ralph J. Thayer, University of Washington; Prof. Samuel E. Thorne, Yale University; Prof. Marlin Volz, University of Wisconsin; Prof. Colston E. Warne, Amherst College; Prof. Donald H. Wollett, University of Washington.

What I want to point out, Mr. President, is that already we are beginning to hear from the country; already sufficient time has elapsed for some of our scholars to analyze the meanings and the effects of the Taft-Hartley bill, and they are coming forward with remarkable unanimity in opposition to this type of legislation. That is why I say that I think we ought to stop, look, and listen before we hastily vote on the veto message. Precious as time is, I know of no better way the Senate of the United States could spend its time for the next few days than to study the veto message and this legislation and take stock of what the sober thinking of the country tells us in regard to what its effects are bound to be.

This afternoon, in the House of Representatives, after the veto message was read, in a very short time the matter was swept through the House by an overwhelming vote to override the veto. There was no debate on the message. I want to say about the House action that it is a commentary on representative government. I do not want to see the branch of the Congress of which I am a Member engaged in such hasty action.

Some of the proponents of this legislation, Mr. President, already are deeply concerned about some of its weaknesses and are hastily preparing amendments to offer immediately after the final vote on the veto. I would suggest that statesmanship calls upon us to perfect our legislation before we pass it. Oh, yes,

some great newspapers, like the Washington Post of this city, in editorials are trying to lead the readers into believing that it is this legislation or no legislation. That does not follow, Mr. President. The leadership of the Congress rests with my party, and whether or not we get good legislation or bad legislation is the responsibility of the Republican majority in the Congress. The leadership of the majority knows that if we sustain this veto, if they have the will to pass good legislation they can pass it within 10 days after the veto is sustained. We do not need to pass legislation on any promise that once it is passed we will proceed at once to correct some of the weaknesses in it. What we should do, in the name of wise statesmanship, Mr. President, is to sustain the veto and then go to work immediately and endeavor to put through Congress legislation which will function properly, which will be workable, and which will promote industrial harmony and stability.

I wish to say that if the President's veto is sustained, within the hour after it is sustained, I myself will introduce some legislation on the subject, I shall introduce legislation which, on the basis of the experience gained from the work we did in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, will meet the objections raised in the veto message and will give us legislation which will be fair, reasonable, and workable. It will give us legislation which will equalize the Wagner Act and check those labor abuses which employers legitimately protest against.

But I shall not sit here and vote for an early overriding, if it may be that, of the President's veto message, until the country has an opportunity to be heard from in regard to the veto message. As a matter of courtesy and consideration to the President himself, who will speak over the radio tonight, I think we owe it to him not to vote on this question until the early part of next week.

Therefore, Mr. President, I object to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I did not know that the Senator from Oregon was going to object so abruptly. I wished to ask him to yield to me. However, inasmuch as he has objected, I shall not ask him to yield now.

I wish to make an observation—if the Senator from Nebraska will yield to me, if he has the floor; or, if he has not, if I have it——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think I have the floor; but I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I have listened with the greatest of interest to the statement which has been made by the Senator from Oregon. I agree with him absolutely with respect to the basis of his intense feeling about this legislation. The President's message has not only confirmed all the objections which I raised to this bill when it was originally under consideration in the Senate and when it later came before the Senate in connection with the conference report, it has confirmed not only all the objections which were raised by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and other Senators who discussed the proposed legislation at length before it was finally passed by both Houses of Congress, but the President's message has gone beyond some of the objections which we thought of, and which we raised at the time when the bill was previously under consideration.

Mr. President, we are confronted with a practical legislative situation. After we make a further study of this measure, carefully and without prejudice, in an earnest effort to understand not only the legislation which the President has vetoed but the sincerity with which he has done it and the meticulous care he has exercised in undertaking to understand the effect of the legislation, my own judgment is that if after doing so, by late in the afternoon tomorrow Senators who voted for the bill are not by that time willing to change their minds and are not then willing to vote to sustain the veto, then I doubt very honestly whether a postponement of the vote until next week would change a single vote by reason of outside pressure brought to bear upon the Senate because of a further study of the mesage on the part of the public.

I have a feeling that tomorrow there will be a more representative attendance in the Senate than there will be on any day next week. That may sound like an indictment of the interest of Senators in their attendance here, but it is not so intended. It is always impossible to have all Senators on the floor at one time. Exigencies arise which make inescapable that some Senators will be absent when any vote is taken. I believe that tomorrow afternoon, at the hour suggested, there will be a larger attendance of the Members of the Senate than there will be on any day next week; and I believe that our best chance to sustain this veto is by having the fullest possible attendance of Senators when the hour to vote arrives.

I do not believe that a delay from 5 o'clock tomorrow afternoon until Monday, Tuesday, or even Thursday of next week will result in the changing of any votes. On the contrary, it is entirely possible, taking into consideration the human elements which enter into these considerations, that a prolonged effort to bring pressure on either side upon Senators who have been under long pressure, for months, upon the subject, might do more harm than good.

Therefore, although sincerely believing in the position taken by the Senator from Oregon and recognizing his great service in this body and in other capacities in behalf of labor and his services in connection with the interpretation of the law as it now exists and his efforts to interpret the proposed laws on the subject—agreeing entirely with him about that—nevertheless, I have the hope that the Senate will agree to vote on this matter at some hour tomorrow. I say that in view of the situation, the unlikelihood that any greater change would take place next week than would take place tomorrow—if any changes are made in the final vote—by the time tomorrow at which it has been proposed that the Senate vote, to which proposal the Senator from Oregon has objected. We all know that seven Senators must change their votes if the veto is to be sustained. I have not undertaken to insert my eyes into the breast of any Senator to see what is going on in his bosom. I do not know whether any Senator is prepared today, or will be prepared tomorrow or next week, to change his vote, or whether a sufficient number of Senators are willing to do so, so as to sustain the veto. I fervently hope so. I fervently hope that all Senators will read the President's message with open mind and sincerity and without guile, to try to see whether under the conditions which he portrays, it would, in their judgment, be in the interest of the country for them to change their votes—and I refer particularly to the Senators who must change their votes if the veto is to be sustained. I sincerely and earnestly hope that that may take place.

But, Mr. President, I also sincerely and earnestly believe that if that cannot take place by tomorrow, at 5 o'clock or some other hour, it will not take place by Monday or Tuesday or any other day next week.

Therefore, with the greatest deference and with the greatest admiration for the position of the Senator from Oregon and his sincerity in regard to the matter, I earnestly hope that we may reach an agreement to vote at some hour tomorrow afternoon, because I believe there will be a larger vote tomorrow afternoon—knowing what I do about the situation confronting many Senators—than there will be on any day next week.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not intend to press unanimous-consent requests any further at this time. However, I am very optimistic that we shall be able to work out this problem later. I was attenmpting to give the opinions of, I believe, most of those who feel that an early vote on the veto message is what they would like to have; and with that end in mind, I have put in some untiring efforts, I suggest to the distinguished minority leader, in trying to obtain an agreement as to an hour which I thought would be acceptable to everyone concerned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the Senator from Nebraska and to other Senators, including the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and other responsible spokesmen on the other side of the aisle, for collaborating with those of us on this side of the aisle in an effort to determine whether some agreeable hour might be arrived at, and also to see whether Senators might be accommodated. I appreciate that effort.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the distinguished minority leader, and I ask him if it is not a fact, that we gave every consideration so that all Senators might be in attendance, regardless of how they would vote. It was our feeling that the hour which has already been suggested would be the most satisfactory hour.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true; and I say, further, that we have made a special effort to have Senators now absent be in attendance here tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; and we have done so regardless of their position on this question.

Mr. BARKLEY. We have done so in the case of Senators who now are on their way here, and will be here at the hour tomorrow afternoon for which the vote is suggested, unless some difficulty which we do not contemplate and cannot foresee arises.

Mr. President, I appreciate all these efforts; but I also appreciate that every Senator has a right to his own opinion, and we cannot avoid the exercise of such rights by Senators who entertain their opinions strongly.

However, I still hope that, notwithstanding the objection which has been registered to this request, it may subsequently be possible for us to work out an agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I associate myself completely with the optimism expressed by the minority leader, who has in many years gone by worked out unanimous-consent requests, and I shall certainly try again.

However, in view of the fact that objection has been made, and there are those who would like to know what the Senate expects to do, I should like to say that, with the consent of the Senate, we expect to continue on the remainder of the afternoon and into a night session debating the subject matter at hand. In the meantime, we will see what can be done toward arriving at an agreement on an hour for a vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from Oregon on the splendid statement he has just made. Generally, in an overwhelming majority of instances, I have agreed with the Senator from Oregon in his actions and statements. A time or two I have disagreed with what he has done, as in the last election, when he supported different candidates than those I supported, and spoke for them in the vain hope that he was liberalizing the Republican Party. I can forgive him, knowing his zeal for liberalism and for his party.

I wish to say, however, Mr. President, that I feel that the President's veto message is the first opportunity the opponents of the labor legislation have had to get their point of view across to the country, and, as the Senator from Oregon pointed out, it will take several days for that point of view, a very clear explanation of the bill, to be broadcast throughout the Nation. The President is taking to the radio this evening. I feel that the decision we are to make should be postponed in order that the country may have time to digest the very splendid analysis of the bill which the President has presented to us.

I might say for myself—of course, I cannot presume to speak for the Senator from Oregon or for any other Senator—that it would be agreeable to me if a day for a vote on the bill could be set some time next week. Next week there will be a dedication ceremony at Warm Springs, Ga., and many Senators are leaving the Capital for that ceremony, so that it seems to me that the only practical day for a vote on the bill, when we would have a full attendance, would be Thursday of next week, when Senators have returned from the trip to Warm Springs.

I have no desire to make an extensive speech on the subject. We have said about everything that can be said on it in the Senate, and what we have to say would not get Nation-wide attention and change any opinion out yonder. But the President's message will.

However, Mr. President, if it is the plan of the majority party to keep us in session until the bill shall be voted on, I do not propose to have it voted on immediately. As I have said, my object is not to talk. I deplore a filibuster. Of course, a filibuster is for the object of killing legislation or preventing a vote upon a matter. I have no objection to the veto message and the bill being laid aside and any other legislation being considered, and to our having an agreement for the vote on a day certain, which I would suggest be Thursday of next week. In that case I should be perfectly satisfied not to talk on the subject any further.

However, if it is the intent to throw down the gauntlet and say, "We are going to vote at the earliest possible moment, and those of you who feel that the country should have an opportunity to react will just have to hold the floor," I will say that I hope the time will never come when I shall be forced to see how long I can talk on the floor of the Senate. I do not relish the prospect at all, and, as I have said, my remarks would not be in the nature of a filibuster to prevent action; they would be in the nature of delaying the vote until the people have had time to think over the matter, and let their Senators know their views.

I am perfectly willing to have the vote taken at the time I have suggested, without anything at all being said by me. But if the only way by which we can delay the vote until the full import of the measure gets across to the country, by way of the President's thorough, calm, coolly reasoned message—if the only way we can delay the vote so that that may happen is by talking, then I say, Mr. President, I shall talk, I shall talk at length, and I think that I can talk at considerable length if I am compelled to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. It is my understanding that the vote on the bill which has been vetoed takes precedence over any other business of the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. And that if any other business is to be transacted, it must be done by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It can be done by motion.

Mr. WHERRY. On motion or by unanimous consent?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Objection to any other business is in order, and the vote on the labor bill on its reconsideration is the pending question and has the right of way?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a few minutes ago a unanimous-consent request was presented to the Senate. Reserving the right to object, the Senator from Oregon gave his reasons as to why he thought he should file his objections. Is the junior Senator from Oregon correct in his understanding that when he made that response to the question of the Chair as to whether there was objection to the unanimous-consent request, he did not sacrifice any of his rights under the rule to speak twice on the same legislative day on the pending business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would rule that the Senator was speaking on the unanimous-consent request only.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, apropos of the question as to the time for a vote, I believe that it probably would be an injustice to some of the Members of the Senate if a vote were to be had tomorrow afternoon, although I would have been perfectly willing to agree to such a time for a vote if there could have been general accord.

It is known, however, that Senators are en route back to Washington, some from other countries. Some of those Senators have been vitally interested in the legislation which is the subject of the veto message, and other legislation of a similar character. I think that within reasonable limits every Member of this body is entitled to vote on vital matters of legislation, and especially when the matter is of such far-reaching significance as is the matter before us, and where the issue is whether a veto of the President of the United States shall be overridden or sustained.

So far as I have heard from the Senators who made objection, or indicated a desire for delay, they have not specified any time next week, and it seems to me it might be possible that a vote could be taken the early part of the week. I suggest to the leadership the consideration of that possibility, if no agreement for an earlier vote can be achieved.

I agree thoroughly with what has been said about the importance of the labor bill, and the right of the American people, in a democracy, to know what the President has said and what the measure involves. Do Senators realize that this is just one sentence in the President's message:

> I find that this bill is completely contrary to that national policy of economic freedom.

In instance after instance the President has said that the measure goes to the essential democracy of America. Surely, when we are to make a decision of such great import, it does not have to be done on a week end, with Senators scattered all over the country, and some in foreign countries, on official missions.

Surely, Mr. President, a matter of that importance can be determined in one of the early days of next week. The Chair has advised that this measure can be laid aside on motion or by unanimous

consent. I know of nobody disposed to object to a motion or to a request for unanimous consent to lay this bill aside, so that a vote may be had at an agreed time. That will not therefore delay the progress of Senate business, for we can begin immediately, if we could make such an agreement, to consider anything else the leadership of the majority desires to bring before the Senate.

I realize that we are not going to persuade one another with what we say here upon this measure. I never saw the message or had a chance to examine it, until it was being read from the rostrum here. I do not know whether any other Senator had a preview of the message; but I dare say many did not, if any at all. Yet we are asked to vote upon a measure of that vital importance, without a chance reflectively even to read the President's message; certainly, without the people of the country having a chance to see it and to manifest their opinion to the Congress.

Mr. President, the people of the country under our Constitution have a right to petition Congress; they have a right to assemble, and to address their public officers. If we decide this matter before they have a chance to exercise that right, we, for all practical purposes, thwart a provision of the people's Constitution. I think the people of the country are vitally interested in this legislation. I think that every man, woman, boy, and girl in America has a stake in how this issue is decided. I think, Mr. President, that this bill is contributing to the momentum that the country is already acquiring down the road to another depression. Surely, that will strike at the heart of every business enterprise, every financial institution, the integrity of every home, the job of every working man and woman in America.

Mr. President, the President of the United States says the issue of democracy and economic freedom is involved in this legislation. Surely, the American people, upon legislation of such vast importance, have a right to be heard, have a right to manifest their opinion.

The President has emphasized in his message what the bill does to our political rights in our cherished democracy. He says, in the latter part of the message, that the bill would make it unlawful for a labor-union newspaper to write an editorial opposing or favoring candidates for public office. He emphasizes, Mr. President, that it would be unlawful, as the Senator from Ohio said here upon this floor it would be, for a labor leader, if his time were paid for by his union, to speak to the people on the radio about a public issue, about a party, or about a candidate for public office.

Mr. President, the President points out that the corporations of America own the newspapers and own the radio stations. They have access to the public ear all the time. Yet, to deny the working people a right to speak through the leadership of their unions, which they may pay for with their hard-earned wages, to deny a union newspaper a right to express its opinion, to deny a labor union the right to issue pamphlets for those they think favorable to the cause of labor and the public interest, is to strike at the very heart of political democracy as well as economics in America. Yet that is what the President of the United States says the bill does. That is a serious matter, Mr. President. It is not an irresponsible columnist; it is not a radio commentator; it is not a partisan; it is the Chief Magistrate of the United States who, in a solemn veto message, has proclaimed those sentiments and convictions to the Congress and to the country.

Yes, Mr. President, the President has said that the bill goes far beyond the question of labor disputes in America; it transcends partisanship; it goes beyond the effort of one class to gain the ascendancy over another; he says it goes to Americanism, Mr. President, to the very fundamentals of our political and economic structure.

These are just the last few paragraphs in summary of the message:

> The most fundamental test which I have applied to this bill is whether it would strengthen or weaken American democracy in the present critical hour. This bill is perhaps the most serious economic and social legislation of the past decade. Its effects—for good or ill—would be felt for decades to come.
>
> I have concluded—

Continued the President—

> that the bill is a clear threat to the successful working of our democratic society.
>
> One of the major lessons of recent world history—

Says the President—

> is that free and vital trade-unions are a strong bulwark against the growth of totalitarian movements.

Let me interpolate there, Mr. President. As Senators will recall, it was brought out at Nuremberg that in his effort to accomplish totalitarianism, the three objectives of Hitler were to destroy the church, destroy the labor unions, and to persecute the Jew. I am quoting further from the President's message:

> We must, therefore, be everlastingly alert that in striking at union abuses we do not destroy the contribution which unions make to our democratic strength.

The President says further:

> This bill would go far toward weakening our trade-union movement. And it would go far toward destroying our national unity. By raising barriers between labor and management and by injecting political considerations into normal economic decisions, it would invite them to gain their ends through direct political action. I think it would be exceedingly dangerous to our country to develop a class basis for political action.

The President says further:

> I cannot emphasize too strongly the transcendent importance of the United States in the world today as a force for freedom and peace. We cannot be strong internationally if our national unity and our productive strength are hindered at home. Anything which weakens our economy or weakens the unity of our people—as I am thoroughly convinced this bill would do—I cannot approve.
>
> In my message on the state of the Union which I submitted to the Congress in January 1947, I recommended a step-by-step approach to the subject of labor legislation. I specifically indicated the problems which we should treat immediately. I recommended that, before going on to other problems, a careful, thorough, and nonpartisan investigation should be made, covering the entire field of labor-management relations.
>
> The bill now before me reverses this procedure. It would make drastic changes in our national labor policy first, and would provide for investigation afterward.
>
> There is still a genuine opportunity for the enactment of appropriate labor legislation this session. I still feel that the recommendations which I expressed in the state of the Union message constitute an adequate basis for legislation which is moderate in spirit and which relates to known abuses.
>
> For the compelling reasons I have set forth, I return H. R. 3020 without my approval.

Mr. President, this veto message is a document that will go down in history as thoroughly American in its every word and line.

I have regretted to see on the other side of the aisle such a degree of unanimity in expressing a determination to pass this legislation. It may be that the majority party will say that it has a mandate from the people. It is strange to me, Mr. President, that the people should have given a mandate for the destruction of their fundamental economic and political interests. But if the majority party feels that it has a mandate, and it wishes to make a political issue of economic democracy in America, then I think the challenge can well be accepted.

I believe that this measure presents an issue as clear as the noonday sun. In voting on this measure I think Senators disclose where their sympathies lie and on which side they desire to be aligned in the industrial struggle between the masses of the people and the privileged corporate few in America. I am not in any sense of the word disparaging the opinions or impugning the motives of any other Senator. I am only expressing my own views as to the issues, as I see them disclosed in the legislation.

As a Democrat, I am proud that a Democratic President had the courage to say "No" to this effort to hamstring the working people of America, and to hurl the Nation into another economic abyss and pull down with us the rest of the world. At a time when General Marshall is talking about our strength being measured at home, when former President Hoover is saying, "Let us see how much we can afford to give to Europe and the rest of the world," here before us is a measure action upon which will help determine how much we can afford to give to the people of the devastated countries and to others in need. At a time when everything possible should be done to strengthen our economy, we find before us a proposal which if enacted would result in weakening rather than strengthening our economy, and instead of our production being increased, would result in its dwindling into a trickle.

That is the reason why the President says that what we now do is of vital concern not only to America but to democracy in the world. As a Democratic Senator I am proud that a majority of those on this side of the aisle—and I make this as a prediction—will be found sustaining a Democratic President in the magnificent veto message which we have just heard read from the rostrum.

Mr. President, I do not think there is anything extraordinary about the way the two parties by their majorities have alined themselves. I think it simply represents the customary division in point of view between the parties. I think the majority party is still expressing the philosophy of its recognized founder, Alexander Hamilton. It still believes that the best kind of a tax bill is the bill that gives the principle benefit to the privileged few. We on this side of the aisle do not have such a belief. That is the reason Senators on this side of the aisle generally opposed the recent tax bill. We believe that if we are to give tax relief we should give it first to those who need it most. Even before that, perhaps we should pay our debts when we have the money with which to pay.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. And when the public were able to understand the meaning of the tax bill they, too, rejected it, according to polls which were taken throughout the country.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is absolutely correct. We were assailed by a great clamor and a great tumult, and had we been persuaded by it we would almost unanimously have adopted the tax proposal which was submitted to us. But when the people had a chance to analyze it, when they had a chance to see whose nests it feathered, that the nests it feathered were the already downy nests of the privileged, they said, "Well, that is a different kind of a tax bill from what we thought it was. We thought it was proposed to give all of us tax relief; that the burdens upon all our backs were to be lightened by Congress." But when they saw the bill they found out that the backs that were to have the burdens lifted from them were the backs that were almost erect, and the backs that were bent over by burdens were hardly given any relief at all.

The House passed the tax bill, and the Senate passed it, but the President, as in the present case, had the wisdom and the courage to veto it, to stand against the clamor of those who did not understand the kind of a bill Congress had enacted. But when the President vetoed it and in a message which plainly showed what the bill would do, the House of Representatives sustained his veto.

As the Senator from Montana has intimated, there was a Gallup poll taken, and what did it show? It showed that the majority of the American people agreed we were right in opposing the tax bill. I cannot escape the force of the analogy here. The people thought this was a labor bill which ought to be enacted; that there were abuses by labor leaders and by irresponsible labor members which should be corrected; that the country should be protected against any excesses, or against grievous emergencies, or against flagrant violation of the public interest. Of course, people thought we should have legislation with those objectives. Everybody thinks so, or should think so. And, naturally, having confidence in their Congress, which all the newspapers told them was doing the just and necessary thing, they believed Congress was enacting wise and necessary legislation. Remember, the newspapers generally are corporate employers, and are not for the workers of America. From what the newspapers told the people they thought that this was that kind of a labor bill.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should like to call to the Senator's mind what happened in this Chamber last year. The circumstances were reversed, however. We had a message from the President advocating drastic action in the matter of labor relations, and the House did the very same thing that has happened there today. They rushed that legislation through in a few minutes, if Senators will remember, and then when it came to the Senate the predictions were that the same thing would happen here. But we kept it from coming to a head for a little while, and on second, sober thought we reversed the matter here.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the Senator from Idaho referring to the bill that was proposed by the President of the United States last year to draft labor into the Army of the United States?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The bill which came over from the House and was advocated by the majority party, and which was blocked on the floor of the Senate by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]? Is that the bill to which the Senator refers?

Mr. TAYLOR. I refer to the bill which was blocked by a number of Senators. I would not give the credit to the Senator from Ohio. I remember at the time that it happened I was reading the bill at my desk, and as I went through it I found it to be very distressing, and I finally came to the last paragraph which provided that, in addition to other things that would happen, all profit from industries while they were in the hands of the Government would go to the Government, and I leaned over to the Senator next to me—I have forgotten who he was, as we have moved around a little bit since then—and I said, "The Republicans will never agree to the bill when they read the last paragraph." At that time I looked over and saw that the Senator from Ohio was just finishing reading the bill, and when he read the last paragraph he hit the ceiling, and his fist hit the desk, and he was bitterly opposed to that labor legislation which would take the profits away from the big industrialists. So, yes; I am happy to say the Senator from Ohio opposed the legislation.

I want to call that situation to mind, in order to remind Senators that it is not good to act in too great haste. Perhaps if we argue the matter long enough we will find that the legislation before us might take some profits from somebody, and that would indeed win converts to our side. I frankly feel that it would take profits from every industrialist, from every little businessman, from every farmer, because it would create uncounted labor disputes, and when business stagnates naturally everyone loses profits. I feel that as soon as the farmers and small businessmen of America realize what this is going to mean they will add their voices in protest to the voices of those who labor with their hands for a living. I am confident that that will have a considerable effect on the final outcome.

As I have said, I have no desire to indulge in a filibuster. All I want is time for the President's message to get to the people. If they talk it over and let their Representatives in Congress know how they feel, I believe that those Representatives can in all good conscience change their votes and help to sustain the veto. I am confident that many Senators have voted on this question thinking that they were reflecting the will of the people back home when, in truth, the people back home were not informed. I believe that the Representatives in Congress of the people should be given full credit for wanting to represent the will of the people.

I thank the Senator from Florida for yielding.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator from Idaho.

I was saying that I had observed with some pride—pardonable, I hope—the stand of the Democratic membership of this body. I speak, of course, of the majority of the Democratic membership. We do not always have unanimity in either party. I am willing that my party should be judged, as I suppose the majority party is willing to be judged, by the action of the majority of its members.

I am proud to recall what the action of the two parties was with respect to price control. Some Democrats voted to eliminate price control; but if we consult the RECORD we find, I believe with one exception, that in all the many votes the majority of the people's party stood on the side of the people in the matter of protecting their standard of living against inflationary prices and profits.

So in this case it seems to me perfectly natural that the party which follows the philosophy of Alexander Hamilton should believe that the rich, the well-born, and the privileged occupy a little higher place in the hierarchy of democracy than do the ordinary run-of-the-mill people. Naturally that kind of a philosophy would lead an exponent of that faith to see first the employer rather than the employee; the large corporation, the colossus astride a nation's economy, with its tentacles extending around the world, instead of the humble men and women who answer the whistle and who eat their lunches in the plant at noon out of their little buckets. Naturally one who adheres to that belief will read the newspaper editorials published by corporate publishers to see what their opinions are, and will heed them more than they do the murmurings and the inarticulate mutterings of the humble people of America.

So it is not surprising that we divide in the Senate as we are divided on this issue. The party which follows the doctrine of Thomas Jefferson, which be-

lieves in the dignity of the people, has no place to go except to the defense of the people, as their President has gone to their defense, and as a majority of their party in the Senate is going to their defense in the final vote upon this veto message.

Why do I say that this involves the masses of the people? Because if the bill had its right name it would be called a bill to cheapen labor in America. If wages rise, that cuts down profits. There are some employers who are so greedy that they are not willing to pay the worker a fair wage, because that would cut down their profits a little.

Mr. President, is this a depression? Are profits so dwarfed and dwindled that they are a mere trickle, so that the stream must be enlarged? No, Mr. President; the river of corporate profits in America today is at an all-time flood, and corporate profits are going up. In 1946 corporate profits in America increased $3,000,000,000, but what happened to salaries and wages? In the same period, while corporate profits went up $3,000,000,000, salaries and wages went down $5,000,000,000. Yet it is sought to impose a labor bill on the workers of America which would make it impossible for their unions to maintain the wages which they are receiving today. Is that in the public interest? Does not that mean that the living level of the people is involved?

Mr. President, this bill relates to calories. It relates to the very food on the family table, for the children who come there in the innocent belief that they will be provided for, in the richest country in the world.

Mr. President, the bill involves the health and lives of men, women, and children in America. During the debate on the bill I gave, from certain reports, reliable figures which showed that people with inadequate wages received less medical care, that more were ill, and that a greater number died than was true of the class in which income was adequate.

There may be some who would not be moved by that kind of an appeal, although it is difficult for me to conceive it if they really understood what was involved. This measure affects the prosperity of the Nation in every aspect of our economy.

Let us take a case which is close to my heart, the citrus industry of my State of Florida. I speak not only for Florida but for the citrus industry of the whole Nation. During this week, representatives of the citrus industry in Texas, Arizona, California, and Florida have been meeting to try to find some way to protect the price level of our product, which is so meaningful to the economies of our States, and to find some market abroad for the volume of citrus fruit which we are producing.

What is beginning to hurt us, Mr. President, is the dwindling purchasing power of the American worker. If the American worker and the people generally are able to buy, of course they will enjoy the grapefruit, the oranges, the tangerines, and the canned fruit juices which we produce in our several States.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. We all know that citrus fruits are a necessity. During the depression I saw piles of oranges in California 10 feet high and half a mile long, laid out to rot. If anyone had taken one he would have been arrested for stealing; and yet at that very moment millions of children were growing up with rickets, as was attested by the statistics obtained from our selective-service files. Many men suffered from physical defects caused by a lack of the necessary vitamins during youth.

Of course, some persons consider citrus fruits were an absolute luxury. If we had to choose between meat, let us say, and citrus fruits, we might give up citrus fruits first. When I was a boy citrus fruits were an absolute luxury. If I saw one orange a month I was very lucky. I could probably remember the times when I had an orange to eat when I was a child.

But does the Senator know that not only citrus fruit, but milk, is involved? Milk is the most basic necessity for the welfare and health of our children, to say nothing of adults. The consumption of milk, at least in Pittsburgh or Philadelphia, I read the other day, has fallen off 7 percent. There can be no other reason for that than that the workers are not receiving sufficient money to buy this most urgent necessity. If that is happening to them in the case of milk, God help the citrus growers. While citrus fruit is a wonderful food and should be a necessity, it does not rank so high on the list as does milk; and if people cannot even afford to buy milk for their children, there will be a lot of sufferers among producers because of lack of return on their crops, and it will be a very costly thing to our Government to maintain support prices.

All this is directly traceable to the fact that the worker's actual take-home pay has been dwindling while profits have been increasing. We know that the people who make the profits have all the citrus fruit they want and all the milk they want. They have had all the milk and citrus fruit that they wanted all the time, and they are not going to buy any more. It is a very serious thing which strikes at the foundations of our economy, because this bill would cripple and possibly ruin labor unions and make it impossible for them to recoup the losses they have sustained in the way of purchasing power.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator from Idaho.

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

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wanted to say to the able Senator from Florida that I shall not at this time, as a matter of courtesy to him, make a point of order relative to his having spoken twice on the same subject on the same legislative day; but since the able Senator from Idaho has at least given the implication that he is willing to conduct a filibuster to prevent the Senate from coming to a vote on this question, I must in the future advise the able Senator from Florida that unless he yields only for a question I shall have to make that point of order.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair make a brief statement. The Chair feels that if the rules are to be strictly enforced there should be notice that they are to be strictly enforced. We have been proceeding under our natural process this afternoon, and up to this point the Chair would not consider it necessary to enforce the strict rule in respect to speeches and yielding to questions. If we are to proceed on the other basis, the Chair needs notification also. Therefore the Chair suggests to the Senator from Florida that he yield no further except for questions.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, while the matter is under discussion I should like a ruling of the Chair, and I hope it may be an indulgent one characteristic of his usual courtesy and generosity. This is, in fact, only the first speech of the Senator from Florida on this matter, because the Chair will recall that the Senator from Florida was addressing the Senate when the acting majority leader asked him to yield in order to present a unanimous-consent request. Then the Senator from Oregon, taking advantage of that request, addressed himself to the subject temporarily. The Senator from Florida had not intended to relinquish the floor, but the Senator from Idaho rose to say something on the same point; and the fact that he, as did the Senator from Oregon, digressed technically a little bit from the rule——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. So able a parliamentarian as the Senator from Florida does not need to be reminded that there are other ways of obtaining recognition. The Chair may say that if a filibuster is undertaken or an effort to indulge in one is undertaken, the Chair is quite ready to enforce the rules. But that is not the usual custom.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Florida has participated in only one filibuster since he has been a Member of the Senate, and that has been for nearly 11 years. He does not expect to participate in another. It is not a filibuster to have 2 or 3 days of debate. So far as I am concerned, I was willing to vote on Saturday, and I am willing to vote on Monday; but on a matter of such importance as is the veto message of the President of the United States, which directly affects the whole economy and the political life of the Nation, surely 2 or 3 days could not be considered an extraordinary time for the discussion of it on both sides of the aisle. So I can assure the Chair that the Senator from Florida is in no sense of the word going to be a party to any filibuster.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I will yield if the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] will not raise a point of order. I do not want to be called out of order.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator realize that twice we have debated every point that is contained in the President's veto message? I have been over it, and there is not a new thing in it. Does not the Senator realize that sooner or later we must stop debating measures which come before the Senate? This measure was debated in full when it was originally before the Senate and it was again debated in full when the conference report was considered.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am sure that the Senator from Ohio, able constitutional lawyer that he is, would not deprecate the importance and ignore the difference in the issues presented to the Congress when we have a Presidential veto and when we are debating legislation for passage by the body itself. Surely the Constitution of the United States vested in the Chief Magistrate of this land the veto power with the expectation that it would be solemnly regarded and observed by the American Congress and by the country. That was an extraordinary authority to give the Chief Magistrate of the land. But the Constitution gave it to him. So I think, Mr. President, if there were nothing involved except whether or not the veto of the President of the United States, elected by the whole people, should be overridden, that alone would be a worthy and proper subject of discussion by the Senate of the United States, which still likes to cherish its world-wide reputation of being the greatest deliberative body in the world.

Moreover, the President has been able to bring to bear upon this measure a degree of scrutiny and a thoroughness of examination which has not in the past been available to the Senate. I will wager, Mr. President, that there has been no report submitted to the Senate by the committee of which the able Senator from Ohio is the chairman, that compares in thoroughness of analysis of this measure with the veto message of the President of the United States.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I will yield for a question.

Mr. TAFT. The veto message goes over, point by point, the points raised in a memorandum put into the RECORD by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], to each item of which the Senator will find an answer which I put into the RECORD. Does not the Senator think that the veto message substantially and in detail follows the Pressman memorandum which the Senator from Montana put into the RECORD?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I cannot attribute any reason for the question asked by the Senator from Ohio except the innuendo that Lee Pressman afforded the basis for this Presidential veto, which I deny with all the indignation of which I am capable. It is an unworthy insinuation. Unless the Senator from Ohio has the fact he should make no such charge; if he has such information I should like him to tell his colleagues of the Senate the basis of his information.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I made no such charge. What I suggested was that if the Senator would read in the RECORD the Pressman memorandum, which was put into the RECORD by the distinguished Senator from Montana, and also put into the RECORD by one of the House Members, the Senator will find that the veto message follows it almost point by point. I am not suggesting that other things were not also considered; but I think the Senator will find that they are very similar.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for a question. That is all I am permitted to do, under the rule.

Mr. MURRAY. I will ask the Senator if it is not a fact that I introduced not an analysis made by Lee Pressman, but a very thorough and impartial analysis which was prepared for me, at my request, by the National Labor Relations Board and which was inserted in the RECORD in connection with my remarks at the time I discussed the bill during the debate?

Mr. PEPPER. I was going to say to the Senator from Ohio that I had never seen any memorandum put into the RECORD by the Senator from Montana as coming from Mr. Lee Pressman, general counsel of the CIO. I will answer the question of the Senator from Montana. My understanding is that the memorandum about which the Senator from Ohio was speaking was prepared by the National Labor Relations Board and not by Mr. Lee Pressman. I have seen no Lee Pressman memorandum presented here on the Senate floor, and I have not seen one privately or publicly.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would it be parliamentary for the Senator from Florida to yield to me in order that I might ask a question of the Senator from California?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not think so.

Mr. TAYLOR. I cannot do that?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Not under this new regime.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for permission to ask a question of the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator can submit his question.

Mr. TAYLOR. I simply wish to ask the Senator from Florida whether he thinks that it ill behooves the Senator to interrupt the discussion on the floor and to insist upon strict observance of the rules when we are discussing the necessity of citrus fruit in the diet of the people of this country, inasmuch as the Senator comes from a great citrus-raising State, the State of California.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Idaho for reminding the Senator from California of his own great interest in the citrus industry. I am sure he would not consciously do anything to its detriment.

Mr. President, I say that the President of the United States has access to sources of information which we ourselves do not have available. I am informed that only today the President has stated that he had from three to five independent agencies make an independent search and analysis of this bill and make an independent response to him, and that then he took all those responses and reexamined and reanalyzed this measure and molded that opinion with his own into the veto message.

So, Mr. President, I am glad to have the Senator from Ohio state that he did not intend to imply or insinuate that Mr. Lee Pressman or any other labor leader or labor-interested person had any part in the preparation of the President's veto message. All of us have been reading in the newspapers statements to the effect that the President has refused to talk to representatives of either one side or the other in regard to this question. The newspapers carry the information that the President did the same thing with respect to Democratic Party officials who yesterday in his office sought to discuss the subject with him; he cut them rather curtly short. I read in the newspapers and I heard from those who were there that he said he had not discussed this matter with either labor or management, and that he would not discuss it with any public officials; and I do not know of any Democratic officials with whom he has discussed it.

But, Mr. President, I was saying that this matter is vital to the country, and I was speaking of the vital importance of this measure to the citrus industry of my State, and I was pointing out that the problem we have today is due, essentially, to the diminished purchasing power of the people of the United States. Between January 1945 and December 1946 the actual wages of the workers of this country—taking into account inflation and the increased cost of what they had to buy—diminished 22 percent, or more than one-fifth. Let me digress here to say that yesterday in the Senate we hurried through, with only a few minutes of debate, a bill which will have the practical effect of immediately raising rents 15 percent for a large segment of the people of the United States, and in the course of a few months will eliminate all semblance of rent control in the United States; we did that just yesterday, here in the Senate; so it is not surprising that the following day an attempt should be made to strike an even greater blow to the homes in America and the standard of living of the American people.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to ask the Senator whether it is not a fact that it was the diminished purchasing power of the American workers, following the last war, that brought on the great depression which put 16,000,000 men on the sidewalks in the United States, looking for jobs.

Mr. PEPPER. It was; and I thank the Senator from Montana for his inquiry, because he has stated exactly what former Gov. Harold Stassen, of Minnesota, said to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, namely, that it was the diminished purchasing power of the workers of America, due to hostile

labor policies on the part of the Government, that contributed very materially to the depression of the late twenties.

Now we are asked to adopt similar policies, and I affirm that they will have similar results, as Governor Stassen stated when he gave his testimony to the Senate committee.

So, Mr. President, if we wish to increase the intensity of the recession, which already is under way, all we have to do is to cut down the ability of the American people to buy goods, and that will be the result.

I do not know why more people are not sufficiently wise to understand the correctness of what Mr. Cyrus Eaton, a leading businessman, pointed out in recent interviews to which I have referred. I do not know why the greed and the avarice of a few people in the United States will let them act contrary to their own economic interest. I know there is not an employer of labor in the United States who will not be worse off, if this bill becomes law, than he is today. Not only that, Mr. President, but there is not a market in the United States that would be as secure and as adequate for goods and services as it is now, before this bill has become law.

So I am disturbed about what is happening to our economy. Today, if we go to practically any part of our country, and ask the people what is happening, they will give us evidence of a returning recession. They will show us rising unemployment; they will show us diminished markets for agricultural products; they will show us more and more working people with reduced wages and earnings; they will show us one sign after another indicating that the structure of the present prosperity is gradually being undermined and that the foundations are being eaten away by the kind of termites that are in accord with the policy embodied in this bill, which some persons wish to hurry through the Senate by passing it over the President's veto.

Mr. President, let us remember, as I have said many times before, that the American people are still a poor people. Of course, some persons say that the labor unions have been getting too much money for the workers and are cutting profits too much, and are interfering more than they should with management. Yet, Mr. President, the statistics of the Treasury Department reveal that approximately half the families of America make less than $40 a week. What kind of a house can a family making $40 a week live in, and what kind of diet can they have, and how much medicine can they buy, and how much doctor's care can they receive, and how many of the clothes which they require are they able to purchase? What can they lay aside for a rainy economic day?

Mr. President, it is said that certainly they must have a lot of money now. However, we remember what the Federal Reserve Board discovered only a short time ago, namely, that two out of five Americans then had—and that was last year—total liquid savings of less than $40. It is upon such American workingmen that this iniquitous antilabor legislation is proposed to be saddled.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Is it not true that installment buying is on the increase because the people have not the current income sufficient to enable them to pay cash for the things they need?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is absolutely correct. He will recall that I put in the RECORD a little while ago a statement from the Wall Street Journal giving a long summary of all the many signs that were present in our economy of the recession I described a moment ago. One was the increase in installment buying. Do not Senators recall the increase in installment buying in the 1920's, what it led to, and what it preceded?

Another sign is the sale of savings bonds, the sale of E bonds which the people bought during the war. They have been sold in great volume. Diminished savings on the part of the people in dollars are another sign.

Certainly there are some Senators on this floor who especially should be interested. I am reminded, for instance the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who makes the wonderful Capehart radio machine. Surely he wants every family to have a Capehart, big or little. They cannot even have a little Capehart in the family if the family income is not adequate so that they are able to purchase something of such excellent quality as a Capehart.

Mr. President, we should stop, look, and listen today in our economy. We are talking about saving Europe. More and more Senators are becoming concerned about what is going to happen to the economy of the United States of America.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to ask the Senator whether he is opposed to installment selling.

Mr. PEPPER. I am not opposed to installment selling, but if it grows beyond a normal volume, it may have a significance because, after all, it is buying on credit. There are two kinds of people who buy on credit, in my humble opinion: One is the person who uses credit wisely; the other is the one who uses credit as a way of getting something he cannot otherwise afford. If it is carried too far, it becomes a danger signal rather than something healthy for our economy.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator agree with me that through installment selling in America millions and millions of our people have been able to enjoy refrigerators, modern equipment, automobiles, pianos, and the like?

Mr. PEPPER. I do agree. Nearly every automobile I have owned I have bought on the installment plan.

Mr. CAPEHART. What is the objection, then, to the fact that installment sales are rising? That means that someone is able to purchase an item for his own use which, in turn, gives employment to somebody else who makes it.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; but we found out, during the days preceding the last depression, that when it goes too far it is a danger signal instead of a sign of health in our economy.

There will always be a certain number of people who will buy on the installment plan, and who can afford to, but if it goes beyond the normal number who should participate in that kind of credit, as I have said, it indicates diminished savings and diminished buying power, and becomes a danger signal to the health of the whole economy.

Mr. CAPEHART. How does the Senator propose to control it?

Mr. PEPPER. I propose to control it by making it possible for more people to pay more nearly in cash, or liquid value, for what they get. They achieve that position by getting better wages, and by having more savings, so that they can pay either a larger share of the total cost of what they buy when they get it, or fewer of them will be forced to the necessity of installment buying. I am sure the Senator does not mean to indicate that everything in America should be sold on the installment plan.

Mr. President, President Hoover and other leaders have said we had bettter examine the ability of America to help others. The bill we are considering would diminish rather than strengthen the power of America to help the destitute nations and peoples of the world.

We hear it asked, how can labor unions have anything to do with the level of wages for the workers? In the recent debate I read an opinion written by former Chief Justice Taft, of the Supreme Court, who referred, better than I can, to what it meant to the workers to have the power of organization, or of bargaining collectively with the employer, of using their united strength. The whole principle of our Federal Union is, that in union there is strength, and that principle applies to labor unions, as well as to the American Union of States.

Yes, we have strength we would not otherwise possess. What would America be if we had been permanently divided by the War Between the States, if other nations could deal with us as parts, not as a great and mighty whole? What were we when we were merely an aggregation of colonies which might become the prey of an enemy? We became strong when we got together in union and in unity. The same applies to the workers of this country. Let the employer be able to discharge any worker, and everyone is weak. But give unity to all the workers, find the mechanism by which they can make a common cause, let the employer know that if he discharges one without just cause they will all withhold their work, and that one man has a strength and power comparable to that of the whole number of men who work in the enterprise.

Mr. President, what the bill we are considering is designed for is to restore the arbitrary power of the employers and to restore the weakness of the employees. That is what it comes down to. The President has gone through the bill item by item, and set forth the details by which that is to be accomplished.

Mr. President, it is not only contrary to the interest of the working people of

the country, it is contrary to the interest of all the people of America.

I have two letters here which I should like to read. The first is from Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor. No one ever accused Mr. Green of being a violent radical. No one ever suggested that he was a Communist, or that he was trying to do other than help the men and women of America to get a more decent wage, and have more decent working conditions under which to labor.

Mr. Green is speaking for millions of the working men and women of America, and this is what he says to me this day:

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am taking the liberty of transmitting herewith to you, and I hope through you to your fellow Senators, a sincere expression of the hope that the President's veto of the highly objectionable Taft-Hartley bill will be sustained by the United States Senate.

The working men and women of the United States whose economic life and activities would be subjected to force and governmental domination, are the same working men and women who served in the army of production during the war period, who responded in full measure to the call of the Government for increased production, who made a no-strike pledge for the duration of the war and carried it out, and who outdistanced the workers of any other nation in the world in the production of planes, ships, guns, ammunition, and war material.

It is inconceivable that these free working men and women who made such a magnificent record during the war period should now be penalized through the enactment of restrictive and compulsory antilabor measures such as are provided for in the Taft-Hartley bill.

The Taft-Hartley bill provides for compulsion, force, and governmental domination in the relationship between labor and management. It should be classified as an industrial war-provoking measure. It will substitute hatred, bitterness, and class warfare for cooperation, good will, and understanding between management and labor.

An analysis of the National Labor Relations Board section of the bill makes clear that if the Taft-Hartley bill was passed, said Board would be converted into a union-breaking tool of employers. This section of the bill would cause confusion and chaos. It would open up a field of litigation which would extend over a long period of time.

The changes in the National Labor Relations Board procedure are so revolutionary as to create widespread misunderstanding, suspicion, and distrust.

The obvious purpose of the authors of this legislation is to strengthen employers and weaken unions. For instance, self-organization of workers into unions has served to secure for them better wages, shorter hours, employment security, and many other benefits. But under section 8 (b) and (c) of the Taft-Hartley bill, a union which asks a worker to join and in doing so tells the worker that his union membership holds promise of benefits, can have such statement held against it as evidence of an unfair labor practice.

Elections under the Taft-Hartley amended Labor Relations Act would be endless. The bitterness and strife which arise out of hotly contested elections would be never ending. The public interest would be seriously affected because of reduced production and increased industrial and management inefficiency.

Labor throughout the Nation will deeply resent the revival of government by injunction and the restriction of the exercise of the right to strike. This would strike a vital blow at our free-enterprise system.

That part of the bill which provides for the institution of suits for damages can only be interpreted as an additional effort to destroy bona fide labor unions. Labor unions accept the principle of the sacredness of contracts entered into and are committed to the maintenance of contracts entered into inviolate. But to subject labor unions to suits for damages as provided in the Taft-Hartley bill means that designing employers can, through the employment of stooges, promote violations of contracts and through such action establish suits for damages against labor unions. The financial resources of labor unions can be wiped out through the institution of such suits for damages inspired by management through the activities of these stooges employed directly by them.

Section 304 of the Taft-Hartley bill stands out as a direct assault upon free press and a violation of the constitutional guaranty of free speech. Under this section the funds of a labor union could not be used for the purpose of acquainting working men and women with the voting record of Members of Congress upon legislation in which labor may be deeply interested.

I will interpolate here to say that when this matter was being considered in the Senate I said that that should be called the "Republican political insurance section" of the bill, it looks as if they might have desired very strongly to curb the voice of labor in the next election.

Under this section, the funds of a labor union—

As I read—

could not be used for the purpose of acquainting working men and women with the voting record of Members of Congress upon legislation in which labor may be deeply interested.

This provision does not apply to unincorporated employers or trade associations. According to the Department of Commerce, there are some 2,400 trade associations, each comprising a combination of employers, and each made immune from these restrictions on political contributions. Farm organizations, cooperatives, and all unincorporated enterprises are free of the political ban imposed by the bill upon labor unions.

Let me interpolate at this point, Mr. President, that an organization of farmers can spend its money in a political campaign; it can put out literature; it can have radio speeches made. Would Senators who are the advocates of the pending measure say that the Farmers Union, the National Grange, or the Farm Bureau Federation should not have the right to use their money to tell the American people that a political party or a political candidate is unfair to agriculture in America? Would Senators wish to vote for that kind of bill? Yet, Mr. President, while we do not deny that right to organizations of employers and to farmers' organizations or to other organizations, this bill singles out labor and says, "You cannot give your opinion in your editorial columns about a political party or a political candidate. You cannot make a radio speech and pay for it with union dues, saying a certain party or a certain candidate is unfair to labor. You cannot distribute literature. You cannot disseminate information, even among your membership, of what are the issues as you see them in a political campaign." All this the President points out in his message.

Mr. President, do Senators realize what that does to the fundamental rights of an American citizen? I want to state here and now, I believe that that section of this bill is in violation of the Constitution of the United States, that it will be stricken down in the courts; but it will cost labor a great deal of money trying to protect itself in the courts against the assaults that will be made upon its exercise of free speech and freedom of the press, under the section to which I have adverted in this bill. And so Mr. Green properly points out:

Farm organizations, cooperatives, and all unincorporated enterprises are free of the political ban imposed by the bill upon labor unions.

Now, Mr. President, I will state frankly what is behind this section. There are certain people in the politics of the United States who do not want the working people to be too articulate or too effective. In the past, it was the rich who put up the money in political campaigns. The reports of the United States Congress show, in campaigns of the past, how much the Pews, how much the Rockefellers, how much the Sloans, and how much the du Ponts and other of the rich families of America have poured into political campaigns. But there is something new that has happened in the last few years. The CIO came along with its Political Action Committee. They said that they had a right to take part in politics. They raised from their membership some money, with which they printed literature, they made radio speeches, they disseminated information to the American public, supporting the Democratic Party and men like Franklin D. Roosevelt in the great fight they were making to better the condition of the working people of America.

Now, they are not a corporation, mind you, Mr. President. What a corporation can do can be determined by the law of the State that grants the charter; but the State has no right to tell me, a citizen, what I can do, except not to violate the law. There is a difference between a corporation, which is a person, and a citizen, who is a citizen. A corporation is not a citizen, yet advocates of the measure talk after this fashion: "We want to put the working employees and management upon the same basis." They propose to reduce the working men and women of America to the inanimate status of a body corporate. They want to strip them of the dignity of a citizen and the right of a citizen under our Constitution, and drag them down to the level of the corporation. Mr. President, a corporation is formed because men and women, the stockholders, do not want to be personally liable for the debts of the joint enterprise. It is a device to limit liability; that is what a corporation is. It is a means of working together, and a device to limit liability. Will it be said that justice is being done when working people are put in that class? Yet there are probably those who say, "We are going to put the corporation that owns the business in the same category with the workers, who are citizens of the country," hence in this bill they

are picking out a class of our citizens, denying them the rights of citizens to better themselves; just as, in a certain part of the bill, they outlaw what they call the secondary boycott.

That means that if a workingman goes to another workingman's home and sits in his parlor in the evening and says, "Listen, you folks over there are working on a commodity which we produce in our plant, and you are helping our employer to become rich, and yet he treats us like dogs. Suppose we strike, quit working for him until he gives us recognition and a decent wage. Why do not you fellows help us by saying you will not work on what he turns out since he treats us as unfairly as he does?" The man who made such a suggestion would violate this law. A man could not even talk to his neighbor about what is best for the community and for the two families without violating the law, according to the provisions of the bill. The President of the United States has pointed that out in his veto message. That is the kind of bill with which we are dealing. That is the reason why I believe we are within our rights when we say that the American people who will be affected by that kind of legislation have the right to know what it is and what it does to them.

I read further from Mr. Green's letter:

This section of the Taft-Hartley bill is accepted by the officers and members of organized labor as an additional direct attack upon them and as an attempt to weaken and destroy the political strength and influence of organized labor.

The facts are that the problems of management and labor can be solved through voluntary action on their part. This principle of voluntarism of collective bargaining between management and labor squares with our free-enterprise system. The attack made upon labor unions in the Taft-Hartley bill is also an attack upon our American free-enterprise system.

That is what the President of the United States also says. It is not simply the statement of a labor leader. It is also what the President of the United States says. Mr Green continues in his letter:

It is impossible to establish perfection in a world made up of imperfect human beings. We can approach a high standard of perfection through honest, sincere cooperation, and understanding. We can never do it through the enactment of compulsory legislation such as the Taft-Hartley bill.

Very sincerely yours,

W. M. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

Mr. President, I also have a letter from Mr. A. E. Lyon, executive secretary-treasurer of the Railway Labor Executives' Association. That is an organization composed, I believe, of 19 of the railway labor brotherhoods of America. Its members are responsible Americans. They are good citizens. Their sons fought and their sons died for America. There is not a finer group of workingmen in the Nation than the railway employees of the country, and a large number of the railway employees are in the organizations for which Mr. A. E. Lyon, as executive secretary-treasurer, speaks in the letter.

I should like to read the names of the organizations affiliated with the Railway Labor Executives' Association. They are: Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen; Order of Railway Conductors of America; Switchmen's Union of North America; Order of Railway Telegraphers; American Train Dispatchers' Association; Railway Employees' Department, A. F. of L.; International Association of Machinists; International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders & Helpers of America; International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop-forgers & Helpers; Sheet Metal Workers' International Association; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America; International Brotherhood of Firemen & Oilers; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees; Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America; National Organization Masters, Mates & Pilots of America; National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association; International Longshoremen's Association; Hotel and Restaurant Employees' International Alliance and Bartenders International League of America.

The letter, dated today, Mr. President, addressed to me by Mr. Lyons, is as follows:

DEAR SENATOR PEPPER: I enclose a statement under six separate headings, which gives in brief form the result of our analysis of a few of the features of the pending labor bill.

The bill as finally changed in conference and sent to the President is, in our considered opinion, vastly more detrimental to the public interest and much more destructive of the fundamental rights of a great body of American citizens than was the original bill passed by the Senate.

We are convinced that should the bill become law it would bring about a most unfortunate and tragic era of industrial discord and internal dissension in our country. That is something that our country, and indeed the entire world, can ill afford happen at this critical time.

Respectfully yours,

A. E. LYON,
Executive Secretary.

Attached to the letter is a statement. Without reading the statement, I wish to read the headings in it. The first heading is: "The bill places unfair restrictions on the political activity of unions."

The second heading is: "The bill makes industry-wide bargaining impossible."

The third heading is: "The bill impairs, if not destroys, the efficiency of the National Labor Relations Board."

The fourth heading is: "Judicial review of the decisions of the National Labor Relations Board."

The statement under that heading emphasizes the changes made by the bill in the administrative procedure for the handling of labor-management cases under the Board.

The fifth heading is: "The union shop is a practical impossibility under this bill."

The statement does not speak of the closed shop, Mr. President, but the union shop. It says the union shop is a practical impossibility under this bill.

The sixth heading is: "The bill jeopardizes vacations with pay, compensation for sick leave, etc."

Under that heading is emphasized the detrimental effect of the bill upon the welfare funds and provisions of the contracts which have been entered into in the past between management and labor, and which, if it were not for the bill, would be entered into between them in the future. As the President himself has pointed out in respect to the welfare funds, the bill simply makes the creation of the welfare funds more difficult; it lays down conditions for their regulation which makes them a more onerous burden and a more difficult task than has been true in the past. Mr. President, when we see how many of our people do not have provision for their security in their old age or in their illness, when we see the human wreckage in our industrial machine in America today and the meager care which is given those human wrecks, it would seem to me that the Congress, instead of striking down and discouraging welfare funds and humanitarian provisions in contracts, should on the contrary be adopting resolutions asking management to be conciliatory with labor in making more generous provisions of this character in the future. We provide that the public must pay for the wreckage of machinery through the increased cost of the product, but we are callous enough to let the human beings be crucified on the industrial cross of America. We seem to exhibit little concern for passing on to the public, in the cost of the commodities the American workman makes, the cost of his own bodily impairment and his mental deficiency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the statement sent to me by Mr. Lyon printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, those are expressions of a view of the labor organization. I am sure they are simply typical of the opinion of all the labor organizations of America. Those letters came from two great leaders, Mr. William Green, speaking for millions of American workingmen, and Mr. A. E. Lyon, also speaking for more than 1,000,000 American working men and women who work upon the railroads of the country.

There are some who say that only the labor leaders feel that way about this legislation. I heard Mr. William Green—and he is an honorable man, one whom I am proud to quote—say that in all his years of association with labor he has never seen the rank and file of American workingmen so deeply stirred, so moved—and I might add, Mr. President, so indignant about an attack upon their welfare as they are today because of the assault which this bill makes upon them.

I have heard Mr. Phil Murray say the same thing. I heard Mr. Lyon say the same thing about railway employees.

And both of these honorable and able men are responsible beyond question.

The other day in passing through one of the cities of my State I got off the train to walk up and down the platform for a few minutes in the sunshine. The workingmen on that railroad showed up from all over the yard, to ask me about the Taft-Hartley bill. Was the Congress going to pass it? Was the President going to veto it? Could we sustain a Presidential veto?

They did not receive their orders from the top. They were talking with me, their Senator, and pouring out their hearts in petition. They were expressing resentment that they were being treated as they were by this legislation.

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

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I ask the Senator if it is not a fact that laboring men are coming to Washington from all over the country to consult their representatives in Congress and advise them of their attitude toward this legislation. They are expressing the very deepest resentment against it, because of the fact that it is punitive legislation, clearly designed to hamstring and destroy labor unionism in the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator very much for mentioning that point. The other evening I attended a meeting at which the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] was present. We saw a church literally jammed to the rafters with men and women who had come from all over America, many of them from the Pacific coast, to protest to Senators against the enactment of this legislation, and to beg the President to veto it, imploring Senators to sustain a veto if one should be forthcoming.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Is it not a fact that the only result of this situation will be that we shall witness a long period of chaos and conflict between labor and management because of the fact that labor believes that the legislation was designed by the National Association of Manufacturers for the very purpose of crushing labor? It will create in their minds the deepest resentment, and will interfere with cooperation and production for years to come.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is absolutely correct. Neither he nor I make that statement in the form of a threat, because, of course, we do not speak for labor organizations. But I express it—as the Senator from Montana implies in his question—as my deep-seated conviction, as the President has said in his message, that the result of the bill will be an increase in strikes. In the paragraph No. 1 on page 3 of the President's message the caption is:

> The bill would substantially increase strikes.

The President says:

> It would discourage the growing willingness of unions to include "no strike" provisions in bargaining agreements. * * *
>
> It would encourage strikes by imposing highly complex and burdensome reporting requirements on labor organizations which wish to avail themselves of their rights under the National Labor Relations Act. * * *
>
> It would bring on strikes by depriving significant groups of workers of the right they now enjoy to organize and to bargain under the protection of law. * * *
>
> The bill would force unions to strike or to boycott if they wish to have a jurisdictional dispute settled by the National Labor Relations Board.

And so forth. Mr. President, there is no question in my mind that the bill would produce the largest volume and the greatest extent of industrial strife in America that we have ever seen. At no time during the war, or even in early 1946, in the early days of reconversion, did we have anything comparable to the industrial strife which we shall have under the provisions of this bill. I say that, Mr. President, because Americans will fight for their liberties. In innumerable cases fathers and husbands have had to go home at mealtime to see nearly an empty cupboard and an empty table. They have had to listen to their children crying in the night because of lack of food; and yet they have remained on strike because they felt that they were fighting for a principle.

Mr. President, there is something deep-seated in the American character which makes an American love and cherish his freedom and independence; and he will fight for it. If anyone believes that the American workingman can by any kind of tyranny be cowed into economic and political servitude, he will learn that such efforts now will be no more successful than those of George III. If in fighting this vicious legislation workers are accused of treason, there will be some of them who, like Patrick Henry, will say, "If this be treason, make the most of it." They will fight to defend their homes, their firesides, their jobs, and their standard of living.

Until the inflation which was initiated by the same interests which support this legislation came along, until an actual wage decline occurred, the American workingman was living better than he had ever lived. He is still living very poorly, but he was living better than he had ever lived. He had more security than he had ever had.

Since Franklin D. Roosevelt came to the White House his employer could not fire him because he wanted to join a union, or because the employer did not like the color of his hair, or because he was a Jew or something else that the employer did not like. Under the protection of the National Labor Relations Act, the American workingman had risen to the dignity of an American citizen, even on his job. He had more security because he had the assurance that other employees with whom he worked were one with him. They would stand by him and he would stand by them. They had the protection of the National Labor Relations Board, which they never had before. He had a welfare fund. If a rock fell on his back and broke it, and he could do nothing but merely move his limbs, he might reflect in his agony that at least he would receive some protection from the welfare provisions, or some other benefits which he had been able to secure by contract, with respect to which he was free to negotiate with his employer. We had begun to achieve something like industrial democracy in America.

Mr. President, I am as proud of my America as is any citizen in it. I think I love it as much. But those who study economic and political systems throughout the world have often said that we are further ahead in our political democracy than we are in our economic democracy. I suspect there is some truth in that statement. It took the administration of Franklin Roosevelt to begin to give economic rights to the men and women of America who work and who earn their living by the sweat of their brows. Up until that time they could not organize. If they tried to organize they could be discharged. Every man stood on his own, not with his fellows. He had no job contract; he had no assurance that he could work a certain length of time. He could go to work one morning and work, and at the end of the day might receive a little slip along with his time check saying, "We do not need you tomorrow." All he could do was to stagger home and tell his wife and children that he had received his notice and that he did not have a job. Moreover, Mr. President, in time past there was a little notice put into a man's pay envelope telling him, "If you vote for William Jennings Bryan tomorrow you lose your job. Do not come back." That happened in the Bryan-McKinley campaign. That happened not so very long ago, Mr. President, or something very much like it happened.

A workingman in respect to his job did not enjoy the rights of an American citizen or rights in the enjoyment of which an American citizen should be protected. But we tried to change all that; we tried to give the workers a security they had never before had, a protection they had never before had, safeguards, strength, bargaining power. "Yes," we said, "you can have an election in your plant. Choose your own bargaining agent. The employer has nothing to do with it; he cannot say anything about it; he cannot call you in and tell you that if you select a certain bargaining agent he will discharge you or demote you. If he does, that is an unfair labor practice. You can take him before the National Labor Relations Board and it can restrain him from doing it or penalize him if he does it."

For the first time in America the American workingman began to stand up and walk like a man. Mr. President, instead of trying to increase those rights, to enlarge those safeguards, to add to his bargaining power, this bill strangles, throttles, and chokes the organized-labor movement in America. Have we not been getting along all right under the

present system? I do not think that anyone in America would seriously suggest that we turn back the clock. Have we ever had greater prosperity? Have we ever had greater purchasing power? Have the corporations ever made more profit? Has monopoly ever been more powerful? Has the output of American factories ever been greater? No, Mr. President. At a time when America is at its peak in power, in profit, and in production, they would fasten upon the back of labor this octopus, the crushing weight of this destructive legislation.

Mr. President, we hear a great deal about the example that we set before the world. We urge other people to practice democracy. We tell them how they should conduct their elections, how they should protect their minority groups; we admonish them, Mr. President, how they should practice democracy. Is there not something of an obligation upon us to make our democracy effective, to make it speak so eloquently that people will wish to follow it and to lead the world to democracy without trying to force it down their throats? Is this legislation going to be an asset to us in showing the world how we practice democracy in America? People will read what the President has said about it. This is the President who speaks to them for us. If they cannot believe him with regard to a labor bill, how can they believe him about other subjects about which he speaks for us?

He says that the American Congress is strangling the labor movement in America. Suppose Congress ignores the statement of the President. Will it not give ammunition to the people over there who say that there is no real democracy in America? They will say, "Look how they are trying to strangle the working people in the United States. The Congress of that country is not friendly to the masses of the people. No wonder they are against this, that, and the other thing. They are not friendly to the masses of the people. Their own President says that they are unfair."

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I just wondered if the able Senator from Florida, at the time he was making the statement about the President speaking for his party——

Mr. PEPPER. I said, speaking for the people.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wondered if the Senator recognized that in the House today, among the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives, there were 106 who voted to override the veto and there were only 71 who voted to sustain the veto. Certainly the Members of the House of Representatives who are of the Senator's party also feel that they speak for the Democratic Party of the Nation.

Mr. PEPPER. My remarks, the Senator will recall, were directed to the action of the Senate. Since we are not, under the rules, permitted to speak disparagingly of our sister body, I do not suppose there is very much we can say about the behavior of that body. But I am willing to go to the country next year upon what a majority of the two parties of the Senate will do regarding the President's veto message. I predict that a majority of the Democratic Party in the Senate will be found supporting the leadership of the President of the United States on this veto message.

Mr. President, as I said, and as the President said in his message, democracy is on trial today; it is on trial everywhere in the world.

I do not think it can too often be said that the only way to win the battle for democracy is to make democracy work. We must show that democracy is the best way to advance the progress of the human family; that nothing else compares with it.

Mr. President, I deeply regret to see the trend that there is today in our country away from that principle. The principle of my party and, I believe, the principle of Americanism, is the greatest good for the greatest number of people. This bill cannot possibly give the greatest good to the greatest number of people. Is there anything about this bill to give better wages to the working people of this country? Is there anything that will assure them of receiving a larger share of the profits of industry in America? Is there anything in this bill that will give them shorter working hours, better working conditions, more leisure, and recreation?

Is there anything in this bill that will house American families in better homes or will put more children in school or will give the families of the United States a better diet? How can this bill be the vehicle for the greatest good for the greatest number of our people? This bill is aimed at benefiting the privileged few in America, the large employers who want to get cheaper labor so that they can make more profits; at least, that is what its effect will be. Does any abuse that may have been committed by any labor leader justify that kind of legislation? Are we to act like a bull in a china shop? Are we so blind that we have to strike down everyone who works, in order to wreak retribution upon one who wrongs us? Is the Congress of the United States so incompetent that it cannot separate the good from the evil in the American labor movement, and preserve the good? If I correctly recall, I think there is a maxim in the law—utile per inutile non vitiatur—in the Latin, meaning that the useful is not rendered valueless by the useless.

Mr. President, the existence of some abuses in the American labor movement does not justify the destruction of that movement. Are not there some abuses in the capitalistic system of America? Would Senators deny that in American industry there are tycoons and tyrants who violate the principles of Americanism and justice? The La Follette committee of the Senate told a story—one of the most sordid stories ever related—about how certain employers, in order to break the organized labor movement in America, had men killed. In 1944, I was in the coal-mining section of West Virginia, and people there told about how detectives, who were sent there by the mine owners, threw the furniture of the miners out into the roads, on the ground, and drove the families out of the company-owned houses.

Yet, Mr. President, because some capitalists do wrong, we are not trying to abolish the capitalistic system. We put in jail those who are found guilty of criminal offenses; we enjoin in the courts those who are engaged in the commission of remedial wrongs; we sue at law those who are liable to suit at our choice; but we are proud of our capitalistic system, and we are not trying to destroy it. Yet, because a few labor leaders have done something they should not have done, because some irresponsible workmen may have violated a contract here and there—although the record during the war years stands like a glowing light as to the fidelity with which the American workingmen stood by their contracts, as Mr. Green has said—and because there are a few annoyances and provocations of that sort, there are persons who wish to destroy, as this bill would do, the dignity of the workingman in America, and imperil his job and his pay, and break his labor unions, diminish his bargaining power, and leave him stripped of the gains made in the last few years, and thus place him in the pitiable state he was in years ago.

Mr. MURRAY. M . President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Is it not true that as a result of the wrongs and ills that had developed in our capitalistic system, it was brought to the verge of ruin in 1929, and there was precipitated a long period of unemployment and distress in this country? That situation was due to the fact that no effort to correct those evils were made by the very persons who today are trying to inflict this punitive legislation upon labor unions. And is it not true that they allowed all those conditions to prevail because they were profiting from them; and so allowed the country to come to a point where we were in danger of losing our capitalistic system?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Montana is absolutely correct. In my opinion the President in his veto message is trying to preserve in all its great and mighty strength the free-enterprise, capitalistic system of American democracy; and I venture to say that it is the opposition—not by design, I am sure, but by the effect this bill will have—who will prove to be the enemies of the present vigorous strength of our industrial system.

Mr. President, I am not permanently discouraged. In the first place, I do not believe the Senate will override the veto. I believe that Senators who voted for this legislation are impressed by the analysis of the bill which is embodied in the President's veto message. I believe that Senators will see this matter differently after they read the moving message of the President. Everyone knows the record of the President. He has spoken out against labor abuses. He has recommended to the Congress legislation

stronger than I thought should be enacted; he did that at the last session of the Congress. He is not the partisan of organized labor in America. He is occupying a position where he is trying to do what is right. In this matter he is trying to do what is good for all America, not merely for a class. But he knows that what is good for this class is good for all America.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think that when Senators have read the President's veto message and have meditated and reflected upon it, a sufficient number of them will see the matter differently to cause the President's veto message to be sustained. But, regardless of whatever happens tomorrow or next week about this matter, there is one thing that I know and believe with a faith that is as firm as that which makes me believe that beyond the sky there is a living God, and that is that this measure will not stay law. I would wager my right arm upon that, Mr. President: It will not stay law, if it becomes law. If it goes on the statute books, it will not remain there. In the first place, it will be impossible of enforcement. It will be impossible to keep it on the statute books. It is not possible to strangle American working men and women in a noose of restrictive legislation; so long as the right of the ballot and the right of assembly and of speech and of press exist in the United States, it is not possible permanently to place excessive burdens on the backs of the hard-pressed working people of the United States.

We remember what happened in Great Britain. In the early twenties—in 1926, as I recall—there was a general strike there. It was a regrettable experience for the British nation. The most stringent labor legislation was passed. But the worm turned, Mr. President. The liberal party was destroyed, and there emerged the Labor Party, a party which today is the Government of Great Britain. One of the first things that Government did was to repeal that law, which had rankled in labor's breast since the day it was passed.

I declare, Mr. President, that is going to be true with this bill if it shall be passed. I say that out of as deep a conviction as I have had about anything in my life. I believe this bill to be morally, economically and politically wrong, and I believe we will repent of our action if we ever make it law. If we do not repent, I believe the people of the country will change it anyway; and I think they should.

If this was an isolated blow which in these days of reaction was being struck at the lives of the people of this country, it would not perhaps be so bad; but it is one of a shower of arrows which today are being shot into the well-being of the masses of the people of America.

I had hoped we could continue what we had achieved in recent years. History will say that one of the fine days of America was not only when we fought our war and gloriously won it, but when we dreamed anew of what America might be, in the stirring days of Franklin D. Roosevelt's early tenure in the White House. We were moved and lifted up by great emotion and great aspiration to go ahead. We were having cultural projects all over the country, giving the boys and girls with talent a chance to play and sing and draw, and we were not ashamed of giving men and women a chance to work. We were thinking about the America we were building again out of the wreckage of a depression. We were lifting our national income up notch by notch, putting more and more people to work, opening more and more schools, giving health care to more and more people.

Even the migrant workers, in the many States of the Union where seasonal crops are harvested necessarily by migrant workers, were not forgotten. Camps were built for them, with running water. They had the assurance of sanitation and supervision. The children got a chance to go to school. There were nurses who looked after them. They were even provided with hospitals and given the medical care they needed free. There was one of those hospitals in my State, at Belle Glade.

Now what has happened? At a meeting of the Committee on Agriculture 2 or 3 days ago testimony was being heard upon the proposal to sell the migrant labor camps. Where are those workers to live? The proposal is not only to sell the migrant labor camps but the hospitals will close down June 30 if no funds are added to the appropriation; and there is no hope of getting any.

The dream that was in our breasts that people were entitled to live somehow has been dissipated. Gentlemen say they have a mandate to destroy America's dream and to shatter her hopes and her aspirations.

Mr. President, I am proud to be a New Dealer. I care not how high the flood of reaction rises, so long as I can raise my humble voice I will say I am as proud of my political faith as I am of my faith in God. I believe they both relate to the dignity of human beings. And if my desire to lift people up to better living makes me a New Dealer, I am proud to wear the badge.

And be sure, Mr. President, that that is the way of the future. Reactionary movements come and go.

This temporary fanaticism, this psychological fear of the rights of the people of this country, will pass like a thunderstorm in the summer, and after awhile we will begin to see a new light, and it will be leading us toward the east again, when we will talk, not about how we can strike down the working people, but how we can lift them up.

Mr. President, so long as I am a Member of the United State Senate, when I get a chance to vote for a decent minimum wage, I shall be for it. When I get a chance to help every American man and woman have a job, a decent job, with decent pay and reasonable hours, I shall be for it. When I get a chance to vote to put every American boy and girl in a good school, I shall be for it, I do not care what it costs. It cannot cost as much as it will cost us not to have it. Whenever I get a chance to vote to give every man and woman, boy and girl, a chance to get the medical care they need, I shall be for it, I care not what it costs. I think they can, and should, and will pay for it by an insurance plan such as the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and others have proposed. I want to help to build a greater and stronger America—to assist all our people.

Mr. President, what I regret to see is that the people who are against one of these objectives are usually against all of them. They think there is some good reason why we should not do any of them. I think this is part of the same struggle that is going on in America today between those trying to better the condition of the masses of the people, those who are trying to help them, and those who are trying to preserve the well-being of those already well off and are trying to help them. That is the way I feel.

So, Mr. President, I am proud of the President of the United States, who would send to Congress, against terrific political pressure, against vituperation and bitter denunciation, a message which will again remind the American Congress of the American dream of economic and political democracy for our people. I hope that he will have, as he so rightly deserves, the hearty support of the membership of the Senate.

EXHIBIT A

THE BILL PLACES UNFAIR RESTRICTIONS ON THE POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF UNIONS

Section 313 of the bill is admittedly outside of the scope of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, and stated to so be on page 69 of the conference report. This device of injecting such a provision into legislation which purportedly is designed to improve labor-management relationships should certainly be condemned if this legislation is the result of a mandate such as that claimed by its sponsors. The provision relating to political activities clearly does not come within that alleged mandate. It is entirely unrelated to the other provisions of the act and is a matter which in fairness to all concerned should at least be subject to separate debate and consideration.

This section of the bill makes it unlawful for any labor organization to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors, or a Representative or Senator, or Delegate, or a Resident Commissioner to Congress will be voted for, including any primary election, political convention or caucus.

One of the important functions of a labor union is to educate its members in a variety of ways. To accomplish this purpose it is the practice of such organizations to issue magazines, newspapers, and periodicals which contain items of interest to the members of the organizations. Such articles include news items of importance to working people, instructions and lessons in the trade or craft or work in which such members may be engaged, reports of the activities being carried on by the various unions and officers and representatives, etc. These magazines and newspapers are not published for political purposes and deal with political subjects only incidentally. During the periods immediately prior to primary elections and general elections the members of the union are obviously interested in the records which have been made by candidates for public office and the effect which the activity of these candidates may have had upon the rights and welfare of the working people. It has been the practice for labor organizations to furnish their members with tabulations of the voting records of representatives to Congress in connection with legislation which has to do with the welfare of employees. It

has been the practice in these magazines to carry biographical sketches of certain candidates for public office and in addition thereto to publish what might be termed "editorial comment" with respect to the political and economic views of candidates. Unions conceive this activity to be a worth-while program and a contribution to the improved citizenship of their members. Candidates for office or incumbents should have no objection to having the record which they have made in their high office furnished to the citizens whom they represent.

This bill would prevent labor unions from using their magazines for any political activity, from issuing circulars or bulletins or any other type of information which requires any expenditure of money, if such expenditure may be attributed to political activity.

On the other hand the provisions of this bill not only make possible but encourage the indirect method of accumulating huge sums of money for political activity which is not restricted to the furnishing of information to the members of a given organization. It is perfectly proper under this bill for individual members of labor unions to make contributions to a political committee obviously designed to promote the interests of labor in any election. There is no limit upon the amount which can be contributed to such a political committee and it may use these funds not for the education of the working people but for any other purpose it may desire. We submit that it is this kind of activity which may in the hands of the wrong individuals result in some corrupt practices. It is not the activity of unions in connection with their own members which could become corrupt.

Indeed this legislation merely emphasizes the common criticism of the restriction on expenditures by corporations in political campaigns. It is commonly known that corporations utilize the device of individual contribution by very wealthy persons to political committees and thus successfully and effectively and by the use of tremendous sums of money influence the voting public either for or against a certain candidate.

Both because this bill does not accomplish the end sought to be accomplished in the prevention of any corrupt political activities and because it is so obviously unrelated to the avowed objectives of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, it should not receive the support of the Congress.

This effort upon the part of Congress to inject into this bill a provision designed to protect its Members from the consequences of their own votes in connection with it cannot be justified. It does not represent the forthright and honest approach to legislation which American citizens are entitled to expect from their representatives.

THE BILL MAKES INDUSTRY-WIDE BARGAINING IMPOSSIBLE

Language contained in the conference committee report indicates that it was not the intention to make industry-wide bargaining illegal, in that it is stated on page 32 that—

"The treatment in the Senate amendment of the term 'employer' for the purposes of Section 9 (b) is omitted from the conference agreement, since it merely restates the existing practice of the Board in the fixing of bargaining units containing employees of more than one employer, and it is not thought that the Board will or ought to change its practice in this respect."

It is significant, however, that industry-wide bargaining can be just as effectively restricted by obstacles placed in the way of its being carried on as by an actual statutory ban.

The conference bill makes provision for the partition of the various collective-bargaining units into distinguishable groups which would make industry-wide collective bargaining an impossibility.

Section 9 (b) of the bill provides, in part, that—

"The Board shall decide in each case whether, in order to assure employees the fullest freedom in exercising the rights guaranteed by this act, the unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining shall be the employer unit, craft unit, plant unit, or subdivision thereof: * * * (2) decide that any craft unit is inappropriate for such purpose on the ground that a different unit has been established by a prior board determination unless a majority of the employees in the proposed craft unit vote against separate representation."

If individuals or small minority groups are to be given the right to bargain collectively in employer units, craft units, plant units, or subdivisions thereof, and the Board is under the positive duty to recognize such units, there could be no industry-wide bargaining in any industry where the employees in a single plant or of a single employer, or even in a subdivision of these units, desired the right of separate representation.

Thus the suggestion of the conference committee that it has not made industry-wide bargaining illegal is no defense against the charge that as a practical matter the bill has made industry-wide bargaining impossible.

THE BILL IMPAIRS, IF NOT DESTROYS, THE EFFICIENCY OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

One of the most serious defects in the present bill is the effect which it will have upon the administration of its provisions by the National Labor Relations Board. Statutes which contemplate administration by an administrative agency and especially those which are remedial in nature can be no more effective than the procedure which is prescribed for their administration.

Under the present law, and with the benefit of a number of procedural practices designed to expedite the board's proceedings, there now exists a backlog of 5,000 cases and the figures show that during the year 1946 more than 12,000 cases were docketed. There has been an increase of 40 percent in the number of cases in a single year.

The present board has followed a practice of having the many thousands of pages of testimony, taken in various hearings, reviewed by certain attorneys employed by the board for that purpose. Obviously this has relieved the board itself from the long and tedious task of studying such transcripts. Under this bill such a practice would be prohibited.

This bill places in jeopardy every collective-bargaining unit now in existence by requiring the Board to recognize as appropriate units such groups as employer units, craft units, plant units, and subdivisions thereof. As a matter of fact, section 9 (b) (2) of the act provides that the Board shall not "decide that any craft unit is inappropriate for such purpose on the ground that a different unit has been established by a prior Board determination unless a majority of the employees in the proposed craft unit vote against separate representation."

This invitation to every small group to separate itself from presently existing collective-bargaining units will multiply the representation cases to a degree which is beyond comprehension.

There are any number of other provisions in this bill which will complicate the procedure of the Board and add tremendously to the volume of work. For example, prehearing elections are abolished; the Board is charged with the duty of interfering with the internal affairs of unions to the extent that it must decide in certain cases what constitute reasonable dues and initiation fees charged by unions; the increase in the number of unfair labor practices provided for in this bill cannot help but greatly increase the number of cases before the Board; the Board is required to conduct elections in connection with the establishment of union shops in addition to its obligation to conduct elections in representation cases; and the obligations on the part of the Board to initiate injunction actions in certain types of cases will require its participation in unlimited litigation.

One of the provisions of the bill which will probably do more to discredit the board and to bring it into disrepute in the eyes of the parties who are to utilize its functions is the duty imposed upon it to inject itself into jurisdictional strikes to the extent that it must determine the proper work-task allocations as among unions. This involves the board in the most intricate and complicated problems of job content which it cannot possibly be equipped to handle and will inevitably result in decisions which will destroy confidence in its judgment and integrity.

While the above duties are not all which have been added to the board's already heavy burden, it must be clear that its functions will necessarily break down when it is considered that under the present law it now requires 9 months to process an election case and 20 months to process an unfair labor practice procedure.

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF THE DECISIONS OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The National Labor Relations Board is an administrative agency of the Government and as such should be treated, insofar as procedure and review are concerned, the same as any other administrative agency. It is further significant that this board is dealing with problems involving human relations and the parties who appear before it are for the most part laymen. Collective bargaining agreements are not customarily prepared by attorneys nor is there need, in the vast majority of cases which are processed by the board, that the parties be represented by counsel.

This bill provides that proceedings before the Board or any member or agent thereof shall, so far as practicable, be conducted in accordance with the rules of evidence applicable in the district courts of the United States. This provision prescribes a different rule, with respect to the introduction of evidence, from that prescribed for all other administrative agencies of which we have knowledge. This requirement is not contained in the Administrative Procedure Act which has for its purpose the creation of some uniformity and procedural justice in proceedings before all administrative agencies.

The above-mentioned section of the bill is destructive of the principal purposes sought to be accomplished by administrative agencies. It prevents the informality and speed which are essential prerequisites to a successful administrative procedure. It will, particularly in labor cases, prevent a direct approach to the essential problems involved in such cases. It will require, for the proper presentation of any cases, the services of a lawyer or a representative trained in the rules of evidence as they are applied to court procedure. It will require the board to weigh each item of evidence on the basis of court rule.

Even more important, this bill will change the scope of the reviewing power of courts which are called upon to consider decisions of the Board. The conference committee itself stated on page 56 of its report that the requirements of this bill will give rise to questions of law which the courts will hereafter be called upon to determine and, further, that it will very materially broaden the scope of the courts' reviewing power.

This bill, by virtue of these provisions, discriminates against the working people of this country in requiring them and their

representatives to submit to more rigid standards in the presentation of questions involving their rights than those established for any other citizens in any other field of endeavor. These provisions remove from the field of labor law the worthy purposes of administrative procedure and will prevent an adequate, fair, and just disposition of labor-relations problems.

THE UNION SHOP IS A PRACTICAL IMPOSSIBILITY UNDER THIS BILL

The conference bill outlaws the closed shop even in those industries where it is mutually acceptable if not actually desired by both employees and employers. In attempted mitigation of this deprivation of long-established rights the committee bill offers what it terms the union shop.

An examination of the bill discloses, however, that the obstacles to the acquisition and maintenance of a union-shop agreement are almost insurmountable.

This bill removes certain supervisors from the coverage of the law, requires that professional members may not be included in the same unit with nonprofessional employees unless they vote for such inclusion, prevents guards or plant protection employees from being represented by labor organizations representing other than guards, and requires that craft unions must be recognized unless a majority of the craft votes against it. The bill further provides that the board must conduct an election in which a majority of the eligible voters in the unit must vote in favor of the union shop before such union shop is legal. More important still is a provision in the bill which prevents such election being held if a question of representation exists.

There are thousands of collective bargaining units now enjoying the privileges of the union shop which include within their scope certain supervisory employees, professional employees, guards, and employees of more than one craft. In some of these units a separation must necessarily be made to comply with the law. Until all of these representation cases are settled the representative of the employees in the existing units will be foreclosed from petitioning the board for an election on the union-shop question. As a matter of fact, with the added inducement in the bill for individuals and minor groups to further subdivide existing collective bargaining units, it is doubtful whether a vote on the question of a union shop could ever be taken where there exists any distinguishable group of discontented employees. Furthermore this act gives the employer the right to initiate a representation dispute merely on the ground that one or more individuals have presented claims to be recognized as representatives of a unit of employees.

Should any union have the good fortune to obtain a union-shop agreement under the foregoing conditions it will still be confronted with an impossible problem in maintaining it.

This bill makes it an unfair labor practice for an employer to discharge an employee for nonmembership in a labor organization if he has reasonable grounds for believing that membership was denied or terminated on grounds other than the failure to tender periodic dues and initiation fee, and makes it an unfair labor practice for a union to cause or attempt to cause an employer to discharge an employee for nonmembership on any ground other than his failure to tender the periodic dues and initiation fee.

Thus, regardless of the conduct of the union member, or his character or activities, neither the union nor the employer can, without risk of being charged with an unfair labor practice, bring about the termination of his employment on any ground of nonmembership in the union other than a failure to pay dues or initiation fees.

For example, this bill requires that no union shall be certified as the collective bargaining representative if one of its officers is a Communist. The union may undoubtedly remove such member from office or even from membership in the union in order to obtain the right of representation or to maintain order and discipline in the union. The employer, however, even under a union shop agreement, could not discharge such Communist from his employment without being guilty of an unfair labor practice. One of the vital purposes of the union shop is to permit the union to handle its own affairs in such manner as to make it possible to assume and carry out the responsibilities expected of it. If, as is so commonly stated, the unions should assume more responsibility for the powers vested in them, it certainly should follow that they should be vested with sufficient power to carry out that responsibility.

It is apparent from the foregoing that this bill does not, as is declared by its sponsors, grant to employees and labor organizations a procedure under which a union shop may be established and maintained.

THE BILL JEOPARDIZES VACATIONS WITH PAY, COMPENSATION FOR SICK LEAVE, ETC.

A term which has been almost universally misunderstood in labor-management relations is "feather bedding." Section 8 (b) (6) of the conference bill purports to ban "feather bedding." It is generally recognized by those familiar with labor laws that there are a number of benefits accorded employees which contemplate the payment of money or some other thing of value for time not worked.

The present bill makes it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents "to cause or attempt to cause an employer to pay or deliver or agree to pay or deliver any money or other thing of value, in the nature of an exaction, for services which are not performed or not to be performed."

It is not clear what the bill means by referring to the payment of money "in the nature of an exaction." The word "exaction" contemplates any use of compulsion and does not necessarily refer only to extortion or to conduct of unjust severity. Thus a strike or a threat to strike might well constitute a type of force which would be well within the meaning of the term "exaction."

Some of the objectives of employees which contemplate payment for services not rendered are vacations with pay, payment to employees while on sick leave, and, even more generally, a rule which requires that employees who are called for service and not used on that particular day are entitled to compensation for a fixed number of hours.

These objectives, as well as others which could be mentioned, have never been considered to be unreasonable or unjust, and yet it is clear that they involve payment for services which are not performed and which are not to be performed. It would seem, therefore, that they would come within the meaning of the provisions of section 8 (b) (6).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 20, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 814. An act to provide support for wool, and for other purposes; and

S. 1230. An act to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—VETO MESSAGE

The Senate resumed the reconsideration of the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

MISSISSIPPI RIVER FLOODS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief United Press dispatch published in the Washington Post of June 18, describing the major Mississippi River flood now hitting the 150-mile stretch of the central Mississippi Valley. It is pointed out that the Iowa State Department of Agriculture predicts that most of the bottom land in the southern half of the State will produce no corn this year, with an estimated loss of millions of dollars. This new flood now cresting along the Mississippi River is prevented only by already weakened levees from sweeping across 400,000 acres of the Nation's richest farm land.

These startling facts prompt me also to ask to have printed in the RECORD two ably written editorials describing this continuing problem of damaging floods, and pointing out the necessity of once and for all preventing such devastation through the enactment of a unified river basin resources development plan such as is suggested in the Missouri Valley Authority bill, Senate bill 1156. One editorial, entitled "At Expense of the Many," was published in the York, Pa., Gazette and Daily for June 16. The other, entitled "MVA, Lesson of the

Floods," was published in the St. Louis Post Dispatch of June 11. I commend these thoughtfully written editorials to Members of the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. TAFT. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—VETO MESSAGE

The Senate resumed the reconsideration of the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may we have the motion stated again?

Mr. McGRATH. The motion is that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The Clerk will call the roll.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, there seems to be some desire to vote. I withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH].

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest that a second quorum call at this time is not in order, because no business has been transacted by the Senate since the last quorum call.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, business certainly was transacted. I asked unanimous consent to have certain matters printed in the RECORD, and objection was made. That is the transaction of business.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will have to rule that that was not business.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, what is the ruling of the Chair on the point of order raised by the Senator from California?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ruling of the Chair is that the refusal of the Senate to permit the matters presented by the Senator from Montana to be printed in the RECORD was not the transaction of business.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a Senator certainly has a right to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is the appeal from the decision of the Chair. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Is the question subject to debate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The appeal from the decision of the Chair is debatable.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. If a Member of the body debates the appeal from the decision of the Chair, and thereafter seeks to make a speech on the veto message, will his speech on the appeal from the decision of the Chair count as one speech against the veto message?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will not.

The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to discuss that question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I asked permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD certain editorials and a newspaper article concerning the Mississippi flood which is now raging in the Mississippi Valley. It seems to me that this is a matter of such vital concern to the Nation that this material should appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I cannot understand how any Senator could oppose such a reasonable request on my part, because it seems to me that the Senate ought to be willing to be advised with reference to the dangerous flood situation which prevails at this time, and which is of great concern to the American people.

There is now pending before one of the Senate committees a resolution calling for an immediate study of this problem. It seems to me that if Members of this body understood what I am seeking to accomplish they would not desire to block my action. I cannot believe that the Senate desires to remain in ignorance of this problem. I therefore suggest that the Senate should vote in favor of reversing the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. MURRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

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

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, supported by the Parliamentarian, no business having been transacted, a quorum call is not in order.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Does not the appeal from the decision of the Chair itself constitute a sufficient transaction of business so that a Member of this body can suggest the absence of a quorum so as to obtain the attendance of Senators who are absent, and who do not know what has transpired?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is not the transaction of business until it is voted upon.

The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? [Putting the question.]

The decision of the Chair was sustained.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon will be recognized in a moment.

Is the demand for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll, unless the Senators from Oregon wishes to be recognized.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's request for a quorum call is justified, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Cooper	Hill
Baldwin	Cordon	Hoey
Ball	Donnell	Holland
Brewster	Dworshak	Ives
Bricker	Eastland	Jenner
Brooks	Ecton	Johnston, S. C.
Buck	Ferguson	Kilgore
Butler	Fulbright	Knowland
Cain	George	Langer
Capehart	Hatch	Lodge
Capper	Hawkes	McCarran
Chavez	Hickenlooper	McCarthy

McClellan	O'Daniel	Taylor
McFarland	Overton	Thye
McGrath	Pepper	Umstead
Malone	Reed	Vandenberg
Martin	Revercomb	Watkins
Maybank	Robertson, Va.	Wherry
Millikin	Robertson, Wyo.	White
Moore	Russell	Wiley
Morse	Saltonstall	Williams
Murray	Sparkman	Young
Myers	Taft	

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

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The motion is not debatable; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. On this vote I transfer that pair to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who is absent because of illness, is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent on committee business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are unavoidably detained.

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

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] has previously been announced by the Senator from Kansas.

The result was announced—yeas, 16, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—16

Aiken	McCarran	Pepper
Chavez	McFarland	Russell
Hill	McGrath	Sparkman
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Taylor
Kilgore	Murray	
Langer	Myers	

NAYS—52

Baldwin	George	Overton
Ball	Hatch	Reed
Brewster	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Hoey	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Holland	Saltonstall
Butler	Ives	Taft
Cain	Jenner	Thye
Capehart	Knowland	Umstead
Capper	Lodge	Vandenberg
Cooper	McCarthy	Watkins
Cordon	McClellan	Wherry
Donnell	Malone	White
Dworshak	Martin	Wiley
Eastland	Maybank	Williams
Ecton	Millikin	Young
Ferguson	Moore	
Fulbright	O'Daniel	

NOT VOTING—27

Barkley	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hayden	Smith
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Byrd	Kem	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McKellar	Tobey
Ellender	McMahon	Tydings
Flanders	Magnuson	Wagner
Green	O'Conor	Wilson

So the Senate refused to take a recess.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I think it is deplorable that the majority will not agree to let this mattter go over until Monday or some other day next week in order that the American people may have time to read the President's veto message and listen to the President on the radio and form their own conclusions about this matter, and then have sufficient time to inform the Members of the Senate how they feel regarding this most important and vital subject. I deplore the fact that the majority have thrown the gauntlet to us, instead of agreeing to let this matter go over until next week, and that they have said they will hold us here and make us talk, if we want to give the American people time to consider this matter.

Mr. President, I have heard the word "filibuster" used here on this floor. In my opinion, a filibuster exists when a group of Senators, large or small, begins to talk with the object in mind of preventing action on a piece of legislation. Certainly my object is not to prevent the taking of action on this legislation. I realize that that could not be done, in the first place, for it is a long time until the final adjournment of this session of Congress. I have no desire to prevent action upon this bill. My sole aim and hope is that action will be postponed sufficiently long to enable the American people to have the opportunity for the first time, I believe, to obtain a true picture of this piece of legislation, in order that they may decide what they think of it; because, after all, we are only the servants of the American people, and if they have had no opportunity to get a clear understanding of the full meaning of the provisions of this bill and what it will mean to them, they have not had sufficient time to study it; and naturally, therefore, they have not been sufficiently informed to be able to let us know what they really think of it.

Only now is organized labor becoming acquainted with the full implications of this bill. They are the people most vitally and most directly interested, the people whose livelihood will be directly threatened because their means of sustaining their wage scales and of securing decent working conditions and the things that affect them most fundamentally will be seriously impaired, in many cases destroyed, if this bill becomes law.

But I say that only now, at this late date, have the members of organized labor become fully cognizant of the full implications of this measure, and only now are they really making their voices heard. Only now are they writing to their Senators and their Representatives in Congress. Indeed, so desperate is their plight that they are coming to Washington, to try to prevail upon the people they sent here to represent them, to get them, in turn, to fulfill that obligation and truly represent them by repudiating this legislation.

Mr. President, I believe the President of the United States has given us an opportunity to save this Nation from one of the most vicious pieces of class legislation which has ever come out of the Congress.

I fervently hope that the President's wise action in vetoing the Taft-Hartley labor bill will be sustained by this great body.

To me, Mr. President, the bill is completely in the pattern of most of the legislation which has been sponsored at this session by Senators on the other side of the aisle. It attempts to do by subterfuge what they dare not do by direct and open legislation. Through its voluminous pages it presents us with many pious words, ostensibly designed to safeguard the rights of labor, and to arrive at a general recipe for labor-industrial peace in our great Nation. In presenting those acres of pious words, the bill too closely follows the pattern of such legislation as the Reed-Bulwinkle bill, passed day before yesterday, to exempt the railroads from the antitrust laws. It too strongly resembles the fine words contained in the so-called rent-control bill, which preserves the form but not the fact of rent control.

The rent-control bill, Mr. President, is another measure very similar to the labor bill. It is another measure which is going to affect the working people most severely. Everyone will feel its effects, but the man who works for wages—the white-collar worker on a fixed income—they will be the ones least able to bear the dire consequences of the so-called rent-control bill, which was passed by the Senate yesterday.

At that time, Mr. President, I meant to go into the question of the so-called advisory boards provided for in the rent-control measure. As Senators know, the

rent-control bill provided that the governors of the various States should appoint boards in their various rent-control areas. I am sure the proposal was offered in good faith by the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], for whom I have the highest respect, and I am sure that he thought it would be a good idea, or he would not have presented it for consideration.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my friend the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure the Senator from Idaho knows——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will advise the Senator from Idaho that he can yield only for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am asking the Senator a question. I am sure the Senator from Idaho knows, does he not, that the Senator from Alabama, when he offered the proposal that there be local advisory boards, did not propose that those boards should be named by the respective governors, but that they should be named by the person, whoever he might be, whom we would designate as the rent control director?

Mr. TAYLOR. I had not remembered that. I am glad the Senator called it to my attention. That absolves him from any responsibility in the criticism which I am about to level at this so-called rent-control measure.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to ask him another question.

Mr. TAYLOR. May I yield for the question, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may yield for a question.

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Would the Senator from Idaho have been in favor of local boards had they been set up as the Senator from Alabama intended them to be when he suggested that they be named by the Director, in order to have people who were down on the local level assist the Director, and advise him as to the three or four things which were specified, first, whether or not a particular area or portion thereof should be wholly decontrolled; second, whether or not there should be a general increase of rent in that particular area or portion of an area; third, whether or not there should be some relief for that particular area or section of it in some other form; and fourth, whether or not individual cases in that particular area or section might be entitled to some specific relief? Would the Senator have supported that type of local advisory board, which was the type suggested by the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I may say to the able Senator from Alabama that I doubt if I could have supported the plan even had it been in that form, which was far superior to the way it is now. I never did feel that it would work. I appreciated the Senator's intention. It was a good idea to get this matter to the local level, but I have several reasons for thinking it would not work.

One reason is that we are presuming that there still exists the spirit of self-sacrifice which was apparent during the war, when people were willing to serve on the draft boards. Patriotism was the impelling motive then, Mr. President, because certainly those people took a great deal of abuse, and received no remuneration. That was one of the finest jobs that was done during the war, one of the most unselfish, because, while the men who actually went away to war received glory and praise, the draft boards generally received little but condemnation, from people who thought they should receive special favors. The service of the draft boards was a great monument to our American way of life, to the high quality of the citizenship of our people. In an overwhelming majority of the cases our draft program was handled on a fair, impartial, patriotic basis.

It is now proposed that people be appointed to serve on rent boards, and the abuse will be heaped upon them for raising people's rent or not raising it. They are bound to get abuse in every instance, because if they raise the rent the tenant will abuse them and if they do not raise the rent the landlord is going to be their enemy for life. So, anyone who would volunteer to serve on one of these rent boards might just as well go around and kiss half his friends goodbye, landlord or tenant, for they are bound to be one or the other. The members of the board are going to lose one out of every two friends they have in the community. I do not believe we would be able to get people to serve on the boards unless they had a special reason for serving.

If there had been a provision that the boards were to be apportioned among various segments of our population, for example, with a representative of labor, a representative of real-estate interests, a representative of the renters, and a representative of the public, that might be all right. If we could get a fair representation in that way, the idea might have worked, except for the fact that the members are to be appointed by the Governors of the State.

The rent boards are to have the privilege of raising the rent on one house, a block of houses, a whole city, a whole district. They can raise the ceiling or they can abolish the rent on one house, or two houses, or a block of houses, or for a city, or for a whole district.

When the Governor appoints these people, if he wants to be political about it, and an election is not very far away, he can and will probably appoint members of his own party, be they Democrats or Republicans. I am not casting aspersions on any one party; I am merely mentioning politics. The members of one party could raise the rent for landlords who were their Democratic friends. They could lower the rents of their Democratic friends who were tenants. They could discriminate in either way. They would not take the responsibility. They could lay the blame on the Federal employees who were in the office and had to meet the public face to face. They would say, "Look what those bureaucrats are doing to you." So it will not work out satisfactory, in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. President, I meant to discuss that subject yesterday, but it slipped my mind; not that it would have made any difference, because Senators probably had made up their minds as to how they intended to vote.

I want to say, Mr. President, I am happy to see the seats here all filled. I do not know what has impelled Senators to stay in such force to listen to me. I am highly gratified by this display of friendly affection and interest in my remarks.

Mr. President, the labor bill too strongly resembles the fine words contained in the so-called rent-control bill, which preserves the form but not the fact of rent control in our country. Its form, more than coincidentally, appears to be the same as that of the legislation which has been introduced to emasculate our reclamation projects in the West, by cutting out the public power features, which are so necessary to their financing. I may say, in speaking of public power and private power, that in the last election in Idaho, the Democrats campaigned on an issue of the CVA. Those initials, Mr. President, stand for Columbia Valley Authority. We wanted to develop our great Northwest. Senator Hugh Mitchell, who served here during the last Congress, was greatly interested in CVA. He was one of my closest friends; I respected him highly; in fact, I thought as much of Hugh Mitchell as of any man I ever met. We sat next to each other, and our friendship was so close that, several times, each of us had an opportunity because of seniority to move our seats nearer the front, but we refused, in order that we might stay close to each other. I know he was a man of integrity and honesty and high principle. He told me he hoped to put through the Columbia Valley Authority, to develop the resources of the Northwest, and especially his State of Washington. He told me of the great plans he had for aiding his people in the State of Washington. We campaigned in Idaho, in the last election, on the issue of a Columbia Valley Authority, right down the line. We had strong opposition. The contractors opposed it. Under the present system of handling reclamation, we let a contract for one dam every 5 or 10 years. The contract is let to a private contractor or group of contractors. They round up the machinery, rent it, lease it, or buy it, and haul it back into the hills. They get a gang of green-horn laborers, and transport them back into the mountains. They have to go to the expense of recruiting them each time. Then they complete the work on one dam, or perhaps they just do part of it, and Congress refuses to appropriate funds with which to carry on the work, so they all move out for a year or so; the machinery is dispersed again about the West. Then we get a little more money from Congress, and the contractors round up all the boys and the machinery and go back to work for a little while longer; the appropriation runs out; they take all the machinery out, and the workers return to their homes in the various States. We get another little appropriation, and they work a little while longer.

That is very fine for the contractors. They do not like the idea of a valley authority, because, if the work were done

the way it was done in Tennessee, the Government would set up a construction outfit which would move from one dam to another, become proficient and efficient, and would do the work much cheaper. The Government, under CVA, would save the people millions upon millions of dollars.

The contractors do not like that, so they fight a valley authority. I think, really, Mr. President, that they are very short-sighted, because if they were to get behind it and let us get a valley authority, the development that would take place would create enough additional activity on the part of private interests to more than compensate the contractors for the loss of the one dam they get every 5 or 10 years, but they cannot see it that way.

"A dam in the hand is worth two in a valley authority" is their motto. The power companies oppose the Columbia Valley Authority, because, Mr. President, if we develop a small amount of cheap power in the Northwest, and municipalities and REA cooperatives are permitted to buy it and distribute it to their customers, they will do it more cheaply; they will cut out or lessen power-company dividends. The power companies would not lose anything, actually. They would be paid, if the municipality voted to take over their facilities; but the stockholders would miss those dividend checks.

However, I might say this: There are a large number of patriotic citizens in Idaho who own large blocks of stock in the Idaho Power Co. who favor the Columbia Valley Authority, because they know it means cheaper power for their farms and other undertakings. They know they would be just as well off without the dividend checks from the power company. They would get their returns in other ways, through opportunities of investing money in other places. However, the power companies opposed CVA bitterly. They had a very clever scheme. They simply told the people that if there were a Columbia Valley Authority they would lose their water rights. Now, of course, Secretary Krug came to Idaho to tell them that their water rights would be protected under a CVA even better than they are now; we all told them that. The question is important, Mr. President—water is all we have in Idaho. The land is of little value without water. It can be seen readily that water is what creates the value. The farmers could not be blamed. I did not blame them for being apprehensive about a Columbia Valley Authority in view of what they had been told. It is as if someone came to me and told me that if a certain bill passed he would take my oldest son out and shoot him. I might not believe it, but I love that boy and I would not take a chance. That is the way the farmers in Idaho felt about their water rights.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. First, I desire to say that I agree thoroughly with what the Senator has said about power and about the power interests. I have enjoyed what he has had to say about rent control. I wanted to know if the Senator from Idaho would favor the payment of terminal leave bonds in cash, in the event the bill having that purpose in view were reported favorably by the committee?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I certainly would be in favor of paying our terminal-leave bonds in cash. As I have pointed out here, and as others have pointed out, the actual take-home pay of our workers is dwindling. It is I believe about $5,000,000,000 below the peak, in spite of the fact that all the soldiers have come home adding to the total force of wage earners. If all those who were working during the war, while the soldiers were away, and if now all, including the soldiers, get $5,000,000,000 less now than the war workers received, what are the soldiers living on? I suppose many of the veterans have nothing. It would be a very good time to pay the terminal-leave bonds in cash. Most of the soldiers now, of course, are married, I suppose, and many probably have infants. As I pointed out earlier this evening, in the city of Philadelphia the consumption of fresh milk has fallen off 7 percent, recently. That can be attributed to nothing in the world other than the fact that the people simply do not have enough money to buy this absolute necessity. Inasmuch as the veterans are probably in the majority as parents of small children at the present moment, it would seem that they could use the money due from their bonds to buy milk for their babies. Yes, I certainly would vote for a measure to pay the veterans in cash for their terminal-leave bonds.

To get back to my point about a Valley Authority, Mr. President, those opposed to such an Authority told the people of Idaho that if a Columbia Valley Authority were established, the people would lose their water rights. It scared the people to death, and our candidates were defeated.

Oddly enough, the power company furnished much of the money for this attack. They had front organizations to speak for them and spend the money. One was the National Reclamation Association, which has degenerated into a front organization for contractors, power companies, private fertilizer interests, coal companies, and barge companies. Another such front organization is called the Southwestern Idaho Water Conservation League, Inc. It was set up in Idaho, originally, by irrigation farmers to promote irrigation, but the power companies, the contractors, and the special-interest groups found they could use these organizations. So they bored from within. We hear talk about the Communists boring from within. They are not the only borers from within in this country. I will say that the power companies and special-interest groups in Idaho are some of the most expert borers from within that I have ever seen. They took over these organizations, and for a while they could obtain genuine dirt farmers to serve as officials of these groups, until the farmers found out how they were being used. Then the farmers refused to serve. So during the last campaign these front groups had to have officials of the Idaho Power Co., bank officials, and officials of the contracting companies serve as the board of directors of these alleged water-conservation groups which were supposed ostensibly represented the interests of the people who owned irrigated land.

I should like to say, Mr. President, that I could end this feud with the Idaho Power Co. any time I saw fit to do so. I could get them to support the Columbia Valley Authority, and they would certainly be glad to support it. In fact, I was told recently by a substantial stockholder of the Idaho Power Co. that if I would agree, and if I could get the Interior Department to agree, to give the Idaho Power Co. a 20-year lease on the power from all the dams in Idaho, with an option to renew for 20 years more, they would cease and desist in their efforts to block the Columbia Valley Authority, and we could all get together and live happily ever after. We would get our valley authority, we could irrigate our land, if we would just let them have the power. Of course, that would not be so good, because the power would not be available at cheap rates. It would not be attractive to industry. We would only get one-third of the benefits we should get out of such a project. All we would get would be supplemental water for the land now under irrigation, and water for new land. We would get that. It would result in homes for veterans. It would help develop our State. But we would not get the new industry which would come if we could furnish abundant cheap power. We would lose the benefit which would come from new industries, and we would also lose the benefits of cheaper power for home consumption. Thus these interests work.

It is a question which must be decided, whether we want to compromise and give the private power companies the electricity and let them make a profit on it in exchange for the cooperation in getting the Valley Authority. In 40 years we might have a chance to enjoy the full benefit. The alternative is to continue to fight straight down the line. Personally, that is what I would do. I like to do that. But, the people of Idaho are deeply concerned over this matter, and I will confer with them and see what they think. I will try to find whether they believe it would be better to compromise for immediate gains, or just stick to our guns. I think we can beat them in the next election. If we cannot, then I believe we can in the next election, and if not in that election, then in the next one. And there ought to be others after that.

I may say, Mr. President, that we did not fare too badly in the election in Idaho on the issue of a Columbia Valley Authority. In the States of Washington, Idaho, Utah, and Nevada there were senatorial elections in 1944 and again in 1946. I may say that in the State of Washington my good friend, to whom I previously referred, Hugh Mitchell, was the candidate for the Senate. He was an incumbent Senator. In the State of Utah, Abe Murdock, a very fine and able Senator, was the candidate and an incumbent. In Nevada, the candidate was

Mr. Berkeley Bunker. He was in the House and had served in the Senate. But here was the difference. In the State of Washington, Hugh Mitchell, who had introduced the bill, thought he saw the conservative trend, so he did not stress too heavily the issue of a Columbia Valley Authority. In Nevada, Mr. Bunker, who had been quite liberal the last year or so, drifted quite a ways over to the right to get in line. In Utah, Senator Murdock had no good, liberal issue, although he had been known as a New Dealer. In Idaho, our candidate, Mr. George Donart, was not an incumbent. He was a State senator. In spite of that fact, in Idaho from 1944 to 1946 we Democrats lost 9 percent, in Washington the Democrats lost 10 percent, in Utah they lost 11 percent, and in Nevada they lost 14 percent. The Democrats lost almost in direct proportion to the liberal tone set in the campaigns they conducted. So, we will probably be back campaigning again on this issue of a Columbia Valley Authority.

Mr. President, the appropriaion bills we have passed here in the name of national economy have throttled individual functions in reclamation, public power, agriculture, labor relations, and in a score of other activities. These appropriation bills involve selective cutting, cuts which would take the heart out of the programs which have been legislated by law. I wish to disassociate myself from these cuts which have been going on in Congress. I do not approve of this type of legislation. Most of the cuts the West has received are not in out-of-pocket expense; they are simply refusals to make investments in developments for which the Government will be paid back fully in cash. In addition, when a reclamation development is built not only is the money paid back in full but industries are started, farms and factories established, and in all this development increased production results, with the further benefit that millions of dollars of additional taxes will be paid into the Federal Treasury. It is a handsome investment; and yet we have cut it down.

Mr. President, I feel that, if the Senate believes that we should have a bill which would take away the rights of workingmen to form a union and bargain collectively on working conditions and hours, it should pass a straightforward repeal of the Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would it be proper for the speaker to ask a question of the acting majority leader?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that, under the rules, such procedure is not in order.

Mr. TAYLOR. Very well.

Mr. President, we should present the people of the Nation with a clear-cut decision in which they could concur or not concur at the polls.

I had intended to ask the acting majority leader if he had any idea how long he intended to keep us here tonight, so that I would know how to pace myself. If we are going to stay a long time, I do not want to take it too fast or become excited. On the other hand, if it is a reasonable length of time, I shall try to give the occupants of the gallery a run for their money. But inasmuch as there is no way of knowing, we shall have to assume that we shall be here until morning, when the sun comes up.

That is nothing new to me. I spent my life in show business, and we never got started until this time of the evening. We would finish about 1 o'clock, and then, for a good many years—7 or 8 years before I came to the Senate—after that time I would read about economics, what the Congress was not doing, and things like that. Many times I would sit up until the sun came up, trying to prepare myself for the day when I should be in Washington. So it will not put me out a great deal if we stay here until sunup.

Mr. President, we should not entangle our laws with thousands of words of window dressing which pretend to preserve the spirit of our beneficial labor laws but which will, in fact, dismember them when the lawyers and the courts have finally succeeded in ferreting out the meaning of the Congress.

I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that the majority in this Congress has but one aim. That aim, it must appear upon the basis of the legislation which we have passed, is to send the Nation into another great depression as quickly as we possibly can.

Mr. President, the "bust" of 1929 to 1932 was hatched by the policies pursued by the Republican administration of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. The depression, as it was called in those days, resulted from the scarcity of purchasing power on the lower levels and a muscle-bound concentration of power and wealth above.

I wish to make it plain that I am not in any way conducting a filibuster. I am only talking to give the American people time to think this question over, to read the President's message, and decide whether or not they think this is good legislation. I am acting in the best interests of the American people. I am not trying to prevent action on anything; but I think we should delay action long enough to let the people find out what this is all about. They have not yet had an opportunity to do so.

I have previously spoken against this measure, but the press did not see fit to print my remarks.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield only for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the position of the Senator from Idaho that the President of the United States is entitled to the courtesy of the lapse of time over the week-end, which would enable the American people to study his veto message?

Mr. TAYLOR. I think the President is entitled to that simple courtesy, and the American people are entitled to that opportunity.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the position of the Senator from Idaho that the United States Senate should take a recess at this time so that there can be further consideration and reflection upon the question, and reconvene tomorrow at noon for further consideration?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly that would be the fair thing to do. As I have previously pointed out, I am willing to agree to a unanimous-consent arrangement to postpone consideration of this question until some time next week. I would be willing to agree upon Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday. The President and a number of Senators are leaving the city on Tuesday to go to Warm Springs, Ga., for dedication ceremonies. They will not be back until Thursday morning. Therefore it seems to me that Thursday would be the logical day. If we could reach such an agreement, we could proceed with other legislation, and nothing would be delayed 1 minute.

So Senators on the other side ought not to accuse me of delaying consideration of the question. They are delaying it by being bull-headed and saying, "We must vote now," without giving the American people an opportunity to study the question. It was even suggested that we vote tonight, before the President could speak on the radio.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the position of the Senator from Idaho that the United States Senate should give the employers of America an opportunity to study the President's message and this legislation, so that they can make known their reactions to Members of the Senate before we finally vote on the legislation?

Mr. TAYLOR. I think that is very important. I believe that if the majority leadership are sincere in their desire to protect the best interests of the American people, they will be happy and anxious to agree to some such arrangement, to give the people an opportunity to study the question.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Idaho that after the country has had an opportunity to react to the veto message and make known to Members of the Senate its views on the message, it will be our duty as individual Senators, after we weigh those views, to exercise honest, independent judgment on the question as to whether we should vote to sustain or override the President's veto?

Mr. TAYLOR. Of course, we should always exercise our best judgment. I point out to the Senator that on yesterday we had the wool bill before us. We have a lot of sheep out in Idaho, and someone owns them. I felt that the wool bill was detrimental to our best interests as a Nation, to our reciprocal-trade program, and I voted against it.

I have no idea what the political repercussions will be in Idaho. I hope the President will veto it so that it will come back here and we can cut out the objectionable parts and pass the support-price part of the bill so that our sheepmen will be taken care of. That is my hope. But if I had known that would not happen, I should still have been forced to vote against it in the best interests of my country.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Idaho agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that it is the duty of the individual Members of the Senate to weigh very carefully the points of view of their constituents on an issue such as the veto message and to satisfy themselves that they have a full understanding as to what their constituents want done in regard to a message such as this?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly. Each Senator should always try to get the views of his constituents. He should be happy to receive them, at least, on any subject, and let them enter into the over-all consideration of the problem. I do not say that they should always be the governing factor, but we should consider them seriously.

With reference to the Bulwinkle bill, frankly I received a number of resolutions from Idaho urging me to support the bill. But I am convinced that those people did not have an opportunity thoroughly to understand what the Bulwinkle bill would mean to them. So I had to exercise my best judgment. I had sought the most expert advice I could find on the subject and I voted against the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Idaho agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that after receiving the views of his constituents on a given issue such as this—and such views could certainly be received before the first part of next week—it then becomes the duty of each Senator to determine for himself, under our representative form of government, whether the public welfare and interest will be best served by the proposed piece of legislation?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly, a Senator should study this veto message carefully, because it is the clearest, most concise, and forthright analysis that has come to my attention. It should be weighed in that light and in the light of the feelings of his constituents. Then he should act according to his conscience and vote for what he feels would be best for all the people of America—not just the laboring man, but all the people.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree that if, after we have reached our final decision, after giving due weight to the views of our constituents on a given issue, we are of the opinion that our final view does not coincide with the view of a temporary majority as of that time, we have the political responsibility of standing upon our vote and taking to the people our reasons for our vote?

Mr. TAYLOR. Absolutely. I may say that I did that in connection with the Columbia Valley Authority. There was no demand from the people of Idaho for a Columbia Valley Authority. They never heard of it. I had to go out and tell them about it and try, against great odds, to sell them on the idea. I shall continue to do so, because I think it is for the best interests of my people and for the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree that if we should agree to vote on the President's veto message tomorrow we simply would not have sufficient time to make an accurate check as to what public opinion on the respective sides of the issue really is?

Mr. TAYLOR. Of course, we would not have time. The President is going on the air this evening. By tomorrow our constituents will not have time to digest the matter and write us and let us know what their idea is as to how it is going to affect their business. That is very important. We have not gotten down to cases here and heard from the average businessman. He has not had a clear exposition of this bill and has not seen what it might do to him. It is important that we hear from those people.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that if we should proceed to vote on this measure tomorrow there would be those within the ranks of the public who would be inclined to believe—rightly or wrongly, it is not for me to say—that we wanted to get the vote over with before we could hear from our constituents?

Mr. TAYLOR. Oh, yes. As I said a while ago, I think that was the object. They wanted to get it over with before the President could open his mouth and have anything to say about it and before the newspapers could print it, for that matter. No one could have gotten home from work and read about it in the evening paper if we had voted this afternoon. A man would have gotten home and looked at the paper and that would be the first time he would have seen anything about the labor bill. Then he would turn on the radio and find out about the vote which had already been taken just about the time he made up his mind that the bill was not a good thing after all.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that under our constitutional form of government the power of veto vested by the Constitution in the President of the United States is one of the very important checks in our check-and-balance system?

Mr. TAYLOR. Most certainly; and it is not something to be regarded lightly. When the President sends a veto message to the Congress we should, in the language of the West, take another look at our "hole card" and kind of look the proposition over again before we vote.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I am happy to yield to my good friend from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. By his last statement does the Senator mean to make clear that he feels that because the veto power is one of the important checks vested in the President under our Constitution to protect the people from hasty action by a majority in Congress, we owe it to the people, to the President, and to our form of government to give very careful and thorough study to any veto message, particularly when it pertains to a subject which is vital to the Nation's economic welfare, as is this particular message?

Mr. TAYLOR. Most certainly. This is, I believe, one of the most important messages in years on domestic problems, at least. No one can say that I am for this veto because I am a Democrat, because I do not hesitate to oppose my own party whenever I feel that the party is wrong. I opposed President Roosevelt on his proposition to draft workers in defense plants. I had just come from a defense plant, and I opposed it. It was the first important matter which came before us when I came to the Senate, and I had just told the people that I would probably agree with the President 95 percent of the time, which was true; but the 5 percent hit me in the face the first thing, and I had to disagree.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Indiana for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; I shall try to put it in the form of a question.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I cannot yield unless the Senator wishes to ask a bona fide question. I do not want any slip-up to occur.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall do my best to put it in the form of a question. If I do not, the Senator need not answer.

The Senator from Idaho was a Member of the Senate, was he not, when President Truman sent to this body a message asking us to enact legislation drafting workers into the Army?

Mr. TAYLOR. We discussed that earlier this evening.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am asking the Senator whether he was a Member of the Senate when that happened.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Idaho voted against that measure; did he not?

Mr. TAYLOR. Most emphatically, I did.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the President was wrong on that issue, why might he not be wrong in his veto of the pending labor legislation?

Mr. TAYLOR. He may be; it can well be that he is wrong, Mr. President. All we ask is that the American people be given time to consider whether he is right or wrong.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to ask another question: Has anything new been added to the labor legislation which we have not been discussing for weeks and weeks?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is anything new added to the legislation, anything that all of us do not know about and have not known about for weeks?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; something new has been added.

Mr. CAPEHART. What is the newness?

Mr. TAYLOR. Veto. [Laughter].

Mr. President, today we are following the same disastrous policies that were engineered by the heirs and successors of the bunglers of the decade of 1929 and 1932. We are now moving toward another 1929.

The Congress already has voted, for all practical purposes, to abolish rent controls and further lower the living standards of our workers. The majority is preparing to leave the building cycle free to soar and smash. It has done nothing to provide housing for the middle- and low-income family.

It recently voted to reduce income taxes in the higher brackets, but it has done little to increase the purchasing power of consumers in the low-income groups. No better illustration of the effect of this kind of policy can be found than the fact that in one city the consumption of milk, one of the most basic necessities, has fallen off 7 percent.

On the contrary, in the House Ways and Means Committee, the majority party members are beginning to talk about sales taxes as a way to pay off the national debt. Sales taxes destroy the buying power of the little man. They cut into the income of the consumer. Mr. President, the chairman of one House subcommittee has even proposed that a tuition be charged in the public schools as a means of raising revenue for the District of Columbia.

We have given great tax bonuses to big business through the enactment of the carry-back provisions and the repeal of the excess-profits tax, and now the Congress has voted to destroy the Wagner Act which enabled labor to organize and to maintain wage scales through collective bargaining. Now the majority is asking us to override the veto of the President of the United States, and to pass this bill, after he has given us a chance to save the country from the debacle which this and measures like it will create.

Congress, likewise, has demonstrated its interest in lowering wages through the enactment of a bill which, under the guise of eliminating portal-to-portal-pay suits, is actually destroying the effectiveness of the minimum wage law.

We are heading pell-mell for another depression. We are destroying the purchasing power of the great mass of the American people.

Now, Mr. President, comes the ultimate and the acme of all the acts and deeds guaranteed to undermine the morale of our people and the stability of our economy. The crowning touch has just been added. I read from the Evening Star of Monday, June 16:

> Chairman TAFT told a reporter the Senate-House Economic Committee certainly will want to hear from Mr. Hoover when it begins its scheduled investigation next week of how to prevent depressions at home and still give the world some help along the road to recovery.

Mr. President, the Republican steering committee, which thus far has steered an unerring course toward depression, is not satisfied with the progress being made, so it has called in a greater expert—in fact, the greatest expert of them all, the man who knows more about creating depressions and less about how to get out of a depression than any other man in the United States—yes, in the world—that great engineer of two-car garages in which to store pots of two-chicken capacity because there were no cars for the garages and no chickens for the pots, that great defender of a veteran's inalienable right to sell shiny red apples on street corners, that great architect and builder of housing whose lack of accomplishments in that field are only exceeded by his present-day contemporaries who have failed even to equal his famous pioneer housing development known as Anacostia Flats.

Mr. President, the Republicans are not satisfied with their efforts to bring us to chaos, and so they have called for the advice of the man whose very name is synonymous with depression, Herbert Hoover. In view of all this, I am sure I echo the sentiments of millions of Americans when I say God help us.

Mr. President, we should present the people of the Nation with a clear-cut decision in which they could concur or refuse to concur when they vote at the polls. That is what we should do when we vote on such matters as labor legislation and other legislative proposals. It seems that the majority party is no longer interested in preserving the private-enterprise system in which business can function competitively within certain laws which keep it from becoming monopolistic. It seems, if we are to judge by the legislation which has been introduced and passed, that it is the desire of the majority party to reduce labor to the basis of individual bargaining, which was the rule when capitalism came into being in the eighteenth century. Great corporations—hundreds of thousands of times larger than the small companies of the 1800's—are to be given a completely free hand to exploit their workers if they so desire—and I regret to say that apparently most of them do so desire. Perhaps we should have been forewarned that there are people in this Nation of ours who desire the disastrous cycle of boom and bust.

I have before me a copy of a few paragraphs from an article printed in the fall of 1945. It was written by Mr. Ralph Blodgett, an advertising executive, and it appeared in an employer's magazine, the Automotive and Aviation Industries. These unbelievable phrases appear in that article:

> It is to be hoped that depressions are never abolished, for they have many desirable features.

Mr. President, I suggest that the majority steering committee employ this man as one of their staff. He should fit into the picture very nicely.

I read further from his article:

> Those who learn to ride the business cycle can find as many advantages in depressions as booms.

That is sage advice, Mr. President. Frankly, I never learned how to ride a business cycle. I can ride a motorcycle, I can ride a bicycle, and I can ride a bucking horse, but I do not know how to ride a business cycle so a depression seems a nice thing to me.

Think of it, Mr. President, in the year 1945 appeared a statement in a responsible trade publication extolling the benefits of depressions; extolling the great suffering and human misery which result from mass unemployment; extolling the great loss of productivity in this Nation, whose productivity we are so wont to glorify, as proof positive that our system of economics is the greatest in the world today.

But let us read on. Mr. Blodgett is not through. Why does this spokesman for a great American industry feel that depressions are such happy events—almost a blessed event, I might say? I quote again:

> That very name "depression" is inappropriate. It horribly maligns those great periods so full of splendid opportunities and human benefits. Let us keep those periods but abolish only the name.

That is a quotation, not my sentiments, Mr. President. I was in a depression once, and I do not like them.

It seems that that part of the admonishment in this trade magazine has been carried out very well. Senators will recall that most of our business publications now do not use the term depression. When they talk about the possibility of a decline in the business cycle nowadays, of even a crack-up, we have more euphemistic terms thrown at us. Recession has come into wide use. I think it originated in 1937. When we were making progress but had not yet gotten out of the depression and started backward again, they did not want a depression within a depression, so they called it a recession.

However, in late months even so mild a term as "recession"—to describe the almost complete break-up of our free-enterprise capitalistic society—has come into disrepute.

It, too, in the words of this writer in the automotive- and aviation-industries magazine, "horribly maligns those great periods so full of splendid opportunities and human benefits," and so now we have the latest coined word to describe this situation.

The daily newspapers and trade publications in the last few months have adopted the term "shake-out." That is very pleasant. It reminds one of a hula-hula dancer, probably, or something of the sort.

It seems that a shake-out is even more desirable and probably several times as desirable as a depression. They all mean the same thing, of course. They all mean bread lines, hungry children,

broken homes, unemployment, and a scale of living far beneath the dignity of the African Hottentot, whom the New Dealers were so roundly criticized for once having said they would like to aid.

But the very nicest description has just been coined by Mr. Aldrich, president of the Chase National. He said in a recent speech that the United States is headed toward a corrective recession.

Incidentally, milk consumption has fallen off 7 percent, as I mentioned a while ago. Perhaps we could make an arrangement with the Hottentots to take up the slack with that bottle of milk now.

As I have said, this gentleman, Mr. Blodgett, writing in the magazine, said, "Let us keep those periods, but abolish the name," meaning depression.

Apparently we have abolished the name, and this Congress seems hell-bent on keeping those periods. Fortunately, the President of the United States, in vetoing the Taft-Hartley bill, the latest in a long series of measures designed to "keep those periods," has given us an opportunity to thwart at least one attempt at insuring depression.

But I must read to the Senate one more paragraph from the omniscient writings of Mr. Ralph Blodgett away back in the fall of 1945. He said this:

> Unemployment brings needed rest to millions, whether they are ready for it or not.

I agree with that.

> There is a job to be done, of showing all America that the miscalled "depressions" offer as wide a range of rich opportunities and human benefits as a prosperity season or any other part of the business cycle.

Mr. President, I am sorry I cannot agree with my friend when he looks back with nostalgia upon these depressions and says we should have them right along, that they are fine things, and that all we ought to do is merely to change the name and they will be pleasant experiences. I cannot agree with him, because I was in the other depression. I was in bad shape, in fact. I was in a business, a luxury business. Ironically enough, I was in the show business, one of the first to suffer. When people do not have money they do not have to go to a show. They do have to buy a few groceries and a few clothes once in a while, they do have to pay their rent; but they do not have to buy any jewelry, they do not have to buy any fur coats, and they do not have to go to a show. So one can be down and out pretty quickly in that business, as I discovered. But I will say this, that I never went on relief. I might have done so if I could have, but being in the show business, I had no home, and having no home, no one was responsible for me. So I had to fight it out.

I ate jack rabbits, although in the West we do not consider jack rabbits fit to eat. We will not eat them in normal times.

There is nothing pleasant about the memory of not knowing from one day to the next where one's next meal is coming from. There is nothing pleasant about the recollection of having a sick wife and a sick baby and not knowing how in the world you are going to get medical attention for them. In fact, Mr. President, in my case I did not get medical attention for them. I just prayed to God that everything would be all right, and that they would pull through. They did. No, there is nothing pleasant at all about those recollections, and I disagree with this gentleman who has that philosophy.

I disagree with the things the Republican Party is doing nowadays—the very same things that were done in the 1920 to 1929 era that brought on the depression—and which will bring on another depression. I hope I can escape the suffering I went through in that depression. I probably will, if I am fortunate enough to stay in the Senate, with a fixed income, which is very nice. But there will be many other people out where I was who will not be able to escape the depression. I shall be glad to try to help them as much as I can, so long as my finances hold out, but that will not be for long.

I think the exponents of free enterprise, who like to call me a Communist, a Bolshevik, and a Socialist, are the worst enemies of our capitalistic system. They are selfish, unthinking of the consequences of their actions, looking only for greater profits, trying to saddle the burdens of taxation upon the little man all the time, trying to fix it so that his wages can be cut, trying to get the big man out from under the antitrust laws so that he can corner everything. They are the enemies of democracy.

Mr. President, I would not be United States Senator this minute if it had not been for this dog-eat-dog attitude of our conservative friends who care nothing about the little man. I was contented to go my humble way and make a very humble living, with nothing fancy about it. I was content not to have a great abundance of this world's goods. I was not overly ambitious. I liked a condition in which I could go fishing once in a while and enjoy myself and be with my family. All I wanted was to have just enough to eat, and to be sure I could pay the doctor bills. I was not even insistent that I should have a home, and I did not have one. I was traveling in the show business. I did want to have enough money to pay my hotel bill. But no, Mr. President, they would not even let me have that. They so engineered things that finally I had to eat jack rabbits. I could not get a doctor for my family. I could not afford to stay in a hotel, so we lived in a truck. We did not have even a mattress, hard times overtook us so quickly. We slept on a pad about 3 inches thick—one of these camp mattresses that we happened to have. We spent a winter in Wyoming, in weather 20° below zero, sleeping on that pad. When we got ready to go to bed, instead of taking off our clothes and putting on a nightgown or pajamas, we just left everything on. We had to put a muffler around our head and put on our overcoat, and so to bed.

Mr. President, it got me roiled up a little bit, and I started looking into economics, to see what caused it. I found out. I found out, Mr. President, that it was not an accident, it was not all just by guess and by God; there were reasons for everything that happened. I found out what the reasons were. It was because there were too many Republicans back in the United States Congress, enacting bills of this kind, during that period. So I determined that there would be one less, back there, of that kind, and I kept that promise.

Mr. President, I want to say that the course that is being followed at the present moment will result in the same result again. There are many people out yonder who are perfectly satisfied with the lot that has been given to them; they have a decent place to live; probably, for the first time in their lives, they are making a decent wage, although it will not buy very much nowadays. They would like to see prices come down a little, but they are fairly well satisfied. They can buy clothes, they can get a doctor, they can go to the movies once in a while. But, Mr. President, if we continue passing measures to help monopoly, to destroy labor, to push down the little man, and fortify the big man in his castle, there will be a lot of Glen Taylors springing up out yonder, and there will be a lot of hard-bellied United States Senators who will be going back looking for another job.

I was a small free-enterpriser back in those days, Mr. President. I was very happy with it. I had my own troupe of actors touring the country when the depression hit. Frankly, I do not know which came first, the depression or the talkies; they came together. It is like the chicken and the egg. They placed loud-speakers on the stages, and we could not get any bookings. That did not make any difference, because if we got bookings, the depression had started, and nobody came, anyhow.

I enjoyed to the fullest those "rich opportunities and human benefits" of the great depression of two decades ago; and Mr. President, I can tell you, for one, that I want no more of them, and, speaking both as a "free enterpriser" in the best American small-business tradition, and as an individual, I do not want anybody else to have to put up with them. That is why, because of my background, my sympathies are with the people who work, including, of course, the farmer.

I was raised on a farm, if it may be dignified by calling it that. I worked with my hands. The last job I had before I came to the United States Senate was working with my hands as a sheet-metal worker, as a member of one of the unions we now have down on the floor, whose throat we are trying to cut. I was a small businessman; I understand their problems; I sympathize with them. I sympathize with the problems of big business. There are many problems, divers and diverse. There are many good, big businessmen, but some of them seem to want the world with a fence around it, and they seem to send a lot of folks down here to Congress to represent them. It is not going to turn out very happily either for them or for the little folks, either. That is the reason I entered politics, because I thought I might be able to help in some small way to avoid the horrible manifestations of mass suffering which have been progressively and euphemistically described as "depression," "recession," and now "shake-ups." I want no more of them; that is why I

want no part of the Taft-Hartley labor bill. That is why I urge the Members of this body to vote to sustain the courageous veto message of our President.

Mr. President, the thesis that the Taft-Hartley labor bill is a part of the over-all program of the majority party to insure another depression would seem to be upheld by none other than one of the eminent sponsors of the measure, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

If he was correctly quoted in the newspapers—and I do not believe he has denied the statement—the senior Senator from Ohio said only a week or so ago that the effect of the President's veto of the Case bill in the Seventy-ninth Congress was to bring higher wages. That statement, it seems to me, carries with it the corollary that had the Case bill been made law wages would have at least not risen and perhaps would have declined.

If that was the objective of the senior Senator from Ohio a year ago in urging passage of the Case bill, it would seem fair to assume that it is still his objective, and that it has been one of the major goals in connection with the writing and passage of what is now the Taft-Hartley bill, which is before us.

There we have the conflict. On the one side we find the supporters of this measure, those who would override the President's veto, saying that this is not a repressive bill for labor.

Mr. President, I hope that everybody listening to my voice, or who may hear me talk, will tell his friends that I am talking here for one purpose only—to give the people time to read carefully the President's veto message and decide for themselves whether or not they want this legislation passed. I am not trying to keep anybody from voting upon the bill at an appropriate time. Such a time which will be when everyone has had an opportunity to read the President's message, to hear what he has to say on the radio, one or both, and to think over the matter. And then I should like sufficient time for the people to communicate with their Senators and let them know what they think of the bill. If the people want it passed, then that is all right; I certainly am not one to protest a decision of a majority at any time, if I think the decision is arrived at fairly and openly and after full discussion and debate.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I can yield for a question only, I am sorry.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question. May I ask if the Senator's philosophy goes this far; if the Senator became convinced tomorrow, or in the immediate future, that the majority of the people wanted the veto overridden, would the Senator vote to override the veto?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; I would not vote to override the veto; certainly not.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then, Mr. President, what is the object? I take it that the Senator is advocating the use of his own judgment as to whether or not the bill is good or bad.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. And that, even if he were convinced that the majority of the people of the country desired that the veto be overridden, as I understand, the Senator says he would still not vote to override the veto.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am convinced in my own heart, after applying to the subject the best judgment I can, that it is a bad measure. I feel, however, that all of us, in our deliberations, consider the wishes of our constituents as much as we can. If a matter comes before us on which I do not have profound convictions, though I think generally it is bad, but I am not sure of it, and I find that my constituents want it, then I will let my own weak convictions go by the board and try to do what the people want done. But if I have profound convictions that are deep-seated I will stick with them.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then, Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator this question: What then is the logic of his argument in saying "Let us delay until the people express themselves to their Senators," when the Senator himself says that he would not take the will of the people if he were convinced that the will of the people actually was to override the veto? I fail to follow the Senator's logic in his desire for a delay for that purpose.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator from Iowa is absolutely correct in what he says, that I would not change my mind simply because the people told me they thought I ought to vote to override the veto. However, if they presented arguments, I would be willing to listen to them, and if they convinced me that I was wrong, then I would change. I feel that there are a number of Senators who do not have strong convictions about the measure, and if they find out that the people really want the veto sustained, and that the people think it is a bad piece of legislation, those Senators may change their votes. Not many votes will have to be changed to sustain the veto. Not many Senators' votes will have to be changed; only four or five or six to decide the issue. So I think my position is perfectly logical and defensible.

Mr. President, the situation becomes all the more interesting when we look at the statistical information available on total wages and total profits.

The Federal Reserve Board—hardly to be criticized as a source of prolabor statistics—reports a continuing upward trend in total profits of corporations in this country.

The National City Bank of New York has compiled a table showing that leading industrial corporation profits in 1946 were about 29 percent more than they were in 1945.

The Office of Business Economics of the Department of Commerce has estimated that profits of all corporations in the United States after taxes, in 1945, were eight billion nine hundred thirty-nine million, as compared with total profits for corporations after taxes in 1946 of twelve billion five hundred and thirty-nine million.

That the trend is continuing is borne out by the Federal Reserve Board in its report for the first quarter of 1947. The Board's compilation of profits after taxes for 629 corporations shows that during the first quarter of 1946 the total was $323,000,000, and in the first quarter of 1947, the total profits, after taxes, had risen to $875,000,000—more than double. Yet there are those who contend that labor is out of hand and must be curbed, when the actual take-home pay of labor, of those who work in this country, has declined by $5,000,000,000, and the profits of the corporations, the poor little corporations which we are going to protect from these big bad wolf workingmen—their profits have more than doubled. It seems to me, Mr. President, we are getting the regulation at the wrong end.

Let us look at the total wages and salaries. Figures compiled by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce show an actual decline in total wages and salaries in the years 1944 to 1946.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERGUSON in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the opinion of the Chair is the Senator from Idaho making his first speech or his second speech on the bill?

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I desire to have the parliamentary situation explained first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the opinion of the Chair that it is the Senator's second speech.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is it fair or is it permissible to ask why the Chair so rules?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After the message dealing with the bill was laid down, the Senator from Idaho took the floor and spoke. That was the first time the Senator spoke. The present speech is the second speech.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I want to say that I was trying desperately to be recognized by the Chair at the time the matter of unanimous consent was being discussed. I tried a number of times to obtain recognition. The Chair would not recognize me, and finally laid down the message, and then recognized me, and I had to say what I had to say on the subject of unanimous consent. That is what I was talking about.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I can yield for a question only.

Mr. KILGORE. Has the Senator checked the question of present prices of automobiles?

Mr. TAYLOR. I bought one a while ago.

Mr. KILGORE. The figures will show that the present price of the average automobile is approximately 102 percent more than the price was in 1941.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator will have to propound a question. I cannot yield for a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator refuses to yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Except for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will yield only for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. I was asking a question. Has the Senator checked to ascertain whether or not the present price of automobiles on the market is approximately 102 percent above the price in 1941, whereas the increase in wage, plus the increase in cost of material have been approximately 33 percent. Has the Senator checked that?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, I have not checked it. I wonder where the extra money is going.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the Senator that in an investigation of the Bilbo case——

Mr. TAYLOR. I cannot yield except for a question. I am sorry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator refuses to yield.

Mr. KILGORE. May I ask one question then?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield for a question, but I cannot yield for any other purpose.

Mr. KILGORE. Will the Senator kindly explain to the Senator from West Virginia why it is there is such a terrific urge on the part of the majority party to act upon the legislation at the present time? At the same time, despite the terrific housing shortage existing in the United States, there appears to be no urge whatsoever to pass the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which would provide housing for veterans who have returned from the wars, who have wives and families and no place to live.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am sorry that I cannot enlighten the Senator as to why there is so little display of interest on the part of the Republican majority in this Congress in the housing extremities of our veterans. Not only are they doing nothing about housing, but they are doing their best to tear down what little remained that could done under regulations. In the rent bill which we have just passed, they struck down all remaining housing controls, that is, controls over materials. Such materials will now all go into commercial buildings; and a veteran or anyone else will indeed be fortunate if he can find enough materials with which to build himself a lean-to.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. Yesterday, I believe, it was announced in the press that in certain unions an agreement had been made for an 11½ percent increase in wages; yet we have recently passed in the Senate, under terrific pressure, a bill permitting a 15 percent increase in the price of housing for the same type of workers who received the 11½ percent increase in wages.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the Senator has been listening, of course he has heard the Senator from Idaho contending all evening that the course of the majority party, if it were planned by the highest paid experts for that purpose could not be better calculated to lead us into a depression. It is hard to believe that they actually want a depression. But, Mr. President, the actions which have taken place would certainly seem to indicate it.

Figures compiled by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce show an actual decline in total wages and salaries in the years 1944 to 1946. According to this agency in the Department of Commerce, in 1944 salaries and wages totaled $112,800,000,000. In 1946 they had declined to $106,600,000,000. Mr. President, I think those figures are shocking. They show that while total profits are rising, total wages and salaries are declining.

As the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] has pointed out, the automobile companies have raised the prices of their cars 102 percent, while their wages and materials cost them 33 percent more. It is a pretty good racket that they are working on us. Every time the worker asks for a dollar increase in wages, they raise the profits $3 or $4. That is the way they have been doing during the war and ever since the war. The Congress is doing its level best to help them by crippling the unions so that they cannot ask for wage increases, so as to make it possible for the big fellows to increase their profits whether the workers receive any increase in wages or not. They do not like the ratio of a $3 increase in profits for a $1 increase in wages. They want to raise profits without raising wages. Perhaps they will succeed pretty soon.

Mr. President, I can think of no better recipe for a depression than to augment the trend of higher profits, higher prices, and lower wages. It is an unbeatable formula. Of course, there are a very few in this country who profit from a depression. It is hard to believe that they exercise enough influence to send a Congress here to work their will upon the other 99 percent or more of the people. But this very small percentage of the people has so much of the country's assets that they can withstand a depression; and then, when everyone else has gone bankrupt and assets are for sale at 10 cents on the dollar, they can step in and buy them. Those people benefit by a depression. It is difficult to believe that they have taken control of our Congress; but it is hard to find any other explanation. Perhaps that is what our friend Blodgett, from whom I was quoting awhile ago, meant by "riding the cycle of depression," as he termed it. That is why a depression can be so good.

Mr. President, the decline in wages and salaries means only one thing—a drop in purchasing power. Likewise a drop in purchasing power means only one thing—a curb on buying power, a curb on consumption, which means the shutting down of factories.

As the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] pointed out earlier in the day, citrus fruit in Florida—and I presume also in Texas, Arizona, and California—is going to waste. It cannot be sold. The people have not the money to buy it. Idaho potatoes are in the same situation. The people simply have not the money to buy them.

Some persons have the idea that the great demand for our farm products during the war was brought about because of the fact that we shipped so much food abroad. Actually, what we shipped abroad in the way of foodstuffs was almost negligible. We sent considerable food abroad to feed our soldiers, but they would have eaten if they had been at home. But they are now at home, and they should be eating just as much as they did when they were soldiers, but they are not. The average person cannot feed himself as well as soldiers in the Army are fed, with wages going down as they are. We were able to sell all the farm products of our great State of Idaho and other agricultural areas simply because, for the first time in the history of the United States, or for the first time in the history of any country in the world, for that matter, the people had enough money to buy practically all they wanted to eat, and they consumed all the products of our farms. But the surpluses are showing up again, because the people have not the money with which to buy.

Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], in an aside, asked me to yield to him for the purpose of making an announcement. I should like to yield to the Senator for that purpose, but the Republicans are becoming pretty tough, and will not allow me to yield for that purpose. I would even yield to a Republican if they would permit me to do so, but I cannot do it, so I shall have to continue.

Let us look for a moment at the background of some of those who, I understand, have been boasting in the hotel lounges and cocktail bars of the city of Washington that they had a hand in writing the labor legislation which we have before us today. One such person is a Mr. Theodore Iserman, who, I understand from his own words, describes himself as one of the most active consultants in the writing of the Taft-Hartley bill. Mr. Iserman is an attorney representing the Chrysler Corp. Certainly such connections would seem to make him most eminently qualified to write a fine, human document fully nondiscriminatory against the rights of employees, which would lead this country along the primrose path of industrial peace.

Let us look at the labor record of the great Chrysler Corp., which pays Mr. Iserman his hire. The report of the Committee on Education and Labor in the Seventy-sixth Congress, on its investigation of violations of free speech and the rights of labor, gives us this interesting information on the activities of the Chrysler Corp., Mr. Iserman's employer.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I will yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. Has the Senator from Idaho ascertained whether Mr. Iserman equipped the bill which he drafted with fluid drive, with which all other Chrysler vehicles are equipped?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Iserman has a fluent drive which urges him on to write these bills for the Congress, it seems.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. OVERTON. Is he as fluent in his oratory as the Senator is?

Mr. TAYLOR. I appreciate the compliment of the Senator. I have

never been called fluent. I have just been accused of being persistent.

Mr. President, the Chrysler Corp. was listed in the report among the largest purchasers of gas and equipment. That is not gasoline and equipment; that is tear gas. In the appendix to the report, part 6, No. 3, in a table listing the purchasers of over $1,000 worth of tear- and sickening-gas equipment, the Chrysler Corp. is shown to have purchased on December 4, 1935, approximately $7,000 worth of this type of gas and equipment. Of course, Mr. President, the Chrysler Corp. was looking forward to a day when Hitler's troops would invade this country, no doubt, and the corporation wanted to do its part in repelling the invader, I suppose. No doubt that great corporation, employing thousands of men, had no thought of using this tear-gas and sickening-gas and equipment on its own employees. Time after time these great corporations have told us that they never resort to violence in an attempt to settle a labor disturbance. Somehow, Mr. President, it is always the strikers, armed with fists, who attempt to beat the living daylights out of machine guns and tear-gas equipment in the hands of the employer's representatives.

But the report of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, of the Seventy-sixth Congress, has this to say:

> The committee found that the large purchasers of gas munitions during the period of this study, 1933 to 1937, were employers involved in strikes or threatened strikes, and law enforcement agencies in localities affected by the strikes.

Then the report had this to say:

> The Chrysler Corp. advanced the funds in May or June 1936 for the purchase of one submachine gun by the police of the city of Hamtramck, Mich., where most of the Chrysler plants are located.

That was nice. That was a public-spirited gesture on the part of Mr. Chrysler's corporation to buy machine guns for the policemen in the towns where the company's plants are located. How much better it would have been, than to advance funds for purchasing submachine guns for the police department of the town, to have advanced funds for hiring additional school teachers or for establishing playgrounds for the children of the workers, or for beautifying the parks, or doing any of a hundred other nonessential things. It might have been a good idea to set up a labor-relations school where people could study to make better labor relations in representing unions and employers.

The report of the Senate committee went on to detail further activities of the Chrysler Corp. in the field of labor spying, but I will not burden the Senate with the details. It is enough to show the eminent qualifications of the Chrysler Corp.'s representative, Mr. Theodore Iserman, to write, or help to write, a bill in the public interest to control labor relations in our Nation.

Mr. President, there is still another coauthor of this bill whose name, strangely enough, does not appear in the formal sponsorship of the measure. He is Mr. William Ingles, a representative of the Allis-Chalmers Co.

Mr. Ingles, too, has been, shall we say, devoid of false modesty about taking credit, in the better clubs and lounges, for the provisions of this great welfare document which is now before us for action.

Let us see whose interest Mr. William Ingles is protecting.

This company has since 1906 provided us with one of the worst examples of labor relations in our Nation.

It has consistently sought to break strikes—break unions—grind down the conditions under which its employees worked, and has consistently refused to bargain with representatives of its employees.

I quote from the magazine Survey of April 1941:

> Accounts of the Allis-Chalmers strike in Milwaukee headlined "The man-days lost, the outbreak of violence, the charge of Communist influence." But it was only in an inconspicuous paragraph—if at all—that the dailies carried the fact that on March 3, a month before the strike was settled, the union accepted the OPM proposal for settlement, and the company refused even to consider the proposal. This made the controversy not a strike, but a lock-out.

The accuracy of this statement is further attested by Mr. Thomas Burns, of the Office of Production Management. Mr. Burns said:

> The company's rejection of the OPM recommendations now places responsibility for continuation of the deplorable situation squarely upon their shoulders.

Further substantiation of this view came from Mr. William Davis, who was Vice Chairman of the National Mediation Board and who took an active part in the settlement of the 1941 strike. He declared:

> The strike was caused because the employer did not accept the principle of collective bargaining in good faith.

This, then, is the background of Mr. William Ingles, another self-described author of the Taft-Hartley bill.

I hope that every Member of the Senate will take time or has taken time to read the pointed remarks of Congressman JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan, a member of one of the conferences which considered this measure.

Mr. LESINSKI in his speech before the House yesterday made very clear the fact that the Taft-Hartley conference bill differs only in language—not in spirit—from the Hartley bill originally passed by the House, although it was presented to the Nation as substantially a "mild" bill along the lines of the original Taft bill.

By the way, I do not grant the validity of the statement that the original Taft bill was a mild bill. Even though the conference bill was thus advertised, the bill, in fact, retains every one of the 20 major points which Representative HARTLEY described as distinguishing his bill in the House of Representatives.

I shall not attempt to go into the undesirability of all of those major points, because I think they have been or will be well covered in the debate. However, there is one portion of the bill which is so patently undemocratic that I cannot refrain from calling attention to it in particular.

I refer to the provisions revising the laws by which voting on union security and other contractual relations are conducted. For example, in order for a union to receive authorization to make with an employer an agreement containing a union security clause, the union must obtain a favorable vote from a majority of all of the employees in the entire unit, regardless of whether they vote. In other words, an employee who, because of illness, disinterest, or any other reason fails to cast his vote in such an election is automatically recorded as voting "no" for all practical purposes. That is, indeed, a strange conception of democracy as it is practiced in this country. That is not the way we vote when we elect Governors, Members of the House of Representatives, and even Senators and Presidents. It is an entirely foreign idea injected into a bill which claims to bring about a greater degree of democracy in the conduct of union affairs.

The bill's restrictions on free speech on the part of unions and union spokesmen have been well covered in the debate on this floor, as well as in the veto message. I feel that such restrictions utterly contravene the constitutional guaranty of the right of free speech.

A corporation may hire whom it pleases—radio commentators, newsmen, or publicity experts—to influence elections or legislation as it pleases; but by the terms of this bill a union is even prohibited from publishing a voting record of a Member of Congress. If union members have thus to be expected to vote for or against a Member of Congress on the basis of something other than his voting record, I say our democracy has gone a long way from the principles of the founding fathers.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I can yield for a question to the distinguished and eloquent Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. The President of the United States has stated in his veto message that under this bill a labor-union newspaper——

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I can yield only for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. I am going to ask a question. I say that the President has stated in his veto message that this bill, if enacted, would forbid a union publication from editorially supporting or opposing a political party or a candidate in a political contest. Does the Senator from Idaho think that is in accord with the free press provision of our Federal Constitution?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; certainly I do not, Mr. President. I deplore those provisions in this bill.

Frankly, I am inclined to agree with the President that this thing may backfire, and all the radio commentators may find that they will be off the air, regardless of whether they work for a labor union or for some corporation. Indeed, I can see no good reason why a newspaper should be permitted to publish comments

about an election, if this bill becomes law, because the bill provides that no corporation can take part in an election, and certainly the average newspaper is owned by a corporation. The bill does not say anything about exempting a newspaper corporation.

Mr. President, inasmuch as the labor unions are, by this bill, forbidden to take any part in elections or political matters, either directly, indirectly, or in any other way, presumably the voters should vote for or against a Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives because of the way he combs his hair, the way he smiles, or perhaps even the efficacy of his technique in kissing babies; but certainly they would seem to be prohibited from voting in the truly American way on the basis of whether they favor or disapprove of the things for which the Members of Congress voted.

The steamroller tactics by which this bill was pushed through the House of Representatives have a parallel in the methods used to bludgeon public opposition to it.

I was encouraged and pleased to see the fine position taken by the National Catholic Welfare Conference with regard to this repressive labor bill.

The statement of the National Catholic Welfare Conference is, in part:

> The Taft-Hartley bill does little or nothing to encourage labor-management cooperation. On the contrary, it approaches the complicated problem from a narrow and excessively legalistic point of view.

I think that is a true and factual statement. I think it is a forthright and Christian statement coming from an organization of religious people.

I think the National Catholic Welfare Conference had not only the right but the duty to strike out at legislation which it deemed designed to grind down the living standards and well-being not only of laboring people but of everyone in this Nation.

When living standards are lowered, Mr. President, it leads to immorality in many cases. We know there is more lawlessness, more robberies, more crime, where there is poverty. And this Taft-Hartley bill is a bill to subject the laboring people to a regime of poverty.

So I think it is salutary for this Catholic organization, the welfare conference, to take cognizance of the great harm that can be accomplished by this bill, and to do something about it.

But, Mr. President, we hear a self-righteous criticism of the National Catholic Welfare Conference from a strange quarter. I have quoted Mr. David Lawrence previously on this floor. I often quote him when I want an authority of the utmost reliability on what is fashionable in reactionary circles. Mr. David Lawrence, who has won a position of eminence as a spokesman for big business in the United States, took occasion to chastise the conference severely for its temerity in rashly speaking its mind on a vital national issue, in an article published on Monday, June 16, 1947, in the Washington Evening Star.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I can yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. I am going to ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. TAYLOR. For a question.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator has quoted from the resolution of the Catholic Welfare Society opposing the proposed legislation. Does the Senator know of any single agency which is dedicated to humanitarianism in the United States which is trying to better the lot of the masses of the people of our country, which is agitating for the passage of this legislation?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, none. Of course, there are a number of organizations which claim to have the interest of everybody at heart. The National Association of Manufacturers spends millions upon millions of dollars trying to convince the American people that the National Association of Manufacturers is our Uncle Moneybags, just doing everything it can to help us.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. My inquiry related to a humanitarian organization. That excluded the National Association of Manufacturers.

[Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There must be no manifestations of any kind on the part of the occupants of the galleries.

Mr. TAYLOR. No genuine humanitarian organization is trying to have the bill passed.

I may say that I am gratified to realize why the Presiding Officer is pounding his desk at various times. It is because of the trickles of laughter emanating from the galleries. A moment ago I thought I might be out of order when I offered the Senator from Louisiana a cough drop, and the Chair rapped on his desk. I thought that I was not in order, but I see it was because of the fact that there was a little laughter occasioned at that time. I assure the Chair that offering the Senator from Louisiana the cough drop was not meant to cause levity in any way. The Senator was coughing, and I thought he needed one, so I offered him one.

Mr. President, Mr. David Lawrence gratuitously attacked the statement made by the Catholic Welfare Conference, saying this:

> It is a partisan attack on the labor-relations bill now before President Truman for approval or disapproval.

Now that is indeed a strange criticism. It seems to me the sponsors of this bill were boasting that they had bipartisan support for the bill; that there was no partisanship in its backing. Yet when a private organization of Catholic laymen, admittedly not affiliated with either party, deigns to criticize the measure, they are accused of partisanship. The conference did not criticize the Republicans; it did not criticize the Democrats, it criticized the legislation. So there was nothing partisan about it. Its interest was simply in the welfare of the people of America, especially those who work.

Mr. President, I think there could well be added to the old saying that "man does not live by bread alone," the further statement that he certainly cannot live without some bread.

Mr. Lawrence's criticism does not stop with an allegation of partisanship. He continues:

> To mix the church with politics in America has long been looked upon with disfavor by laymen of all denominations.

Now that is an interesting assumption. Because a group of leading Catholic laymen criticize proposed legislation they are mixing in politics. It seems to me they are merely expressing concern for the welfare of their members, and all people. If the Catholic Church or any other church sought to take an active part in the Government of this Nation by collecting or receiving taxes or by having its officials perform governmental functions, I agree that such action would be mixing church and politics, and would be thoroughly undesirable. I would oppose it, no matter what denomination resorted to it.

I see no such threat here. And it is passing strange that no such anguished cries of mixing church and state were heard from Mr. Lawrence, or any other reactionary columnist or commentator supporting the pending legislation, when clergymen take a reactionary position.

But do not let them speak up for the working man, or they are butting into other peoples' business!

Mr. President, I am happy that our Catholic brethren in the United States have seen fit to take a fine, progressive view on this critical issue. It is the duty of the church to assist its members in developing physical, as well as spiritual, well-being, because the two are inextricably tied in together. As Benjamin Franklin said, an empty sack cannot stand erect.

Could it be that Mr. Lawrence abhors what he calls mixing church and politics when it goes against the grain of the National Association of Manufacturers, and yet silently applauds when such action redounds to the benefit of the forces which work against democracy?

Mr. President, I can think of no more concise and yet no more complete statement of the effect if the Taft-Hartley bill should become law than the words of the President in his message to the Congress, in which he said:

> The bill taken as a whole would reverse the basic direction of our national labor policy, inject the Government into private economic affairs on an unprecedented scale, and conflict with important principles of our democratic society. Its provisions would cause more strikes, not fewer. It would contribute neither to industrial peace nor to economic stability and progress. It would be a dangerous stride in the direction of a totally managed economy. It contains seeds of discord which would plague this Nation for years to come.

Those are the words of Harry Truman, President of the United States. The President's analysis of the bill shows that not only would it discriminate against laboring men and their unions and thus have an adverse effect upon the entire economy but by its very terms would so limit and complicate the action

of employers as to make more difficult rather than less difficult the settlement of disputes with labor organizations.

And in turning to the effect which this bill will have on our domestic economy and its correlative effect on international relations, the President is no less logical when he says:

I cannot emphasize too strongly the transcendent importance of the United States in the world today as a force for freedom and peace. We cannot be strong internationally if our national unity and our productive strength are hindered at home. Anything which weakens our economy or weakens the unity of our people—

That is what the President has to say. He continues—

as I am thoroughly convinced this bill would do—I cannot approve.

Those are the words of the President.

And then the President recalls that in disapproving this abomination of a bill he is not closing the door to just and necessary reforms in our labor laws. The President says:

In my message on the State of the Union which I submitted to the Congress in January 1947, I recommended a step-by-step approach to the subject of labor legislation. I specifically indicated the problems which we should treat immediately. I recommended that, before going on to other problems, a careful, thorough and nonpartisan investigation should be made, covering the entire field of labor-management relations.

The bill now before the Senate reverses this procedure.

It would make drastic changes in our national labor policy first and would provide for investigation afterward.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that a bill carrying out the President's recommendations in his message on the State of the Union last January was introduced in the form of an amendment to the Taft bill by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the senior 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 junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and myself.

I believe that the provisions of that bill which would curb jurisdictional disputes, smooth machinery for mediating labor disputes, and otherwise perfect our labor laws, should be approved by the Congress in order to provide a forward step in our entire labor-management relations.

Let us take this positive action rather than the negative, repressive, and depression-breeding action, representing an absolutely erroneous approach to the labor problem, of allowing the Taft-Hartley bill to become the law of the land. Let us embrace the last chance we have to repudiate it.

Mr. President, in connection with the matter of labor relations—and it is a matter that affects our whole economy, the functioning of our whole economy, the question of whether or not workers will have sufficient purchasing power with which to buy the goods produced, whether or not we shall have prosperity or depression—evidently we have got to reverse the trends which have been indicated here tonight—profits going up; purchasing power going down; prices going up. That situation must not continue, for it can only lead to ruin.

Another facet is the question of credit. As was pointed out, installment buying is increasing by leaps and bounds. Installment buying is a good thing for people who stay within their means, but some do not do that. Some people will buy when they cannot really expect to pay for a thing. It is not sound. That is what happened in the depression of 1929. Thousands of people bought things they could not pay for, and finally, when the national economy started downhill, they had to return what they had bought. The fellow who had sold the goods had no use for them; he went broke because he could not get his money for them.

But there is a larger field of credit, Mr. President, to which I wish to call attention. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a very disturbing fear which is beginning to overtake our people.

It is the fear of another financial depression.

It is the small businessman's fear of bankruptcy.

It is the worker's fear of unemployment.

It is the farmer's fear of declining farm prices.

I share these fears, and I cannot take them lightly.

I cannot share the unruffled optimism of such members of the banking community as Mr. Winthrop A. Aldrich, retiring president of the International Chamber of Commerce and president of the Chase National Bank, who, in a speech made last week in Switzerland, referred to the prospects of what he blithely called a corrective recession in the United States.

This, indeed, exhibits an attitude of spartan courage. The banker does not fear the slight decline.

He faces the ravages of economic decline with head high.

Perhaps he will draw the velvet curtain of his club window a little closer, to shut out the sight of the poverty on the streets.

Or perhaps he is even too brave to do that, but merely closes the curtain so that the cold and the hungry will not see within the clubroom, and will build up unhealthy resentments.

Corrective recession, indeed.

Mr. President, let the banker try his optimism out on the unemployed, on the GI emerging from college and looking for a job, on the old man laid off because industry no longer requires marginal employables.

Let him stop the jalopies on the highway, and tell our migrant laborers that this is merely a corrective recession.

Let him tell that to the small businessman, who is forced into bankruptcy, and who watches in anguish while his life savings and his business prestige dissolve in despair.

Corrective, indeed. A ruler on the knuckles for the little fellow, who has been eating too much meat, whose children have been drinking too much milk. Let him cease and desist from union activity; he is making too much money anyway.

Mr. President, I hold no brief for or against Mr. Aldrich. But by a revealing word formulation he has made himself a symbol, a symbol well worth our attention.

We must decide now whether Congress will adjourn without taking action to prevent another depression.

Depressions are caused by a lack of purchasing power in the hands of the little people.

Inventories begin to pile up and the wheels grind down to a standstill and panic fills the land.

There is one sure way to prevent depression. That is to keep purchasing power widely spread. Are we doing that?

First, has our Joint Committee on the Economic Report made its reply to the President's suggestions—a reply due by law on February 15? No; it has failed to do so. It has missed its deadline.

If the head of any executive agency stood almost 4 months in default on a report due both Houses of Congress, he would have been excoriated, condemned, and chastised. But when a committee of Congress sees fit to fail to render a report when due, not a ripple perturbs the surface.

The majority party has decided that there are more important issues before the Congress. Canute has told the waves to be still.

Have we faced the threat of coming depression in our tax bill? No. We have passed a bill which gives millions to millionaires and pennies to the poor. It gives a great deal to the top brackets, but does nothing to increase purchasing power where it is required if a depression is to be prevented.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. TAYLOR. I may yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator has spoken of what in effect the bill accomplishes. I wonder if it might be the opinion of the Senator that the labor bill is just the converse of the tax bill which the President recently vetoed, which action the House of Representatives sustained? Whereas the tax bill gave the benefit to the rich and little aid to the poor, the labor bill imposes a burden upon the working people and no obligations upon the employers.

Mr. TAYLOR. And now as the Senator from Florida points out, we come to a labor bill. By this bill are we strengthening labor unions in their efforts to increase wages—that is, increase purchasing power—of the average American?

No, we are crippling unions; we are doing our utmost to destroy them; we are racing backwards to the place where wages were fixed by the employer, and the worker took his pay or left it—he had no choice in the matter.

Mr. President, if a depression or recession, corrective or otherwise, or a

shake-out, or whatever one may want to call it, comes upon us, we can look back to this day, we can look back to this bill, and say: "That was the greatest step toward national financial ruin since the days of Herbert Hoover."

While purchasing power diminishes, wealth accumulates at the top. Are we doing anything to prevent a depression by retarding that accumulation at the top?

Are we doing anything to root out the gigantic weeds which choke and destroy the plants of small business?

We are failing to do that.

Let us see what we are doing to thwart the growth of monopoly.

What does the majority want us to do about the railroad monopoly problem?

It wants us to exempt the railroads from the antitrust laws.

Imagine! Mr. President, if a corrective recession is what is wanted, we certainly are on our way.

Cripple labor, tax small business, and exempt big business from the antitrust laws.

Mr. President, this proposal to trustify railroads and to lessen labor's bargaining power presents a very neat juxtaposition. It is one to shock the conscience of the American citizen.

I have often heard members of the majority assert that last November they were given a mandate to destroy the gains made for the common man by the Roosevelt administration. Mr. President, it is hard for me to reconcile that with the campaign promises, but I have grown used to the assertion.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. McGRATH. I should like the distinguished Senator from Idaho to enlighten the Senate further by giving his views as to why the American people elected so many Republican Senators and Representatives in the last election. The Senator has given a partial answer.

Mr. TAYLOR. I can expound further on the subject. It was because, as I said, the housewife could not obtain canning sugar, and because she was obliged to present coupons for her sugar, and such things.

The people had forgotten about Hoover. Many of them were too young to remember Hoover, and the older ones had forgotten. So they did not vote for labor legislation, or anything else in particular. They simply vote against inconveniences.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. McGRATH. I should like to ask the Senator to expand upon the theory as to whether, in the last election, the people voted for more meat or for the enslavement of labor.

Mr. TAYLOR. They voted against small irritations. They were told that if they would only get rid of the Democrats and the OPA there would be plenty of meat at reasonable prices. I can remember when that statement came from the other side almost every day. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] used to make a daily practice of telling us how meat was doing. The price had not gone up very much. Everything was simply lovely. Before the controls went off he assured us that everything would be fine. For some reason the Republicans have not bragged much lately. I do not know what the reason is.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator a question. First, I wish to give him a résumé——

Mr. TAYLOR. I will yield for a question; and if the Senator is out of order, I will depend upon the Chair to correct him.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In October of last year, just before the election, I went to Ohio——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The point of order is that the Senator from South Carolina——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am asking the Senator a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The point of order is that it must be phrased as a question, and not as a statement.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. From the foregoing facts——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. Can the Presiding Officer tell whether a statement is a question or a declaration until it is finished?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. From the foregoing facts, I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho, when the people were voting last November, whether they were voting at that time on whether or not we should pass the labor legislation which we now have under consideration; or were the people at that time stirred up about the OPA, the want of meat, and things of that kind? To illustrate that point and throw a little light on the situation, just before the election I went to Ohio. I appeared on the radio at that time. A Republican was to have been there with me to answer questions. If I remember correctly, every question that came in to be answered on that day was along this line: "We want meat. When are we going to get it?" Nothing was said about labor. The only thing I could say was, "Well do I remember that in 1933"——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from South Carolina is making a speech and not asking a question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am giving information as to what was taking place just before the election. I want to know whether at that time the people were asking for this labor legislation or were asking for something else.

Mr. TAYLOR. I can give the Senator an answer to that question, if I may illustrate with a little story.

In Fremont County, which is largely agricultural, our county chairman is a rather prosperous farmer. He has now retired and lives in town. The day after election he went out in the country to look at one of his farms, and stopped at a small crossroads store. He stopped there because he knew that the proprietor of the store was a Democrat, and he thought he would go in and commiserate with him a little. He said, "Bill, they beat hell out of us yesterday; didn't they?" Bill, the storekeeper, looked at him for a minute, and then said, "Joe, I voted Republican yesterday." Joe said, "No; you didn't." He replied, "Yes; I did." The farmer then asked him, "Why did you do that?" The reply was, "Well, I don't know. With all these coupons and regulations and everything, I just voted Republican. I know that they will get us into a mess. I think I will sell my store." [Laughter.]

So he voted Republican, and the day after election he was ready to sell his store and get out from under, to escape the "bust." Many will not have the foresight of that gentleman.

Mr. President, I am startled to learn that the bill goes much further than I expected. It now appears what the Republicans meant when they said that they had a mandate to upset the advances made in the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Woodrow Wilson said that the business of government was to organize the common interest against the special interests; but the Eightieth Congress has done just the opposite. I submit that in the Taft-Hartley labor bill it has sought to weaken the organization of the common interest. In the Reed-Bulwinkle bill the Senate strengthened the organization of the special interests by granting them special exemption from the antitrust laws.

INVESTMENT BANKING TRUST

Let me tell the Senate about the top monopoly in our great pyramid of monopolies. I refer to the money monopoly, the Wall Street top directorate. I think it will be highly relevant to this discussion to consider what is happening on the employer's side of the bargaining table, while we are pulling the chairs out from under the employees.

When we speak of Wall Street, the average person sees a porky individual with a fat cigar and a high hat, seated upon bulging money bags. This is the stereotype which has been created by caricaturists for the American people. I do not know whether Wall Streeters are fat or thin, or whether they smoke cigars or pipes; but I am very sure of what four exhaustive investigations by the Congress in the past 35 years have proved, and that is that Wall Street is still sitting on the money bags, and still has the power of life and death over American business, transportation, and industrial development.

What I mean by Wall Street is the Wall Street investment banker, the firms and individuals who purvey financial advice to large American corporations, who originate and purchase the stocks and bonds of corporations, and in turn sell such securities to the public.

For example, take the group centering around the so-called House of Morgan in Wall Street. According to the National Resources Committee, this includes the investment banking house of Morgan, Stanley & Co., Inc.; the Commercial Bank of J. P. Morgan & Co.; the First National Bank of New York; and 41 other large financial and industrial corporations closely grouped together by interlocking directorships and other associations. In 1939 the Morgan group included 13 industrial corporations headed by the United States Steel Corp., 12 utility corporations headed by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 37 electric generating companies, 11 of the Nation's major railroads, and several important financial institutions. The total assets of the banks and trust companies alone in which the members of the Morgan firm held trusteeships, according to the records of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, amounted to $3,811,400,000.

Mr. President, the railroads in which the Morgan members held directorships had assets totaling $3,430,000,000. The public utility and holding companies had assets of $6,222,000,000. The insurance companies had assets of $337,000,000. The industrial corporations had assets of more than $6,000,000,000. In grand total the Morgan members held 126 directorships in 89 corporations with total assets of more than $20,000,000,000. This was called "incomparably the greatest reach of power in private hands in our entire history."

There are similar groups of lesser magnitude centered around other important investment banking houses as well.

Perhaps, Mr. President, we now see why the cartoonists draw pictures of the big man on the money bags. Why does the investment banker sit at the top of the pile of money? Why is he such a powerful figure in our national life? The investment banker is a person of great wealth only in rare instances. Since the Banking Act of June 16, 1933, he has had to cease making deposits, doing a commercial banking business, and has had to confine himself to the business of selling securities and financial advice. In fact, the firm of Morgan, Stanley & Co. admits to capital assets of less than $5,000,000.

As a group the leading investment bankers parcel out business, decide which enterprise may or may not have access to large-scale credit, and set the prices, terms, and conditions of sale at which companies may secure their capital and at which their securities are sold to the public. The leading investment houses form a tight little group organized by custom and mutual understanding. They may quarrel among themselves, but they form a united front against any outsider, and whoever poaches on their preserves does so at his own grave risk. No one investment banking house has a complete monopoly, but a group of a dozen leading firms effectively dominate all business of investment banking. Corporations needing money, Mr. President, and investors needing securities to buy have to meet the banker's terms or go without.

The great investment banking houses have access to confidential information unavailable to others.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. TAYLOR. So, if they care to adjourn at any time they will not lose any advantage——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If the Senate will agree to it, would not the Senator like to listen to the President at 10 o'clock out of courtesy to him?

Mr. TAYLOR. Oh, of course, I would like to listen to the President, but I do not think it is possible to get the Senate to agree to let me listen to the President of the United States. He is a Democrat.

Mr. President, as I have said, the great investment banking houses have access to confidential financial information.

I will say to the Senator from South Carolina that the Senate did not even want the people to listen to the President of the United States until after they had rendered moot the subject of his speech and done away with any reason for delivering it.

The great banking houses have access to confidential information unavailable to others. They receive secret monthly and quarterly reports from corporations which the ordinary stockholders never see. They interlock on the boards of numerous corporations and financial institutions. The relative strength and influence of investment bankers within their own tight little group can very easily be measured. In 1938 the Investment Bankers' Association reported a total membership of 723 dealers in securities having 1,410 offices located in 210 cities in 40 States. Thirty-eight leading investment bankers dominated the entire field, having sold in a 5-year period in the 1930's 91 percent of all stock issues registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission and offered to the public. In other words, 5 percent of the investment houses dominated 91 percent of the business. Six leading firms——

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I will yield for a question only.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I was out of the Senate Chamber and have been informed that the Senator from Idaho has served notice that he will talk until noon tomorrow.

Mr. TAYLOR. I said I was going to talk until we recessed. I would be willing to agree on a vote next week but I insist that we accord the President the courtesy of letting the country read his veto message before we vote.

Mr. WHERRY. I would like to say to the Senator that in view of that statement he may be interested to know that we had already determined, if it be the pleasure of the Senate, to stay in session as long as it takes to get a vote on this bill, if it takes all night, tomorrow, tomorrow night, the next day and the next night, until we finally get a vote on the pending measure.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to hear the Senator say that. That will indeed call attention to the tactics being employed by the majority party in trying to railroad this measure through before the American people have an opportunity to read the President's message, hear what he has to say, make up their minds, and get some word to their Senators as to how they feel about this measure.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. No. I refuse to yield. I am just getting going now. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the point of order.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will yield for a question.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator has yielded. He had declined to yield before, which he had the right to do. He has now yielded, so that the point of order is not in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we have to have some decision; we have to have someone say what is the pleasure of the Senate and what the procedure will be; and I ask this question of the Senator, in view of the statement he made: If the Senator wants to have the information, and an announcement is made to the Senate that we expect to stay in session tonight, and tomorrow, and tomorrow night, or as long as it will take to get a vote on this measure, does it not seem to the Senator that that gives ample opportunity for everyone to debate the question? It is my humble opinion that this is such an important measure that there ought to be continuous debate until a vote is had upon it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, that is a very interesting statement. I am sure that the American people appreciate the devotion to the cause of labor displayed by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sure the American people appreciate it; yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question from me?

Mr. TAYLOR. For a question, I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator from Idaho understand that the Senator from Nebraska announced that we would violate the Sabbath here, if necessary, in order to vote on this measure?

Mr. TAYLOR. That would not be the first blow at religion delivered by the Republican majority of this Congress. We changed our Chaplain the first thing in the session. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. A moment ago the Senator from Idaho called attention to the fact—and I am prefacing my question with a remark—that he wanted some Christianity in this bill. It is within the rules of the Senate for the Senate to meet on Sunday, if there is an emergency. I agree with the Senator from

Idaho that the principles of Christianity are involved herein.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. And as a Christian and as an active member of a church, I think it is within the province of the Senate to be in session on Sunday to settle such an important issue as the one which now confronts the people of the United States, and I think the people will deeply appreciate it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho will state it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I move to strike out the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield to any Senator who is on the opposite side of this problem, to permit him to point out anything in this bill that has any Christianity in it?

Mr. TAYLOR. I will yield to any Senator for that purpose, if the Chair will permit me to yield. I will even be discriminatory in my yielding; if a ruling is made that I cannot yield to Democratic Senators except for questions, but that I can yield to Republicans, such as the majority whip, for speeches, I shall abide by that ruling, if Senators wish to have that done.

No, Mr. President; I agree with the Senator from Nebraska that this is a great Christian issue; we must vote on it right away, for we have the laboring man down, with our foot on his face, and we must not let him up, for if people hear what is going on, they might insist that we let go our half-Nelson hold, and then we might have to desist in this crusade to "uplift" the workingman down to a dollar a day. Perhaps Senators on the other side of the aisle have never heard of the Biblical admonition that the laborer is worthy of his hire. I may say that when they talk about staying in session, there is a group of us on this side of the aisle who are prepared to stay in session indefinitely for the sake of the American workingman and the American working public in general.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries will be in order. If there is any further demonstration, which is against the rules of the Senate, it will be necessary to have the galleries be cleared.

The Senator from Idaho will proceed.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I should like to say, on behalf of the occupants of the galleries, and in connection with the statement that the galleries are out of order, that I have heard more applause in the galleries on issues less important to the American people than this, without the galleries having been admonished by the Chair.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, let me return to a discussion of the investment bankers.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate very much the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, but I submit to the Chair that the galleries are out of order in making any demonstration in the Senate Chamber. In fact, after——

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am stating a point of order. In view of the traditions of the Senate of the United States, the greatest legislative body in the world, I think we should preserve inviolate the Senate's traditions; and I suggest to the distinguished present occupant of the Chair that he has ruled in keeping with the Senate rule, and that it is out of order for the occupants of the galleries to make any demonstration of any kind. That rule has been adhered to as long as I have been a Member of the Senate, and I think that rule should be explicitly applied, not only now, but always.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, if I may answer the remarks which the Senator from Nebraska has made——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks the Senator from Michigan to withhold his inquiry until the Senator from Rhode Island states his question.

Mr. McGRATH. I think the remarks of the distinguished majority whip are entirely out of order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho has the floor. Does he yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I cannot refuse to yield to a point of order, can I?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Michigan for the purpose of having him state his point of order or parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FERGUSON. I make the point of order that the Senator from Idaho has lost the floor by permitting the Senator from Rhode Island to make a speech intervening in the speech of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I make the point of order——

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the Senator from Rhode Island was discussing the recent point of order.

At this point, the Chair will read the rule, so that Senators who may not be altogether familiar with it and the occupants of the galleries may understand what the rule is:

> Whenever confusion arises in the Chamber or the galleries, or demonstrations of approval or disapproval are indulged in by the occupants of the galleries, it shall be the duty of the Chair to enforce order on his own initiative and without any point of order being made by a Senator.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McGRATH. What Senator has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho has the floor.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. McGRATH. Lest I do the case of labor justice some harm, I shall not take advantage of my opportunity to answer the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I have not yielded——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I rise to question whether the Senator from Idaho yielded for a comment.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I had not yielded for a comment.

Let me say that six leading banking firms—Morgan Stanley & Co., Inc., the First Boston Corp., Dillon Read & Co., Kuhn, Loeb & Co., Smith Barney & Co., and Blyth & Co.—constituting less than 1 percent of all the investment bankers in the United States, managed 57 percent of all the business. Morgan Stanley managed more than 23 percent of all the business.

In case anyone should get the idea that I am doing this because I am subservient to any labor group, I should like to repeat, once more, that there are only about 15,000 organized laborers in Idaho, and I am doing this because I feel it is best for the people of America, the small businessmen, and particularly the farmers, who make up the great bulk of the people in my State of Idaho.

In opposing the passage of this bill and in my efforts to hold up this decision for a reasonable length of time, until the people have had a chance to look into this bill and find out how thoroughly vicious, how un-American, and how disastrous to the future of the country it can be, I believe I am doing the correct thing. I believe I am thoroughly justified in taking this stand. I may say that if the representatives of the majority party in the Senate wish to get tough and stick out their chins and tell us that they are going to stay here all night, that is just fine. However, in that case I shall ask the indulgence of the occupants of the galleries, for it will be a little difficult for me to keep my voice raised sufficiently to be heard throughout the Chamber, in which the acoustics are not very good. I would rather take it a little easier, if I have to talk for such a long period of time.

Mr. President, this select group of New York firms kept all the best business for itself.

During the period referred to in the 1930's, no investment banking firm located outside of New York managed any first grade registered bond issue. The lower the grade of securities the larger the relative importance of the firms out-

side of New York City. The gravy was kept for the elect and the crumbs were dusted off to what they call the "hinterlands."

Mr. President, our people are concerned about the fact that the wealth of the West is owned and controlled from offices in New York, rather than from offices in Boise, Salt Lake City, Spokane, Portland and Seattle.

Our power companies, our railroads, our air lines, our telephone companies, our chain stores, and many of our industries are controlled, not by the people who live among them, work among them and use them, but by a relatively small group of Wall Street financiers.

This is how the investment bankers sit on top of the money pile. The figures I have just mentioned are proof positive that the channels for the control of credit in this country—the money that makes the wheels of enterprise turn—is wholly in the hands of a small but powerful group of investment bankers. Out of approximately nine billions of registered industrial securities issued and sold to the public from 1935 to 1939, the top group of investment bankers—the present-day money trust—handled eight and one-half billions.

A dozen firms in Wall Street can thus control the flow of this essential of our economy.

The investment banker occupies a key position. A director of an industrial corporation who is also an important investment banker is in a position to decide as an industry man that the company should issue securities and sell them to himself as a banker. As an investment banker he is in a position to fix the price at which they are to be taken and the price they are to be sold to the public.

He is on both sides of the table at one and the same time, and he is bargaining with himself. What he says goes, whether the corporation likes it or not. It cannot be otherwise.

Being a banker-industrialist, he buys the securities from his own corporation at a price and on terms which he has a share in fixing. Then he sells these securities as a banker to insurance companies and financial institutions in which he or his associates are able to exercise some control as directors.

Often the issue of the securities may be undertaken not because the corporation particularly needs the money, but because the market for securities has been favorable. For example, the tremendous number of new railroad issues that were floated during the hectic 1920's had little relation to efficiency or improvement of railroad property or service. In consequence, many railroads found themselves overextended with valueless or uneconomical operating properties and burdened with tremendous amounts of capital indebtedness.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. I wonder if the Senator from Idaho is aware that the investment bankers connected with these corporations probably draw far more of their income in the way of salaries from the profits of the corporations by means of fixing prices than they do from their investments as investment bankers. I wonder if the Senator from Idaho is aware of that fact.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am aware that they have many angles. I have been studying the situation, and it is really a revelation, I will say to the Senator from West Virginia. They have them going and coming and turning around all the time.

I do not need to recount the history of railroad financing in the United States. These unbalanced financial structures caused a wave of bankruptcies among railroads. After the railroads went bankrupt and the stockholders took their losses, the investment bankers, who had sold the stock in the first place, and insurance companies maneuvered themselves into controlling positions on the reorganization committees of the very same railroads. The stockholders were out in the cold.

Frequently, Mr. President, the bankers called upon the Government's Reconstruction Finance Corporation to bail them out. I regret to say that the recent investigation by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] of the RFC's dealings with the B. & O. reveal that these arrangements were not always conducted on a high plane, to say the least. But the man on the money bags sees to it that none of his activities as a corporation director harms his interests as a banker.

His first loyalty is not to the corporation on whose board he sits and to which his loyalty and fealty legally belong but to the investment banker he secretly represents. He is, in short, a Trojan Horse on the corporation's board of directors.

Mr. President, this sort of protective activity cripples efficiency of our industries. Inventions remain undeveloped, and advances in operating techniques and production are delayed. For example, the president of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad has publicly charged that the introduction of air conditioning into railroad coaches was discouraged because it would have forced the Morgan-controlled Pullman Co. into what was stupidly regarded as unnecessary expense.

In short, the bankers are taking the word "enterprise" out of their phrase "private enterprise."

Now, some may ask, Why cannot corporations shop around and get credit facilities and financing elsewhere in Wall Street? Why cannot new enterprises and corporations needing credit secure funds from the controlling coterie of investment bankers?

In the first place, that question partially answers itself, and the answer is in another question:

Does anyone believe, Mr. President, that a responsible group of industrialists could have secured capital funds from the Wall Street investment bankers to bid on the great United States owned Geneva steel plant in Utah?

Of course not.

Does anyone believe that the Morgan group would have provided the means for creating competition affecting the interests of the United States Steel Co., the largest industrial unit in the Morgan group—or would they permit anyone else in Wall Street to provide such financial backing? To ask that question is to answer it.

Mr. President, does anyone believe that the Morgan group would provide capital to the railroads they dominate to replace antiquated ice cars with automatic refrigeration when the same group has a financial stake in retaining the old-fashioned equipment? In other words, they own it and rent it to the railroads, so why should they get rid of it?

Does anyone believe, Mr. President, that Henry Kaiser could have secured from the Wall Street investment bankers the financial resources to build a new plant to manufacture a competitive automobile, with a different labor policy, in competition with General Motors?

The investment bankers who handled automobile financing for many years turned Kaiser down flat. Henry Ford, too, knew better than to go near the Wall Street investment bankers. When he needed additional credit he was forced to go to his dealers and to draw on his own financial resources. He wanted to keep control of the great enterprise he had built up from a bicycle shop.

But the real reason why corporations needing money cannot shop around in Wall Street is that the investment bankers do not compete. The people who sit on the money bags do not consider competition ethical.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I can yield for a question, and I will be happy to do that.

Mr. McGRATH. I was very much interested in what the Senator was saying.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to make inquiry as to whether the Senator from Idaho is yielding to the Senator from Rhode Island merely for the purpose of his asking a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is the only purpose for which I have yielded. I expect the Chair to protect my interests in this matter.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask if the Chair really understands that the Senator from Idaho has yielded for the purpose of a question being asked?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands. Will the Senator from Rhode Island state his question?

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I would like to say that I would not ask the Senator to yield for the purpose of taking the floor away from him. I was very much interested in his bringing into this discussion the name of Mr. Henry Kaiser, and I wanted to ask the Senator if he realized that Mr. Henry Kaiser is probably the first American in this generation who has had the courage to go ahead and promote new enterprises against the monopolistic influences of

which the Senator is speaking to a greater extent than any other industrialist?

I also wanted to include in my question, since I must put my remarks in the form of a question, whether the Senator knew that committees of the United States Senate, as of today, are trying to put in the way of Mr. Kaiser and his enterprises every embarrassment that they possibly can, as against the entrenched interests against whom he is trying to compete. Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. TAYLOR. May I say to the Senator from Rhode Island, I was not aware of the fact that committees were hounding Mr. Kaiser, or were after him. Of course, Henry Ford had the temerity also to not let himself become enslaved to the money bags. Another one who is having a scrap with them, more or less successfully, is Robert Young, who seems to be getting along fairly well in his fight with Wall Street. But individuals seldom get away with it, Mr. President.

Of course, they never say that they do not compete, or that they do not believe in competition. They give free enterprise and competition a lot of lip service and rationalize their behavior in a dozen different ways. But the fact remains that the precious rule of the investment banking fraternity is one of phony ethics by which it is declared unprofessional to come to the financial relief of any corporation which is already the customer or client of another investment banker.

I do not want to talk irreverently of the business hierarchy so close to its shrine, but I am prompted to ask, How different is this from the days of the beer barons, when the mob in the Bronx did not "muscle in" on the territory of the Manhattan mob and vice versa?

And the people who sit on the money bags force these ethics down the throats of their subordinate firms and associates. For example, when several investment banking firms and their affiliated or associated security dealers are organized to market securities for a particular corporation the group is called a syndicate, and its members, underwriters.

Thus the good will of the combination of investment bankers must be solicited and their favor courted by dealers and smaller firms if they are to continue in business. In the hierarchy of investment banking, J. P. Morgan & Co., is known as the Corner. When matters are in dispute or differences of opinion arise, it is the Corner which issues the orders and gives the final word.

With the investment bankers calling their shots it is no surprise to find that they have profited handsomely from their transactions. And the people who pay the freight are the securities buyers—the public, you, me, and Aunt Jane, who has a few dollars to invest.

The investment bankers, it must be remembered, purchase the securities from the corporation at one price and resell them to the public at a higher price.

The difference in prices—the spread—is the banker's profits. In the days before the Securities and Exchange Commission, this spread was often 5 to 8 points. That is, five to eight dollars on every hundred dollars worth of securities sold went into the pockets of the bankers. This was a toll levied on the corporations and on the public.

In a $100,000,000 issue, for example, the bankers got from $5,000,000 to $8,000,000 as their take. Their out-of-pocket expenses were only an infinitesimal fraction of this sum. Within recent years the "spread" has been reduced.

Mr. President, I have been thinking the matter over and to me it is indeed strange that this piece of legislation, the labor bill, is the only piece of legislation in the consideration of which the majority party has seen fit to force night sessions so as to hurry it along. Is there a dead line with respect to it? I do not know of any. I believe there is no appropriation connected with the bill. There is a great hurry, however, a great urgency exhibited with respect to it. I think I have discovered the reason for the haste, Mr. President. The whole proposition stinks to high heaven, and the Republicans do not want it around so long that the people can smell it.

Mr. President, we do not seem to have time nor the inclination to take up housing legislation. The people need homes. Housing legislation is one matter respecting which we should stay up nights working on. It is only proper that we should do so, because there are many people sitting up tonight, or sleeping in chairs. Only the Lord knows where they are sleeping, because they do not have decent, proper housing accommodations. But we should worry! We are Senators! We all have houses. I was renting a house, but I bought one. Of course, if I had not been a Senator I could not have done so. I had to borrow some money and make a down payment on the house. If I had not been a Senator I could not have borrowed the money. But I have a place to live. All God's children have places to live if they are United States Senators. But there are many people who do not have places in which to live.

Of course Congress passed one rent-control bill applying to the country generally, and there is another for the District of Columbia. We turned the people of the country over to the tender mercies of the 15-percent landlord. The bill which deals with the District of Columbia is of an altogether different color, however. I think the same old bill has been renewed so Senators and Representatives will not get stuck with the 15-percent increase. Members of Congress are going to fix things up nicely for themselves. They do not, however, have time to pass housing legislation. They have time to pass the Bulwinkle bill exempting the railroads from the antitrust laws. They have time to pass the rent-control bill raising the ceiling 15 percent, and making provision that a landlord can nail up a door between two parts of his house, thus dividing it up into two sections, where before there was only one section, and thus come out from under rent control. By so doing he can charge more for each section which he has divided by nailing a door between them, than he could charge before for the whole place.

Mr. President, the 15-percent increase across the board is mere chicken feed. That is nothing to what landlords are going to receive as a result of the passage of the so-called rent-control bill. That bill is as big a farce as was the bill which a year ago purported to extend the OPA. We were told that under it we had price control, but all the bill did was to make price increases mandatory. And now, see the fix we are in. Prices have gone completely through the roof; they have gone sky high; and there is no hope of bringing them back again.

I was astounded the other day when the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the present occupant of the chair, suggested on the floor of the Senate that an investigation be had into high prices. Does the Senator not know that it was the Republicans in Congress who scuttled OPA? Of course he does not know that. He was not here at the time, and I can excuse him for his genuine concern for the common people. He was not here when the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the capable Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] almost got into a fist fight one day over who should have the most credit for killing the OPA. For a long time they boasted about it. I wish they would get up and boast about it on the floor of the Senate tonight. It would be very helpful under the circumstances. After boasting about how they killed the OPA, they said, "Look, you can get meat. The price is up to about a dollar, but it will come down in a few days to 50 cents." But the price did not come down. I grant that we did succeed in getting meat at a high price. But the price did not come down so the low-income family still does not get meat.

Finally the bragging appeared to peter out for some reason. They have learned better than to brag. But they will keep us here 4 or 5 days in an endeavor to have the pending legislation passed, and get labor all tied up in a knot, and the whole country tied up in a knot, and we will probably have more strikes than the country has ever seen.

Mr. President, if I were a laboring man—and I was one not very long ago—and if I were working in a plant I would not pick up another tool until they had changed the legislation. I would let my tools lie idle; and I am afraid that is what the workers of America are going to do. They are going to show that they just cannot be kicked around.

Mr. President, I feel that if we can forestall action on this measure for a few days we might be able to defeat the bill. As I pointed out, the only reason I am taking the time of the Senate now is to try to hold up action on the measure until next week. Tuesday would be an agreeable time to me on which to vote on it. That would give Senators and others the opportunity to go down to Georgia to the dedication ceremonies at the place where President Roosevelt spent so many happy hours—as happy hours as a man in his physical condition could have. I am sure, however, he was a very happy man because of the many good things he did for people. After all, the greatest happiness that can come to anyone in this world accrues from serving his fellow men.

I sometimes feel sorry for Republicans. How unhappy they must be, because they are always trying to do somebody instead of doing something for somebody. Of course, they are doing something for the fellows who do not need anything done for them. That does not result in any real satisfaction. My conscience would hurt me terribly if I did such things. But then I guess it takes all kinds of people to make a world. So we have Bulwinkle bills, and labor bills, and rent-decontrol bills, and we have tax bills that help the rich and do not help the poor.

Since the introduction of competitive bidding by the SEC in 1941 for the securities of registered public-utility holding companies, and by the ICC in 1944, with respect to railroad bonds, the average banker "spreads"—that is, the profits—have been reduced by half. This means more money for the railroads and public utilities and better bargains for the investing public which wants these securities. The investment bankers, with two exceptions, bitterly fought the adoption of competitive bidding and still seek to discredit it.

Perhaps there will be a law to exempt the bankers from the antitrust laws one of these days. If there is not, it will be because they never thought of having one of their lawyers draw it up and hand it to some Member on the majority side.

Moreover, competitive bidding does not extend to include the vast field of industrial securities.

The most recent Roper poll in Fortune magazine demonstrated that the banking and stock-exchange reform legislation of the past 15 years has been the most appreciated legislation that the Congress has ever enacted. But the banking fraternity is still awaiting the day when Republican majorities in Congress will be large enough to make it possible quietly to repeal this protective legislation. They will slip it by in the dead of night, after people have gone to bed, as they are trying to do in this case. But the people are not going to bed. Look at them in the galleries. They are going to stay around and watch to see what happens.

It is a comforting thought to know that the President of the United States has also been talking to the people for the past few minutes on this subject, trying to forestall this catastrophe.

We owe more money than does any other country in the world, but we have not yet found out that we are broke, and the other countries have.

The situation is illustrated by the old story of the soldier who was fighting the Germans in the First World War. It is an old joke. One day he went over the top. He threw away his gun and took out his razor, a weapon with which he was more familiar. He passed a German soldier and took a swipe at him. The German said, "Ha, you never touched me." The boy said, "The heck I didn't. Just wait until you try to move your head." [Laughter.] We are likely to move our head one of these days and find out that we are bankrupt, that our throat has been cut. We had better be careful not to get into situations of that kind, where we have to move our head and find it out. It is all right if we never turn our head. If the German had never turned his head, and had kept going, he might have lived to a ripe old age. If we get into a big economic upheaval, the people will become frightened. That is all that is necessary. Of course the Republicans will have to assume the responsibility for it, but that will not help a Democrat to get something to eat.

Coming back to the banks again, the fundamental structure of the investment banking business, the traditional relationships between the Wall Street investment banking firms and their domination and control over the corporations whose securities they sell, have been unaltered. The great financial and economic power of those investment bankers has only recently been challenged by the Government in an attack launched against their monopolistic and restrictive practices.

Mr. President, I suppose that the President of the United States has now finished speaking. The people have heard what he has to say. Now they can start thinking about the subject, and after that they can inform their Senators how they feel about it. As the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] said, I am particularly interested in our industrialists, our businessmen. They have been for this measure but some of their ablest leaders have in recent weeks sensed its dangers. I am particularly concerned that they should have a full, complete, and understandable description of the bill from someone who could not possibly afford to misrepresent it. That would be the President of the United States. I believe that when the small businessmen, the big businessmen, the farmers, and the rest of our citizens get this report and have an opportunity to study it, there will be a decided change in the thinking of Americans.

I feel that possibly even some of the excited editorial writers may wake up and change their tune.

As I have stated, it is not a hopeless undertaking, and one which I would not attempt, unreasonably to delay the vote on the veto message. I know that there are a number of Senators who are not strongly committed on this question. They have felt that we needed some legislation. They are doubtful as to the wisdom or efficacy of this particular measure. They are on the fence, so to speak. If they felt that the folks back home were supporting them a little more, they would be only too happy to change their votes and sustain the President's veto.

I do not expect to change the attitude of any legislators who are violently opposed to labor—men like the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who sponsored the bill, and any number of other Senators on the other side of the aisle who would like to hamstring labor completely. I would not try to change the attitude of the junior Senator from New York, who participated so actively in its preparation.

No; I do not expect to change them. There are some Senators on the other side of the aisle and some on this side who do not feel strongly about this matter and who would be glad if they thought their constituents felt that way. It would be well, Mr. President, for them to change their views and spare us this catastrophe.

After an epochal investigation lasting some thirty months the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has at last come to grips with the combination of Wall Street investment bankers that bestride American industry and finance. At long last it is to be hoped that the Antitrust Division can break the power of the investment banker.

We can soon look forward to action to make it possible for businessmen to have freer access to the capital which the general public wants to invest. We can look forward to the day when they will be able to get that capital on competitive terms. Both the borrower—the businessman who wants to finance his plant operations—and the lender—the members of the general public with money to invest—will profit by this action of the Antitrust Division. The only loser will be the middle man—the investment banker.

And, above all, this will reduce the control—the stifling, unimaginative, selfish, and unenterprising stranglehold—which investment bankers now maintain over business. It will pave the way for self-management of American business and industry.

No longer should the influence of Wall Street be paramount in merging and combining competing companies, and in the creation of great combinations of economic power.

In our economy it is essential that industry and business, both small-scale and large, should have free and unhampered access to the capital markets.

To hope for any less is to turn back to Wall Street a large share of the direction of the future of our country.

And that, Mr. President, is the surest way to financial crisis, panic, depression—or, as Wall Street itself now calls it, "corrective recession."

Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senator from Nebraska, the majority whip, was talking about its being a very Christian thing to put this bill through as fast as is possible. Indeed! I wish he were here and that I could yield to him for the privilege of having him point out what is Christian about this bill.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I can yield for a question only, I will have to admonish my friend.

Mr. MCGRATH. I was about to suggest that probably a quorum call would bring to the floor the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. TAYLOR. I cannot yield for a quorum call. I would probably lose the floor; so there will be no quorum call for many hours.

Mr. President, what is Christian about the proposition of denying the workingman the right to associate himself with his fellow workers for the purpose of seeking to maintain his standard of living and his wages? Especially what is Christian about it in face of the fact that the profits of corporations have risen to fantastic heights, while the take-home pay of all workers has

decreased approximately $5,000,000,000? I have seen that kind of Christians, Mr. President; I have seen plenty of them; they go to church every day of the week, if they can find a church open every day of the week; and when they are not in church they are busy skinning someone out of his eye teeth. That is the kind of Christianity embodied in this bill, Mr. President. What semblance of Christianity is there in telling the working people that they cannot associate themselves, exercise their collective influence in any way, shape, or form, to see that they do not get the kind of Senators who occupy so many seats and are able to pass this sort of legislation to enslave the workingman? Some Senators want to enslave the workingmen and make it impossible for them ever to take any action to free themselves. That is all very clever, very Christian, Mr. President—very Christian, I must say!

While we are on the subject of who is a Christian and who is not, I should like to read a statement signed by 642 prominent religious leaders representing all parts of the country. What are they urging, Mr. President? Are they urging the passage of the Taft-Hartley bill because it is the Christian measure described by my good friend the Senator from Nebraska? Are these religious leaders urging that it be passed? No, Mr. President, they are urging a veto of the Taft-Hartley labor bill.

Representing the National Clergymen's Committee on the Taft-Hartley bill, a four-man delegation bearing the petition was to visit the White House. The delegation was to include the Reverend John Duffy of New York City; Rabbi Ira Sud of Arlington, Va.; Father Charles Owen Rice, and the Reverend Sheldon Rahn, secretary of the committee.

May I warn these gentlemen, Mr. President, that they had better watch out or David Lawrence will find out about it. If he does he will write them up in his column and say they are interfering and mixing church and state and that they should not be urging a veto of this bill. They ought to let the Republicans get the workers down and keep their heads under water until they suffocate.

Among those supporting the delegation are: Bishop William Scarlett, of Missouri; Father William Kelly, of Brooklyn; Dr. David De Sola Pool, of New York City; Dr. Sidney E. Goldstein, of New York City; Dr. Liston Pope, of New Haven, Conn.; Father Wilfrid Parsons, of Washington; Rabbi Bernard Segal, of New York City; Rev. Donald Harrington, of New York City; Rabbi Julius Mark, of Nashville; Bishop Charles K. Gilbert, of New York City; Rev. Ernest Fremont Tittle, of Chicago; Bishop Edward L. Parsons, of California; Bishop Francis J. McConnell, of New Haven; Rev. William Lloyd Imes, of Dundee, N. Y.

This is a roll of honor, a group of clergymen who have issued a statement urging that the Taft-Hartley bill be vetoed. I would not doubt that every really true Christian in America, if he were familiar with this bill, would urge its defeat.

I resume giving the names of these clergymen:

Father Richard B. Lavelle, of Brooklyn; Dr. Howard Thurman, of California; Father Joseph F. Buckley, of Brooklyn; Rabbi Manuel Laderman, of Denver; Father M. Sidney Rushfort, of Brooklyn; Father Philip Dobson, of Jersey City; Dean Walter Muelder, of Boston; Father Joseph Hammond, of Brooklyn; Rev. Edwin McNeill Poteat, of Rochester, N. Y.; and Bishop Walter Mitchell, of California.

I like the way these names are all mixed up here—fathers, rabbis, and reverends.

Father Philip Dobson, of Jersey City, N. J.; Dean Walter Muelder, of Boston, Mass.; Father Joseph Hammond, of Brooklyn. Mr. President, a great many good people come from Brooklyn, it seems. All of them seem to have a soft spot in their hearts for the workingman. They are against this bill.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield for a question to my good friend, the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. McGRATH. Does the Senator subscribe to the belief that a clergyman in these United States cannot express his views on an economic question without being accused of making an attempt to mix the church and the state?

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not understand the full implication of the Senator's question. I should be glad to have him repeat it.

Mr. McGRATH. The Senator from Idaho spoke of an article by David Lawrence in which he stated that he resented the fact that certain people who have some responsibility for the morals and social welfare of our people have dared to express their views, in accordance with their rights as free Americans. Does the Senator from Idaho subscribe to the view of Mr. Lawrence that because a man happens to be of the cloth, he thereby is precluded from expressing his views on economic and social and political questions.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I say to the Senator that I disagree with that view of Mr. David Lawrence's, and I may add that I do not recollect ever reading anything which he wrote that I did agree with.

Mr. McGRATH. Does the Senator from Idaho agree that an expression of that kind by a columnist is worthy of the severest condemnation in the Senate of the United States—a comment of that sort from a man who proposes to silence the voice of morality in this country, as against his own, self-proclaimed right of expressing his views on politics and economics and unmoral issues?

Mr. TAYLOR. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island that I have been condemning Mr. David Lawrence for that statement as vigorously as I possibly could, here on the floor of the Senate. I think he is absolutely wrong. I think it is one of the first duties—possibly not the first duty; I suppose the first duty of a clergyman is to look after our souls; but after our soul has departed this body for lack of sustenance, he will have a hard time looking after it. So I think the second duty of a clergyman is to see that the physical man is taken care of, that the worker has a chance to earn a decent living, and certainly that little children have a decent break in this world and decent food, and are able to consume the oranges and other citrus fruits that are going to waste in Florida. Of course, we note that the consumption of milk has fallen off 7 percent. There is only one answer to that: The children are going without the milk they need.

Certainly any clergyman can speak out against this unspeakable piece of legislation, and can assert that the workers have a right to get their wages up to a point where they are able to buy the milk that is being produced but is not being sold. Surely that is Christian.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether he agrees that the promotion of social justice in our country is the primary work of the church.

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly social justice is one of the most important things that can possibly be done by any church, because if a man has security, a decent place to live, where he can raise a family, and if he is assured a steady income, be will have time to think; and when a man has time to think, his thoughts turn to the immortal and the meaning of life and, indeed, when a man begins to think those thoughts, there can be only one conclusion, namely, that there is an Almighty, an Omnipotent Being; and, naturally, his thoughts will turn to religion.

But, Mr. President, if a man is in dire economic circumstances, worried every moment about how he is going to take care of his family, it is very likely that he will have little time for such thoughts. In fact, just the physical fact that a man and, or his family, have no decent clothes to wear, will keep them from going to church. In fact, that has kept more people from going to church than any other reason. As a matter of fact, it kept me from going to church more times when I was a little boy than any other reason—the fact that I did not have decent clothes to wear, when I was a boy. I was afraid to go to church and have other children see that I did not have decent clothes.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, if I may make this observation without prejudice to the Senator's right to continue——

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I must remind the Senator from Rhode Island that I cannot yield for an observation. I must ask the Chair to protect me if I get caught off guard.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a comment——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I was going to comment on the morals of the duty——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Idaho may yield for a question, but for no other purpose.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have not yielded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

The Senator from Idaho may proceed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, let me ask a question of the Chair: If some Senator rises and begins to talk, even though I have not yielded, am I supposed to talk louder than he does?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will assist the Senator in the protection of his rights, but the Senator will have to take primary responsibility for what happens.

Mr. TAYLOR. In other words, I shall have to watch out; and if a Senator to whom I have yielded for a question departs from his question and begins to make a statement, I shall have to take cognizance of that, and shall have to call the attention of the Chair to it; is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will cooperate with the Senator in that respect.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, a point of order: I do not want the RECORD to show that I intended to take the Senator from Idaho off the floor, for I am in entire sympathy——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is compelled to say to the Senator from Rhode Island that the Senator from Idaho cannot be interrupted, under a strict application of the rule, which can be required, except for a question.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island will state it.

Mr. McGRATH. May I state the point of my inquiry to the Chair?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island can address his inquiry to the Senator from Idaho, if he has a question to submit to him.

Mr. McGRATH. I cannot propound a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; the Senator can submit a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, my parliamentary inquiry is whether during the course of the remarks of the Senator who has the floor, another Senator can explain the purpose for which he rises to obtain the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A Senator cannot now interrupt the Senator from Idaho except by his consent, and, then, only for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, during the debate tonight we have heard much about Christianity and the fine Christian act we would do by staying here indefinitely, probably into Sunday, to pass this great emancipation document that we are working upon. I wish to ask the majority whether they think it is Christian to keep these poor little page boys here all night. They should be home, in bed, Mr. President. I have suggested my willingness to have us adjourn, and convene again tomorrow. Nothing will be gained—not even 1 minute—by keeping these page boys here tonight. I suppose it will not hurt the Republicans to stay up all night, and probably it will not hurt the Democrats. But these page boys certainly should go home and go to bed, when there is nothing of any more urgency than this labor bill before us. It is not going to die or expire, as I pointed out before; it can well wait. Yet Senators insist upon having us continue on and on and on, while our page boys sit in the front of the Chamber and their morals are corrupted by seeing adults stay up all night.

Mr. President, I was reading the names of these clergymen and others who have issued this statement.

Father Joseph Hammond, of Brooklyn.

Rev. Edmund McNeill Poteat, of Rochester, N. Y.

Bishop Walter Mitchell, of California.

Catholic members of the committee pointed out today that strong opposition to the Taft-Hartley bill has been voiced by such leaders as Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, of San Antonio, and Bishop Bernard J. Sheil, of Chicago, and many priests in local communities throughout the country.

Mr. President, Bishop Sheil is a splendid gentleman. He has appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency a number of times, and he is a true Christian. He loves the common people. He is out battling for them all the time. He is not one of these Christians who wants to pass a bad labor bill so that he can starve somebody to death.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference, representing America's Catholic bishops, in opposing the bill, has said it "will almost inevitably lead to industrial strife and unrest."

The formal statement of Protestant and Jewish leaders follows:

"We appeal to you to veto the Taft-Hartley labor bill because it would violate human freedoms essential to the ethic of both democracy and religion."

Mr. President, I am sorry that my good Christian friend the Senator from Nebraska is not present to hear what other Christians think about this proposition.

I continue to quote from these other Christians:

Basically it substitutes government regimentation for sound collective bargaining and wise attention to the fundamental economic and psychological causes of industrial strife. It is a measure calculated to destroy the real strength of a free-labor movement by undermining basic principles of collective bargaining, making the Government of the United States a ready instrument of employer resistance to legitimate needs of workers, and subjecting unions to a process of decimation and frustration under government control.

Where are our friends on the other side of the aisle, Mr. President? Where, may I ask, are those friends of ours over there who have always fought so nobly and so valiantly against Government control? Where are they? Suddenly they want the Government to run labor relations, that is, run them for the employers. I guess they have seen what good luck the Government had in running the mines. There has not been any trouble at all. Of course, that is quite a deal. The employers have not been doing a thing but vacationing in Florida, while the Navy ran the mines for them and sent them the profits. Nobody could strike. It gives a lot of people a chance to see the flag. It is up over each one of the mines. We put up a flag to show we took them over, and we send the profits to the boys who own the mines.

My friends on the other side of the aisle seem to have forgotten their great antagonism to Government control now, as the President pointed out. They want the Government to jump in with both feet. Do they not realize that if the Government takes over labor relations, pretty soon it will start moving in a little further, and the first thing we know there will be a demand from the people that if the Government is going to make labor work, that the employer should be not a private employer, but a publicly owned institution?

That is what our friends are preparing. It will be a great joke, an ironic joke, when that day comes to pass, and they find out they have scuttled our private enterprise system by passing legislation of this kind.

Mr. President, these churchmen proceed to say:

The closed shop and the union shop developed historically as a defensive union measure against determined employer resistance to independent unions. Many industries such as clothing have combined closed shops with some of the best and most constructive industrial relations in America. But in addition, just as every town resident must share the costs of community services by paying taxes, so every worker in the industrial community bears an obligation to share the costs of collective bargaining through the agency designated by a majority of the employees. Just as some towns have occasionally enforced tax collections under tyrannical administrations, so a few industries have had closed shops under tyrannical and dishonest union controls. But the remedy lies, not in abolition of compulsory union dues or town taxes, but rather in the enlightened concern of free community and union members. This legislation would destroy constructive industrial relations already achieved.

We look to you for a vigorous veto message.

Mr. President, I think that men of God who have the courage to send a message like that to the President of the United States deserve to have their names put in the RECORD of the United States Senate, and I intend to read them into the RECORD in order that everyone may see who these men are who are not afraid to get up and say to the Senator from Nebraska, and all the Senators who have voted for this bill, including the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], that they are wrong in voting for the bill, and that it should not pass.

So, Mr. President, I should like to read the list of the names of the signers of the veto appeal. I am sure it will be most interesting to Senators, and so I shall proceed with the reading of this honor roll.

I may say for the benefit of the Senator from Florida that this is a list of clergymen, Catholic fathers, and rabbis, who have sent a very forceful message to the President of the United States urging that he veto the Taft-Hartley bill, pointing out the reasons for it. I have stated that I feel that these men deserve to have their names inscribed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for posterity to see; those who had the courage to stand

up here and fight for the rights of the common man and to do the Christian thing, when special privilege is attempting to strike down the unions of the country and undermine the living standards of our workers, their families, and children. First on the list is a minister from Alabama, Mr. President. I call this to the attention of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who is on the floor. I think that he voted for the bill, but he announced he would uphold the President's veto. I am very glad of that. As I pointed out, he was one of those who did not have strong convictions on the matter. I am sure there are many others who, if we can just hold this off a little while and give them time to consult their constituents will change their minds. I believe there will be a number of others, a sufficient number at least, who will change their minds, so that the President's great and courageous veto will be upheld.

I may say that the prayers of the clergymen were not unanswered. The President of the United States came forth with a veto message, a splendid message. I believe it is one of the finest, most logical, calm, cool, collected arguments and presentations to come from the White House since Mr. Truman has occupied it. I want to congratulate him on it. I think the outcome of the elections in 1948 may very well be decided upon the veto message that is before us. The people of America did not vote for legislation of this kind; they do not want it; and as soon as they have a chance to get to the polls again, many of those who are behind this sort of thing are going to find out that the people do not want it. No, the farmers in my State do not want it. They want the workers to have good wages, good jobs, so that they can sell their products. The farmer is just as intelligent as the men who occupy the seats on this floor.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. What I rose to ask the Senator, in regard to his comment about the agriculutral attitude, was this—if it is not an established and provable fact that there is a very direct relationship between industrial wages and agricultural prices in our national economy, and if that does not establish the fact that there is an identity of interest between the well-being of the workingman and the prosperity of the farmer? Is it not, therefore, to the interest of the farmer that he support the workingman in getting a fair wage for his work so that he, the farmer, can get a fair price and an adequate market for the product of his farm, and if it is not a fact, therefore, that the farmers of the country, when they understand the issue involved in this legislation, will realize that their own interest is being attacked, their own prosperity destroyed, and the present high level of agricultural life in America impaired, if this legislation shall become the law of the land?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished and able Senator from Florida for that penetrating question.

Mr. President, would the reporter please read the question so I can ponder it again?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would suggest that the Senator from Idaho not press good nature too far.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am sorry; I could not hear sufficiently well what the Chair said.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests that the Senator from Florida repeat his question. I think we can get at it a little easier that way.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Chair is asking the Senator from Florida to repeat his question? That is all right; the Chair has said so. If the Senator will repeat the sense of it, I may say he does not need to be so eloquent as he was before.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, what I was asking the Senator from Idaho was, since he comes from one of the great agricultural regions of the country——

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank the Senator for that compliment to the great State of Idaho.

Mr. PEPPER. Whether or not it is a provable statistical fact that the indices of industrial wages and agricultural prices in our country are very directly related; in other words, to boil it down to a point, whether it is not a fact that if we impair by this legislation the wages of the working people of the country, if we do not to that degree impair the market and the prices that will be enjoyed by the agricultural producers of the country; and therefore, is it not true that whatever is contrary to the interest of the industrial workers of the country is contrary to the interest of the agricultural element of our Nation?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Florida. I agree with his statement, absolutely We all know what happened in the 1920's.

When the farmers' income fizzled out; it got lower and lower. Naturally, they could not buy the products of the factories; and, while the farmers do not buy all the products of the factories, their ability to consume is considerable—it is enough to start this thing in reverse. It does not take much, Mr. President, to start this economy of ours in reverse.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question only.

Mr. KILGORE. I realize that the Senator from Idaho is younger than the Senator from West Virginia. I wonder if the Senator from Idaho or the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] can recall when the only time a workingman's children ever saw oranges or tangerines was at Christmas, because at no other time of the year could the workingmen afford to buy such fruits for the tables of their homes?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] does not believe that. He comes from a State where tangerines and many other kinds of fruit grow. I pointed out earlier in the evening that I could almost remember every orange I had up until the time I was 12 years old.

Mr. President, I am going to read the names of a group of men who, I feel, are Christians, real Christians as was my father, who was a sincere and devoted minister of the gospel. They are sincere and honest in what they believe, or they would not issue a statement of this kind. By issuing a statement of this kind, Mr. President, these men are not going to secure better jobs in high-tone churches to which the Four Hundred go, where the NAM boys hang out. They are not going to secure jobs in such churches for signing their name to a statement such as this. These men are sincere, they are honest in their Christianity, and I think they deserve to have their names read into the RECORD.

There is Rev. A. R. Carlton, of Geneva, Ala. There is Rev. C. C. Garner, of Stockton; Dr. Howard I. Kerr, Huntsville; Rev. William H. Marmion, of Birmingham; Rev. John Bransford Nichols, of Prattville, Ala. Then there is Rev. Andrew S. Turnipond, of Montgomery; Rev. Cullen B. Wilson, Fairhope, Ala.

Rabbi Nathan Barach, of Phoenix; Rev. Francis T. Brown, of Phoenix.

From Arkansas we have the following names: Rev. S. F. Freeman, Jr., of Little Rock; Rev. John P. McConnell, of Fayetteville; Rev. Glenn F. Sanford, of Conway.

I hope the Senators will listen to the reading of these names if it is their idea that their constituents back home are all excited in favor of the labor bill, and therefore they voted for it. I hope they will listen to the reading of these names because generally we would find most ministers quite closely in touch with the rank and file of the people and know how they feel. It is hard to believe that one would find such a long list of clergymen who would stand up completely against what was the sentiment of their people. I am glad there were this many clergymen who were so brave as to sign the statement. It is reasonable to assume their sentiments are in accord with those of their parishioners.

From California I read the following signers of this statement urging the President to veto this abysmal bill. Rev. Gross W. Alexander, of Redlands.

Rabbi Elliot M. Burnstein, of San Francisco. San Francisco is where I worked in a defense plant just before I came to the United States Senate. I was a member of a union there, Mr. President.

Rabbi S. A. Dalgin, Los Angeles.

Mr. President, we hear talk about crooks being in unions and running them into the ground and stealing the workers' money. If that happens it is the fault of the workers pure and simple. I was a member of the sheet-metal workers union in the plant where I worked in San Francisco, and still am a member of that union, but the union used to offer turkeys and different kind of prizes in an effort to get the workers to come to their own union meetings. I may say that years ago, shortly after I went into the show business, I joined the Actors' Equity Association. I was out West. We never saw a representative of the union. I never got anything out of it, but even at that early stage of my life I was sympathetic with the cause of the workingman. So I joined the Actors' Equity Association. My card had a

number lower than 1,000. Later, when I became a manager, I allowed my card in the Actors' Equity Association to lapse; but recently I addressed a group in New York City. The meeting was held in the Forty-second Street Theater, I believe. It was a meeting of all the actors' groups of America—the four A's, as they are called—representing the musicians, the radio artists, the vaudeville artists, the dramatic actors, and so forth. They held a big meeting in a theater to protest the bill which we are considering at this moment.

I addressed the meeting. I told them about having been a member of their organization at one time. So they said they would bring my card up to date; not only that, they would make it a life membership.

I was reading the names of certain California clergymen, rabbis, and Catholic fathers who signed this statement to the President.

The next name on the list is that of Rabbi S. A. Dalgin, of Los Angeles; Rev. Alfred G. Fisk, San Francisco; Rev. Owen M. Geer, of Los Angeles.

Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority if they do not realize that they are granting those of us who advocate letting the pending question go over for a few days a great favor by their tactics. The only reason I mention it is that I dislike to keep Senators on the floor of the Senate when they might just as well go home and go to bed and come back tomorrow to resume consideration of the question. No time will be gained by this procedure. The majority are in reality helping us, because I know from my years of experience in the show business that their actions make the situation much more dramatic. The effect will be much better if we are forced to talk straight through the night. The night will pass away, and the first announcement on the radio in the morning will be, "They are holding the bridge. They are talking, and saving the labor movement."

The majority are playing right into our hands. Perhaps I should not tip them off. However, as I say, I sincerely dislike to keep Senators here. I am hopeful that by virtue of the delay so gained the people back home will have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the vicious provisions of the bill and will let their Senators know how they feel. It will not be necessary to change many votes. If four or five Senators change their minds, the veto will be sustained, and it will go down in the history of America as one of the gladdest days in all the long and glad history of this glorious Republic.

On this list is the name of Rev. Alfred G. Fisk, of San Francisco. Mr. Fisk does not like this bill. He thinks it is rotten. He does not say so. That is, he does not use that word; but from what he has to say one can get the idea.

The next name on the list is that of the Reverend Owen M. Geer, of Los Angeles. He is against the bill. He implored the President to veto it. I am sure that, if he were present, he could show the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who goes to church every Sunday, that this is not a Christian bill.

The next name is that of Rev. John M. Hestenes, of Fresno, Calif. That is in the heart of the Associated Farmers' country. If a labor organizer goes down there, they tar and feather him, shoot him, or do away with him. But this pastor has sufficient intestinal fortitude to sign his name to this statement. He is in the midst of a hotbed of antilabor agitation in Fresno, Calif.

Rabbi Harry Hyman, Huntington, Calif.; Rabbi Louis Kaufman, Sacramento; Rabbi Jacob Levine, Los Angeles; Bishop Walter Mitchell, Rancho Santa Fe; Rev. Hu C. Noble, Los Angeles.

Rev. Edward Ohrenstein, of Berkeley.

That is where Henry Wallace had to speak from the street, Mr. President. They would not grant him permission to speak on the campus of the university. So he stood across the street with loud speakers, and approximately 15,000 students stood over on the campus. In that way they got around the technicalities.

Rev. Kirby Page, La Habra; Bishop Edward L. Parsons, San Francisco.

San Francisco is a lovely city, Mr. President. Of course the President pro tempore would know that; he has been to San Francisco to attend the United Nations Conference. He was there and has seen what a beautiful city it is. It looks like the City of Tomorrow which is shown in magazines such as Popular Mechanics and in one of the architectural magazines. The great bridges, the Golden Gate Bridge and the Bay Bridge, and many other things about San Francisco, when one sees it in a panoramic view from up on top of the Twin Peaks, make it look like the City of Tomorrow. It is a historic city; and certainly more so since the United Nations Conference, at which our able President pro tempore had such an important part, for which we are all very grateful, as we are grateful for the work which was done there.

Rev. Edwin P. Ryland, of Los Angeles.

He is against this bill.

Rev. Alfred S. Schroeder, of Oakland; Rev. Howard Thurman, San Francisco; Rev. George Warmer, San Diego; Rev. Hugh Vernon White, Berkeley; Rabbi Bert A. Woythaler, of Los Angeles.

Mr. President, it is probably becoming a little tiresome for my good friends and colleagues for me to read these names, so I will leave them for a while. However, I intend to come back and finish this worthy undertaking some time between now and tomorrow noon.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I will yield for a question only.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator have the names of those from South Carolina?

Mr. TAYLOR. If the Senator will bear with me a while I will hunt for South Carolina. Here is North Carolina. I am getting close.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; the Senator is getting close.

Mr. TAYLOR. North Dakota, Oklahoma—well, I do not know. Surely if there are some from North Carolina there must be some from South Carolina. Yes; here is South Carolina. Here the name of the Rev. Pierce E. Cook, of Dillon. Does the Senator know the Reverend Cook? Of course he does. I will bet he knows every preacher in South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I know most of them, I believe. I have conducted 11 State-wide campaigns.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator means, in the same State?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. May I ask the Senator if he knows——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The able Senator from Idaho responded to a question, but as I interpret the rule of the Senate he is not privileged to address a question to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR. I cannot ask anyone any questions? I am thankful.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is technically correct.

Mr. TAYLOR. We will obey all the technicalities, even those suggested by the Senator from California. We will try to obey the rules completely, because I do not want this to wind up.

Here is the name of the Reverend F. Clyde Helmo, of Columbia, S. C. I cannot ask the Senator from South Carolina if he knows the Reverend F. Clyde Helmo, but I will wager that he does, Mr. President.

[Manifestations of laughter and applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator will suspend for a moment, the Chair would like to state to the occupants of the galleries that manifestations of any kind are against the rules of the Senate.

Mr. TAYLOR. Here is the name of Rabbi S. W. Rubenstein, of Charleston, S. C.

I will leave that, Mr. President. I have something else which I should like to call to the attention of the Senate. Here is the speech delivered over the radio this evening by the President of the United States. Many of the Members of the Senate, I know, have been here all evening. They are anxious to know what the President had to say. One of the reasons that I have held forth here is in order to give the people of America an opportunity to hear what the President had to say and an opportunity to act upon it. Obviously there is no object in the President's delivering a veto message to the Congress, and certainly there is no object in his delivering a radio address, unless he delivered it for the purpose of telling the American people why he vetoed this bill and to give them an opportunity to digest the proposition, and, if they care to, to inform their Senators what they think about it. That is simply one-two-three logic, Mr. President.

The President had this to say:

My fellow countrymen, at noon today I sent the Congress a message vetoing the Taft-Hartley labor bill. I vetoed this bill because I am convinced it is a bad bill. It is bad for labor, bad for management, bad for the country.

Mr. President, may I say that if the bill is bad for labor, bad for management, and bad for the country, whom is it good for? The Senator from Nebraska, I guess.

Mr. Truman went on to say:

I had hoped that the Congress would send me a labor bill I could sign.

He does not say that he is against labor legislation. He does not say that legislation is not needed, Mr. President. He says he had hoped that the Congress would send him a bill that he could sign. He goes on as follows:

I have said before, and I say now, that we need legislation to correct abuses in the field of labor relations. Last January I made specific recommendations to the Congress as to the kind of labor legislation we should have immediately. I also urged that the Congress provide for a commission to be made up of representatives of the Congress, the public, and labor and management, to study the entire field of labor-management relations and to suggest what additional laws we should have. I believe that my proposals were accepted by the great majority of our people as fair and just.

Mr. President, Harry Truman is absolutely correct. That was a fair proposal—to set up a commission or board to study the problem, and to do so intelligently, not haphazardly, not in anger, not in a spirit of punitive retaliation or revenge. That was sound. I believe the people would agree that that would be a good thing.

Mr. President, the President of the United States further said in his radio address:

If the Congress had accepted these recommendations, we would have today the basis for improved labor-management relations. I would have gladly signed a labor bill if it had taken us in the right direction of stable, peaceful labor relations, even though it might not have been drawn up exactly as I wished.

Mr. President, the President of the United States is very conciliatory. He would have liked to have a bill he could sign. But he cannot take this thing, and nobody with a level head is going to blame him.

I read further from his speech:

I would have signed the bill with some doubtful features if, taken as a whole, it had been a good bill. But the Taft-Hartley bill is a shocking piece of legislation—

I read further from the President's address—

a shocking piece of legislation. It is unfair to the working people of this country. It clearly abuses the right, which millions of our citizens now enjoy, to join together to bargain with their employers for fair wages and fair working conditions. Under no circumstances could I have signed this bill.

Mr. President, the word "this" is underlined. Harry Truman is doing a good job on this matter.

I read further:

The restrictions that this bill places on our workers go far beyond what our people have been led to believe.

That is correct, Mr. President. The American people have been utterly deceived in regard to this Hartley-Taft bill. There has been a great deal of propaganda about the terribly harsh House bill and about the nice, soft Taft-Ives bill. From all that has been said about the nice, soft Taft-Ives bill, one would think it was only 16 years old. The propagandists certainly have done a good job. We find one commentator after another and one newspaper editor after another talking about this dishwater bill. O Mr. President, they find fault with it, of course. They say it is too mild—that it is a terribly mild bill. Of course, they knew what was in it, but they were simply trying to deceive people.

Mr. President, I wonder whether the press will print any extensive résumé of the President's message. The New York Times is about the only newspaper that I know of that will print it in its entirety.

In talking in this way, Mr. President, I do not want people to feel that I am condemning all the press. Obviously, I am not. But I am speaking of a good, big share of the press. Certainly we have not seen much in the Washington newspapers against the Taft-Hartley bill; almost all the comments in the Washington newspapers have been on the other side of the question. Mr. President, I am not in favor of that. It is not fair. The newspapers have an obligation as well as a privilege; they have an obligation to tell people both sides of every case.

Mr. President, in urging the press to clean house, let me point out that today we see what labor has brought on itself by not correcting little abuses. Just see what labor has brought on itself—the Taft-Hartley bill. The press can do the same thing, of course.

I wish to say that I read the Washington News; I subscribe to it, and I read it every day. But in the last several days I have seen several things in the Washington News that make me feel afraid that I shall not subscribe to it much longer if such things continue. When Henry Wallace spoke, down at the Water Gate, that occasion was described in an article in the Washington News, the next day. The heading of the article contained the word "Peace," and then the word "(cheers)," and the word "(cheers)" was in very large letters. Then it said, "Mother Russia (cheers)"—and the word "(cheers)" was in very small letters, in an attempt to give the impression that Wallace had mentioned peace and had received a great cheer—which he did; that is true—and then had mentioned "Mother Russia," and did not get such big cheers. I simply wish to say that Henry Wallace never mentioned "Mother Russia." He spoke of Russia at different times, in an entirely objective and critical manner, but he certainly never used the term "Mother Russia," or any other term of endearment or unquestioning approval, as was implied in the article in the Washington News. I resent the appearance of such misleading headlines in the newspapers.

Mr. President, that is bad. It is bad for the American people that they cannot get the truth, just the unvarnished truth. It is all right to have a little sensationalism once in a while, but let us not distort in serious matters. It may be all right if a fellow gets run over by a car to blow it up a little bit and give the folks a thrill, or to sensationalize a murder a little, but in the news that affects the country and the people and the world, let us be factual.

Some of these papers will go out of their way to build up a Red scare. The Lord knows the Red situation is bad enough, it is serious enough, without being blown up all out of proportion.

I do not think we are in any great danger from communism as such in this country, unless the Republicans stay in power another term or two, and I do not think the people are going to let that happen.

Mr. President, this business of accusing people of being Communists merely because, for instance, they may associate with CLAUDE PEPPER or GLEN TAYLOR is a serious matter. Mr. President, would you believe it would lay you open to the charge of being a Communist if you associated with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]? I will tell why that comes about.

Where I worked in the defense plant out in San Francisco I was a sheet-metal worker. I had a welder working with me. I had to lay out a job and cut it out and get it in place, and the welder welded it together. He was a pretty nice fellow. I will not tell his name here, because the Rankin committee or the Dies committee would get it, and I do not want them to do that, because he was a nice, quiet fellow. He had a little home up in the country and went home on week ends.

The only thing about this man—and I did not know it to begin with—was that he was a little "reddish." But he was a nice fellow. We argued. He cussed Roosevelt, and I would say, "Now, listen. Roosevelt came in there and took over the Presidency of this country when we were in dire, desperate shape. We were ready to collapse, and Roosevelt came in and saved us."

"Oh, Roosevelt never did a good thing in all his life. He is one of the worst, if not the worst, President we ever had. I hate his guts."

He would say that word. We would talk very plain in the defense plant, use a lot of words I cannot use here. That is the way this man talked, and I talked back to him. I would point out, "Roosevelt fed the hungry. What's eating you, Denny?"

He would argue with me, "Oh, he never fed them. He gave them a little relief and one thing and another." I argued back, and it went on for 6 weeks, I guess.

Finally, one day we were arguing, and he stopped—he always chewed tobacco—he stopped and spit out some of his tobacco and looked at me and kind of grinned and said, "You know, I admire you for your humanitarian impulses, for sticking up for Roosevelt. You sincerely think he did a good job, the best thing for this country, that he saved the capitalistic system, that he presumably saved democracy. Very possibly he did. If he had not come in, we might have had a revolution." He said, "You feel that is the best thing for this country." He said, "To tell you the truth, I am a Communist."

He used to argue with me. He would say, "I don't want Roosevelt to be

elected." I forgot that part of my story. He would say, "I don't want Roosevelt to be elected." That was in 1944. He would say, "I want BRICKER to be elected. I want BRICKER to be nominated. BRICKER is the man I am for," and he would go around talking to everybody, saying that he was for BRICKER. [Laughter.] If he could not have BRICKER, his second choice was TAFT. [Laughter.] He would take TAFT, but he would rather have BRICKER.

Finally, when he broke down and confessed to me that he was a Communist, he said, "GLEN, do you know why I have been arguing for BRICKER? If Roosevelt had not come in we would have had a revolution and had this thing over with long before now, but Roosevelt headed off the revolution, and that is why I don't like him. And I am for BRICKER because if we can elect BRICKER we will have a revolution in short order." [Laughter.]

So, Mr. President, it can be argued that anyone who supports the Senator from Ohio is a suspect. He can very well be a Communist, a Communist of the most violent type. He might want to see us go to revolution.

There are some Communists who support Democrats because they want to move generally in the direction of the better deal for the workingman. They are the milder ones. But the real revolutionary Communist will be found supporting TAFT and BRICKER, RANKIN and THOMAS.

Let us have an end of this Red baiting business. It is going to be difficult enough to keep peace in the world if everybody watches everything he says and tries to keep the ship on a level keel.

Mr. President, if, when history is written, providing anybody survives the atomic bombs, the disease germs, and other new secret weapons, I am afraid it will say that the press of the United States was the biggest, blackest villain the world ever saw, that it kept up until finally it brought the crisis to a head. I wish they would, for the welfare of the country and for their own welfare, Mr. President, and the welfare of the world. I enjoy the newspapers. I am in a way like Will Rogers, in that about all I know is what I read in the newspapers. I like to read newspapers. Some people criticise me for reading newspapers so much; they say I ought not to read the newspapers carefully, but should merely glance at the headlines to see whether Red murdered the Black Dahlia, or not, and let it go at that, and then sit down and read a good book. But I like newspapers. They do not have to reform greatly, but I wish they would just get over their sensationalism when it comes to serious matters affecting the welfare of the world. We all enjoy sensationalism, for that matter, when it is about frivolous matters, something that is not going to affect the future course of the world, or something like that.

Mr. President, I want to continue reading the President's message. Mr. Truman had this to say:

> The restrictions that this bill places on our workers go far beyond what our people have been led to believe. This is no innocent bill.

That is right, Mr. President. It is a diabolical bill, diabolical in the extreme. There is nothing innocent about this bill, and the people that got it up and pushed it through are not innocent, either. I pointed out the Communists are supporting some of them.

It is interesting to note that on June 4 Congressman HARTLEY, on the floor of the House of Representatives, made the following statement:

> You are going to find there is more in this bill than may meet the eye.

That was a clever statement, all right. I read that into the RECORD before, Mr. President. The text here goes on to say:

> That is a revealing description of this bill by one of its authors.

Yes, Mr. President, the truth will come out about this thing if we can just hold out long enough. I hope certain other Senators who really believe in democracy and believe in the people having an opportunity to know what is going on before a deal is consummated—I want some of them to get the material together and ready to speak after a while—tomorrow, sometime.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the very able Senator from West Virginia for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. Does the Senator know that the Prentiss-Hall organization, which publishes very valuable analyses of industrial relations practices for a group of readers largely composed of corporations' personnel directors, has had this to say very recently in one of its publications:

> If it—
>
> Meaning this bill—
>
> becomes law, labor-management relations aren't going to be any simpler. If anything, they will become more complex.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is very interesting. It is very interesting to find out that this organization which services employers has that to say about this very bad bill.

Mr. KILGORE. And does the Senator also know that the executives' labor letter printed for businessmen readers, warns that the Taft-Hartley bill promises a greater industrial strife, a tremendous increase in time-consuming lawsuits, and the rapid growth of Government control over relations between management and labor?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, that is very revealing. That is the reason I am doing what I am doing here on the floor, because management-labor relations organizations are just beginning to find out that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has rubbed Aladdin's lamp here, and the genii is loose, and just what he can do to them—and when they do become fully aware of it, they are going to call off their dogs. I am confident that the bill will be repudiated, that the President's veto will be sustained, and that America will go on to a new and greater day. Doubtless we shall have labor disputes, but doubtless they will be settled and doubtless we shall go on to greater and greater prosperity, if we can just elect the Democrats in 1948.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. A question? I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. Is the Senator aware that under the Taft-Hartley bill the Labor Relations Board is denied the right to select its chief counsel or its attorney, which will lead to endless strife between the Board and its counsel, and to endless disputes; not conducive, may I say, to peaceful labor settlements?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, I was aware of that provision of the bill. It is ridiculous. As the President pointed out in his message to the Congress today, it is absolutely silly to separate them that way; but, in fact, this whole bill is not only vicious, it is stupid; it just is the acme of bad bills, from every point of view; whether it is intelligent draftsmanship, whether it is the ability to accomplish the purposes it sets out to accomplish, or whether it is in the fact it divides up agencies, and here, when we are talking about economy, centralizing, getting everything under one head, this bill just starts chopping everything all to pieces.

As the Senator pointed out, it would have the Government in labor relations far deeper than it is now, and it would cost the people millions upon millions of dollars for holding useless representation elections and one thing and another. All we shall ever get out of it is more and more strife. In fact, I should not be surprised if that welder with whom I worked in San Francisco were not in favor of this bill, for the same reason that he supported the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] because it is the quickest way to bring about communism. Yes, he is probably supporting it right now; I should not be surprised.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. I wonder if the Senator has ever looked at the Rube Goldberg cartoons, which bring out certain very miraculous results, in connection with things that will not work out physically, but which always have inherent in them a certain amount of naturally human aspects, which human aspects alone make them workable? I sometimes think of the bill as a Rube Goldberg cartoon. I wonder if the Senator from Idaho thinks of the same thing.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is certainly a very apt comparison. Now that the Senator has mentioned it, I have not seen a Rube Goldberg cartoon for a long time. I always did enjoy them. Perhaps Rube Goldberg received a patent on a contrivance based on one of his own cartoons and quit drawing cartoons. I do not know. I have not seen one for a long time.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to the able and distinguished Senator and question-asker from Florida.

Mr. PEPPPER. Mr. President, I was impressed by the emphasis the Senator from Idaho gave to the President's message as a body of new information to the American people. First, I wanted to ask the Senator if he did not feel that the President's message to the Congress today and his radio address to the country

tonight has given the people of the country an entirely new understanding of the real nature and purpose and effect of the so-called labor legislation that has been pending before the Congress?

Mr. TAYLOR. Most certainly. I can say that the veto message which the President sent to the Congress was most enlightening because of its clarity, and the simple, direct way in which it explained the proposal. Frankly, I myself understood the bill better after reading the President's message than I ever had understood it before. I gave considerable study to the bill. It is not everyone who can explain a matter so simply that it can readily be understood.

As for the radio message delivered by the President tonight, of course, we have not finished that yet.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. Does not the Senator think that the people of the country will be even more impressed by the President's veto message when they read that the President said in his radio address that the measure is unfair to labor and contrary to the public interest, and when the people recall that the President himself has made recommendations respecting labor legislation to the Congress, and therefore has exhibited by his own record that he is not a partisan of labor trying to protect labor from just legislation? Will not the country, in view of the President's record, be all the more impressed when the President says that this legislation is unfair to labor and contrary to the public interest?

Mr. TAYLOR. I should like to say to the Senator from Florida that President Truman's greatest asset, I might say, is the fact that he does impress people as being sincere, honest, and forthright. This is going to carry great weight with the people of America, because they feel they can have confidence in something the President tells them. After we talk here until Monday or Tuesday or Wednesday, it will take effect, I believe.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it not some corroboration of the President's statement that this legislation, if enacted, would cause more litigation and more strife, when we hear the President give his version of the bill, when we hear the Senator from Ohio, the chairman of the committee, deny positively that what the President says is true about the bill, and when we hear Chairman Hartley, of the House committee, the father of the bill in the House, say there was more in the bill than meets the eye?

Mr. TAYLOR. That, Mr. President, was a very truthful statement. We will have to give Mr. Hartley credit for saying that there is more in the bill than meets the eye. But I think the American people are going to be greatly impressed when Harry Truman tells them what is in the bill, and they are not going to like what is in the bill. They are not only going to be opposed to it, they are going to be angry to think that certain Senators and Representatives and the press have ganged up on them deliberately to deceive them. They are going to demand that some people take action to see that the threatened catastrophe is not brought upon America for no good reason other than to satisfy the hate of a small minority in this country, the Association of Manufacturers and their cohorts and camp followers. No, the people are not going to like it at all.

Mr. President, we will now go back to the President's message. The President goes back to the phrase "there is more to it than meets the eye." He says:

> There is so much more in it than the people have been led to believe that I am sure that very few understand what the Taft-Hartley bill would do if it should become law.

Mr. President, there is a ringing indictment by the President of the United States of the spawners of this filthy and vile piece of legislation. Harry Truman goes on to say:

> That is why I am speaking to you tonight. I want you to know the real meaning of this bill.

Mr. President, I digress to say, what a mockery it would have been had we acceded to the wishes of the Republican majority this afternoon and permitted the bill to have been voted upon at 5 o'clock, when the President did not go on the radio until 10 o'clock. This would have been some speech, would it not, Mr. President, delivered at 10 o'clock, had we voted on the bill at 5 o'clock, and the matter had been all settled? Of course, the President had no idea that we would attempt to be so nefarious respecting the bill as to run the thing through in that way. He expected us to take a reasonable length of time, to give him time to talk to the people, and give the people time to digest what he had to tell them, and to communicate back to their Senators. So help me, Mr. President, that is what is going to happen. People are going to have time to go over the message and find out what it says, and find out the jokers that are in the bill, and they are going to have time to communicate back to their Senators before the bill comes to a vote, in spite of everything the Senator from Nebraska, the majority whip can do. He can sit in his seat from now until doomsday, and he will not succeed in having this matter come to a vote before we think the people have had an opportunity to make up their minds upon it. That will take just a few days. I cannot understand why he begrudges it.

The President goes on to say:

> We have all been told by its proponents that this is a moderate bill. We have been told that the bill was harsh and drastic when it was first passed by the House of Representatives, but that the Senate had persuaded the House to drop out all harsh provisions, and that the final bill, the bill sent to me, was mild and moderate.

Who misled the people in this matter, Mr. President? It was a job of conniving, of course. Certain people made the statement, and it was given prominent display in the press. The truth was never told to the people that this was a bad, vicious, harsh bill. The newspapers had people working for them who had enough sense to figure out what the bill meant. The newspapers did not have them do it. They just played up statements made by certain interested persons that this was a mild, jellyfish bill.

The President says:

> But I found no truth in the claims that the bill sent to me was mild or moderate. I found that the basic purpose and much of the language of the original House of Representatives bill were still in the final bill. In fact, the final bill follows the provisions of the original House bill in at least 35 separate places.

I continue to quote from President Truman:

> We have all been told that the Taft-Hartley bill is favorable to the wage earners of this country. It has been claimed that workers need to be saved from their own folly, and that this bill would provide the means of salvation. Some people have called this bill the workers' bill of rights.

Mr. President, what a mockery. I cannot help but remember sitting here the other day and listening to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] expound at length about what a good friend of labor he was. There were some bad things in the bill, to be sure, he told us, but there were also some good things in it, too, so he was going to vote for it.

Mr. President, labor had better watch out and be sure who its friends are, and not merely take the word of someone on the floor of the Senate. The other day I noticed a group of working people in the gallery. Their Senator was speaking. He was dead against them. He was voting for the bill. He was telling them that there were some bad things in it, but they had been changed, and he was going to vote for it. About every third line he would say, "I am for labor." Then he would look up into the gallery and see these working people. They would nod and smile at each other, and say, "Yes, he is for labor." He would say, "I am going to vote for the bill," and then he would again look up at the gallery and assure the occupants of the gallery that he was for labor. They would look at each other and smile very happily and say, "Yes, he is for labor. He says so."

The working people had better look at the voting record of Senators. Under the terms of the bill it would be against the law to publish the voting record of Senators if the bill should become law; but the working people can find out in some way. They can learn by word of mouth, or bootleg the information. Instead of looking at what a Senator says, they had better look at what he did.

The President continues:

> Let us see what this bill really would do to our workingmen.

This should be interesting. Harry Truman tells the facts as he sees them. He does not exaggerate. He does not try to "kid" anyone. It will be interesting to see what Harry has to say about this "workers' bill of rights." This is what he says:

> The bill is deliberately designed to weaken labor unions.

That is pretty strong language. Whoever drafted the bill knew what he was doing, and its sponsors have been trying to "kid" the people ever since.

When the sponsors of the bill claim that by weakening unions they are giving rights back to individual workingmen, they ignore the basic reason why men can bargain with their employers on a basis of equality. Because of unions, the living standards of our working people have increased steadily until they are today the highest in the world.

I said the very same thing on the floor of the Senate the other day, Mr. President. I do not claim any credit for it. There is nothing original about it. It has been preached for years, and it is very sound doctrine. Unions are probably more responsible than any other segment of our population for our high standard of living in this country, because unions have continually agitated for better working conditions and higher wages. When they do that—and labor is no longer cheap—someone must invent better machines so that less labor is required. That produces more goods with less labor, so that labor can produce more goods on other machines. And when it wants more wages, another machine is invented. The process continues to spread, and redounds to the benefit of everyone. So there are more goods for everyone, and higher wages for the workers. The farmers can sell more products, and everyone is prosperous. Everything hinges on the workingman, and his welfare hinges on the labor unions. Here we have the Republican majority trying to strike down labor unions, the very foundation and backbone of our free-enterprise economy and our democratic way of life.

The President of the United States continues:

Unions exist so that laboring men can bargain with their employers on a basis of equality. Because of unions the living standards of our working people have increased steadily until they are today the highest in the world. A bill which would weaken unions would undermine our national policy of collective bargaining. The Taft-Hartley bill would do just that. It would take us back in the direction of the old evils of individual bargaining. It would take bargaining power away from workers and give more power to management.

There it is, Mr. President. It would take bargaining power away from workers and give more power to management. Those who will presumably benefit from the bill will not really benefit, because it will result in chaos, and everyone will suffer. But the profits of the big fellows whom it is sought to help are swollen out of all reason, at the expense of the people. Actual take-home pay is off $5,000,000,000.

The President continues:

This bill would weaken unions, would undermine our national policy of collective bargaining. This bill would even take away from our workingmen some bargaining rights which they enjoyed before the Wagner Act was passed 12 years ago.

We are going back more than 12 years, back to Herbert Hoover. As I showed earlier in the evening, Republicans are going to call in Herbert Hoover to tell them how not to have a depression. God help us!

Harry Truman continues:

If we weaken our system of collective bargaining we weaken the position of every workingman in the country.

That is true, of course.

This bill would again expose workers to the abuses of labor injunctions.

It would make unions liable for damage suits for actions which have long been considered lawful. This bill would treat all unions alike. Unions which have fine records, with long years of peaceful relations with management, would be hurt by this bill just as much as the few troublemakers.

The country needs legislation which will get rid of abuses. We do not need and we do not want legislation which will take fundamental rights away from our working people. We have been told that the Taft-Hartley bill is a means by which the country can be protected from Nation-wide strikes in vital industries. The terms of the bill do not support this claim.

In other words, Mr. President, they told us this bill would protect us from strikes, and it will not even do that.

The President goes on to say:

Many people are under the impression that this bill would prevent or settle a strike in the coal industry.

This bill would not settle anything. All it would do would be to "cook the goose" of America.

I sincerely trust that the coal operators and the miners will soon come to an agreement on the terms of a contract and that there will be no interruption of coal mining. But if the miners and the operators do not reach an agreement, and if this bill, under the complicated procedures of the bill would be the postponement of a strike from July until October 1.

Under this bill a work stoppage in the coal mines might be prevented for 80 days, and then if agreement had not been reached the miners would be free to strike, and it would be mandatory for the President to refer the whole matter to the Congress.

Postponing a strike in the coal industry until the approach of winter, when our need for coal is acute, is certainly not the way to protect the Nation against the dangers of a shortage of coal.

That is what I said the other day about the rent control bill—that it was not any bill at all. It will just postpone the inevitable, and even a lot of that would overtake us before the middle of next winter, leaving the landlords free to kick the tenants out into the street. I said the best thing to do would be to just be honest and get rid of them and let them stay out this summer. That is the way the President feels about the coal business. There is no use to postpone it until fall and then fight it out when everyone is freezing to death.

Mr. Truman says further:

We have been told by the supporters of the Taft-Hartley bill that it would reduce industrial strife. On the contrary I am convinced that it would increase industrial strife. The bill would soon upset security clauses in thousands of existing agreements between labor and management. These agreements were mutually arrived at and furnish a satisfactory basis for relations between worker and employer. They provide stability in industry. With the present type of agreements outlawed by this bill the parties would have to find a new basis for agreement. The restrictions in this bill would make the process of reaching new agreements a long and bitter one.

I wonder, Mr. President, if that is what the proponents of this bill want. I wonder if they want to provoke violence in the United States. I wonder if they have assurances of support from the military so that they can just take over and end it all in a Fascist dictatorship, like the Communist friend of mine about whom I was talking a while ago. He wanted to end it by electing the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and having a depression and revolution and getting it over and having communism right away.

I wonder if there are not those on the extreme right, who have designs upon our fundamental liberties and privileges here in America.

That is what happened in Germany. Hitler kept hollering, "Look out for the Communists" and all of a sudden the people woke up one day and the Nazis had taken them over. Maybe we had better watch out in America.

The President goes on to say:

The bill would increase industrial strife because a number of its provisions deprive workers of legal protection of fundamental rights. They would then have no means of protecting these rights except by striking. The bill would open up opportunities for endless law suits by employers against unions, and by unions against employers. For example, it would make employers vulnerable to an immense number of law suits, since grievances, however minor, could be taken into court by dissatisfied workers. Insofar as employers are concerned, I predict that if this bill should become law, they would regret the day that it was conceived. It is loaded with provisions that would plague and hamper management. It is filled with hidden legal traps that would take labor relations out of the plant where they belong and place them in the courts.

He says the bill is full of hidden legal traps, Mr. President. It reminds me that the other day I said of the rent-control bill it was a booby trap, which it is. It will blow up on you just when you think you have your rent stabilized. The landlord will come and nail up the door between the rooms and then subdivide it and raise the rent, and the tenant is out from under rent control.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from the great State of Florida, that great citrus-raising State——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair). Does the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I am yielding. It takes a little time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, is it not the opinion of the able Senator from Idaho that what the President has said about this bill opening the employer to multitudinous lawsuits lies in the fact that if a labor union sued the employer for a technical breach of a contract the employer would be kept in the courts all the time because of the many little violations which normally occur in the course of the operations of an enterprise, and if the same principle would not subject the labor unions to constant litigation

and harassment if the employer wished to take advantage of this provision, because of the fact that there will be someone in the employee group who from time to time could be charged with some technical violation of the agreement? In other words, as a practical matter is it not an inducement to take the settlement of industrial disputes out of the hands of arbitrators and away from the machinery provided for in the collective-bargaining agreement, and to encourage the settlement of all these day-by-day industrial disputes by the tedious and expensive machinery of the Federal courts of the country?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I thank the able and distinguished and eloquent Senator from Florida for his question and the many parts of it.

When he says this bill will provide the lawyers with a field day, he is eminently correct. Most certainly if this bill becomes law, it will mean a great deal of employment for lawyers. Perhaps they will be able to take up the slack of the unemployment that will be caused by the strife the bill will engender. Perhaps we shall get enough lawyers to work thrashing out these things to make up for the unemployment that will occur among other groups of our people. In fact, I would say to the Senator from Florida that it seems that the principal business of this Republican-controlled Congress is to make business for lawyers. Certainly the rent-control bill which was passed the other day will make a great deal of business for lawyers. Many people will be kicked out of their houses, and they will hire lawyers to try to keep a roof over their heads. Of course, it will not do them any good to hire lawyers in that case, but they will hire them just the same.

The same may be said in regard to the Bulwinkle bill, which was passed by Congress the other day. Of course, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] wants his name attached to it; he wants part of the credit for it. But I think the day will come when the Senator from Kansas will be no more proud of that bill than the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is of the fact that he helped kill the OPA. He never mentions that any more .

A number of decisions will have to be made on the Bulwinkle bill, too. They will be top-flight decisions. They will not result in bleeding the little people, as the rent-control bill will do; and they will not result in bleeding the unions, as the labor bill will do. But obviously the result will be to help employ lawyers. As a matter of fact, I think I shall have to do something to take care of the actors, in view of all we are doing to take care of the lawyers.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield for a question only.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it not a fact, in the opinion of the Senator from Idaho, that the situation in which the labor unions find themselves is different from that of the corporations by which the members of the labor unions are generally employed—that is to say, that the corporations can bring many lawsuits against the unions and can tie up the unions' funds and can tie up their books and can keep their officials constantly in court and can keep them harassed with various legal technicalities in such a way that the corporations can not only impair the functioning of the labor unions as the defenders of the interests of the laboring people, but can in substance prevent the labor unions from striking, because the corporations will be able to destroy the unions' reserve funds, so that if the workers do strike, the unions will not have any funds with which to carry on the strike and tide over the workers until the conclusion of the strike; in other words, is it not a fact that the power that is conferred by this bill upon the big employers of the country to keep the labor unions constantly harassed and subject to litigation, for all practical purposes will prevent the unions from effectively representing the workers and will prevent the workers from withholding their labor from an employer, because the unions will not be able to aid the workers to keep their families alive while they are trying to carry on a strike?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly; I wish to say to the great Senator from Florida that if this bill becomes law, labor unions will be bankrupt as a result of being kept in court. it will be as simple as falling off a log; it will be possible to take the unions into court on any pretext, and just string out the process; and the corporations will be able to stand it, in view of the profits they are making. They will be able to stand the expense, and will be able to keep that process going long enough to break the unions. Then it will not be long until they have the unions back where they want them.

Mr. President, we will continue with the President's speech. He said:

> Insofar as employers are concerned, I predict that if this bill should become law they would regret the day that it was conceived. It is loaded with provisions that would plague and hamper management. It is filled with hidden legal traps that would take labor relations out of the plant, where they belong, and place them in the courts.

Mr. President, after the last election I thought, when I got back to Washington, "Well, it is not so bad that we Democrats lost. Look at all the young fellows the Republicans have sent here. Any young fellow like that cannot help having a little liberalism about him. This is going to be pretty good." But I am sorry to say that it has not turned out that way. It seems to me that age has nothing to do with a man's liberalism or his reaction, because certainly never in the history of this country, to my memory at least, have the Congress and the country been plagued by legislation of such a reactionary character, as is being conjured up by those now in control of the Congress. It seems that liberalism and reaction know no age limit. So I will not be fooled any more, when I see a young fellow, into thinking he has a soft place in his heart for the common people. Mr. President, President Truman proceeded to say:

> Another defect is that in trying to correct labor abuses the Taft-Hartley bill goes so far that it would threaten fundamental democratic freedoms. One provision undertakes to prevent political contributions and expenditures by labor organizations and corporations. This provision would forbid a union newspaper from commenting on candidates in national elections.

I might say, Mr. President, that is exactly what they want. They do not want them to comment, because there are going to be some pretty uncomplimentary things said about the sponsors of this terrible legislation if they can get an opportunity to say it.

> It might well prevent an incorporated radio network from spending any money in connection with the national convention of a political party. It might even prevent the League of Women Voters—which is incorporated—using its funds to inform its members about the record of a political candidate.

Mr. President, the more we study this matter, the deeper we go into it, the more fantastic it seems, that grown men could possibly have hatched up this thing and foisted it upon the American people. Of course, they have not done it yet. There are a few of us standing between this point and the consummation of this ill-conceived match. The President continued:

> I regard this provision of the Taft-Hartley bill as a dangerous challenge to free speech and our free press.
>
> One of the basic errors of this bill is that it ignores the fact that over the years we have been making real progress in labor-management relations. We have been achieving slow but steady improvement in cooperation between employers and workers.
>
> We must always remember that under our free economic system management and labor are associates.

I guess the framers of this bill, the architects of this great industrial-relations endeavor, never thought that management and labor were associates, that they did not run to a judge every time they had a dispute.

I am not a lawyer, but suppose we wrote a law aimed at preventing a man and wife from sitting down and talking over their differences, their disagreements, and having to go to court every time they got into a scrap. We would have more divorces; marriages would not last long enough to say "Jack Robinson." That is similar to what has been done here. It has been made practically impossible for an employer and his employees to get together on any kind of friendly terms. The provisions are specific, that they have to fight, that they have to fight before they can do anything to have anybody try to iron out their differences. If they do not get into a knock-down, drag-out fight it is not considered a bona fide dispute, so they do not do anything about it. Then after that they do not do anything about it except turn it over to a lot of people, and finally it winds up in Congress, which has to decide the dispute between labor and management.

Mr. President, I may say that the Senator from Oregon informs me that he is

with me, and that he will take over whenever I leave off. I might tell the Senator from Oregon that he can go take a nap if he wants to. I am in no distress whatever. My voice is good and strong, and he can sleep soundly.

Mr. President, President Truman continued:

They work together for their own benefit and for the benefit of the public.

The Taft-Hartley bill fails to recognize these fundamental facts. Many provisions of the bill would have the result of changing employers and workers from members of the same team to opponents on contending teams.

I feel deep concern about what this would do to the steady progress we have made through the years.

I fear that this type of legislation would cause the people of our country to divide into opposing groups.

If conflict is created, as this bill would create it, if seeds of discord are sown, as this bill would sow them, our unity will suffer and our strength will be impaired.

Mr. President, I commend that paragraph to the attention of all within the sound of my voice. Those words might have been written by Abraham Lincoln and, indeed, they may go down in history along with Mr. Lincoln's words. Let us go over them again:

I fear that this type of legislation would cause the people of our country to divide into opposing groups. If conflict is created, as this bill would create it, if seeds of discord are sown, as this bill would sow them, our unity will suffer and our strength will be impaired.

This bill does not resemble the labor legislation which I have recommended to the Congress. The whole purpose of the bill is contrary to the sound growth of our national labor policy. There is still time to enact progressive, constructive legislation during the present session. We need such legislation to correct abuses and to further advance our labor-management relations. We seek in this country today a formula which will treat all men fairly and justly, and which will give our people security in the necessities of life. As our generous American spirit prompts us to aid the world to rebuild—

It is generous of Mr. Truman to say that, in view of the fact that he just got through reading this bill.

As our generous American spirit prompts us to aid the world to rebuild, we must at the same time construct a better America in which all men share equitably in the blessings of democracy. The Taft-Hartley bill threatens the attainment of this goal. For the sake of the future of this Nation I hope that this bill will not become law.

Mr. President, if by postponing action on this bill until some time next week, when the people of America will have had a chance to read the President's forthright message which was sent to the Congress this afternoon, when they will have had the opportunity to listen to this very fine radio address—I think it is very splendid indeed—when they will have had time to listen to that, to make up their minds then on the basis of the first information they have had on this proposition; many of them, I am sure of it; then, Mr. President, I have every confidence that Harry Truman will not be disappointed, that his hope will be realized, that this bill will be killed, and that his veto will be sustained.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Florida for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. As I understood the remarks this evening, over the radio, of the able Senator from Ohio, he implied, if he did not say, that the message of the President was largely a repetition of the sentiment and interest of the labor leaders, and a re-presentation of the argument of the labor leaders. I want to ask the Senator, in view of his knowledge of the President's message, if he does not find on the contrary that those words which he has read in the conclusion of the message are the words of a President thinking about the strength and the welfare of the whole country, and trying to forward and progress the interests of the whole people, rather than a narrow partisan, speaking a class sentiment in the message that he wrote to the Congress?

Mr. TAYLOR. I would say to my good friend from Florida that I think the message to the people of America that the President delivered this evening over the radio is one of the finest messages I have ever heard any President deliver over the radio. For its simplicity, its directness, and sincerity it was a masterpiece.

Mr. President, now that we have reached this final stage in our consideration of H. R. 3020—that is, the last few days—I believe that it is absolutely essential in the interest of future industrial tranquillity, to point out again why this bill should not become law.

I think it is possible, Mr. President, now that we are somewhat removed in time from the arduous task of formulating a bill, provision by provision, for us to consider it dispassionately and in its proper perspective. We can and should examine it with the thought of determining whether those who hold it as I do, to be repressive and punitive legislation, are suffering from some form of mental astigmatism, or whether in fact they are not essentially correct in their conclusions. Separately and cumulatively, the provisions of this bill make for an implacable strait-jacket around the working people of our Nation, Mr. President. They reverse a hitherto healthful workable national policy of encouraging collective bargaining, into a malignant sore-ridden policy of discouraging collective bargaining. They create the basis for unending confusion and chaos in our economic life. They do all this, Mr. President, because they set up restrictions which are stifling of the basic rights of our working people. They do it also, because they create an administrative machinery which is so ponderous and so unmanageable that it must actually serve to paralyze rather than to implement the smooth functioning of the procedures set up under it.

Consider first of all the interminable and enervating litigation to which unions are so cynically subjected by the bill. Compared with only five different employer activities which were prescribed as unfair labor practices under the National Labor Relations Act there are now under section 8(b) of this bill, nine different types of activities which are made unlawful for unions to engage in; where under the National Labor Relations Act the only recourse which existed against an employer who violated its provisions was the issuance merely of a cease and desist order by the Board, the devices created to control unions under this bill are cease and desist orders, injunctions, civil suits for damages and even outright loss, by employees of their status as employees; where up to now labor unions had a protected right to attain some measure of security through the closed shop, that type of union security is now not only forbidden but in its place is substituted a form which is hemmed by impossible restrictions; where previously labor organizations were encouraged to operate free from stifling regulations and circumscriptions, they are, under this bill, overburdened with costly and impossible regulations; where the national policy under the National Labor Relations Act was to encourage collective bargaining it is now plainly one of discouraging such bargaining.

How is this appalling, this backward-looking result reached by the bill?

I have said that the bill would serve to litigate unions out of existence. Let me attempt to show why this is so.

Take, for example, the seemingly innocuous definition for the term "agent" in section 2 (13). This provides that in determining whether a person was acting as an agent of another person so as to make such other person responsible for his acts, the question of whether such acts were actually authorized or subsequently ratified should not be controlling. This section is a complete reversal of, and makes wholly inapplicable, the very healthy restraint set by the Norris-LaGuardia Act upon abuses previously practiced by many unscrupulous employers upon labor unions. Section 6 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act provides that labor unions and their officers are not to be liable for the unlawful acts of individual officers, members, or agents, except upon clear proof of actual participation, authorization, or ratification of such acts after actual knowledge.

The effect of nullifying section 6 will be to make any union subject to litigation, even if it consistently refrains from engaging in unlawful activities within the meaning of the bill. The unauthorized actions of any disgruntled union official, even those of a mere shop steward, and I might add, Mr. President, even of a stooge put there by the employer to make trouble, can, under section 2 (13), be legally ascribed to the union as a whole and make it responsible. Unscrupulous employers will not be slow to take advantage of such a situation. Even if it should be abundantly clear that the individual and perhaps deliberately provocative actions of a so-called minor "agent" were engaged in against the desires of the union, the legal basis for litigation to harass the union will have been afforded to the employer.

Before I turn to other sections of the bill, I should like to point out how a quite

different and much more favorable situation is created, under it as to the liability of an employer. Section 2 (2) redefines the term "employer" so as to exclude from its coverage any person acting in the interest of an employer directly or indirectly.

The employer is out from under, Mr. President. I should think that the Presiding Officer [Mr. DONNELL], with his fine legal education, would be one of the severest critics of the bill. I am surprised that he is not.

The section substitutes in the place of this language the words "any person acting as an agent of an employer directly or indirectly." Apparently, the intention of this redefinition is to change the rule, affirmed by the Supreme Court, that an employer is responsible for the actions of his supervisory employees even though under strict common-law rules of agency he might not be liable for their acts. I think that no one can validly deny that in modern large industry this rule is a good one, since to rank-and-file employees who do not usually come into contact with the top officials of the company but only with their foremen, it is the foremen whom they look upon as management. With this change in the definition of the term "employer," however, an employer cannot be held accountable for the actions of his supervisors unless it is proved that they acted under specific authorization from their employer. The employer, it seems, can be held responsible for the acts of his foremen only if it can be proved that he gave them specific instructions to engage in the offending acts. The union, on the other hand, can be held responsible for the acts of any union official even when it is quite clear that the acts of this official were engaged in against the wishes of the union. Quite an amazing difference, one might say, in the treatment of employers and of labor unions.

Is there anything fair about that, Mr. President? How can the great legal mind possessed by the present occupant of the Chair reconcile such things as this with the ethics of the bar? It is discrimination, making one code for an employer and an absolutely different one for the employee.

Having found that the bill makes a union legally responsible for the actions of any subordinate official it becomes necessary to see how offensive these acts must be before a labor organization can be effectively and legally hamstrung by a watchful and hostile employer. In the first place, section 7 of the bill which sets forth the rights of employees which are protected under the act, includes among them the right "to refrain from joining a union or from engaging in concerted activities for collective bargaining." This right "to refrain" is, of course, a basic one.

In fact, it was just as basic when the National Labor Relations Act was passed. Yet since the stated purpose of the act was to encourage collective bargaining, it was obviously unnecessary to specify the protection of a right which was not being threatened. This basic right of employees of refraining from joining unions is not any the more threatened today. Its inclusion can have the result only of encouraging countless charges by employers against unions, especially in the initial stages of the organizing, by labor unions, of their employees, that the unions are violating their employees' rights "to refrain" from joining.

Another provision of the bill, section 8 (b) (1), serves as pernicious a source for multitudinous lawsuits against labor organizations as does section 7. In fact, both of these should be read together, if some idea is to be obtained as to how the efforts of unions at organizing can be made wholly innocuous by employer litigation, at the very first stages of their organizing campaigns. Section 8 (b) (1) provides that it shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents to restrain or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7.

If we bear in mind that one of the rights under section 7 is to refrain from joining; and that in the minds of some persons the meaning of the terms "coercion" and "restraint" can range from that of enthusiastic verbal solicitation by an employee of membership in his union to that of outright violence, we can get some idea of how labor unions will be subjected to litigation under these sections. Acts which constitute real restraint and coercion cannot, of course, be condoned no matter by whom they are practiced, but it seems to me that our State and local machinery for law enforcement has not so far broken down that the Federal Government must intrude into the sphere of what is purely a function of policing. Not only would the Board be burdened down with investigating charges of infractions of the peace in almost every case which comes before it but the remedy which would be open to it would be wholly ineffectual. Violence should be met by quick arrest, trial and, where guilt is indicated, by conviction and appropriate punishment; not, as would be the case under the bill, of the investigating of a charge, a hearing after the charge has been investigated, and a cease-and-desist order issued perhaps many months after the violence took place. The only purpose that this procedure seems to serve is not in itself to effectively halt the practice by unions of restraint or coercion but to create another method by which unions through useless litigation can be harassed and balked in their efforts at organizing workers.

The employer's opportunity of forcing labor organizations into costly litigation is by no means exhausted with the provisions I have already discussed. In fact, their seriousness, so far as the continued existence of such labor organizations is concerned, is less than that even of certain other provisions in the bill.

Section 8 (b) (4) opens up for employers a brilliant new field for even more destructive litigation. Under this section a union is not only guilty of an unfair labor practice but is also made subject to civil suit for damages if it engages in certain strikes or boycotts whose objective is any one of those enumerated and made unlawful by that section. By this language, the test of the union's liability both as an unfair labor practice or as civil liability for damages, turns on whether even one of its "objectives" was one of those enumerated in section 8 (b) (4). This test, of the "objective" revives in our history a dark period when the courts freely handed down injunctions restricting the employees' right to strike because one of, perhaps many lawful objectives, was a prohibited one. This test is now again made possible in proceedings before the Board and in civil suits. Is there any reason to believe that employers will hesitate from multiplying the number of lawsuits brought against unions wherever such employers can hope to prove that, even in the most minor respect, one of the objectives of the union was a prohibited one?

No matter how little validity such suits may prove to possess, it is certain that they will serve at least the purpose of defeating the organizing efforts of the union, of depleting its treasury, and of sapping its energies.

If any union should be fortunate enough to escape litigation under any of the provisions which I have already discussed, it stands still the further danger of being litigated into abject helplessness by another section of the bill.

Really, this bill sets one gauntlet after another for unions to run. They can be sued and sued and sued, until they finally lie down and turn up their toes. They might as well do so in the first instance.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Is not that one of the principal vices of this bill, that we have to consider the cumulative effects of its restrictive provisions? Probably one alone might not be so disastrous, but when we take all of them together and consider what the total effect of these many restrictive provisions will be, the net effect of it is, as no doubt many designed it to be, to hamstring and strangle the effectiveness of the labor unions of the country as representatives of the working people.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to say to the distinguished, able, and militant Senator from Florida that there would be no other result. The treasuries of the labor unions will be depleted. They will pass into the limbo of forgotten things; and I guess some people will be happy when we are back to that time. Some of the older gentlemen of the Senate could tell about when they used to work for a dollar a week, by gum, and they want everyone else to do the same. We will be back to those good old days, I guess, and some people will be happy.

Mr. President, the test is now again made possible in proceedings before the Board and in civil suits. Is there any reason to believe that employers will hesitate about multiplying the number of lawsuits brought against unions wherever such employers can hope to prove that even in the most minor respects one of the objectives of the union was a prohibited one? No matter, Mr. President, how little validity such suits may prove to possess, it is certain that they will serve at least the purpose of defeating the organizing efforts of the union, depleting its treasury, and sapping its energies.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Florida for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. I would like to ask the able Senator from Idaho if there is not another important difference between the lawyer for the corporation and the lawyer for the labor union. The expense incurred by the corporate employee, for example, in paying its lawyers is a deductible expense, is it not?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. It is taken partially away from the United States Government in diminished income taxes which the corporation pays, whereas the lawyer of the labor union is paid out of the fees contributed by the workers, who are people, and therefore it is not deductible from income taxes. Is not the burden, therefore, far greater upon the working people to try to defend themselves with high-priced lawyers than upon the corporate employers who attack them with vexatious and litigious lawsuits by lawyers who are paid out of funds which may constitute a business expense and be deductible from income taxes?

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator from Florida has stated the case precisely and exactly, as he always does. That is exactly what would happen to those labor unions. They do not get exemptions for getting into court all the time. So it would work a far greater hardship upon the union than it would upon the corporation. That is why they can break the union.

If any union should be fortunate enough to escape litigation under any of the provisions which I have already discussed, there is still the further danger of being litigated into abject helplessness by another section of the bill.

A union, under section 9 (f), must, before it can set into motion the machinery of the Board, by the filing of any type of petition or charge, first file a detailed statement with the Secretary of Labor. Seventeen different items of information must be furnished by it in this statement. I cannot conceive of that unique situation where an employer will not be able to find, by diligent search, some minor deficiency in the statement filed by the union and thus be in a position to successfully challenge the union's right to employ the processes of the Board.

This is the most fantastic piece of legislation that has ever passed the Senate, Mr. President. I am no lawyer, but I can tell black from white and I can tell right from wrong when there is no doubt about it. We passed a bill to deal with Mr. Petrillo. It was a sensible bill, a short one of one paragraph. It went over to the House, and they put everything into it but the kitchen sink and sent it back to the Senate. When it came back I read the bill. Although I am not a lawyer I knew it was unconstitutional, because we cannot do things like that to Americans. I just felt it in my heart. So, Mr. President, I got up and fought that bill one whole day all by myself. Having been in the entertainment profession I felt it was incumbent on me to defend the musicians who were going to be discriminated against. I defended them for one whole day, with all the lawyers saying the bill was fine and would work out well. But, Mr. President, the courts upheld my position. They declared it unconstitutional.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Florida again for one of his very good questions.

Mr. PEPPER. May it not be that the lawyers whom the Senator has mentioned, who gave their solemn opinion that the bill the Senator has been speaking about was constitutional, were motivated by the same point of view as that class of expensive corporation lawyers who gave the very impressive and solemn legal opinion a few years ago that the Wagner Act was unconstitutional?

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, I do not know anything about law as such. I never read the books. But it does seem to me that there are some things that we cannot do to people in a civilized society. They should have some rights. I found out that they did. At least, so far the courts have ruled that way. I do not know about this bill. It seems to me that certainly some provisions of it would be unconstitutional.

It certainly is unsportsmanlike to place two antagonists against each other who have been getting along pretty well. They scrap once in a while, but now they are put into an arena and we say, "Boys, you have really got to fight. We are going to take away a lot of the protection you have had before and we are going to give you more power over here, and before you can appeal for aid to anybody you have got to show us that you have a fight going." We start them fighting and give one fellow all the advantage. It looks like we are putting blinders on the labor boys and giving the other fellows brass knucks and telling them to fight it out. It just does not seem right. Maybe it is constitutional, I do not know; but I cannot see how it can be.

If the bill were objectionable for no other reason than that it provided so many, many opportunities for unions to be harassed into nonexistence by constant litigation, that in itself would be sufficient basis for characterizing it as pure antilabor legislation. But, as I have stated at the outset, there are objectionable features to be found in other provisions of the bill which, in themselves, could very validly make such a label stick. I am referring now to the provisions which deal with the administration of the bill which, to my mind, are so unworkable as to lead to a complete break-down in the machinery set up by it.

Take, for example, section 3 (d) which provides for the appointment of a general counsel by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The duties of the general counsel are to exercise supervision over all attorneys, other than trial examiners and legal assistants to the Board members, and over the officers and employees in the regional offices. He is, also, to have final authority, on behalf of the Board, in the investigation and prosecution of all unfair-labor-practice cases. Regardless of whatever arguments may be made in favor of a so-called separation of functions, nothing can be said, in my opinion, in favor of concentrating into the hands of one single individual so much power.

Under this provision the general counsel, and he alone, can determine what complaint cases are to be prosecuted before the Board. He may refuse arbitrarily to issue a complaint, and no individual may have any recourse against him for such refusal. With this power he can potentially follow a policy wholly inconsistent with that of the Board, as evinced by its decisions. Nowhere in our governmental structure can there be found so complete an absence of checks and balances. Potentially, such a situation can create utter confusion. Neither employers nor labor organizations can, under such circumstances, find any sure guide as to the principles established under the act by which to conduct themselves. It is inconceivable that such a situation should be permitted to exist in the field of labor relations. Labor relations will simply be adrift, with no rudder and no anchor.

Also, from the point of view of proper administration, it is difficult to find any wisdom in that provision in section 4 (a), which prohibits the Board from appointing individuals for the purpose of making economic analyses. There are few fields, indeed, in which analytical studies of currents and trends are as essential as that which deals with labor relations. Many of the duties with which the Board is charged make the use of such trained personnel absolutely essential. For example, under section 8 (b) (5), the Board must determine in certain instances whether union fees are excessive or discriminatory. In making its determination it must consider, "among other relevant factors, the practices and customs of labor organization in the particular industry." It is beyond understanding how the Board is to attain familiarity with such factors without the aid of economic analysts. Then, too, the Board, under section 8 (b) (6), must determine whether a labor organization has committed an unfair labor practice by exacting payment for "services which are not performed or not to be performed."

It is to be expected that unions will endeavor to eliminate sweatshop conditions or speed-up systems. In doing so, they will necessarily demand that work loads be reduced and more workers employed. Whether such demands are legitimate, as will undoubtedly be contended by the unions, or whether they constitute feather bedding, as will no doubt be claimed by employers, are matters which, for the Board, without the aid of economic analysts, will be impossible of determination. The argument may be made, of course, that the information which the Board might seek through the use of economic analysts might better be submitted to it in the form of evidence at a hearing. This argument folds, however, on close examination.

The evidence which must be submitted on questions such as are covered by sections 8 (b) (5) and (6) falls, in large

part, into the category of expert testimony. Every lawyer knows that experts in the same field will often differ with each other, depending upon which side they appear to testify for. An expert representing an employer will differ with an expert representing a union. Only the impartial analyses made by employees of the Government can in such instances serve as a basis for a fair decision. There is no reason why the Board should not be permitted to employ such analysts.

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

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question; yes.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to ask the Senator, before he passes too far beyond the point about the National Labor Relations Board's having authority to determine what fees shall be paid by members of labor unions to labor unions, whether he thinks it is outrageous discrimination against the labor unions to provide that this governmental board by law shall determine the fees which members of labor unions shall pay to the labor unions, when no law requires or permits any governmental agency to determine the fees which members of farm organizations shall pay to their organizations, or permits any such Government agency to determine the dues which members of fraternal organizations shall pay their organizations, or allows any governmental agency to determine the dues which members of an employers' association shall be required to pay to that association?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; certainly, Mr. President, as I have said, it is discrimination of the worst type. It is hard for me to believe that it is legal and that it will not be declared unconstitutional.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is not the same discrimination against a labor union instanced in the President's message when he points out that labor unions are required to file the most elaborate reports and are entitled to no protection under the National Labor Relations Act until they file such comprehensive reports, while the corporate employers, the partnerships or associations, which might be employers, are not required to file any such reports?

Mr. TAYLOR. It is, indeed. This is a bill to "get" labor.

For no valid reason that I can see, the bill proposes to eliminate from the Board's procedures two existing and valuable devices for expediting its functions. Their elimination is especially amazing because they are in the first instance employed in an area which is not at all controversial and, furthermore, have proved themselves to be extremely effective in reducing the number of cases constantly pending before the Board. These procedures have to do with the determination of a bargaining agent in representation cases by the use of the so-called prehearing elections and by the cross check of union application cards to determine majority. Section 9 (c) (4) of the bill has the unfortunate effect of eliminating these procedures. If it is remembered that the first of these procedures—the prehearing election—has been utilized by the Board only in cases where there have been no really controversial issues involved in the proceedings, and the second—the cross check of cards—only where both the employer and the union have agreed to the use of this method, then it becomes difficult to understand why a hitherto successful means of quickly disposing of 20 percent of the Board's adjusted representation cases should thus be eliminated. The need for the Board to hold formal hearings in such cases, under the bill, will not alone be extremely costly but must eventually make unnecessary inroads in the handling of more important functions.

Another provision which I believe to be objectionable from the point of view of good administration is section 10 (c), which provides that the findings and recommended orders of trial examiners shall become final if no exceptions are filed within 20 days after they are issued. In effect, this provision provides an excellent opportunity for a party to skirt the agency and take its case directly to the courts. If a party does not file any exceptions, the agency is powerless to modify the findings of the trial examiner, no matter how ill-founded they may be. Yet, it would be required to uphold in the courts a decision which it has not itself made and which it might willingly have corrected upon review if it were permitted to do so.

There are many other more or less seriously objectionable features in the bill. Time will not permit an exhaustive treatment of all of these. I shall make only brief comments as to some of them.

If any provision of the Board opens up the possibility of tying up the Board continuously and bogging it down to the exclusion of all other matters, it is section 10 (k). This section requires that the Board itself—and not an arbitrator—decide the issues arising out of jurisdictional disputes. The determination of such issues obviously requires specialized knowledge and techniques. How it is to be expected for the Board to involve itself directly in cases so involved and complicated, and yet to perform its other functions, is beyond understanding.

To add to the Board's administrative difficulties, there is section 8 (c). This provides that expression of views, argument, or opinion shall not constitute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice if they contain no threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit. Nowhere in the field of law will such an amazing principle be found. No one would argue that an expression of opinion should in itself constitute an unfair labor practice when it does not include a threat. Such a rule would be a clear violation of an individual's constitutional right of free speech. But, on the other hand, there is absolutely no reason why the Board should not, like any other tribunal, judicial or quasi judicial, be permitted to accept in evidence such arguments or expressions of opinions if they furnish proof of motive in the commission of some other unfair labor practice. Any laymen will readily understand that proof of an individual's intention will in most instances lie in the expressions he has uttered or the arguments he has made. Yet the Board is forbidden by this section even to receive such expressions or arguments in evidence. The idea, in our jurisprudence, is preposterous. The rule serves to nullify almost every section of the bill which establishes specified activities to be unfair labor practices.

Another almost equally ridiculous provision in the bill which goes far toward nullifying the National Labor Relations Act is the amendment in section 10 (c), which provides that the Board may not order reinstatement or back pay to any individual discharged for cause. By these terms, the Board could not reinstate an employe and grant him back pay where his employer clearly discharged him because of his union activities simply because in addition to this reason for discharging him there also existed grounds for which the employer might also have discharged him. It should not be at all difficult for an employer to furnish such additional reasons for an employee's discharge in almost every case. I can see no reason why, if it is proved that an employee actually has been discharged for his union activities, the employer should be permitted to escape liability by pleading conduct which he was perfectly willing to tolerate until the employee became active in the union.

By no means the least objectionable feature of the bill is the one that has to do with the definition of collective bargaining. Section 8 (d) specifically provides that the duty shall not be imposed upon any party to discuss or agree to any modifications of the terms contained in a contract for a fixed period, if the modifications are to take effect before the end of the term of the contract. It is certainly not conducive to good relations between the parties to a labor contract if, when conditions make it necessary, one of the parties should wish to reopen discussion as to some term of a contract and the other party should be permitted to refuse even to discuss this matter. Discussion does not mean necessarily the making of any concession. In good reason, there is no sense in establishing a rule which will support intransigence whether on the part of an employer or a labor organization. This can only lead to strikes and to lock-outs. The existing rule, which requires the parties to sit down and in good faith discuss demands for a change in a contract is far more beneficial to industrial tranquillity.

I should also like to say something about another amendment which appears in section 8 (d) dealing with collective bargaining. In my mind, this amendment is extremely objectionable because it treats so disparately between employers and employees. This provision prohibits either employers or employees to violate the "cooling off" period of 60 days which is required before they can engage in strikes or lock-outs. The

objectionable feature in this section lies in the fact that if the employer violates this section his liability extends only to being subjected to a possible cease and desist order issued by the Board. On the other hand, employees who violate this section can be subjected summarily and at the will of the employer to the most drastic punishment to which any person who makes his livelihood by his labor can be subjected—that of the loss of his status as an employee. Not only is this distinction in treatment for the same type of offense extremely unfair but it makes for the very real possibility that an employer may deliberately provoke a strike to rid himself of certain of his employees. Such inequality of treatment has no place in our laws.

I have by no means covered every objectionable provision of the bill; yet I feel that those I have discussed are, if the bill contained no others, proof that the bill is unfair, biased, and unmanageable. The field of labor relations is not one in which this country can afford to make even minor mistakes. The enactment of this bill over the President's veto would be one of the major disasters of our era. Its passage would not only have widespread repercussions throughout the Nation, including strikes, stoppages, and lock-outs, but it would also indirectly affect the welfare of millions of people outside our borders. To the extent that production of basic commodities is interfered with to that extent must our people as well as the peoples of other nations suffer. Passing this bill is a mistake we cannot afford to make.

Mr. President, I should like to finish what I undertook to do earlier this evening, by inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of the brave churchmen who had the courage of their convictions, whose convictions were born of their Christian beliefs, that the bill is unworthy, that it should not be passed. Earlier in the evening I read the statement, and I read certain of their names. I should like to include the remainder of the names in the RECORD. I believe, Mr. President, I had concluded giving the names of those from California. Colorado is the next State on the list.

Rabbi Manuel Lederman, of Denver; Rev. Samuel W. Marble, of Denver.

Going to the State of Connecticut, there are a considerable number of signers. All these people are opposed to the Taft-Hartley bill, on account of the things that it will do to the American people, who are their parishioners. The names are as follows:

Rev. A. N. Avrutick, Hartford; Dr. James Good Broun, Ansonia; Rev. J. George Butler, Hartford; Rev. Merrill F. Clarke, New Canaan; Rabbi Hyman Cohen, Meriden; Prof. John W. Darr, Middletown; Rev. Lewis H. Davis, Torrington; Rabbi Maurice J. Elefard, Hartford; Rev. Meredith F. Ellor, Hartford; Rev. Richard A. G. Foster, New Haven; Rev. George B. Gilbert, Middletown; Rev. Donald Hamblin, Hartford; Rev. Emerson G. Hangen, Meridan; Rev. Earl C. Heck, Hartford; Rev. Charles X. Hutchinson, Hartford; Rev. Edgar N. Jackson, Bridgeport; Rev. Fleming James, Sr., North Haven; Rabbi M. Aaron Kra, Ansonia; Rev. Roderick MacLeod, Winsted; Rev. Sidney Lovett, New Haven; Rev. Harry L. MacKenzie, Greens Farms; Rabbi Moses S. Malinowitz, New London; Rev. Edward L. Peet, Hartford; Dr. Liston Pope, New Haven; Rabbi Stanley Rabinowitz, New Haven; Rev. Richard H. Ritter, Southington; Rev. W. Glenn Roberts, Hartford; Rev. Alfred Schmalz, Darien; Rabbi Aaron Shuchatowitz, New Haven. Rabbi Morris Silverman, of Hartford. I believe I met Rabbi Silverman at a meeting one evening when I was in that section of the country. Rev. Elsie F. Stowe, Seymour; Rev. Willard Uphaus, New Haven; Rev. Wallace T. Viets, Hartford; Rabbi Max R. Wasser, Torrington; Rev. C. Lawson Willard, Jr., New Haven; Rev. Loyd F. Morley, Stamford; Rabbi Harry Zwelling, New Britain.

That ends the State of Connecticut.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I may yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. I am asking this as a question. Under the Constitution and laws of the United States, is it not necessary, before a State may be admitted to the Union, that it guarantee to the people within the State a republican form of government?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is as I understand it.

Mr. KILGORE. A republican form of government is known as a representative form of government, in which representatives elected, proportionally to the population of the respective States or subdivisions thereof, shall be recognized as voting in their respective districts, is that not correct?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not rather peculiar that with respect to a measure of this importance there should be so terrific an effort made as is made at the present time to eliminate the votes of certain Members of the Senate of the United States, to prevent them from voting because, inadvertently, they happen to be absent from the Senate of the United States at the time the vote is proposed to be taken?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly.

Mr. KILGORE. Senators are representing the United States in Geneva, Switzerland, and in other places. Is it in line with the guarantees made by the Constitution, or the proper processes of a republican form of government, that Members of the Senate should endeavor to preclude other Senators from the right to represent their constituents in voting in the United States Senate on so important a question as the pending one?

Mr. TAYLOR. I may say to the distinguished and able senior Senator from West Virginia that it is a well-known fact that the whole procedure is aimed at railroading the measure through before the people realize what really has overtaken them. They have been kidded into believing that this was a mild bill, that it was not that old, mean, Hartley bill. The first spokesman to speak out to the people whose words will have to be heard—the newspapers will have to print what he had to say—is President Truman. He has told the truth about the matter. Many people have heard the truth now for the first time. Some newspapers have covered the matter in a fairly concise manner, but generally all the propaganda has been on the other side, that the bill was a nice little tame one, just like a little pussycat, that would not hurt anyone. It has been said the bill is sorely needed, and its advocates want to get it through while that impression still prevails.

I have never known before of Senators not agreeing to postpone a vote on an important measure for a day or so. The Senate the other day postponed a vote on the rent-control bill. The postponement was made from Friday until Tuesday of the next week. No one was excited about that delay. There was an expiration dead line with respect to that bill; but there is no dead line with respect to the matter now before us. Certain persons want to "get" labor. These frantic people, who see slipping from their grasp opportunity to strangle labor, to throttle labor, to do away with labor unions, to set up a Fascist state, are not going to miss this opportunity if they can help it. They will keep us here all day and all night, and all the next day and all the next night, and then all day Sunday.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. In the mind of the Senator from Idaho, does not the attitude taken by some Senators show an effort to force through a bill regardless of whether certain States may be represented in the vote taken, regardless of the guaranty of a republican form of government by the Constitution, regardless of the form of representation guaranteed to the States? Is that not the general impression obtained by the Senator?

Mr. TAYLOR. If the Senator means that they are being inconsiderate of the Senators who are absent, certainly that is true. There are Senators like the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is away on official business. He would certainly like to be present to vote on this measure. The people of Utah are entitled to have his vote recorded, and we are entitled to have the benefit of his advice and consultation. The measure is so important that due consideration should be given to it before we vote.

We could postpone the vote on the measure for a week, and proceed with other legislation in the meantime. I am sure such legislation, however, would not be housing legislation. There is nothing pressing about that. People can live out of doors at this time of the year, so there is no hurry about housing legislation. I am sure no legislation would be passed to raise the minimum wage. Workers are receiving a minimum of 40 cents an hour, which amounts to $16 a week. That, some seem to think, is enough. So there is no hurry about raising the minimum wage. I am sure the legislation considered would not be such as would help the little man. We might consider some other monopoly bill which could be rushed in here to save the day, while we were waiting for Senators to return and vote on this great labor legislation, this bill which some contend is going to save the Union. Yes, Mr. President; it is

going to save the Union by wrecking the unions.

Mr. President, the procedure now being taken is very strange indeed. It is unprecedented, unheard of. Since I have been in the Senate I have seen nothing like it. We have indicated that it is not our desire to talk the measure to death, or anything of that kind. We are willing to say nothing more about it; just let the people think about it. We want to have absent Senators have an opportunity to return so they may vote. But no, some Senators will not agree to that. They are going to make us vote at the earliest possible moment. We are going to have to stand on our feet day and night until a vote is taken, Sunday included. I accept the challenge. I have talked about 9 hours today, and will be good for another 9 hours, and then after 8 hours' sleep I will be good for another 18 hours.

Mr. President, I should like to proceed with the list of names attached to the statement to which I referred previously.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. KILGORE. I do not know whether the Senator remembers or not, but I ask him if he does remember that, during the war, when the Democrats were in control of the Congress of the United States, no questions were asked as to who should be General Marshall's assistant, and who should be his chief adviser with respect to the war in Europe or the war in Asia. Is that not a fact?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; that is a fact, as far as I remember.

Mr. KILGORE. Now may I say to the Senator from Idaho——

Mr. TAYLOR. No; the Senator cannot say anything to me. The Senator must ask me a question.

Mr. KILGORE. I ask the Senator's pardon. In the bill under discussion provision is made for a chief counsel, who is completely uncontrolled by the National Labor Relations Board, who is not answerable to the Board, but to himself alone. How would General Marshall have been able to conduct military affairs, settle questions which came before him, had Congress done the same thing with respect to him that is now proposed to be done with respect to the labor relations situation?

Mr. TAYLOR. If I were permitted to ask the Senator a question I would ask him if he really thought that anyone wants the bill to work successfully, that anyone wants peaceful labor relations to result from it. No; those who are anxious for its passage want to wreck the country, to get it into a great turmoil and take things over. That is about the size of it. That is the way it has been done before, by Hitler and Mussolini. They got things into a big uproar and then took over. The Communists do the same thing. We must watch from both angles. We must watch the Communists on one side and the Fascists on the other. This is a Fascist measure. There is no doubt about it. It is cleverly conceived. In its many ramifications it is like a futuristic painting.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Before I ask the question, let me say that I sometimes wonder whether it would not be a good idea to paint the picture with a whitewash brush. With my background of farming and mining experience, of course, I would not ask that.

I ask the Senator if it is not more than merely a question of getting a vote—for example, a vote from the State of Utah, in the form of the vote of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. Is it not a question of getting a man who has had years of experience in labor and industrial relations, in the question of economics, and other things with which the Senator from Utah has had experience during his entire lifetime, particularly his experience in the United States, in Japan, in Germany, and various other countries?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly, if any man in the United States is qualified to pass upon this question, it is the senior Senator from the State of Utah, a man who served with distinction as chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Education, and as United States delegate to many international labor conferences. It is not only a question of obtaining the physical presence here of Senators to vote and to consult and discuss. It is also a question of giving the people of America an opportunity to know about the bill. Before it has left us irrevocably, they should have time to think this question over for themselves and decide whether or not they want this legislation.

As I say, I have no hope of changing the minds of a good many Senators who are definitely decided on this proposal, but I believe that there are a large number of Senators whose minds are more or less open. If they should find, Mr. President, that their people back home definitely do not want the bill, I think it would change enough votes to kill this terrible legislation. A change of only three or four votes would be sufficient to kill this legislation, which will cost America uncounted wealth in dollars, as well as in the happiness of her people. It will involve destruction, disruption, lack of production, inflation, general strife, and turmoil.

It is a sad day indeed when our enthusiastic Republican friends suddenly, out of a clear sky, refuse to grant a reasonable accommodation with respect to the schedule for this legislation. In connection with other legislation, when it is said, "Let us vote next Thursday," they say, "Certainly." They are fine sociable fellows. But in connection with this bill, when the suggestion is made that we vote next week, so that the people can think it over, they say, "Not on your life. We are going to get this through right now, before anyone can think anything about it."

Yet this is a bill which the President felt was so crucial that he went on the air to speak to the people of the Nation. That is something which he has not done for some time in connection with legislation before the Congress. That is the difference. This is important. It means much to America. The Republican majority, which has been enacting one piece of legislation after another which will only lead us to ruin down the road to depression, are determined to get this bill through before the people have an opportunity to think it over. They realize that they can never get it through otherwise. So here they sit, like a bunch of buzzards out in Arizona, waiting for the corpse to drop to the floor. They will sit a long time, Mr. President, because I have outwitted those buzzards out there on the prairie.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the able Senator from Idaho if it is not a fact that whatever demand there was generally in the country of a legitimate character for labor legislation was not directed primarily at a great wave of strikes? Was not that wave of strikes, which occurred in early 1946, attributable to the difficulties and maladjustments of the reconversion period? With the passing of the reconversion period, has not the real demand for that kind of legislation, and the necessity for it, passed? Therefore is not the President correct in saying that this bill comes substantially at a time of industrial peace, and that the effect of it would be simply to promote strife instead of peace? Is it not therefore correct to say that the legislation should not be enacted at this time?

Mr. TAYLOR. This bill should not be enacted at any time. If the country were tied up with strikes in every plant in the Nation, the bill would still be no good. As the President pointed out, it would not stop John L. Lewis or anyone else from doing anything he wanted to do. All it would do would be to get the Government mixed up, and cross its feet so as to make it fall over itself and become ridiculous. We would have a great many strikes, and much strife that we would not have otherwise.

Frankly, I do not hold out to the American people any great panacea that will give us completely unruffled labor relations, whether we pass this bill or not. If we pass it, the situation will be a great deal worse. If we do not pass it, there will still be occasional strikes and lockouts. We might as well tell the people the truth. There always have been conflicts involved in employer-employee relations, and there always will be. So long as we have our free economy, that is one of the penalties which we must pay for freedom. We must suffer a modicum of bargaining conflict and disagreement. I am willing to accept it.

When we see the profits of the big industrialists going sky high while the laboring man's actual take-home pay is dwindling and prices are rising, how in the name of heaven do we expect to escape industrial strife and unrest?

No; we shall never have industrial peace so long as the Republicans are running things. There is no doubt about

that. The situation will become worse and worse.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. During the war it was my privilege to do investigation work with the War Investigating Committee in connection with war production. Has it not been the Senator's observation that during the war labor—and I speak of labor as a whole, the workers——

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator speaks of people?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; the people of the United States. Is it not a fact that they did a magnificent job of production in getting out the necessary tools, machinery, equipment, and other things necessary to win the war?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly they did a magnificent job of production. I worked in a defense plant, as I have said before. The last job I had before I came to the Senate was in a defense plant. I have in my pocket a sheet-metal worker's card. Yes; they did a good job of production. There was a great deal of loafing in the plant where I was, but it was not the fault of the workers. I loafed, and it was not my fault. The materials were not there to work with, and the boss sent down word that the stuff had to last us for 2 weeks or 10 days, or whatever it was, and we looked it over and paced ourselves accordingly. We did not want to do it, but we had to. There is nothing more degrading than to be on a job where you cannot give it everything you have, and if you can think up better ways to do the work, see that they are put into effect. But the management wanted no suggestions. They said, "Keep your mouth shut. Never mind. We do not care whether you can do it more quickly or not."

The inspectors from the Navy would come through the plant and the manager would send someone to tell us that the inspector was coming, so that we could appear busy. It was not the fault of the workers. They did a good job, a magnificent job. I have seen a number of them quit the plant where I was working during the war. A man would say, "My God, my boy is over in Japan. I cannot stay here and loaf as we have to. I am going to some other place where I can work." And they would go. Pretty soon they would come back and say, "It was worse over at the place I went, so I am back here again."

The workers did a good job. They have been blamed for the fact that there was loafing in the defense plants. Sometimes inspectors would see them loafing, when the manager was not right on the job and did not send the warning agent through. The managers had more people than they needed in most places. It was cost-plus—the more it cost the more the plus.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a couple of additional questions?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I am happy to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that most of the delays were caused by maldistribution of supplies? That is what I found in my investigations, as did various others. But during that time there was not any hostility between management and labor. Is not that a fact? In other words, management cooperated with labor to the fullest extent possible, based upon the supplies they had?

Mr. TAYLOR. There was no fighting. We were sorry we did not have the materials, but we cooperated with management. We did not try to put management in a hole.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. From that experience the Senator knows, I believe, that when there is a market for material produced there is cooperation between management and labor? Is not that a fact? They will cooperate so long as there is a market within the price range for which the material can be produced.

Mr. TAYLOR. I certainly feel that there is no necessity for hostility. It is not inevitable at all that management and labor should fight. I know of many managers who get along wonderfully well with labor because they treat workers like human beings. Of course, many of these equitable, amicable labor relations that are in effect will be ended if this bill goes into effect. It says to them, "You cannot do that. You cannot be friends any more. You have got to fight. Let us have some sport. Get busy; fight a little."

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I am happy to have the Senator ask me a question.

Mr. KILGORE. Therefore, it is not necessary for the Government to step in and say that they cannot enter into certain agreements between labor and management in order to protect the public, provided there is a market? Is not that correct?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly the Senator is correct in that.

Mr. President, I have gotten to the District of Columbia now in inscribing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of the churchmen who oppose this bill. I am referring to the group of churchmen, of various churches, priests, rabbis, and reverends, who issued this appeal to President Truman to veto the labor bill.

In the District of Columbia there are Rabbi Samuel H. Berkowitz and Rabbi David Pruzansky.

In Delaware there is Rabbi Joseph I. Singer, of Wilmington.

In Florida, Rev. Floyd M. Irvin, of Eustis.

In Florida there are Rabbi M. Mischeloff, of Miami Beach; Rabbi Sanders M. Tofield, of Jacksonville; Rev. Edward W. Ullrich of Miami; Rev. G. W. Washington, of Jacksonville.

In Georgia we have Rabbi Hyman R. Friedman, of Atlanta; Rev. David N. Howell, of Atlanta; Rabbi Charles M. Rubel, of Macon; and Rabbi Abraham I. Rosenberg, of Savannah.

There is quite a list from the State of Illinois. Evidently the clergy out there are really up and about and fighting for the welfare of the common man.

In Illinois there are Dr. James Luther Adams, Chicago; Rev. J. Frank Anderson, Tinley Park; Rev. Karl Baehr, Chicago; Rev. Frederic E. Bell, Seneca; Rev. Ray E. Bond, Chicago; Rev. H. N. Brockway, Oak Park; Rev. Hugh Elmer Brown, Evanston; Rev. Albert W. Buck, Chicago; Rev. Edwin T. Buehrer, Chicago; Rabbi E. Louis Cardou, Springfield; Rev. William Clark, Chicago; Rev. Harold E. Craw, La Grange; Rev. Paul B. Deferson, Chicago; Rev. Herbert J. Doran, Urbana; Rev. Clifford Earle, Chicago; Rev. Fred Eastman, Chicago; Rev. Robert Worth Frank, Chicago; Rev. Herbert George, Chicago; Rabbi David Graubart, Chicago; Rabbi Philip Graubart, Chicago; Rev. Armand Guerrero, Chicago; Rev. George Halsted, Chicago.

It is quite evident from the names that no particular nationality or faith has any monopoly insofar as a proper attitude toward organized labor is concerned. The names which I am reading certainly reflect America and its many races and nationalities and religions.

I read more of the names: Rev. Louis U. Huber, Jerseyville; Dr. Homer Jack, Chicago; Rabbi Monroe Levens, Oak Park; Rev. C. Sumpter Logan, Lawrenceville; Rev. William N. Lovell, Chicago; Rev. Harold L. Lunger, Oak Park; Rev. Hugh S. Mackenzie, Chicago; Rev. Douglas V. Machan, Chicago.

I read more of the names: Rev. Frank B. McCulloch, Chicago; Rev. William G. McGill, Chicago; Rev. J. B. McKendry, Oak Park; Rev. John Magill, Monmouth; Rev. Paul L. Meacham, Cermi; Rev. Carl T. Michel, Chicago; Rabbi Jacob J. Nathan, Chicago; Rev. Clyde K. Newhouse, Cobden.

All these men are opposed to this bill. All of them are from Illinois. I should like to call that fact to the attention of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], namely, that the names I am reading are those of ministers and rabbis and fathers from the State of Illinois who oppose this bill.

I continue to read the names: Rev. Duane Nichol, Chicago; Dr. Victor Obenhaus, Chicago; Rev. Douglas Patterson, Chicago; Rev. Leslie T. Pennington, Chicago; Rabbi Shlomo Rapoport, Chicago; Rev. Conrad Reiner, Chicago; Rev. Frederick W. Ringe, Franklin Park; Rev. Orville Sampson, Chicago.

Mr. President, I shall finish reading this list of names after a while.

I hear some of the proponents of this bill protesting violently that this is a filibuster. No; this is not a filibuster; this is a time-consuming operation just for the purpose of giving the people of America time to realize what is in this bill and time to think it over and then let the Congress know how they feel about it. I have pointed that out several times, and I think it will bear repeating, because if the press has anything at all to say about what I have said here this evening, I hope the press will tell the people of the country that I am not trying to prevent a vote on this bill. I expressed willingness to have a unanimous consent agreement after the elapse of the customary few days. If it is the will of the people that it pass, that is fine and dandy, and I shall have no argument after I think the people have had an opportunity to think about it. But I do not think they have had

that opportunity thus far. The only reason I am talking is to give the people an opportunity thoroughly to understand the bill and then let their Senators know what they think about it.

Mr. President, I may point out again that this performance is absolutely unnecessary; it is not called for at all; there is no sense in having it. If Senators of the majority party would simply agree to a day certain to vote, a few days hence, and give the people time to think this matter over, we could proceed with other legislation, and they could go home and go to bed tonight, if they wanted to.

They would not ordinarily come back tomorrow; tomorrow is Saturday; indeed, it is Saturday morning now.

Mr. President, if this was not such a great undertaking—stealing labor's rights—they would not think of coming back on Sunday. But this is a great crusade, so they think—a crusade to steal everything labor possesses—so we shall be here on Sunday.

So we shall be here. I simply hope the people find out the real reason why we are here. This is no filibuster; it is an endeavor to give the people an opportunity to know what is going on and what is in this bill.

Mr. President, the Taft-Hartley bill now before us proposes to take the Conciliation Service out from under the Department of Labor, where it rightfully belongs, and to substitute therefor a new kind of conciliation service that will conciliate nothing, that, on the contrary, will produce new and ever-increasing sources of disputes. I can think of no better description of the dangers in this situation and of the value of retaining a really practical, workable conciliation service, such as the one we have today, than that contained in a radio broadcast by the Honorable Lewis B. Schwellenbach, the Secretary of Labor. I quote from his broadcast:

During the 18 months since VJ-day the American people carried out the most tremendous job of military and industrial demobilization in our history. There were setbacks and disappointments, including many serious and costly labor disputes. Despite that fact, however, American production in 1946 exceeded all previous peacetime levels.

I cannot predict what will happen during this next year in the field of industrial relations. But I do know that both labor and management now have a much more constructive attitude today than during the first troubled months that followed VJ-day.

The Congress of the United States now has before it a number of bills designed to prevent a recurrence of last year's industrial strife. There is one particular proposal that I would like to discuss rather fully. This proposal takes two forms: One would set up a mediation board outside the Department of Labor; the other would set up a mediation board within the Department, but would make the board practically independent and transfer to it the work of conciliation and mediation now being carried on by the Labor Department. From past experience I feel sure that such a board would be in the Department for housekeeping purposes only.

Some advocates of this procedure contend that the Labor Department and its Secretary cannot act impartially because we have a mandate from Congress to "foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States. * * *"

The best answer to this argument would be a full review of the record and policies of the United States Conciliation Service. I cannot undertake that in the time at my disposal. But I would like to quote four character witnesses, if I may call them that. Four groups who have a vital stake in collective bargaining and the American way of life. They are: The National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Federation of Labor, and the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Necessarily, these groups have had a great deal of experience with the Conciliation Service. They are in a position to judge the work of the Conciliation Service because they take part in it. Day in and day out they watch negotiations being carried on with the friendly, impartial help of our Commissioners of Conciliation. Let me remind you that during the last year the Commissioners, under the capable direction of Edgar L. Warren, aided in the peaceful settlement of 13,000 industrial disputes. Moreover, in 90 percent of the disputes where Commissioners were called in before work had halted no stoppage occurred.

Last year we also aided in settling 3,400 strikes. Of these, nearly two-thirds had begun before either of the parties called for the services of a conciliator.

Equally important, all of these settlements were reached by voluntary methods of conciliation and mediation.

Knowing that record, the NAM, the AFL, the Chamber of Commerce, and the CIO are unanimously opposed to the creation of a mediation board. Let me quote the chamber's board of directors:

"The establishment of a Federal mediation board, or any similar body by another name, would interfere with and disrupt voluntary collective bargaining. There would be a tendency to refer important issues to such a board, which would undermine voluntary agreement."

My own experience as Secretary of Labor fully supports that view. During the war we could see this perfectly natural tendency at work. Time and time again the parties to a dispute were so eager to have their case settled by the National War Labor Board that the preliminary negotiations were little more than shadow boxing—a warm-up for the big show in Washington. Consequently, the Board found itself heavily burdened with a huge backlog of cases.

But after VJ-day, when numerous wartime controls were lifted, the War Labor Board quite properly began to turn its case load back to the parties for settlement. As a result, about 3,000 cases were left to collective bargaining and the overwhelming majority were settled peacefully—even during the troubled months of reconversion when labor and management faced a host of unfamiliar problems.

Without attempting to gloss over the fact that labor disputes did retard the rate of reconversion, I want to remind you that we now have more than 14,000,000 workers who are covered by some 50,000 union contracts. Yet even during the worst period of labor unrest in our history 45,000 of these contracts were renewed or renegotiated peacefully, not to mention the successful handling of countless grievances that are bound to arise wherever men work together.

To me, and to many others who are close to the labor scene, this indicates a much greater area of basic agreement than most people realize. Can we afford to move in on this large area with Government mandates or a super mediation board? The answer is: Not unless we are prepared to follow up with further controls and increasing Government participation in collective bargaining.

Here again our wartime experience is revealing. In the fiscal year 1943 the Conciliation Service handled more than 14,000 disputes, but 31 percent of these were referred either to the National War Labor Board or the National Labor Relations Board for final action. In 1944 the Service closed nearly 22,000 disputes, and of these, 32 percent were referred to one of the two Boards. In 1945 an all-time high was reached when the Conciliation Service handled over 23,000 disputes and referrals reached 33 percent.

Today the story is very different. Labor and management are again learning to use the collective-bargaining process. As we entered the new year 1947, work stoppages were the lowest since VJ-day. Not only were there fewer strikes but the number of workers involved and idleness were also well below those early months of 1946. As of January 1, 1947 our conciliators were attempting to mediate 111 stoppages involving only 35,000 employees. A year ago they were handling 145 strikes involving 10 times as many employees.

Quite apart from its effect on the Conciliation Service, there is another reason why I am convinced that a mediation board would impede industrial peace. My own experience has convinced me that the job is not one to be done by a board because the solution of labor disputes requires great flexibility. Solutions cannot be reached in an ivory tower. Every case is different; the issues are different; the personalities are different. It requires different types of individuals to handle different cases.

During the last year and a half we in the Department have acquired an intimate knowledge of the current problems of each industry and the various companies within the industry. We know the background and the mental attitude of the negotiators on both sides. No super-duper board can handle such a many-sided and complicated task, regardless of the character, ability, and experience of the men who might be appointed to such a board. With the best will in the world, a board would find itself delayed by technical problems which might prove a fatal handicap to successful collective bargaining.

The general public may not be aware of these facts, but labor and management know them well enough. They know, too, what steps have been taken to develop and strengthen the Conciliation Service. I am particularly proud that what has been done was an outgrowth of a unanimous recommendation by the President's Labor-Management Conference in November 1945. Everyone in the Conference agreed to the report which recommended that the Conciliation Service remain within the Department of Labor and that it operate with the advice of an advisory board consisting of representatives of both management and labor. This advisory board takes its work seriously and the results have been very gratifying to all concerned.

Again, time does not permit me to review these changes in detail. But I can tell you that the Conciliation Service today is better equipped than ever before to aid both unions and employers at the bargaining table. For example, all of the arbitrators now on the roster of the Service were passed upon by the regional labor-management advisory committees, thus insuring competent and impartial arbitrators who have been approved by leading labor and management representatives in their respective areas.

The same can be said of Conciliation's Technical Division which assists the parties in disputes where highly technical problems arise, such as incentive plans, job evaluations, merit-rating systems, workload studies, and related questions.

Beyond these regular methods which the Conciliation Service offers, we have developed several other means of promoting industrial peace. Fact finding is one of them. During the last year I appointed nine fact-finding or special-inquiry boards. In each instance their investigations led to a satisfactory settlement of the controversy. The

public has not heard much of this success, but I believe it can be repeated in the future, provided that certain basic principles are followed.

These principles include the full and voluntary cooperation of both parties, the selection of board members who are thoroughly familiar with the industry concerned, and, of course, a clear understanding that board's recommendations will not be forced upon the parties. Rather, I send each side a copy of the report and tell them in my opinion it should be used and considered in further negotiation. In other words, I do not convert the board from a mere fact-finding function into an arbitration function.

I have tried to outline for you some of the things the Labor Department is doing in the field of industrial relations. Equally important are the fundamental objectives behind this work. Unless I am very much mistaken, our goal is the same as yours. We in America want full, sustained production, and fair distribution. The kind of distribution that will reward incentive and preserve the freedoms we hold dear.

Free collective bargaining does impose serious responsibilities on both labor and management. Recent developments in steel and autos and in the vast construction industry show how different the industrial climate is today from 1 year ago. Unless I misjudge the caliber and democratic purpose of labor and management they will meet their joint responsibility without coercion or compulsion from our Government.

Mr. President, that was the text of the radio address on the subject of labor-management relations. It is a very fine testimonial to the good work being done. It really makes one sad to contemplate what is going to happen to this splendid organization when we get this phony bill.

Mr. President, as I stated earlier in the evening, I was prepared to go on for a considerable time. I could talk for a good many hours yet; but several of my colleagues, insistently pressing for an opportunity to speak, they are urging that I should not hog this thing, but should give them an opportunity to say a few words. So I shall desist temporarily and let some of my colleagues, friends of labor, and friends of the American people, have an opportunity to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. KILGORE Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. KILGORE Mr. President, while I realize that Senators would like to vote and get this over with, that is one of the points which I should like to make.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask for order and for decent courtesy on the part of the Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from West Virginia has the floor. He may proceed.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the first point I should like to make is that under the Constitution of the United States we require the States of the Union to guarantee to their citizens a republican form of government, which is a representative form of government in which representatives of citizens by a proportionate ratio vote on the necessary measures for the Government of their citizens.

Mr. President, by the very evidence of the yelling of "vote" which does not speak so well for the dignity of the Senate of the United States, we have an indication on the part of certain Members of the Senate that they are willing to depart from that guaranty of the Constitution of the United States, insofar as the Congress is concerned, and to deny the representative vote to the various subordinate groups which make up the United States of America. I think it bespeaks ill of the Senate to have Senators take such an attitude.

Mr. President, the attitude all the way through this evening has been to try to deny votes to certain States which are entitled to representation. I do not particularly care how this bill turns out or how the vote turns out; but I say that I have heard so much about communism, as stated in remarks on the floor of the Senate, and so much about totalitarianism that I feel that I, as a humble citizen of the United States and as a Member of the Senate of the United States, should do my utmost to stop movements on the part of——

(At this point Mr. KILGORE made certain statements which subsequently were withdrawn by him.)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I call the Senator from West Virginia to order, under section 4 of rule XIX of the Senate, for imputing to other Senators motives unworthy of a Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule, the Senator from West Virginia will have to take his seat.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I should like to proceed with my remarks on the bill, then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia will take his seat.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senator from West Virginia be permitted to proceed in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BARKLEY. First, Mr. President, let me say with great respect to the Chair and to the Senator from Ohio that I did not interpret and I do not interpret the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia as imputing improper or unworthy motives to any Senator. The mere fact that a Senator makes a point under the rule makes it necessary for the Senator concerned to take his seat. But I listened to the Senator from West Virginia and I did not observe that he imputed any such motives to any other Senator. I do not think he did, and I do not think he so intended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky that the Senator from West Virginia be allowed to proceed in order. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. I was about to make an inquiry which I think the Chair has already answered—namely, whether the Chair means that a motion that the Senator proceed in order is not debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to proceed in order is not debatable.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Will it be possible for those of us who do not recall what the Senator from West Virginia is supposed to have said——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is making a parliamentary inquiry, and the Chair requests that he be allowed to state it.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to repeat it, Mr. President. Would it be possible, for the benefit of those of us who did not hear what the Senator from West Virginia said, which is supposed to be out of order, to have the Official Reporter read the statement the Senator made, so that we pass judgment as to how to vote on this question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The inquiry of the Senator from Oregon relative to whether it will be in order to have the Official Reporter read the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia would be a perfectly proper request and would be in order.

Mr. MORSE. I make that request, Mr. President.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Ohio did not advise the Senate to what remarks he objected. I assume that those are the words that will be read. Will the Senator from Ohio state what they are?

Mr. TAFT. I prefer to have the exact words read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the reading of the remarks by the Official Reporter will, in the opinion of the Chair, answer the question raised by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Official Reporter read all the remarks the Senator from West Virginia has made?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, let me say that if I made any reflection——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is not at this time entitled to recognition.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I think I am for the purpose of the statement I am about to make. May I state my proposition first, before the Chair rules?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia will please refrain for a moment.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, if it shall be interpreted that I cast any reflection upon any Member of this body——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is not in order at this time.

The Chair is trying to work out this problem in a parliamentary fashion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from West Virginia be permitted to make the statement he wishes to make. I think that will clear up the matter so that there will be no necessity to have any action taken here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky that the Senator from West Virginia be allowed to make his remarks in explanation at this time? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, let me say that, if there is anything in what I have just said that would reflect upon any Member of the Senate, I desire to withdraw those remarks. The remarks were largely impelled by a little shouting of "Vote! Vote! Vote!" which possibly antagonized the Senator from West Virgina. I desire to withdraw anything that might reflect upon a Member of this body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia would have a right, under the rule, to withdraw his remarks.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I withdraw any objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well.

The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, with reference to the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, as passed by the Congress and as vetoed by the President of the United States, at which time the President made what this speaker regards as appropriate remarks and gave appropriate reasons, I should like to say a few things.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken. The Senate is not in order.

Senators will take their seats. Those who desire to converse will please retire to the anterooms.

The Senator from West Virginia may proceed.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, after reading carefully the bill as passed by both Houses of Congress and as sent to the President for his signature, I am reminded of one of those old Rube Goldberg cartoons which used to delight the country, and still do when they appear. I refer to those which appeared 15 or 20 years ago. They pictured very intricate systems of handling some natural phenomena. For instance, I remember one in which a trained elephant upset a bucket of water, which in turn disturbed a bunch of bedbugs, and they in turn disturbed a human being who was asleep in bed, and that person, upon arising, put out a fire in the next house. However, all those cartoons ignored certain laws of physics and certain laws of human conduct.

This bill also reminds me of a famous story told by Riley Wilson, a well-known character of my State who used to tell a story about old man Tom Adkins. Tom lived back in the country, in the early days, when there was plenty of timber, and he cut a "passel" of logs and floated them down Twelve Pole Creek and brought them to the market. His boy went along the bank of the river, riding one mule and leading another one. They sold the logs for more money than old man Tom had ever seen in his life. So old man Tom caroused around a little bit and drank a lot of sodapop and smoked some cigars. He started out on his mule, with his boy beside him, returning home. When they got to the edge of town, the boy said, "Pap, we forgot something." Old man Tom said, "What did we forget, son?" He said, "We didn't get nothing for Ma." The old man said, "That's right, son. I'll light and tie, and you go back to Emmons-Hawkins Hardware Co., and get her a new ax." That is what the pending measure does. It lights and ties, and sends labor back to get a new axe, with which to try to get their rights.

In giving expression to the Taft-Hartley bill, Congress has invited the Rube Goldberg type of act—the type of things that forgets the rules of physics, but particularly forgets the rules of human behavior. When the Congress gets time, if they do get it—and I pray to God we shall have time, before we finish—to take another good look at the bill, particularly comparing it with the alleged—I use the word "alleged" correctly—portal-to-portal bill, which was passed 2 or 3 weeks ago, I think we shall notice the flaw. I think we shall ponder the effect, and I think we shall consign the bill to that oblivion it so justly deserves. The bill looks superficially attractive, when studied without reference to other bills upon the statute books and appears as an easy blueprint for avoiding disputes between individuals and groups, through the Government's forbidding them to have any dispute. Senators know how that works. If it worked, we should not have criminal courts. Actually it is a congressional guide to further confusion in our country's industrial relations. I say that most advisedly.

Mr. President, I come from a State that probably has as high a percentage of organized labor as any State in the Union. I began in the oil fields of that State, dealing with unorganized labor. I spent 25 years in the coal fields of that State, part of the time dealing with unorganized labor, part of the time dealing with organized labor. I know the many problems that beset management-labor relations. Only 2 weeks ago, I sat down with one of the leading coal operators in the State. We were discussing this particular bill. He said, "This bill is evidence that Congress did not have sufficient knowledge of industry-labor relations to pass a security bill." He said he had hoped for one, but he was disappointed. He stated the pending measure would not work. Said he, "Take the closed-shop theory; I do not want a mine, part union and part nonunion; I want my mine either all union or no union." He said, "From years of experience, I prefer to have it all union, provided the union has sensible leadership." That was the statement of a hard-boiled, hard-bitten industrialist of my State.

The fact that the bill if it becomes a law will cause further confusion has been noted by many persons other than myself. I refer to employers' groups, in addition to labor leaders, the churches, the civil spokesmen, the public members of our War Labor Board. I am not speaking of those appointed from the ranks of labor; I am talking about the public members, who in the main were recruited from industry. That board functioned through VJ-day, doing really excellent work. They have all warned that serious harm to the Nation will be done by advocating that labor-management relations be guided by provisions of the so-called Taft-Hartley bill.

The Prentiss-Hall Organization, which publishes very valuable analyses of industrial relation practices and policies for a group of readers who are largely composed of corporation personnel directors, had this to say very recently:

> If it becomes law, labor-management relations aren't going to be any simpler. If anything, they will become more complex.

That, coming from Prentiss-Hall, Mr. President, is rather significant to me, because I have always considered that publication as extremely conservative, on the employer side.

The executive labor letter, which is also printed exclusively for business readers, warns:

> The bill promises greater industrial strife, a tremendous increase in time-consuming lawsuits, and a rapid growth in Government control over relations between management and labor.

Mr. President, in our numerous efforts to preserve free enterprise, why should we introduce the question of management and labor in an endeavor to control all management, or shall I say all industry? That is certainly a very strange fruit from a bill sponsored by Republicans who, during all these years, have cried out in solemn tones against "government interference," against "bureaucracy," against "centralization of affairs in Washington"? Is not that a statement of fact? Is that not something that has gone on for the past 5 years—those very cries from the opposition to the administration? Yet it seems that, at the first opportunity, the same people who cried those things have rushed headlong into a dangerous experiment in—I hate to say it, but it amounts to industrial dictatorship, because when an employer is told what he can and cannot do by contract with his employees that is industrial dictatorship. The cries I have mentioned were heard against Franklin D. Roosevelt throughout his administration, in spite of the war crisis. Charges were being made that he was trying to dictate to industry, that he was trying to dictate to capital, that he was trying to dictate to labor. The first thing that is done after the death of our late lamented President is the passing of a bill by the Congress which of itself amounts to an industrial dictatorship—the very thing we have condemned in the past, the very thing we have inveighed against in the past, the very thing against which we have preached ever since, shall I say, 1936.

Let us also look for a moment at the proposals of the bill for changing the structure and functions of the National Labor Relations Board.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Rhode Island for a question?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, the Senator has spoken to us about industrial dictatorship and made allusions to the Roosevelt administration. The Senator comes from a highly industrialized State, a coal-mining State. I am wondering if at this time it would not be appropriate for him to tell us a little bit of the history of workers in the coal mines under the industrial dictatorships as he knew them in his younger days. I think it might be appropriate if the Senator would tell us a little about what went on in the coal-mining industry of his State before labor was given the right to organize, and what might be the Senator's prediction as to the consequences of the passage of the pending measure, in driving labor back to what I think was its condition in those days.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island. May I say, Mr. President, that I well remember those days. I remember them entirely too well. I remember the days when coal miners and their wives were marched to the polls by the foreman, in columns of two, and were told exactly how to vote the ticket. If they did not vote, they found their furniture in the middle of the road.

I remember in other industries that the same thing was done. I remember that since we have gotten to the point where a man may not be discharged except for an industrial "misdemeanor," if I may call it that, such conditions have ceased to exist. I might cite a county other than my own, the county of McDowell, which used to go 6,000 on one side of the column. At the present time, with the voters free from fear of being discharged, it goes 6,000 on the other side of the column; but the men now have the right to vote as they please, and they cannot be discharged for voting the wrong way, either in the primary or in the general election. That is the result of the removal of industrial dictatorship.

I also remember when one was required to obtain permission from the sheriff, in some counties, before being allowed to alight from a train. I also remember that a lawyer found it necessary to obtain permission from the self same sheriff, before he could practice law in the courts of the county, no matter whether he was a member of the bar or not. I remember when one used to be a target for gunfire if he was unknown, and if he had no one to vouch for him.

Those days are gone I hope forever. My State is now a law-abiding State. We live according to the dictates of the laws of the State of West Virginia. We conduct our elections in the same way, despite what certain people may say. Our people are free of dictatorship, due largely to the fact of one clause only in a contract, namely, that a man may not be discharged except for cause—and voting the wrong way is not considered cause for removal.

I hope that is a sufficient explanation for the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. McGRATH. I had hoped the Senator might review certain working conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Rhode Island for a question?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield for another question, yes.

Mr. McGRATH. I had hoped the Senator might review for us certain of the working conditions in the days of unorganized mine workers. I was not thinking so much in terms of their political enslavement as I was of their industrial enslavement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, in the interest of protecting the rights of the Senator from West Virginia, must call the attention of the able Senator from Rhode Island to the fact that he is privileged to inquire, in the form of a question, from the Senator from West Virginia; otherwise a point of order might be raised, that the Senator had already spoken once. The Chair merely reminds the Senator from Rhode Island that the interruption must be in the nature of a question.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I would ask that the Official Reporter place a question mark after my last remarks, and I think they will appear to be a proper question.

Mr. KILGORE. I think that I can explain the questions raised by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, because I am rather familiar with them. In mine safety conditions, the safety of the worker has risen in the State, under a contractual system which has been a free contractual system, protected only by the Wagner Act. With the exception of one, every company in the State operates under a contract authorized by that act. I find no particular opposition from operators in my State to going ahead with a similar contract, so long as a similar situation prevails in the rest of the country. Additional safety precautions have been provided, additional protection for the home, additional health and welfare services have been provided for the mining community.

It is necessary to be around a mining community in order to understand what those things mean. I can remember when there were shanties, like box stalls at a cheap, two-bit race track, housing a family. In place of the shanties there are now decent frame houses. There is less pneumonia and fever, and miner's asthma is not so prevalent. Many similar conditions that formerly prevailed have been eradicated, and it has all been the result of free contractual service. I think any Senator can realize how keen my feelings are on the question of collective bargaining, because it has done so much for my State, and because it has meant so much to us. In 1920, for instance, a representative of the United States Department of Education stopped in Logan County and, lest I be accused of playing politics, may I say that, at that particular time, the sheriff of Logan County and also the county administration happened to be Democratic. The man referred to had to get back on the train and leave town; he was not allowed to check in. At that time it was not a question of what party one belonged to; it was a question of what gang he belonged to. Sometimes I belonged to the right gang, sometimes the other fellow belonged to the right gang. That was a bad situation for the State, and it was bad for the people. I want to see collective bargaining continued.

Let us look for a moment at the proposals of the pending bill, which Senators are considering passing over the Presidential veto; proposals for changes in structure and the functions of the National Labor Relations Board, the Government agency which must administer the legislation which we are considering. It is well known to Senators that a law is no better than its administration. I do not know whether it was Boies Penrose, or who it was that said, "You pass the laws, and let me name the administrators, and I will be satisfied." The success of any law depends upon the administrative agency set up to execute it.

The alterations in the National Labor Relations Board guarantee in advance that this bill will be sending both employers and union leaders, not to mention the Government executives themselves, on frequent trips to the aspirin bottle, or someone may want something a little bit stronger. Under the set-up provided in the bill I defy anyone to figure a way to prevent the bill producing a multitude of headaches for either side, and, I may say particularly for the Government.

First of all, the bill enlarges the Board from 3 to 5 members. Clearly the framers of the proposed law have very little faith in any man the President—and I may suggest for the benefit of aspirants who may be in the Chamber, any of his successors—might nominate, or that the Senate, this deliberative body, might confirm, to seats on this agency, for the bill immediately thereafter provides that the general counsel of the Labor Board shall be responsible, not to the 5 members of the Board for whom he is general counsel, but to the White House and to Congress. In other words, there is a general counsel who is a law unto himself, and there are 5 members who cannot tell him what to do, and yet he is their counsel.

The Board is denied the power to select its own chief counsel, the man who will determine what the Board's legal policy shall be. That is set forth in the bill. The chief attorney, who is appointed by the president and confirmed by the Senate becomes a power in his own right, without reference to anybody else. In other words, why have the Board, if we are going to have a chief counsel with complete power?

If he is at odds with the five members of the Board, the Board cannot remove him from office. If he fails to observe the policies determined by the Board, they have no recourse except admonition, chiding him gently.

This is a new and entirely monstrous departure in the administration of government, something that never has happened before, the attorney being divorced from his client so completely that he handles a case without either advice or direction from the client.

We are fortunate that there was no Republican majority in Congress to forbid General Marshall choosing the man whom he wanted to head his intelligence section, for instance, or to prevent General Eisenhower from removing incompetent officers in his command during our invasion of Europe. I think we would have been in horrible shape if the Chief of Staff under Eisenhower could have gone on operating despite the decisions of the Supreme Commander.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. I ask the Senator whether or not the distinguished Senator from West Virginia did not do his best to remove the Chief of the Army Supply Service during the war.

Mr. KILGORE. I joined with the distinguished Senator from Maine in trying to curb the activities of the Chief of the Service of Supply during the war, when he sought to become Chief of Staff. I think the Senator from Maine will admit that I am correct in the statement that it was the joint action of the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Maine. It was not intended to curb his legitimate activities, but to keep him from engaging in some activities of which we did not approve.

Mr. President, this bill goes even a step further than the terrible divergence of control about which I have spoken. One would think that in creating a Government agency the heads of the organization would be given the power to meet their responsibilities. Is not that normal in government? When an agency is created, do we not give the head of the agency the power to meet responsibilities, or do we simply create it and say, "God be with you. I hope the people play ball and give you what you want."

No; we give them the power to perform the duties of their office, the power to meet the situations which arise as time goes on, and if Congress fails to give them the necessary power, we make of their administration a failure, as does the legislature of a State or the council of a city when they create an agency and fail to give it power. But this bill denies such right to the members of the National Labor Relations Board. All the lawyers, all the regional officers, are responsible, not to the Board which must determine policy, and which must enforce the act, and which must be responsible for its satisfactory performance.

We never charge a lawyer for losing a case. The man who gets charged is the one who is hung. If a lawyer defends a man for murder and he loses his case, we do not hang the lawyer, we hang the man—for which I, as a lawyer, am duly thankful.

The Board members in reality are responsible to the counsel, who is a power unto himself, and who is removed from criticism, the Board taking the rap, the counsel taking the salary and controlling the situation. Mr. President, that is bad legislatively, it is bad administratively, it is bad governmental policy, a bad setup.

That is not all. The members of the Board are forbidden to maintain a reviewing staff to review cases. Under the bill there are no concessions made to efficiency. It demands that each member of the Board or his secretary or legal assistant must personally read every one of the hundreds of thousands of pages of legal documents on which the Board must make its final decision.

Mr. President, as an illustration, let me suggest that a few days ago in discussing the Reed bill the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] lifted up the printed record on the Reed bill, just one of seven or eight thousand bills which come before the Senate, and after looking at it suggested that it probably would take 10 days' time to read it. I tried it out. He was overoptimistic. I think it would take 12 days. Can anyone imagine a member of this Board, with the assistance of a stenographer and one attorney, going over the record in every case that came before the Board for final disposition?

Some of the sponsors of the bill have complained about bureaucracy, but this bill seems to come straight from Alice in Wonderland.

> "The time has come," the walrus said,
> "To talk of many things:
> Of shoes—and ships—and sealing wax—
> Of cabbages—and kings."

Sometimes I think this bill gets into the cabbages and kings idea of the administration when it removes a lawyer from his client, removes the staff from the client, and yet blames the client for what happens.

Future members of the National Labor Relations Board, if they take their mandate seriously, will have no time to think of long-range policy or of the human relations in industry. The bill demands that they become bookworms, that they spend their days and their nights, and such time as comes in between, working on a mass-production basis, going over these records.

We would do better to appoint five photoelectric cells to the Labor Board, since these rules require, not men, but rapid-fire machines to scan the work arising out of hotly contested cases in every industry and in every section of the country. It often makes me think of a Chinese gentleman named Wang, in a town where I went to college. We used to ask Wang how long he worked, and he said 25 hours a day, and when we asked him what he did the rest of the time, he said the rest of the time he slept. It looks to me as if these fellows will have to work 25 hours a day and then sleep in between time. If they do any administrative work they will have to do it between times in the 25 hours a day, under the bill.

Mr. President, that is not the whole story. The bill specifically forbids the National Labor Relations Board to hire economic experts. We are not going to get five economists on this Board. If we did, they would not be worth anything as lawyers and as judges, yet they will not be able to hire economic experts to pass on whether or not a wage scale is fair and whether it will work. Nevertheless such experts are necessary to study industrial relations, to study company statistical records, to help compute back-pay obligations of companies, to provide the necessary advice for the Board to determine what is and what is not fair in the way of wages. But they are forbidden to hire such men.

Whom are they going to get? Will the Board proceed along the line of intelligent guesses we hear so much about? How a Government agency concerned week in and week out with problems arising out of economic conditions can function without the help of economists is a question I cannot answer. I would as soon operate a mine without a mining engineer as to try to establish a wage scale without an economic staff who can study the economics of the situation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield for a question?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Am I to understand that the Senator from West Virginia feels that if the National Labor Relations Board is to work effectively in the settlement of industrial disputes by the use of peaceful procedures, it needs a staff of trained economists to collect for the Board and to make available to the Board data bearing upon cases under consideration?

Mr. KILGORE. There can be no question about that. It is utterly impossible to reach a fair-wage scale and to reach a fair meeting of the minds between employers and employees unless there are economists who can study both sides of the case and give an impartial opinion, a long-range opinion.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree that the type of case that is submitted to the National Labor Relations Board for decision is quite different in its nature from the ordinary type of case that is submitted to a common-law court for decision?

Mr. KILGORE. Unquestionably. It is a case in which it is necessary to analyze costs, sales, man-hour work. It requires a very detailed analysis to determine what is a fair answer.

Frequently in common-law courts the Senator, as a lawyer, well knows that economists as experts are called in. But in the labor relations field they are far more essential, because, as in medicine there is diagnosis and prognosis, not merely diagnosis but prognosis as well. One is prophesying what is going to happen, and it is a field in which economics is of the utmost value.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree that in the ordinary issues before a common-law court in a civil case, the court is able to rely upon the briefs and the arguments of counsel for determination of the issue in accordance with the law which the court has before it to administer, whereas in a case before the National Labor Relations Board, the Board is dealing primarily, in most instances, not with legal issues, but with determinations of economic factors which have given rise to a dispute between an employer and an employee?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct. The situation of the National Labor Relations Board is more nearly parallel with that of a court in chancery, in which we try to work out an equity based on estimates, as compared with a suit in law in which we are dealing with facts in esse, which we can multiply and divide and get at the result. I think the difference is best expressed that way, from a lawyer's viewpoint. But I think it goes even further than that, because there is a bit of prophecy, like the bit of prophecy that is necessary, shall we say, in a mandamus proceeding in a court of chancery, in which one has to see into the future, and there has to be a certain amount of prognosis.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that in the field of administrative law, there rests upon the administrative tribunal a responsibility to get for itself, if necessary, provided counsel for the two sides are not providing data, the necessary data upon which a fair judgment can be rendered on the issues?

Mr. KILGORE. That is one of the differences between an administrative handling of a matter and a judicial handling. In the judicial handling, the court can leave it up to what is proved, but there is a duty upon an administrative court to go further than that, to try of its own volition to find what is the correct solution, which does not rest upon a court of law.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from West Virginia agree with me that in the drafting of the particular bill before us for consideration an error has been made so far as the final workability of the law is concerned, in that there has been too much of a commingling of common-law court procedures with administrative law procedures, as illustrated by the particular point the Senator from West Virginia is raising now, in that the bill eliminates from the Board the services of economists?

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that in my opinion the bill creates a court and gives it an administrative problem to deal with, with only the judicial power of a common law court, or even less, I may say. I think that is the best description that can be made of it. We create an administrative court, but we give it only the power of a common law court in its administration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the last question?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. I am to understand, then, am I, that the criticism of the bill the Senator from West Virginia is trying to get across at this point is that the bill purports to give to the tribunal created under it administrative law functions, but gives it as its tool of procedure primarily common law procedure?

Mr. KILGORE. I may express it perhaps a little better than that. It gives it administrative court duties with common law powers.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Am I to understand from the last colloquy that it is the opinion of the Senator from West Virginia that this administrative board can go outside the record, build up its own record unbeknown to the union or the company, and make a decision based on what it may find from the opinion of its own economists outside the record? Is that what we are to understand?

Mr. KILGORE. No.

Mr. FERGUSON. So that we may keep the record straight with respect to the duties, will the Senator explain?

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the Senator from Michigan that the court has duties thrust upon it which it has no power to carry out, and the people of the United States have a right to believe that having duties thrust upon it, it has powers, and when those powers are removed the court is limited in its functions.

Mr. President, getting back to the main topic. Unfortunately, workers and employers will have no need to wait until their case goes to Washington before they discover themselves wrapped firmly in the embraces of the Taft-Hartley bill's red tape. Senators have all heard speeches designed to convince the general public that the bill is merely a mild—I love that word "mild"—cure for abuses—I have heard carbolic acid 50-percent diluted called mild compared with the straight solution—and that in no fundamental way does the bill act to curb or restrict collective bargaining. To anyone who has taken the trouble to read the bill, that type of assertion is pure propaganda. It has no connection with fact whatsoever, and no connection with the wording of the bill. Actually, in section after section, the impact of the bill will be to disturb, if not destroy, the harmonious process of reaching agreement between labor and management by forbidding certain kinds of contracts. It provides rewards and bonuses to those sinister forces in our industrial community which seek to escape the responsibility for reaching accord with the workingmen and the workingwomen. It loads the dice, for instance, against fair and open collective bargaining. It loads the dice in a subtle and in a vicious way which the lay public, unacquainted with the technical details of industrial relations, can little appreciate. But the public will find out all too soon if the bill becomes law that the Taft-Hartley proposals are a mighty obstacle rather than a guide to industrial peace and full production.

Mr. President, I may say that were it not for my hope for national security in the ensuing months I should like to see the bill experimented with just to convince the public how many strikes, how much industrial disharmony, how much disturbance it will promote. For example, workers in a particular plant may have had one union to represent them for a long period of years. There may have been an uninterrupted period of good relations with the employers. In my own State I know of hundreds of such plants, some of them union and some nonunion. There may be the highest degree of cooperation and good will between the union, or the employees in the case of a nonunion plant, and the company. But in the event any small group in the plant or the mine wants to split that bargaining unit and destroy the pattern of harmony, the bill allows the National Labor Relations Board no choice but to order a separate election for a small handful of workers. And, incidentally, when the employer decides to call an election he can call one.

Let us take two plants, A plant and B plant Both of them have had good industrial relations. Neither is a union plant. The employees do not belong to any union. They have gotten along with the employers. A new man comes in and buys B plant, the competitor of A plant. He asks for an election. He receives it, and the plant elects no union. Under the provisions of the portal-to-portal pay bill—and we cannot read one section of the law without reading others—he has 12 months in which he can increase hours and cut wages and do anything he wants to, and he cannot be sued. Mr. President, he either crucifies his competitor or he starts a strike the like of which has not been seen in that industry. However, the Board cannot take into account the good or the bad of the situation. It must mechanically order the election, with the possible destruction of the pattern of harmony that has prevailed, and once the election is held another election cannot be held for 12 months. I am in favor of the limitation of 12 months. But I do not believe the employer should call for an election. It is just like the owner of a lodge hall asking for a charter for a lodge in order to put a lodge in the hall.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask the Senator if he does not believe that one of the troubles with the bill is that the rights of both labor and industry are not clearly stated; that the bill is so written that almost all its provisions will require lawsuits to determine what the respective rights are?

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Arizona that I think it would be a very advantageous proposition if every lawyer and United States Senator resigned and went home to his own State and secured employment in settling the various lawsuits which are going to grow out of the bill. The bill is going to be a godsend to lawyers, because there are so many things left open in it to court interpretation, and interpretation may be made in various ways in various States, because in the bill we have even left various questions to be decided under various State laws. There is no uniformity. One cannot go into the Federal courts and secure decisions on certain points. I thank the Senator from Arizona for his question. What he brought out is one of the great weaknesses of the bill, that is, that there is no definiteness about it. There is too much left for interpretation. There is too much left for court action. The court action which will be taken in the future will result in litigation for the next 5 years.

Mr. McFARLAND. Of course, when the law is finally interpreted by the courts, it will be a better law. But does the Senator not think that, in the meantime, that will cause strife in the industries and probably strikes?

Mr. KILGORE. It is bound to, because everything that calls for court interpretation is going to result in strife. Strikes are going to be begun, and then court interpretations secured. Strikes will be brought about, and court interpretations made. There is going to be continual strife in the industry until every feature of the bill can be interpreted. It was drawn by a law firm, I think, with that in view.

Mr. President, while any group may automatically seek to disrupt an established functioning mechanism for reaching an agreement, the bill applies an all-or-nothing yardstick, when unions organize a previously unorganized plant. The bill overturns the time-tested doctrine, for instance, of the National Labor Relations Board. That, Mr. President, is a dangerous thing to do. The Board operated through one of the greatest crises in the history of the United States, through which collective-bargaining units were established on the broadest possible base, and to meet the greatest possible production. In some industries, unions have been able only to organize sections or departments of a particular factory. The Board has recognized in the past this process by setting up bargaining units on a department of section basis, pending final organization at some possible future date. In West Virginia we have a plant which has a CIO union in one section and an AFL union in another section. Yet it gets along with its workers. They do not have any trouble. Each union has its own bargaining policy, its own bargaining group. Mr. President, the Board recognized that process a long time ago. Such a policy of gradualism and common sense would be outlawed by the Taft-Hartley bill. Only if a union has organized every section and every department may it become the bargaining agent of the workers involved. All, or nothing at all, says the bill.

Mr. President, I diverge at this point. I grew up in a little unorganized industry, the oil fields. When I was a boy no one heard of a union because everyone treated oil workers fairly. We were the highest paid employees in the United States. It required a high degree of skill and a high degree of knowledge, and we were well paid for it and we responded accordingly. It has only been in recent years that that business has gone union. It only went union when the companies operating became so large that someone had to deal with them collectively. In my day and time, Mr. President, a contractor who employed 48 men was a big man. The oil companies did not try to drill. They employed contractors. So we did not have unions. We became highly concentrated, and when the companies started doing their own drilling and when various other things came in, then for the first time we secured collective bargaining. We never had it until that time. We would not have had it even now but for the fact, Mr. President, that someone in Pittsburgh, someone in New York, someone in Oil City, or someone in Boston undertook to tell the field superintendent how much to pay Joe Doakes, and Joe realized that he was not being paid enough. So Joe joined the union. And someone in New York, wanting more profit for the oil, without considering the livelihood of Joe Doakes and his wife and children, lowered the pay, at the same time upping the living cost.

Mr. President, the Board has recognized the process of setting up bargaining units in departments, pending some possible organization at some future date, as absolutely essential to the economic organization of a plant. Such a policy of gradualism, as I stated, and common sense, would be outlawed by the bill. Only if a union has organized every section, as I said before, every division, every department of the plant, can the bargaining of the workers prevail. In other words, the bill is an all or nothing bill. A union has to control all the plant or it cannot control any of it.

This double standard runs throughout the entire bill. A union is liable to damage suit for the action of every single member, even if he be a company-paid union agent assgned to cause trouble and violence.

Mr. President, let us suppose that a commission sales agent of the Aetna Insurance Co. could cause his company to be sued in case he ran over someone. That is what the bill would do with respect to unions. If we applied the same rule to corporations, there is not a corporation in the United States of America that would dare to employ anyone. They could not have a single employee, even on a commission basis. Yet, that is the rule we try to apply to the unions, even with respect to the committee at the mine in the mine field—their agents. All that is necessary to be done is to hire some fellow and put him on the committee. If any Senator does not believe that, I suggest that he read the report of the La Follette Committee on Industrial Practices, based on the hearings held by a Senate committee some 7 years ago, practices which still persist in the industries of the United States respecting what are commonly called company stooges, who can be shoved into jobs in the union in order to cause trouble. It is a common occurrence to have such stooges. Every coal company has them. They are men who belong to the union, who work at the plant, but who are on the company pay roll. I have often seen union presidents, secretaries, members of the board, and others who quietly drew a cash payment from the company. That was all shown up, as I said, in the La Follette report. Suppose the company wanted to wreck the international headquarters; all the company had to do was to get some of those fellows to do something detrimental.

Let us say someone wished to sue a coal company for damages caused by its agents. He would not need the provisions of the Taft-Hartley bill to do that. There is a decision of the United States Supreme Court on that point in the case of Willis Branch Coal Company against the United Mine Workers of America, which was tried in 1921 from the State of West Virginia, in which the Willis Branch Coal Co. recovered from the United Mine Workers of America approximately $485,000—and they got the money—for an explosion that wrecked a tipple. But they had to prove that the explosion occurred under the order of the executive committee of the United Mine Workers.

In my State at one time we had what was known as the Logan march. That was one of the situations I was talking about a while ago, in which it was necessary to get a special license from the sheriff to practice law in certain counties. Some were Democrats and some were Republicans, so I cannot blame that on either party. It was purely an industrial situation. In those counties the sheriff got 5 cents a ton. When I think of the howl that is raised over the 5-cents-a-ton welfare fund, I think of the 5 cents a ton that they used to pay the sheriff for protection. In Logan County a sheriff got rich at the rate of 5 cents a ton, just as the sheriffs did in McDowell and Mingo and other counties. When they undertook to discuss the question of organization with the miners of Mingo County, the sheriff there would not let them off the trains. So they undertook to go through Logan County; and the sheriff there, working with the sheriff of Mingo County, refused to let them do so. So they went back and got some shotguns and rifles, and then returned, and there was a first-class civil war, purely because of an endeavor to tell those people about organization.

Mr. President, similar situations might arise under the Taft-Hartley bill. I want to avoid such situations.

Under this bill the union is liable to damage suits for the actions of any

member of the union, even if he is a paid company stooge or if he is an agent assigned to cause trouble and violence. That is a practice that the Senate Civil Liberties Committee discovered to be widespread, in its investigations a few years ago; and it was not confined to the coal industry by any means. It also existed in the steel industry and in the automobile industry and other industries. But the same bill provides that a company need not be responsible for the illegal activities of even its own supervisors. This is a doubtful, lop-sided piece of legislation which we as Members of the Senate passed, to my regret, and are now asked to pass over the President's veto. Unless a supervisory employee has specifically been designated as a company agent, the company will not be held responsible for the illegal activities of that person.

I am reminded of Lawrence Dwyer, who worked for the Raleigh Coal & Coke Co. many years ago, about 1901. One day he went into the mine, and discovered that the top of the room in which he was working was coming down. He called that to the attention of the mine foreman. At that time there was about three-quarters of a carload of coal backed up against the face. He asked the mine foreman for more props to prop up that top. The mine foreman told him to get in there and get that coal out.

Dwyer was a young man with a wife and two children, and he said, "Oh, that is dangerous."

The foreman said, "Get in there and get that coal out, or else vacate your house tonight."

So Lawrence Dwyer went in and got part of the coal out; he got about half of it out, and then the top came down, just as he expected it would. He managed to jump over to the rib, which is the side wall of the room, and he only lost part of his leg—about 6 inches below the hip.

He went to the hospital. Of course, he lost his job; he could not hold it.

When he sued the company for the negligence of the mine foreman in sending him into a dangerous room, the company contended that the foreman, under the old pilot rule, was not representing the company; and Dwyer lost his suit. That man became known as Peggy Dwyer, and he, together with Mother Jones, started the 1903 strike against the Raleigh Coal & Coke Co. and organized West Virginia and stirred up probably more disturbance over a piece of legal injustice that was perpetrated on him by the courts of my State than was ever stirred up before. I think he was justified in what he did, although he broke the company he worked for and broke a number of other companies in doing so.

I say that if we persist with legislation of this type, we shall make Peggy Dwyers—he was Lawrence Dwyer, if you please; I knew him, and he was an Irishman and a gentleman, despite his feelings—we shall make Peggy Dwyers out of a great many workers in this country. Mr. President, that is something we must guard against.

The Logan march, as I said, was used to wreck the unions. It was stirred up and fomented to wreck the unions in my State; and as a result of that, we went into a situation of political peonage in which the legal voters had to vote as they were told.

Later the depression came. When the boss could not hire anybody, he could not kick the worker out of a company-owned house just because he wanted to get a little rent out of him but was unable to get it. As a result, the men who had been forced out of the union by reason of the complete denuding of the union treasuries came back; and West Virginia became approximately 99-percent organized as far as the miners were concerned. It always had been organized as far as the railroad workers and most of the other workers were concerned, with the exception of the steel workers, who were organized later.

Mr. President, one provision of this bill relates to the necessity of designating supervisory employees as agents of the company, before the company can be held liable for the acts of such employees. I cannot see that any company would be so stupid as to do that in any case. For instance, let us consider the superintendent of a plant. It would be necessary to put on him a badge stating that he is an agent, before it would be possible to charge the company with any misconduct by him. Otherwise, no matter what that man might do or say, the plant would be free from all liability on that account. On the other hand, if a member of the grievance committee does something in the plant, the international organization is chargeable for it. That shows the lack of fairness of the bill.

Such provisions cannot help but build the fires of resentment in the hearts of workers who find themselves confronted with a bill which clearly establishes obstacles in the path of organization and the maintenance of a union of strength and integrity. Everything is set up to break it down, and nothing is set up to help it hold its own.

The Taft-Hartley bill goes further than to weaken labor's hand at the collective-bargaining table. It does much to destroy the collective-bargaining process itself. Under this bill, no employer need ever discuss with the union of his workers any question of modifying an agreement during the life of the agreement itself. This provision flies squarely in the face of a Supreme Court decision in 1939 that employers are obligated, under the Wagner Act, to talk over proposed changes in an existing contract and to discuss interpretations of the agreement with the union. A proposal such as this could come only from persons who do not understand collective bargaining, or who do not want to see it work—persons who never have met a pay roll and who probably never hired any workers, and probably could not pay them if they did hire them. A union agreement is not a mechanical device; it is a set of working rules governing human relationships between employees and employers; and it should be flexible. It should be possible to change it so as to meet changing conditions. It should be possible to have discussions held between both parties at frequent intervals, when questions arise, so that the new contract will be ready for drafting when the time for it arrives. That is the democratic way. The United States Steel Corp., employing nearly a quarter of a million workers, understands that fact, even if the sponsors of the Taft-Hartley bill do not. The Big Steel contract specifically provides for quarterly discussions between the union and the company, at which the rules can be studied and difficulties worked out. This is the democratic way, the common-sense approach to a difficult problem. But the Taft-Hartley bill implies that it is wrong and unproductive.

I well remember the case of a man who was discharged for cause, and I wish to refresh the minds of other Senators on the same subject. He was putting up brattices in a mine in my State. He had a little pride of workmanship in putting them up, and he had a habit of scratching his initials on them. So he did so. They are made of concrete, and it is common for miners to scratch their names or initials on the brattices in the room they are working in. So when he finished the job, he put up a concrete brattice, and then he took a nail and scratched his initials on the brattice. Nevertheless, that was used as an excuse to discharge him for defacing property belonging to the company—simply because he had scratched his initials on it, something that had been occurring in that mine and every other mine for many years.

Mr. President, I have seen all sorts of excuses given. I have heard it said, "We will cut out this section," just so they could discharge a man "for cause." I have seen them suddenly have a mine-motor break down, and I have seen a machine pulled out of operation, just to provide a so-called "cause" for discharging the men who had been using that machinery. I have seen all sorts of things done, with the purpose of discharging a man "for cause." I remember that one man was discharged "for cause" from the Weirton steel mill. They did not even have to discharge him for cause, but they thought it would be better. The stated cause for which he was discharged was that he voted for Franklin D. Roosevelt, although Ernest Weir told him not to. The real reason for discharging him was that he happened to be a shop foreman. That shows us what happens "for cause."

Mr. President, such provisions cannot help but build resentment in the hearts of workers who find themselves in such situations.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it not a fact that, taking the provisions of this bill relative to discharge for cause in connection with the provisions about not allowing any statement to be admitted in evidence unless it contains the whole threat—and no doubt the Senator has been discussing them—for all practical purposes they give the employer arbitrary power to discharge a worker any time he commits a minor infraction of the rules? Cannot that be construed as "cause"?

Mr. KILGORE. Certainly. That is unquestionable. There does not have to

be any major cause. Any minor infraction can be regarded as sufficient, and will suffice, because the worker is able to have so few defenses. For instance, a worker can be insulted; and if he happens to "blow up" and say something to the boss, he can be dismissed "for cause," despite what the boss may have said to him, for, as I have stated, the company is not liable for what the boss does. I do not know whether a company would be liable for what the president of the company did or, perhaps, for what the chairman of the board did. Perhaps if he were caught napping, he might be "hooked," but I doubt whether even he would be held responsible.

But if the poor worker makes any mistake, he can be fired "for cause."

Mr. PEPPER. And if cause existed, no matter what the real reason for the discharge was—Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. As I was saying, if cause existed for discharge for an infraction of the rules, no matter what was the real basis of the discharge—perhaps it might be his labor activities—is it the opinion of the Senator that he could not be reinstated?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct. If any violation or infraction of the rules could be alleged, even though the reason for discharging him might be his union activities, he could be discharged. Of course, he could not be discharged because of his union activities, if that were the only cause of complaint that could be stated. But perhaps it might be proved that he drew a chalk mark on the entryway or hung his hat on the wrong hook, or something of that sort. Such things could be used as "cause." Or perhaps the worker might resent something said to him by a foreman or superintendent who might have threatened him. There are many ways of egging a worker into giving a "cause," and the bill contains nothing to protect the workers in any way against such attacks, because we must realize that no one will be held to be an agent of the company unless he wears a badge marked "Agent of the XYZ Company."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question? Is it a fact, also, that this bill has placed a very difficult obstacle in the way of proving that the employer did discharge the worker for his union activities, by denying admissibility to any statement of attitude that the employer may make, if the statement does not contain an explicit threat?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct. In fact, the bill has thrown an insurmountable obstacle, in my opinion, in the way of making it possible for a worker to protect himself against being fired for union activities.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KILGORE. I am glad to yield for a further question.

Mr. PEPPER. Is not the rule of evidence in respect to that matter, as laid down in this bill, contrary to the present law or at least the present rulings of the National Labor Relations Board? So, does not that show that the intention was to have the bill make it more difficult for an employee to be able to prove that he was discharged for his union activity?

Mr. KILGORE. I say to the Senator from Florida that it is not only contrary to the present rules of the National Labor Relations Board, but it is also contrary to the Anglo-Saxon principles of justice. A man is presumed to be innocent until he is proved guilty, under Anglo-Saxon principles of justice; but under this bill a man is considered to be guilty unless he proves himself innocent. Such a rule is contrary to the Anglo-Saxon principle of justice and contrary to the American concept of justice. It is contrary to the rulings and decisions of our courts, and it goes back to the days of Napoleon and the Napoleonic code.

However, that is the kind of law that Senators talk about enacting for the purpose of settling labor disputes. Mr. President, if Senators think the enactment of this law will settle labor disputes, at least it is clear that such a law has not settled them in other places in the world, and I doubt that it will settle them in the United States.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does not that simply reveal that at that very point of contact with the labor-management question, some greater burden is added upon labor and some added advantage is given to the employer by the provisions of this bill?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes. Unfortunately at almost every point of this bill we find that added burdens are placed upon the workers and the organizations of workers, just as was the case under the portal-to-portal bill. That is an unfortunate thing, because those are factors which have caused most of the labor unrest in Europe and will cause further labor unrest in the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator agree that, vicious as are the separate provisions, the whole put together, each adding to the cumulative effect, makes the bill simply a distinctly antilabor bill, the effect of which will be effectively to strangle labor unions of the country?

Mr. KILGORE. It reminds me very much of a problem in physics I heard of recently. The distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] may remember this old formula, that while no horse of his own power can produce one-horse power, yet 25 horses can pull more than a 25-horsepower engine.

We have the same situation in this bill. We have 10 or 15 or 20 different horses pulling in different directions, who will do more damage than one concentrated engine or motive force of the same combined power mechanically could do. The separate action will be found more damaging than the concerted action in just one direction, but it goes in every direction. It is a disturbing factor, a deterrent to peaceful relations between employer and employee, which will constantly grow and pile up until it becomes like a snowball going down hill, and eventually somebody gets rolled under.

That same inhuman, mechanical approach runs throughout this vindictive piece of legislation. It says, for instance, that there can be no complaint by a union if a worker is fired for cause. Yet the whole history of our industrial relations has shown that even in the most outrageous cases of anti-union discrimination, the boss provides a cause to cloak the dismissal of an active union member with a seemingly legitimate alibi. A principal activity of the Labor Board has been to weigh the facts and determine whether a dismissal was actually for cause or for union activity. In the future, under this bill, it will be barred from even investigating such cases.

The red tape is particularly in evidence when a union seeks to secure a clause in the collective-bargaining agreement to give it security against possible efforts at undermining its status—efforts which this bill would encourage in every possible way.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. Does not the way that single provision is written disclose that the design of the authors was not to assure freedom of speech to the employer, which would be a sensible reason for the provision, but to go further than that and to make it, as the Senator has already said, almost an insurmountable difficulty to prove any offense on the part of the employer in the discharge of the employee?

Mr. KILGORE. We are making it so easy for the employer to hide behind any threatening statement he may want to make. He may have said yesterday, "I am going to fire you," and tomorrow he may say, "I am going to fire anybody I don't like," and there will be trouble, under the bill, connecting the two statements together and getting a real threat.

A closed shop is now illegal—despite 125 years of such contracts. Consider, also, the steps a union must take to win even a union-shop or maintenance-of-membership agreement, which at present covers an estimated 10,000,000 workers in industry. The union must first be certified to be the collective-bargaining agent of a majority of the employees, as at present; it must then seek another special election on the security issue alone, and must achieve a majority vote among every single worker affected—including those not sufficiently interested to cast a ballot. In other words, first one has to be elected bargaining agent, then there must be another election, then after that is all done, there might be a maintenance-of-membership contract.

The union must show that it has not only made available but actually furnished to every one of its members, on both a local and national basis, a complete financial statement of the union's condition; and before securing a vote on

the union security question it must have supplied affidavits from each of its local and national officers that they are neither members nor affiliated with the Communist Party.

Mr. President, I want to ask a few questions. Suppose we should ask the Bell Telephone Co. to do the same thing every time it hired a man, to do the same thing every time it sold a share of stock, to do the same thing every time it sold a bond. They would raise cain before the Securities and Exchange Commission.

These are provisions calculated to invite employer opposition, to invite delay and litigation, to remove the collective-bargaining action from the sphere of simple human relations into a complicated realm of technical forms and legal action.

Truly, under these circumstances, the Taft-Hartley bill should be described as a severance of labor-management relations bill. Advertised as a measure to promote harmony, it will invite stress, discord, and never-ending litigation. Hailed as a bill to limit strikes, it will prove to be the greatest incentive to industrial unrest and increased friction that the Congress could possibly have adopted.

Supporters of the bill describe it as moderate and limited only to the correction of abuses. Theirs indeed is a masterpiece of understatement.

Mr. President, we should have accepted the advice that the President of the United States offered to us in his first message to the Congress, to convene a commission of industry and labor, and Members of both Houses, to study this situation, and properly prepare corrective measures for the labor bill, and not have started out, with the able assistance of a few Wall Street lawyers, to try to draft a bill dealing with the very human relations between employer and employee, a relation which a few of us have had a little bit of experience with and have a little bit of feeling for. The bill not only removes protections for our industrial workers which were enacted during the administration of the late President Roosevelt; it sets up curbs and restrictions never before considered.

It establishes complicated administrative machinery. It places a premium on procrastination in settling industrial problems. It bids fair to remove collective bargaining from the hands of those best equipped to conduct it—the representatives of management and employees—by turning the human relations of industry into a lawyer's paradise of court actions, injunctions, damage suits, and affidavits.

Clearly, the Taft-Hartley bill offers no substitute for mutual trust and developing cooperation between capital and labor. In fact, it will poison those relations and make more difficult the goal of industrial peace which its sponsors claim to seek. Such a bill is a menace to a democratic America, to democratic recovery, to industrial peace, to what we seek, which is maximum production.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The absence of a quorum is suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Baldwin	George	Morse
Ball	Green	Myers
Barkley	Gurney	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hatch	Pepper
Bricker	Hawkes	Reed
Briggs	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Brooks	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Jenner	Russell
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kem	Sparkman
Chavez	Kilgore	Taft
Cooper	Knowland	Thye
Cordon	Lodge	Umstead
Donnell	McCarran	Vandenberg
Downey	McClellan	Watkins
Dworshak	McFarland	Wherry
Eastland	McGrath	White
Ecton	Malone	Wiley
Ellender	Maybank	Williams
Ferguson	Millikin	
Fulbright	Moore	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I desire to take a few minutes to discuss the parliamentary situation. Frankly, I doubt the wisdom of the course the Senate is pursuing at the moment, and I feel impelled to make a short statement with reference to it.

It is now half past 5 o'clock in the morning. We have gone through the night in continuous session. I recognize the reasons that have compelled us to that action. I recall the efforts which were made by the leaders on both sides to reach agreement for an early vote, and I was in accord with those efforts, and had hoped to see that result. A Member of this body, my colleague from Oregon, made objection to the request for unanimous consent. That was in accordance with the rule of the Senate. In an attempt to advance the earliest possible consideration of this matter the Senate continued in session, and I am not critical, Mr. President, of any Member of the Senate in what I am saying. That effort has continued to this moment.

Mr. President, I feel that the Senate should not continue in session longer. I feel there is other business the Senate must attend to—I was going to say tomorrow, but let me say today, Saturday, and the fore part of next week—business which is also important.

Mr. President, I recognize the importance of the question we are now considering. I think my views on the pending measures are well known. I have made my decision with reference to this matter, and what action is taken here in the interim I am confident will not bring forth any new information or evidence that would change it. I think that is generally true.

Mr. President, my colleague the junior Senator from Oregon and I do not see eye to eye on portions of the legislation with which we are faced. I am not in agreement with my colleague as to whether we should go over the week end before a vote is taken. I lean to the view that the earliest possible vote would be better for all concerned.

But, Mr. President, I have in mind this fact: The Senate has long been jealous of its tradition of always extending to its membership an opportunity of free and open debate. In this instance I am impelled to the belief that in our desire for immediate action we have forgotten that ancient tradition of the Senate. We have gone through the night, the first night, Mr. President, after this matter came before the Senate. We will go through the day, perhaps through another night—I know not how much longer. My colleagues are heavy-lidded at this moment. Other urgent matters, with which we must speedily go forward, will suffer as the result of our action now. We know that. The strain of too long a vigil might be felt otherwise, as well.

I express the hope, Mr. President, that my colleagues on this side of the aisle will give careful thought to the situation that faces us. I recognize that, having the floor at this minute, I might move for a recess. I shall not do so. I feel that those whom we have placed in leadership should continue in that position, and I shall certainly not attempt to place my will ahead of theirs.

I do not believe, Mr. President, that this action, carried through to a conclusion, will even achieve the result that is intended. I believe it will only end in a worn-out group of men and the slowing down of the work to which we are giving our attention, and to which we have given undivided and constant attention for weeks and months past. I believe that we shall not gain any time with reference to the final vote on this measure, and I fear that we shall lose considerable time in the consideration of other business before the Senate.

I know that the clashing of wills which we have witnessed here yesterday and today cannot make for even the degree of cooperation which we have had in the past; and, Mr. President, we need that cooperation. We have a heavy backlog of legislation yet facing us. We need all the cooperative action that it is possible to get.

I voice the hope that the leadership in my party will give consideration to the thought that it is better for our good, for the good of the Senate, and for the good of the people as a whole, that we give heed to what we are doing, and that we take a recess and get a little of the rest which we have lost, and prepare ourselves as best we can to go forward with all the manifold duties which face us.

I understand that my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] expects to follow with a discussion of this question. I wish to say to my colleagues that the junior Senator from Oregon did not know before I rose that I was about to make these observations. They have come from me because I have been impelled to the conclusion that our action is not in our own best interest.

I wish to be objective about this question. I hope that I may always go about the business of the United States Senate from that viewpoint, and that alone. Certainly I have no criticism of any Senator, but I do believe that the good

of the people and of the Senate, and certainly of my colleagues, will be advanced if at this time we can find a way to a recess, and to the taking up of our business later today.

I understand that there is some thought of continuing in session through Sunday. So far as I am concerned, if that be done, I shall leave my telephone number with the Sergeant at Arms, but I shall not report on Sunday. I believe that we are all entitled to a rest. I believe that we must have it if we are to continue to do our work.

Before I take my seat, I should like to add that if the time comes in this body when there is clearly a deliberate attempt by filibuster to avoid voting upon any measure, and it reaches the point where, in my judgment, it is simply a stratagem for delay and delay only, I shall be glad to work day and night without end until that matter can reach a determination. I feel that that situation does not face us here. I cannot but believe that those with whom I disagree as to this measure, and as to whether we should take further time for consideration, have the right to be heard in the ancient tradition of the Senate.

Again I express the hope to my colleagues that they may find agreement with me in the thought that it is better for us all to take a recess.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in line with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, and also in harmony with what has been expressed by the minority leader [Mr. BARKLEY] in a prior statement in connection with a unanimous-consent request relative to the time which should be devoted to a debate on this question, I should like to say that I, for one, would like to be cooperative with all the other Members of the Senate.

I have previously stated that if I felt that the time had again arrived when we might propose a unanimous-consent request to vote upon this measure, I would do so, if possible. I expressed the optimistic hope that we might do so. Therefore, at this time I renew the request previously made, that we vote upon the pending question at 5 o'clock today. I ask unanimous consent now, in the light of what has been said, and urge every Member of the Senate to agree to the request in order that we may vote upon the pending question at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation for the very sensible remarks made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and the tone and temper of those remarks. In view of the objection which has just been made to a vote at 5 o'clock today, I make bold to make a further request, namely, that at 5 o'clock p. m. on Monday next the Senate proceed to vote upon the veto message without further debate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice to the words which have been spoken by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. We have been here all night long. I do not think anyone can say that anything has been accomplished by this night session. It is true that the method of keeping the Senate in continuous session may force a vote contrary to the wishes of not only one Senator, but a minority of this body. There are more Senators than one who desire that the time for voting be postponed past Saturday, and perhaps until next week.

Mr. President, I realize full well that a majority can always force its way if it cares to use force; but I doubt very much whether anything worth while is ever accomplished by the use of force in a body such as this.

This is Saturday morning. It is not at all unusual for the Senate to adjourn over Saturday and Sunday, no matter what the busines may be. If members of even a small minority of the Senate sincerely desired—as I am sure they did—that the President of the United States should have the privilege of addressing the Nation before a vote was taken, and that the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] should have the privilege of presenting to the people of America views contrary to those of the President of the United States, which respective objects have been accomplished by both those honored gentlemen; and if even a small minority of this body desired that the people of America express themselves by telegrams or other communications to us in response to the pleas of those two able men, I see no reason why we should rush through with the consideration of the bill by continuous sessions, all night and all day, and all night tonight and all day Sunday.

Probably that could be done; but I am quite convinced that if the minority has sufficient determination it may use force on its side just the same. That is all that is being done. When we come to Monday or Tuesday and then vote, all we have done is to wear ourselves out and make more or less of a spectacle of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, I am voting with the majority on this bill. There is no question about how I shall vote. While I would have the utmost respect for any messages which I might receive, I know of nothing that might be said which would cause me to change my position, unless I am in such a hurry to cast my vote that I am unwilling to give the people of the Nation an opportunity to express to me anything they want to express.

Mr. President, I hope that this body will furnish some means by which we shall not have to remain in session all day Saturday, Saturday night, and Sunday, and vote on Monday or Tuesday. Surely there is enough wisdom in this body, enough of the spirit of cooperation, to dispense with the rule of force against force, and in some measure of intelligence find a solution of the problem with which we are confronted.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to superimpose my judgment upon those who are responsible for the conduct of the business of the Senate. I think we all recognize the fact it is entirely possible, if we are compelled to remain in continuous session through the rest of today and tonight, tomorrow and tomorrow night, that a vote could be delayed until Monday. Having in mind that possibility and that probability, as I see the situation, I proposed the request a while ago that we vote on Monday, to which the Senator from California objected, which he had a right to do. It seems to me the practical effect of that would have been the same as that which may come about, with less exasperation on the part of the Senate than may be likely if we are compelled to continue in session until a vote is had.

I did my best yesterday to bring about an agreement to vote at 5 o'clock in the afternoon. That was objected to. The Senator who objected had a perfect right to do so. I have no complaint about that. I have made another request which has been objected to; and in the hope that we may arrive at some agreement about it at some time and govern ourselves accordingly, and recognizing that probably as minority leader I have no right even to offer a suggestion to the Senate as to what it should do, nevertheless, I now make the unanimous-consent request that at 3 o'clock on Tuesday next the Senate proceed to vote on the President's veto message without further debate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California objects.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 3 o'clock on Wednesday the Senate proceed to vote on this veto message.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California objects.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that at 2 o'clock on next Thursday the Senate proceed to vote upon this veto message.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the same objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California objects.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to suggest that the Senate vote on this measure at 6 p. m. today. I suggest that with the hope that arriving at that hour will meet the objection of all in the Chamber. I appreciate the very fine words of the Senator from Kentucky, the minority leader. I think he will agree that we did everything we could to bring about an agreement. It seems to me that there is little difference between 6 o'clock and a more or less early hour, or even the hour of 4 or 5 o'clock on Monday. Certainly we can debate this matter from now until 6

o'clock tonight, and there is not enough difference for anyone to assert his will if we really and truly agree with the sentiments and words expressed by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. I, for one, would like to have him and the other Members of the Senate know that we all want to cooperate to that end.

I ask once again that we compromise upon this matter and that we continue to debate the pending measure until 6 o'clock tonight, at which time I urge all Members to agree that we shall then vote upon the pending measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Oregon objects.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I share the feeling of the Senator from Oregon in regard to this situation. I also feel that it is the most serious question that has come before the Senate since I have been a Member. This is the first time I have seen the Senate in a state of mind which demands that an issue be voted on within 24 hours. We have to have a unanimous consent agreement to vote in a little over 24 hours or we have to work day and night. That kind of procedure is not good government and it will not lead to good government. If there had been any reasonable amount of debate upon this subject it would be a different proposition, but when Senators must work day and night or agree to vote within 24 or even 48 hours, it is not good government, and it will not lead to any good for this Nation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I dislike to continue to rise and inject my views into the situation, but I wish to emphasize and to elaborate for a moment on the views expressed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

I do not think any of us, regardless of our views of the situation, can doubt the sincerity and the good faith of the Senator from Oregon. I am sure he shares the viewpoint which I share and which I feel every other Senator shares, that the preservation of the dignity, the reputation, and the high standing of the United States Senate is more important than any hour at which we may vote upon a pending matter. If by the course that we are pursuing we lower the high opinion in which we hope and believe that the Senate of the United States is held by the American people, we have lost infinitely more in the sense of government and legislative responsibility than anyone can possibly gain by any point, however important or however petty it may be, in connection with the present procedure. I sincerely hope that all Senators, regardless of what position they take on this veto matter, may have in mind the Senate of the United States, which is made up of 96 men representing 140,000,000 people, the faith of the American people in the Senate of the United States, and their belief that it will not resort as a legislature body, in this critical juncture of our history, to any petty, stubborn assertion of individual rights, merely in order that a point may be gained either by a single Senator, or by any group of Senators, or certainly by any political party.

If the Senator from Nebraska has something else to offer, I shall be glad to yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the dintinguished minority leader suggested Monday as a day on which to have the vote taken, I myself was about to make a bold venture, as he suggested his was, and I was about to restate what I have already stated, namely, that there is very little difference, from my way of thinking, between whether we vote at 6 o'clock on Saturday or at an early hour on Monday. Of course, there is a week end between.

So I should like to suggest another hour. If what the Senator wishes is time over the week end, I should like to suggest the hour of 1 o'clock on Monday as the time at which the Senate shall vote on the pending measure. That certainly would comply with all the arguments that have been advanced, and it seems to me it would be in keeping with the spirit of what has been said.

So, Mr. President, once again I urge that the Members on this side of the aisle agree to a unanimous-consent request for a vote on Monday at 1 o'clock.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to say that in view of the remarks of the able Senator from Oregon and the able Senator from New Mexico, and in the interest of trying to work out something so that the public business may be expedited, I shall not object to the request to have the vote taken at the hour of 1 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I object to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask for the regular order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I regret that all the oil that has been poured out for the past 30 or 40 minutes has failed to still the storms of emotion that are responsible for the Senate remaining in continuous session. For my part, I am ready to vote now, and will be ready to vote at 5 o'clock this afternoon or at 1 o'clock on Monday.

I regret to observe Senators in the state of mind which obtains in the Senate at the present time.

I appreciate the efforts which were made by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] to placate the clashing wills and minds of Senators who have been unable to agree on a time to vote.

I listened with great interest and admiration to the very temperate statement of the senior Senator from Oregon, but there is one statement which he made with which I cannot agree, namely, that there has been no filibuster in progress in the Senate on this measure.

Mr. President, I wonder just what constitutes a filibuster, if a filibuster is not in progress at the present time.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon does not intend to usurp the prerogatives of Noah Webster, but the Senator from Oregon would like to say that his conception of a filibuster would be the carrying on of a discussion going almost entirely into irrelevant matters, after every possible avenue had been explored and every opportunity given to present all the views and arguments which might be pertinent to the issue.

It seems to the senior Senator from Oregon that somewhere between the opening of debate and infinity there might come a time when it might be said that the subject was exhausted.

Of course, I recognize that it will be a matter of judgment as to when we reach that point, and I say to the Senator from Georgia that the senior Senator from Oregon in exercising his judgment will be most lenient and will give all the odds to those who desire to present further debate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am one of those who believe unalterably in freedom of debate in the Senate; but I have been the target for the charge, in times past, that I was guilty of the practice of filibustering, even though the matter I was opposing had not been on the floor of the Senate for more than 4 or 5 hours, and no discussion had been had save on the merits of the question.

I simply wish to observe that if a filibuster has not been in progress on this bill, it is because any debate which occurs and which does not have what can be called a southern Democrat participating in it, cannot, under any circumstances, be regarded as a filibuster. No matter how long or repetitious or irrelevant the speeches may be, a southern Democrat must participate in the debate before it will be defined as constituting a filibuster. I have always complained of this unjust method of definition.

Mr. President, I thought the Senator was merely showing regard for the sensibilities of his colleagues when he stated this was no filibuster. My colleague from Oregon is one of the most delightful of all Senators who have served in the Senate of the United States, and it is within his right to maintain the view which he has stated. However, I remember that when another measure was pending, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] all on occasion arose to denounce any speeches of any length in opposition to the measure which they were espousing; they denounced such speeches as being a negation of the democratic process. They asserted again and again that any speeches or paliamentary tactics which delayed the effort of the majority of the Senate to take action upon the bill which then was pending made a mockery of democracy, was an affront to the Senate and an injury to the country.

What I say here is not critical of any speech which may have been made or

which may be delivered hereafter, because I believe in freedom of debate for all other Senators as for myself. I may say, however, in all kindness, that if there has not been a night-long filibuster by three Senators who have condemned filibusters and who have introduced resolutions to change the rules of the Senate so as to make lengthy discussion impossible, then certainly we have seen a great deal of threshing of old straw which has been heretofore thoroughly threshed on the floor of the Senate for several weeks. The question of deciding what is a filibuster goes back to the old fable of whose ox is gored.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I invoke the regular order, and I propound the inquiry whether the Senator from Florida has spoken twice on the same subject on the same legislative day.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to inquire whether all Senators on the floor are governed by the same rules and whether the principle of fairness requires that all Senators be governed by the same rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would first rule on the point made by the Senator from Georgia relative to whether the Senator from Florida has spoken twice on the same subject on the same day.

In the opinion of the Chair, the Senator from Florida——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry: Can the Chair rule as to what the Senator from Florida was going to say, before the Senator from Florida announced what he was going to say? The Senator from Florida had only addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator from Florida that the Chair will first rule on the parliamentary inquiry propounded by the Senator from Georgia; namely, whether the Senator from Florida has spoken twice on the same day on the same subject.

The Chair rules that the Senator from Florida has spoken twice.

Mr. PEPPER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the fact that the Senator from Florida has spoken twice on the same subject prevent the Senator from Florida from making a motion if he is properly recognized, as he was by the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida can be recognized for the purpose of making a motion.

Mr. PEPPER. Then, Mr. President, I move that the further consideration of the pending bill be deferred until 2 o'clock on Monday next.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REED (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. On this vote I transfer that pair to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who is absent because of illness, is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

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

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] has previously been announced by the Senator from Kansas.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 14, as follows:

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Ferguson	O'Daniel
Ball	George	Reed
Brewster	Gurney	Revercomb
Bricker	Hatch	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Russell
Buck	Hoey	Saltonstall
Butler	Holland	Taft
Cain	Jenner	Thye
Capehart	Kem	Umstead
Cooper	Knowland	Vandenberg
Cordon	Lodge	Watkins
Donnell	McClellan	Wherry
Dworshak	Malone	White
Eastland	Maybank	Wiley
Ecton	Millikin	Williams
Ellender	Moore	

NAYS—14

Barkley	Johnston, S. C.	Morse
Chavez	Kilgore	Myers
Downey	McCarran	Pepper
Fulbright	McFarland	Sparkman
Green	McGrath	

NOT VOTING—31

Aiken	Lucas	Stewart
Bushfield	McCarthy	Taylor
Byrd	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Connally	Magnuson	Tobey
Flanders	Martin	Tydings
Hayden	Murray	Wagner
Hill	O'Conor	Wilson
Ives	O'Mahoney	Young
Johnson, Colo.	Overton	
Langer	Smith	

So the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senate will be patient with me, I should like to make one more unanimous-consent request. I do so in the hope that we can get unanimous consent at this time. I think the Senate should at least have the proposition put to them, because we have taken considerable time now out of the regular order. Without further remarks, I should like to say that I hope Senators will accept it. I now make the unanimous-consent request that the Senate vote upon the pending question at 3 o'clock p. m. Monday next.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I only wish to say that I am in charge of the bill. If anybody wants an early vote more than I, I do not know who he is, and I hope very much the Senate will agree to the proposal made by the Senator from Nebraska. It seems to me it presents the best solution to the problem. I do not like the idea of running through Sunday any more than does the Senator from Oregon. I think we should permit full debate today, and I would hope that we may recess until, say 11 o'clock this morning, and continue the debate this afternoon; and, if we can agree to the unanimous-consent request, that we then vote on Monday at the time requested by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I should like to ask, what is the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to state it again for the benefit of the Senator from Arkansas. I made a final request for unanimous consent to vote upon the pending measure at 3 o'clock Monday afternoon next. I do that with this hope: It seems to me there is little difference between voting at 5, 6, or 7 o'clock Saturday, and voting at an early hour on Monday; and, once again, as I have already stated, in keeping with the sentiments expressed by the senior Senator from Oregon, it seems to me that if we can comply with those sentiments and that request, we should do so. Personally, I am as anxious to continue in session as anyone here.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator correctly?

Mr. WHERRY. I am just as anxious—well—[laughter]. Watch out—I will make a speech here this morning. I am beginning to feel fine. I certainly would not want to impose a speech upon Senators. I am going to say I would like very much to have the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, now that we seem to have almost complete unanimity—I cannot even pronounce the word [laughter]——

Mr. BARKLEY. The word is unanimity.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator will pronounce it for me. I ask that we unanimously agree to vote at 3 o'clock Monday. I hope that this last unanimous-consent request I have proposed will be accepted, because I feel that if it is not, the only thing that can be done is to proceed with the regular order and continue to debate the subject.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield that I may make a request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have not been asked to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio made such a request.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I only wished to ask the Senator from Nebraska if he would add to his request a division of the time on Monday, between 12 o'clock and 3 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly, Mr. President; I had that in mind. Excuse me—will the Senator from Arkansas yield, to enable me to answer the distinguished Senator from Ohio?

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is perfectly agreeable to me to amend the unanimous-consent request. I thought that should have been made prior to this time, but, in all the discussions we have had, some felt that the best thing to do was to merely fix an hour certain. For that reason we did not divide the time. But now I should like to suggest a modification, namely, that from the time the Senate convenes at 12 o'clock on Monday, the time between 12 o'clock and 3 o'clock be divided equally, and that it be controlled for those opposing the veto by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and for those supporting the veto by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], or anyone that side of the question might select.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I regret that this request could not have been made and agreed to at a proper time and at a reasonable time. We have been kept here all night long, listening to a lot of harangue, that has accomplished nothing and to accommodate whom? Many Senators have been greatly inconvenienced by this procedure and this useless all night session. I had an obligation, a speaking engagement in my home State this afternoon. I was perfectly willing, after the President's veto message came, to accommodate everyone and anyone with reference to the time of voting. But I have not been accommodated; the whole Senate has not been accommodated. We have been imposed upon, and no good has been accomplished. Now, after staying up all night in continuous session, we are asked to accommodate those who provoked this situation and insisted upon this procedure. I do not like it.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Arkansas says, but that is—

Mr. McCLELLAN. May I say, Mr. President, it is the truth.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not disputing that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Here we are, right after a quorum call and a vote. I challenge any Senator to deny it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not getting into a dispute with the Senator about that, but what I was about to observe is, that that is water over the dam. It is impossible to fix any time that accommodates every Senator. For 6 weeks I have had a speaking engagement in my State to address the State convention of the Rural Electrification Cooperative Association, some five or six hundred men and women, who will be at Louisville at noon on Monday. I am hoping we may enter into this agreement to vote at 3 o'clock on Monday, notwithstanding that means I must cancel the engagement and cannot fill it. Other Senators have to be disaccommodated by reason of any unanimous consent that is granted. I appreciate and sympathize with the Senator because of the fact that he has had to cancel his appointment in his home town. I have one in my home town, too, that I shall have to cancel. I hope that we may not, because we have been disappointed already, or will be disappointed on Monday, as I will be, refuse to grant the consent. I hope the Senator from Arkansas is not going to object to the request. I earnestly hope he will not. I do not know of anybody that will find Monday so inconvenient a time to vote as myself.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senate will agree to adjourn until Monday and vote at 4 o'clock I will enter into such an agreement. I will not enter into any other agreement. After having stayed here all night, after having prepared myself to make a speech last 10 or 12 hours, I shall not agree to a unanimous-consent request that the Senate recess until 11 o'clock today. I shall object to such a request, and the Senate can stay in session all day today, if necessary, and all night, too.

I will agree to a unanimous-consent request that the Senate adjourn until Monday, and vote at 4 o'clock Monday. But, after having stayed here all night, and having prepared to speak on the subject, I shall not agree to a recess until 11 o'clock today.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I simply reserved the right to object in order to bring to the attention of the Nation the ridiculousness of the procedure which has been pursued here during the past 12 hours. There was no reason on earth why a sensible agreement could not have been worked out by unanimous consent. But, in order to accommodate some whim of someone—and that is all it was—we have been kept here all night. Then at 6 or 7 o'clock in the morning, it is desired that the Senate enter into a unanimous-consent agreement, an agreement which could have been entered into and which should have been entered into, if one was going to be entered into, before the Senate began its night session.

Out of deference to the wishes of the very large majority of my colleagues who were not to blame, and who are not responsible for the disgraceful procedure that has gone on here all night long, I am not going to object, but I want the RECORD to show that I have been inconvenienced, and I want those responsible for this all night session to know that the Senate of the United States has been made to look ridiculous in its deliberation on this, one of the most vital measures that has been before this body.

Mr. President, why has such procedure been indulged? Where does the responsibility lie? Let the blame rest on the shoulders of those who are responsible, and let the country know who they are. I do not propose to take the blame. I have been willing, every minute, to vote on the question, or to agree with respect to any proper request that might have been made. I have not had the opportunity to have my way. Whoever has had his way in what has happened tonight, let him take the blame and the responsibility.

Mr. President, I am not objecting to any reasonable proceedings or requests, but I am not going to remain silent and inactive with respect to this sort of procedure in the United States Senate. Whenever I filibuster I am ready to acknowledge it and say I am filibustering and fight for whatever position I may take. But to go through a procedure such as the Senate has gone through this night, and then have a request made at 7 o'clock in the morning to postpone everything by unanimous consent until next week, in my opinion, does not comport with either statesmanship, patriotism, integrity, or sincerity of purpose. What has happened has been a mockery here tonight, and a lot of cheap demagogery. That is my appraisal of it.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator think whether we stay here 1 minute, 1 hour, 1 day, 1 month, or 1 year will change any Senator's mind?

Mr. McCLELLAN. My answer to the Senator is emphatically no.

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly not.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Those responsible for this all-night session know that what has happened will not change any Senator's mind. It has been a lot of horse play and cheap acting, and the country ought to know it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator spoke of the procedure which has taken place now during 1 or 2 days. The issue in question has been debated in the Senate since January 1.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. Mr. President, I am not going to object because the majority of my colleagues are not responsible for this; they have not had their way about it. We have had to suffer at the hands of a minority, and a very small minority, who have put on this show for some purpose, but not for the glory or to the credit of the Senate of the United States. Under the circumstances, Mr. President, I prefer now to continue until we can have a vote, but out of deference to the great majority of the Members of this body who are not to blame for this situation I shall not object to the request of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho has objected to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Nebraska.

The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

DEATH OF FORMER GOV. HOWARD M. GORE, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I have quite an important announcement to make. I tried to make it yesterday during the course of the proceedings, but under the rules was not permitted to do so. I feel that I should make it now.

It is with genuine distress that I announce to the Senate the death of former Gov. Howard M. Gore, of West Virginia, at his home in Clarksburg.

The work of a truly great man has ended. He served both his Nation and his State with ability and distinction. He was Secretary of Agriculture in the Cabinet of President Coolidge, and was Governor of West Virginia. During the last few years he has been head of the public service commission of his State.

His first interest was in agriculture and those who farmed the land, but he had a keen understanding of the problems of men in all walks of life.

As chief executive of our State he was progressive and independent, and active in his leadership. The roads built under his plans and direction will long stand as a monument to his contributions to the well-being of our citizens.

He was the soul of honor and dependability. He was lofty in thought and in his action. He was sympathetic to the call of distress. He was demanding of all, particularly of himself, in the fulfillment of obligations.

Genial of disposition, pleasant and entertaining in conversation, he was a delightful companion. His friends were drawn to him and held steadfastly to him through their genuine admiration for him, for his ideals and accomplishments.

Now, on the eighty-fourth birthday of statehood, West Virginia deeply feels and mourns the loss of one of her most distinguished sons.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—VETO MESSAGE

The Senate resumed the reconsideration of the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, by way of preface to my discussion, I wish to join in the commendation of the speech made by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. For a great many years the senior Senator from Oregon and the junior Senator from Oregon have been very close friends. In my opinion, there is no more beautiful friendship in the United States than that which exists between the senior Senator from Oregon and the junior Senator from Oregon. We may differ from time to time on certain great national issues. Although we may differ on such issues, as we have differed on the merits of the Taft-Hartley bill, the two Senators from Oregon do pursue a common course when it comes to problems affecting the State of Oregon, when it comes to problems of Oregon politics, and also, I think the record will show, when it comes to agreement on matters of procedure such as were discussed by the senior Senator from Oregon tonight in his very able speech.

My colleague is quite correct when he says that I did not know that he was about to make the speech which he made before he made it; but it came as no surprise to me, even though I did not know of it in advance, because the senior Senator from Oregon is a man who believes in fair dealing. He is a man who believes that at all times minorities, too, should be protected, at a time when strong differences develop between majorities and minorities, and when fatigue, emotion, and hard feelings sometimes color the judgment of men.

I want the senior Senator from Oregon to know that I personally appreciate the great act of courtesy which he sought to perform for me in the remarks which he addressed to the Senate. That is not the first act of courtesy which the senior Senator from Oregon has extended to me. I am sure that on the witness stand he would testify also that such acts of courtesy have been reciprocated many times on the part of the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I wish to discuss for a few minutes my views as to the procedural problem which faces us, because, as so often happens, once differences begin to develop, as they have developed since the unanimous-consent request was made yesterday afternoon, men form very early opinions as to what the facts are in those differences, and sometimes it requires the passage of time for them to come to realize possibly the facts are not what they thought they were.

When my good friend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] submitted a unanimous-consent request yesterday afternoon to vote this afternoon at 5 o'clock on the question as to whether or not the Presidential veto should be sustained or overridden, I objected. As has been pointed out, it was my right to object under the rule, and at the time I objected I gave my major reasons for the objection, which I shall now expound for several hours.

I pointed out at the time that in my opinion the President of the United States had handed down a veto message on the labor bill which in my opinion was sound and unanswerable. I think the record will show that I also stated that in my opinion it was one of the most powerful veto messages that any President had handed down in the history of our country. I repeat that opinion now.

I continued, in my remarks yesterday afternoon, to say that I felt that under our form of representative government the people of the United States should have an opportunity to react to that veto message, and should have an opportunity to make their reaction known to the United States Senate. I still believe so.

Mr. President, I have on my desk certain telegrams which have already started to come in. They are a little indication—and I think it will be multiplied—that the country is beginning to react to the President's veto message. It happens to be an honest opinion of mine that when employers come to analyze the veto message many of them will change their minds on the question whether or not the veto should be overridden. I shall come to that question later in greater detail. I mention it now only because it bears upon the question of why I felt compelled to object to the unanimous-consent agreement which was requested.

There were other reasons, too. As I stated at the time, the White House had announced that the President was going on the air at 10 o'clock last night to discuss his views on the bill and give his reasons to the people of the United States for vetoing the bill. I stated that I thought that it was a matter of courtesy and decency and respect to the President of the United States that we delay action on the veto message over the week end so that it could become a matter of public discussion prior to a final vote.

I think that was a very proper suggestion, Mr. President. We may have our

party differences; we may become involved in the bitterest of partisan disputes, but there is one thing I think we must always make clear to the world, and that is that we all believe in the American system of government which includes, it seems to me, the great duty to show the highest of respect to each one of the three great coordinate branches. Oh, I know there are times in the bitterness of debate when each one of us forgets to the full extent his responsibility to show the highest of respect for the three branches of the Government. Sometimes we as lawyers become somewhat irked at a decision of some court. It might even be the Supreme Court on occasions. I am afraid that in those periods of emotion we are sometimes publicly unduly critical of our judiciary system. That does not help to strengthen that system. We commit error, it seems to me, when we do that. Sometimes in the heat of controversy, even on the floor of the Senate, we do not show the respect for the President of the United States that we should show him. I have been guilty of that on one occasion. I acknowledged it. I made clear on the floor of the Senate my regret for not having shown on that occasion the respect for the President to which I think he is always entitled, I care not who he is. His is a great office; it is a great symbol in the world today.

I do not think we help the standing of America when, either as individuals or as a body, we fail to recognize at all times to the maximum degree that that office is entitled to every possible consideration on the part of us as individuals and as Senators; that we should not act hastily in our judgment toward the man who occupies that position, and that in the Senate we should not, even though we might think it would be to political advantage to do so, act with unnecessary haste on a Presidential recommendation.

So I felt yesterday afternoon, Mr. President—and all I can say is that no one could be more sincere about it than I was then or than I am now—that the bare amenities of the situation, if nothing else, called upon us as one of the three branches of our great governmental system to delay for a time, for a week end, final action on the veto message. I think my objection to the unanimous-consent request on that ground, and on that ground alone, would have been justified. I should be perfectly willing, and I am perfectly willing, to stand before the American people today and say that on that ground alone I am perfectly willing to take their judgment.

But there are other reasons which I think make my objection a sound one. We did not have all the Members of the Senate present yesterday afternoon. I understand that all of them are not yet back in town; and I do not like, Mr. President, to enter into unanimous-consent agreements to limit debate under such circumstances, when the issue involved is of such great importance to the Nation, until I feel that full and ample protection has been given to all my colleagues in the assertion of their rights. So I objected, Mr. President, because I felt that there was no need for the great haste exhibited. Certainly by the beginning of the week we could find out one way or another, either by their presence or through telegrams or by telephone, what the wishes of the absentee Senators might be in regard to this matter.

I think, Mr. President, we owe each other courtesy also. I think decent comity should flow from each one of us to each other. It was my opinion that it would not be fair to hasten through a vote on this measure this afternoon at 5 o'clock, when, so far as I know, and no proof could be given to me to the contrary—at least, I could not find any assurance of it—that some of the absentees did not, when they left town, have any understanding that an attempt would be made to pass upon this message on Saturday afternoon at 5 o'clock.

I recognize, Mr. President, that on a great many issues the making of a unanimous-consent request does not call for checking with absentees. I know the rules do not make it necessary. I know that on a great many issues it really does not make any difference. But here we are dealing with one of the most vital issues to face the Eightieth Congress. It is so recognized by all of us and by the country. So I felt, Mr. President, that it was only fair that an opportunity be given for sufficient delay in the final vote on this message so that the absentees would have opportunity to return here, try to arrange pairs, or make their wishes known as to whether they felt we should proceed to vote on Saturday afternoon in their absence. On major issues such as this, if an absent Senator, for example, made known that he did not want the vote to be taken in his absence, I would never hesitate to object in his behalf, even though he then were absent.

But I also wish to say that in my opinion there is a responsibility upon each one of us, even though we may disagree on the merits of issues, to lean over backward in trying to be fair and highly courteous and respectful of the rights not only of those who agree with us but also of those who disagree with us.

So I objected to the proposed procedure on that ground.

I objected on another ground, and I wish to be very frank about it. I think my colleagues who have worked with me on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare this year will testify without exception that from the beginning of the hearings to the final meeting of the committee, at which time the committee voted to report the Senate committee bill, not a single time did I fail to extend to my committee colleagues the utmost consideration and cooperation in the honest endeavor that each and every one of us was making to come forward with a labor bill which we felt would check the abuses of labor, which abuses most certainly need to be checked and should be checked, and to the extent that they can be checked by legislation they should be checked by the Eightieth Congress.

That was the spirit in which I worked on this labor legislation. The record will have to speak for itself as to whether I made any worth-while contributions to that end; but if Senators will check the legislation I have introduced during this session of Congress and will check the work of the committee and will take note of the specific suggestions, motions, and proposals I made, they cannot escape the conclusion that a good many of my suggestions were woven into the fabric of the Senate committee bill.

Mr. President, as the RECORD shows, when the bill came to the floor of the Senate and certain amendments were made, and when the bill went to conference and certain additions were made, I could not see my way clear to vote for the measure, because in my judgment it would not work; because in my judgment it had become legislation which was administratively unsound, and because in my judgment it would result in a serious impairment of the rights of both labor and industry. I shall discuss that part of my speech later at greater length.

I am simply seeking now to lay the outline as to why I have seen fit to object to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement. I could not agree to the legislation, but I make these points because I know that in a controversy such as this there are those who momentarily will overlook the true position of the junior Senator from Oregon in regard to labor legislation.

I feel that this legislation is so bad, and I feel that the President's veto message in regard to it is so sound, that I thought at least a week end should be devoted to public discussion of the legislation and the veto message. I think great good will come of such discussion, because had we voted yesterday afternoon and had the die been cast, so to speak, at that time, all of us know that there would not have been nearly as much public discussion as there will be as a result of the objection I filed and, through it, the focusing of public attention on the message and the bill, because if and when this bill is enacted into law and becomes operative, it is very important that as many of our people as possible understand what it entails and what some of us think are its weaknesses, and prepare themselves—if those of us who object to it are proved to be correct, and I think time will prove us to be correct—to make the adjustments in the economic field which will have to be made in order to meet the various emergencies and dislocations which in all probability will develop in our economic order as a result of the application of the legislation to specific instances.

Let me make myself perfectly clear at this point in the RECORD in regard to another position of mine concerning legislation of which I may not approve, and that is that once such legislation is actually placed on the statute books and has the standing and the sanctity of law, there is no man in this body who will be more insistent than I upon its enforcement and who will refuse to condone in any respect or to any degree whatsoever any refusal on the part of anyone to comply fully with its terms.

We cannot have Government by law in this country maintained on any other basis. Of course, my deep feeling about that, that once it takes on the sanctity

of law it must be carried out, is not going to change human nature. Thus, as I have said before, if a law becomes unpopular with a large minority of our people who believe that it is inherently unjust to their legitimate rights, it is going to be very difficult to administer such a law, but so long as it is on the books I think every effort should be made to enforce it, or as I have said in some decisions, whatever forces of Government are available and necessary to be used in an attempt to enforce the law should be used.

I have applied in many arbitration decisions and many War Labor Board decisions what I thought were mistaken laws, laws which I would not have voted for had I been in Congress at the time, laws which I felt did not strengthen Government by law, and I have said to a good many unions, in many decisions, words to this effect, "I did not write the law, but it is the law, and this union is going to comply with the law under its contract as long as this arbitrator is arbitrator under the contract."

Mr. President, I make this point because I want the RECORD to show that no one need worry about my countenancing any violation of the law. I can hold my beliefs as to what I think some of the administrative and enforcement problems of the law are going to be without in any way countenancing any practices which seek to defeat the administration of the law.

I cannot throw away years of very practical experience in the field of labor relations. Sometimes I am a little amused at one typical criticism which one of my background gets now and then, namely, "Did you ever meet a pay roll?" "Did you ever run a business?" "Do you really know anything about the practical affairs of business?"

I cannot understand that attitude. Of course, I did not come up with a silver spoon in my mouth. For a good many years the two most important dates in my home were the interest date and the tax date. I learned something about the value of money in that training. So the practical businessmen who are inclined to criticize me for a lack of practical experience know very little about my background, apparently.

For many years on our farm we sought to meet the economic wolf at the door, so to speak, when farm prices were depressed, but for everything we had to buy the prices were very high. So, from the standpoint of practical life and understanding in the field of agriculture, I have had experience.

Mr. President, that is not all. I know what it is to drive a mail wagon, because in high school and college night after night I met trains until 4 o'clock in the morning, and went to school the next day. I think it gave me a little practical understanding of the problems of labor.

Then there were the harvest fields in the Dakotas, and the cement mixers, and many other menial jobs, which I think gave me a little practical understanding of the worker's point of view.

There were years of college administration. I am surprised at the number of businessmen who seem to think, apparently, that administrative work in the field of education is no practical problem. Running a law school for 13 years during a period of depression, when budget problems were severe, was quite a business, and I think involved the requirement of some business acumen.

In my own private affairs, my own financial interests, small as they are, have not left me in any vacuum as far as the practical problems of business and our economic system are concerned.

There have been years, and hard years, of very practical work in the field of labor relations, when in case after case, amounting to several hundred, I had a baptism in the practical problems of American business. I became as familiar as anyone possibly could with the financial problems, the financial books, the profit-and-loss problems, and the economic problems confronting both employers and labor in those cases. I think out of that experience, to a very large degree, I demonstrated a practical knowledge of the problems of the business, that proved in many instances of great help to the businessman involved in the cases. I am willing to say that one will look in vain to find any businessmen who have tried cases before me, who would share the view of the critics, that I lack a practical background or understanding of American business and its problems, or of American labor and its problems.

It is not particularly agreeable to me personally to say these things, but I say them because the suggestion is made in some quarters that I am a perfectionist in regard to labor legislation, that I am making the approach to it of a theorist and ex-college professor; although, let me say, in defense of my former profession, that, contrary to a general opinion, members of university faculties are very practical people. In fact, I have found in my work that some of the most impractical are to be found in the field of business and not on our college faculties at all. But be that as it may, I call attention to these things only because I want to have the record as clear as I can make it that I have not sought to make any theoretical approach to the labor legislation. I have sought to work for legislation that would work. I have sought to promote through the Senate legislation that would meet the practical problems of employer-employee relations; and I do not think this bill will do that. I think that as American industry comes to study it we are going to find that more and more of its members will come to share my view.

But, as I said, I thought it very important that American industry and the people generally be given an opportunity to consider the legislation over the week end, and therefore I am willing to run all the risks of unpopularity among certain colleagues in the interest of focusing attention on the legislation and the veto message by my objection. I am perfectly willing to assume the full and single responsibility for it. The fact is I was not alone. The fact is I do not stand alone in the fight which I am making this week end. There are other Senators in this body who share my view, and who, to the extent of our physical endurance, are going to see this fight through to a conclusion, if we are able to hold out that long; and I think we can.

I digress from that point for a moment to say that I agree with the senior Senator from Oregon that it is not good practice for the Senate to hold sessions on Sunday, unless some really great national emergency compels it; and the session on this coming Sunday, which apparently seems to be in the offing, is not necessary; it would not have been necessary, if an attempt had not been made to force a majority view upon a minority, which was asking only for what I think was a reasonable postponement of final vote on the question. To the extent that I can, tomorrow, during the second speech which I shall make on this subject, which undoubtedly will fall on the morrow, I shall endeavor to move to the extent possible upon a spiritual level. But I think it is a great mistake for the majority in effect to force a Sunday meeting upon us, simply because we will not bow down and accept the unanimous consent agreement to vote on this day, Saturday, at 5 o'clock.

I think the senior Senator from Oregon was entirely correct on another point that needs to be reemphasized, and that is, this type of struggle and controversy in the Senate really is unnecessary. It is bound to produce strains. Oh, yes, I know in the cloakrooms we can laugh it off, but it does not produce, as the senior Senator from Oregon implied in his very excellent statement, that cooperation among us and that brotherly feeling which I think ought to exist even though differences of opinion exist. There is a little difference here, though, Mr. President. Some one very aptly put it, I think, when he said that this situation was really based upon the law of force, the force of the majority imposing its will upon the minority. At least I do not think it is the most kindlly approach that could be made to the solution of the problem; and I regret it. I think it is too bad. I think we ought to move above it. In fact, I think what the Senate of the United States needs now, Mr. President, more than anything else, is a period of relaxation. We need a good fellow get-together. We need to wash the slate clean of this controversy. I think we need to recognize that it should not have arisen in this way. I think there is a pretty good case in support of my view on that subject. Let us look at the RECORD.

I wonder if the Chair knows of any time—I cannot recall one—during the present session when we thought a situation was of such an emergent character that immediately upon its being laid before the Senate, as was the President's message yesterday afternoon—when I say "immediately," I mean within certainly a very short time, a matter of minutes, but I cannot recall now how many minutes—the request was made to vote upon it as of today at 5 o'clock, and when that request was objected to, lo and behold, it was made clear to those of us in the minority that we were going to stay in session until such time as a vote could be had.

I was shocked at that. I think it was very unfortunate, because I cannot for-

get my experiences in the Senate of the United States in connection with unanimous-consent agreements and filibusters. I know my own record on that subject, too, Mr. President. No one in the Senate, not even my good friend the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is more aware of my position on filibusters than I am myself. I shall vote any time for a rule of the Senate that will make filibusters impossible. I shall vote also at any time for a rule which will prevent the abuse of the unanimous-consent agreement, because, as I have said before, I think it is very important that we keep this body a forum in which there shall be untrammeled, unlimited debate on the merits of an issue.

Ours is the last great citadel in the world, among all the parliamentary bodies in the world, in which that precious right is still guaranteed. But it is going to become an empty right, Mr. President, if a dominant majority by way of a unanimous-consent agreement procedure, places a minority in a position of feeling that if it acts to protect the right of unlimited debate it is guilty of some great wrong against the Senate. I think in the present session of Congress the unanimous-consent agreement procedure has been overused to such a degree that its use is in fact, not in theory, threatening the principle of unlimited debate on the merits of issues in the Senate.

The Chair knows my conviction concerning unanimous-consent agreements procedure. The Chair will recall that in the Seventy-ninth Congress, when I was leading a fight, in cooperation with my senior colleague from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] in behalf of protecting the interests of the lamb producers of Oregon from what we knew to be the very arbitrary and unreasonable action of OPA, after failing in all negotiations with the OPA I decided, upon my own motion, to keep the Senate informed daily of the developments of the OPA relations to the lamb industry in my State. I received a considerable amount of criticism for that, and a great deal of good-natured kidding in the Senate. I knew it would become monotonous. I meant it to be monotonous, because through the monotony itself I hope to make crystal clear the position in which the lamb producers of my State found themselves—and I did. But it was during that debate, Mr. President, that I had my first run-in, so to speak, with this practice of limiting debate through unanimous-consent agreements.

The Chair will recall that the issue then pending before the Senate was of such importance that it resulted in the practice of yielding the floor at the close of the day to some Member of the Senate so that he might have the floor and make a speech at the beginning of the next day. It had been the practice, after obtaining the floor under such a unanimous-consent agreement, to yield the floor again to colleagues in the Senate so that they might do what is so frequently referred to as the floor-chore work—the introduction of bills, the presentation of memorials, the submission of material for insertion in the RECORD, and the making of brief speeches on subjects foreign to the one pending before the Senate. That had been the common practice.

However, on this particular afternoon when the junior Senator from Oregon obtained the floor to make his daily presentation of the most recent facts in connection with the situation of the Oregon lamb market, he was startled by the statement from the then holder of the floor that he would be yielded 5 minutes of time. I knew that that was not consistent with untrammeled debate in the United States Senate. I protested, but to no avail. So I used the time allotted, with the statement that when I obtained the floor in my own right I would discuss the procedural principal involved. The next day I did so at some length. I think the RECORD will show approximately a 45-minute discussion of it, in which I stated that it seemed to me the whole practice of unanimous-consent agreements for limitation of debate had a great many dangers in it, and that I felt that each request should be weighed very carefully, because as a general rule I would thenceforth object to unanimous-consent agreements, which I did.

The RECORD will show that during the Seventy-ninth Congress I objected many times to unanimous-consent agreements. I tried to be reasonable about it and I think I was, because the RECORD will also show that on some occasions when it was perfectly clear to me that it was the will of every other Member of the Senate to vote on an issue, and if I had satisfied myself that that was true, I gave consent; but each time I made it very clear that so far as I was concerned each request would have to be carefully scrutinized, and that unless I was satisfied that it was a highly meritorious request I would object. That has been my policy.

In the last session of Congress a great many of my Republican colleagues, shall I say, were not opposed to the position I had taken. I think I could go even further and say that on a good many occasions they welcomed my objection, because they felt that it gave them some advantage, although my objection was based upon my feeling that the use of the unanimous-consent procedure should be limited.

In this session of Congress I think the majority leader, the whip, and the chairman of the policy committee could be offered as my witnesses, who, under examination, would have to testify that the fact is that I have been extremely cooperative in regard to working out unanimous-consent agreements. I have been cooperative, although it has seemed to me at times that some unanimous-consent agreements which were entered into when I was absent from the Chamber were not particularly fair to me—not that any Senator thought for a moment about my interest in the matter or intended to be unfair; but I think the result was that they were unfair.

Take, for example, the recent incident involving the National Science Foundation bill. We had before us the Kilgore amendment which called for a geographical distribution of funds on a certain percentage basis, and we had before us, my amendment which called for the application of a similar principle, but with some variations.

I was called from the Chamber one afternoon on a very important conference over the coffee cups in the Senate restaurant below, the conference dealing with the Swan Island Shipyard in my State. A unanimous-consent agreement was entered into on the floor of the Senate to take up the Kilgore amendment the next day, which was Friday, at 1 o'clock. That was perfectly proper under the rules. The effect of it, of course, was to place my own amendment in a more difficult position, because as yet I had not discussed my amendment, although I had hoped to do so that afternoon at some length, and I had my material on this desk for a discussion of it. It was simply one of those unfortunate and unhappy circumstances for which no one was responsible so far as any wrong doing was concerned; but the agreement was entered into without a quorum call. The rules do not require it. However, my amendment was prejudiced. I stated at that time, and I stated at a meeting before my Republican colleagues, that I thought we ought to be more careful in exercising requests for unanimous consent agreements in order to make certain that the rights and interests of no Member of the Senate should be prejudiced thereby. I suggested that as a practice a quorum be called in order to provide that safeguard.

I think that what I am saying, Mr. President, is important as a background for an understanding of my position on unanimous-consent agreements. With my view of them—and I am entitled to that view—and with the cooperation which I have extended to the Republican leadership in the Senate in this session of Congress, I think it is fair from the standpoint of the rights of a minority, that we not insist on any unanimous-consent agreements. It really is not necessary. The one suggested yesterday afternoon with regard to a vote on the veto message today was not necessary, in view of the fact that it involved the one piece of legislation to which in this session of Congress I have devoted more time than to any other, and it involved a piece of legislation on which I have a very deep conviction.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALL in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. What is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the able Senator from Oregon feel that he is discussing the merits or demerits of the question before the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very glad to answer that question. I think it is a very fair question, and I am sure it is asked by my good friend from Indiana in a very kindly spirit of wanting to cooperate with the junior Senator

from Oregon. My answer to the question is "Yes." I think it is necessary for me to lay the foundation which I am laying in my introductory remarks for my discussion of the merits of the veto message.

But, to go back, Mr. President, to the point I was making, I think that in view of the fact that I have these views on unanimous-consent agreements, it was due me, although no one need recognize the obligation if there be one, not to press for such a unanimous-consent agreement on this particular piece of legislation, in view of the cooperation I have extended on unanimous-consent agreements and other matters in this session and in the last session also, for that matter, and knowing at the same time that this whole practice of unanimous-consent agreements is tending to become abused in the Senate; in fact, it is putting into practice—a loose practice, I admit—a form of limitation of debate in the Senate.

I want to clear up another matter, because there is an ugly rumor afloat in the Senate. It was mentioned to me by the President pro tempore, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] early last evening by way of a question which he put to me in conversation, and a similar question was put to me by my good friend the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. I think I state the question accurately when I say they wanted to know from me if at any time I had agreed to go along with the unanimous-consent agreement to vote on this bill at 5 o'clock on Saturday. I told them I had not, which is the truth, Mr. President, so help me God. I take my oaths very seriously, and I am very glad to spread on the RECORD what I know about any basis for any such rumor.

For a good many weeks, I have been planning that at the close of the Washington schools my family and I would take a little trip by automobile to Madison, Wis., for a family reunion picnic which is to be held tomorrow. In fact, it has been a topic of considerable conversation. It has been looked upon by us in the family as not exactly a vacation, but somewhat as a reward for the success of each one of us in the family, including the parents, in passing some very difficult courses this year. I have been going through the fifth grade and seventh grade and sophomore courses in high school, and I am afraid it has not been at all times with very good grades, from the standpoint of my preparation of answers to questions. I had quite forgotten all I knew about plane geometry, and I discovered that percentages with fractions were a little far removed from the ordinary work of the Senate. But we passed. In fact, those who have actually received their grades did pretty well. So this little trip was a sort of reward. On Thursday—time is slipping so rapidly that I for the moment find it difficult to recall the date—before I left the floor of the Senate, I spoke to my good friend, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] about whether he knew what the procedure would be if the President should send a veto message. Of course we did not know on Thursday. The best guess was that he would, but we could not tell with absolute certainty.

So the Senator from Nebraska—and I am giving my best and honest recollection of the conversation—said, "Well, WAYNE, I just don't know. I suppose there will be an attempt to vote shortly after we get the message, but it is hard to tell." He said, "I understand that some of the men on the other side are away, and there is some question as to whether they can get back. For example," he said, "I understand that Senator THOMAS of Utah is in Europe, and that if the Senators on the other side think the vote is going to be close enough, they may try to get him back. I simply can't tell you."

I said "I want to go to Wisconsin with my family; but, of course, in view of the fight I have made on this bill, I certainly cannot justify not being here when a vote is taken. So I guess I had better cancel my trip."

He said, "I don't know how to advise you. I think you are probably right; probably you shouldn't take any chances."

I said, "Very well; I will think it over."

Mr. President, I shall relate two or three other conversations. I wish to make very clear that in that conversation there was no discussion of any position on any unanimous-consent agreement. There was no request as to whether I would go along with any agreement, if such an agreement were offered. It was simply a discussion, as I have recalled it here, in which I laid my problem before the Senator from Nebraska. Let me say that he was most courteous and friendly about it.

Then I went over to my office. I was doing some work, prior to going home, and I got a telephone call from my good friend the Senator from Nebraska. He said, "Wayne, I think I ought to tell you that I have just had a talk"—I think he said "with Mr. MARTIN"; but I may be in error about that. If he did not have it directly with Mr. MARTIN, he had it with someone who had had a talk directly with Mr. MARTIN. I cannot recall which of those two alternatives is correct; but it is either one or the other. "And," he said, "It looks as though we are going to have a veto. No one knows it for a certainty, but everything points that way. MARTIN says he thinks the House will get the veto message over to the Senate by 1:30, if it comes down from the President." He said, "If that happens, I don't see how we can miss taking it up." He said, "I think an attempt will be made to get a vote before the week end is over."

I said, "I haven't decided what to do yet."

He replied, "You certainly probably are in the best position to know whether the boys over on the other side are going to make any long speeches on it."

I said, "Ken, the truth is, I don't know. They haven't told me what their pleasure is in regard to it."

Mr. President, that was the sum and substance of that conversation. Again I emphasize that I am sure that KEN WHERRY, of Nebraska, will testify to the same thing, namely, that there was no discussion that by any stretch of the imagination involved any unanimous-consent agreement or any commitment on my part to any unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. President, in view of my position on unanimous-consent agreements, the leadership of my party in this body always puts to me, point blank, "Will you or will you not go along with such and such an agreement?" Mr. President, here was a conversation that had been initiated by me in seeking information from my leadership as to whether it thought a vote on this matter would be pressed before the week end was over, because if there was not going to be any, I wanted to know whether it would be safe for me to go to Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I want to make very clear at this point that, so far as I know, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] does not hold to the view that I made any commitment on a unanimous-consent agreement. He will have to speak for himself. I think it was a matter which he took for granted because I was raising a question as to whether or not it would be safe for me to go to Wisconsin. Any intimation to me that any offer was being made by anyone to bind me to vote on this question before the week-end would have immediately brought from me my objection.

In the telephone conversation with the Senator from Nebraska the matter was left hanging in the air again as to any definite information on the basis of which I felt I was justified either in going to Wisconsin or canceling my trip. So I tried to get in touch with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], but unfortunately I had lost the little book of telephone numbers, and could not reach him. I found that perhaps the operator could help me. I could not reach him before I left my office, but by the time I reached home the Senator from Ohio very kindly called me. My recollection of that conversation, which I think the Senator from Ohio will also verify, is that he, too, said no one could be sure. He said, "I do not know what they are going to do." He laughed and said, "I think probably it will be a little risky if you want to vote on the question, but you know the Senate."

Mr. President, at no time in that conversation was there any suggestion that I was to go along with any unanimous-consent agreement. Had the request been made to me I would have objected, as I did when it was made on the floor of the Senate, because I have felt that the veto message should receive very careful and thorough debate on the floor of the Senate In fact, for some time I have been checking on the congressional history of vetoes. I forget the exact date, but I think probably 3 or possibly 4 weeks ago I called upon the Library of Congress to prepare a memorandum for me, based upon an analysis of whether or not at the time of the Constitutional Debates, and on down through our history since the Constitutional Debates, there was any basis for the view that under our check and balance system a

veto should be given the benefit of a presumption, as we say in the law.

It is a little mooted; there are arguments both ways on it, but I cite that at this point—and I shall come back to it later in detail—to witness the fact that it has been my intention over a considerable period of time to call for a thorough debate of the veto message, if one should be handed down.

Mr. President, I think that background is important in weighing and appraising rumor as to my seeking information as to what my party leadership thought the chances were, first, that the bill would be vetoed, and, second, if it were vetoed, whether we would vote on it before the end of the week.

I wish to make clear again, Mr. President, that to my knowledge neither the Senator from Nebraska nor the Senator from Ohio takes the position that I made any commitment to them. I do not know how a rumor like that got started. I shall refer to another telephone conversation in a moment; but I do not know how a rumor like that got started. I presume it was started when feelings were running a little high, and out of the knowledge that someone had that I had talked with the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Nebraska along the lines I have discussed; but really out of the whole cloth, has come sufficient cloakroom discussion of this matter so that my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon, and the senior Senator from Michigan, put the question to me. Each one of them, when I told him there was no foundation in fact for the rumor, said, "That settles it with me." As I have said before, I repeat, a man's coin in the Senate is his word, and no one is more jealous of his word than is the junior Senator from Oregon.

Again, Mr. President, it does shed a little light on the laxity which I think is developing in our attitudes toward unanimous-consent agreements, because if there is a desire to ascertain whether a Senator is to be a party to a unanimous-consent agreement, it is very simple to find out whether he is going to be a party to it or not by asking him point blank. I do not know of any other way of entering into such an agreement, and if I want to know whether or not a Senator is willing to go along with a unanimous-consent agreement, I am going to ask him in so many words whether he will or will not.

No such question was ever put to me by any Member of the Senate, no commitment was ever obtained from me by any Member of the Senate, and the first request for a unanimous-consent agreement that was put to me was put on the floor of the Senate yesterday afternoon, when I rose at my place and objected to it.

I entertain the hope that that statement will clarify a matter which has hurt me very deeply, because it is not pleasant to have anyone in the Senate spread a rumor which is not based on fact. Certain of my colleagues in the Senate do not know me very well, but those who do, know that if any request were ever made of me to go along with a unanimous-consent agreement, and I said I would, no power could possibly get me to change my position, unless I were released by those asking the consent.

I may say, Mr. President, that contrary to the notion of some, I do not like to be looked upon as a constant dissenter with any of my party organization in the Senate of the United States; it is not a pleasant position. I know that my views on republicanism do not coincide with the views of many of my colleagues within the Senate; and there are minority views within the Senate; and so I find myself frequently voting contrary to that of most of my Republican colleagues. Whether they are sound Republican views, or whether they represent the views of a majority of Republicans in the country, can not in my opinion, be determined in the Senate of the United States. I think that issue must be determined on the campaign platforms, I think it must be determined by the rank and file of the Republican voters of America. With perfectly good nature I may say, Mr. President, that I am willing to take my chances in that forum. I think there is a place for my views in the Senate of the United States, on this side of this aisle, just as I think there is a place for the views of those to whom we refer as more conservative; because our party finds its greatest strength and its only hope for progress in hammering out a middle-of-the-road pattern, a fair and conscionable compromise between and among our views. I have a little hunch that in 1948 some of my critics, possibly some even in the Senate of the United States, at that time, in the heat of a campaign will say, "Well, after all, he is not such a bad fellow; we do not agree with him, but we cannot question that he, too, believes in this form of government of ours; such differences as we may have with him are pricipally differences of degree; he, too, believes that the only way we can check the spread of leftist philosophies, Fascist and Communist concepts of government, is to make this system of ours work." That is the answer; and that means there is going to have to be a give and take in modifying the views of each one of us in the common interest of a sane and progressive Republican Party. There have been others, in times gone by, who have run into some disfavor now and then with men in their party who may be at a given time in a position of party leadership; but I submit that the Republican Party in the long run has never been strengthened by disciplining the progressives within it; and such will be proved to be true, in my judgment, in the years of the immediate future. I think we ought to stop it. I do not say that out of selfish personal interest, because, as I have said once before in the Senate, after all, it is difficult on the floor of the Senate, at least, to discipline a man who refuses to be disciplined. Oh, the leadership may keep him off committees; it may adopt a policy whereby not a single Republican Senator from the Pacific coast can have a seat on the Foreign relations Committee of the Senate; but four from the Middle West, and three from the east coast can have. The leadership can keep a Senator from the Pacific coast off; I suppose it could even be done in the name of party discipline, but I do not think that is the way to build a strong party, I think it is a short-sighted policy.

Likewise, Mr. President, one in the Senate who bears the label "progressive" can be denied a seat, for example, on the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, even though that Member of the Senate, along with three of his colleagues frequently referred to as progressive, submitted on the floor of the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress a series of four amendments, as I did on behalf of myself and three of my colleagues, and made speeches in support thereof. Those amendments, I think it must be admitted, were very instrumental in passing the so-called full-employment bill of 1946, and after the submission of the amendments and the acceptance of the principle they embodied then by the other sponsors of the bill, these four so-called progressive Republican Senators became cosponsors of the bill proper. Yet each and every one of those Senators were kept off the very important committee called for to be appointed under that act, which committee was appointed, because the power was there to impose that type of discipline. I do not think that is the way, however, to build a strong Republican Party in the Senate, Mr. President. I do not think such action lends itself to the maximum of cooperation within the party, particularly when note is taken of the fact that two exceedingly able, and very fine, and certainly qualified, freshmen Senators were put on that committee.

Oh, there are many other interesting little disciplines that can be used against the minority. Not only can minority members be discriminated against when it comes to appointments to Senate committees, but they can be discriminated against when it comes to the appointment of party organization committees. They can be kept off such committees. It can be made very sure that little or no recognition will be given to them or prestige added to them, but the vacancies are filled as they arise, by appointment of very able, fine men, but men who are new in the Senate and junior in seniority, and use can be made of the seniority rule when maybe it meets one's purpose, or maybe not.

I mention these things because I think they have a bearing on the procedure which is now followed in the Senate. I suppose the mentioning of them shows that I am a pretty human person after all. But it is not the personal aspect of it that is important. The important thing is that it is not good for the Senate to have developed within it on the part of anyone, such a situation—I am not alone, Mr. President, because too many men have come to me, including freshman Senators in the present term of Congress, and said, "We want you to know, Wayne, that although we are not voting with you on some of these questions, we do not like what is being done to you and some others on our side of the aisle."

The time will come, Mr. President, when those men will not be freshman Senators and will be more inclined—and I certainly understand their present position—they will be more inclined, I am sure, to express themselves in regard to the question I am raising.

No, we do not need discipline in the Senate, Mr. President. We merely need to recognize that we have some sincere and some honest differences of opinion involving issues which are raging throughout the country, and which will continue to rage for some years to come, because of the fact that great social turmoil exists here and abroad and the globe around, and we need all points of view in the Senate consistent with principles of our form of government. We need the utmost of cooperation among all of us, freed from any feeling that because some do not share the view of others, disciplinary measures must be resorted to.

I am making no charges against any individual. I am just baring my heart on this subject for the good of the party.

Because a majority of men in my party in the Senate may not share my predominant points of view on various issues does not change the fact, Mr. President, that millions of Republicans in this country do, and they are being heard from more and more, month by month. I think they are going to make clear—pretty clear in 1948 and very clear in 1952, that if the Republican Party wants their continued support it had better move over into the middle of the road and follow the course I seek to follow.

With that as a background, a little different light is shed, Mr. President, on my feelings concerning the action which has been taken on the proposed unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday. I think it was entirely unnecessary, for the majority to insist upon that agreement, in view of the sincere and deep and honest convictions which I hold and which some others, too, hold with regard to the inadvisability of that agreement. I believe that a real test of the bigness of a majority is its ability to safeguard the rights and respect the prerogatives and privileges of the minority. We must not forget that. We should remember that we may be in the majority today but in the minority tomorrow. We may be in the minority today and the majority tomorrow.

Mr. President, the matter of human minds acting upon highly volatile and controversial issues is a very interesting phenomenon.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MALONE in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. BREWSTER. The very able Senator from Oregon is carrying on a very valuable discussion of this measure in very extended fashion, which equals the record of many men who have held the floor in this Chamber. I am sure that he does not wish to take any advantage of others who have competed with him for a long-distance record in discussion. It is necessary, in order to qualify under the championship rules here, that a Senator shall not avail himself of any aid in carrying on the discussion. I do not know whether the Senator from Oregon has in mind to qualify in this long-distance derby, but the rules require that he shall not lean upon the desk or have any other material aid.

I call this matter to the attention of the Senator not for the purpose of disrupting his discourse or disturbing him, but in order that he may realize what has been the practice which has prevailed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that my good friend from Maine is in error in his point of order. I shall be perfectly willing to have the Chair rule upon it, and, after the ruling, discuss it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that there is no written rule on the subject.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I refer to the precedents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that there is nothing in the rules or precedents with respect to leaning. The Senator is merely required to stand.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I can assure the Senator from Maine, from the sensation on the bottoms of my feet, that I am standing.

Another word or two with regard to the filibuster. I am not one to deny for one split second that the debate which is going on in the Senate of the United States is a form of filibuster. As I stated earlier, I say that as one who is opposed to filibusters, and who will vote to outlaw them from the Senate; also as one who will vote to surround the unanimous-consent agreement procedure with greater protection so far as minorities are concerned.

I wish to call attention to a few elements of this particular filibuster. This is not a filibuster which seeks to prevent a vote on this measure. It is not a filibuster which seeks to kill a given measure by consuming whatever period of time may be necessary until other Members of the Senate agree to withdraw the legislation in its entirety. Those are the typical filibusters. This is only a little battle over procedure. We are ready to vote on this measure on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, or any other day beginning with Monday. We have given our reasons why we think a delay for that period of time is justified.

No; we are not filibustering to kill a measure, in the sense that it shall not come to a vote. I think it was entirely unnecessary from a procedural point of view for the majority to force the minority into this position. I am willing to take my share of the responsibility for the filibuster, judged from the standpoint of the reasons which I have advanced as to why I think it is necessary and justified. I am willing to let the American people judge as to who is truly responsible for the spectacle which the United States Senate has put on for the past several hours. I do not think it was wise or desirable. It certainly was not necessary for the majority to say, in effect, "You are going to take it and like it." We shall see. We do not like it. We dislike it very much. But if our forces hold out—and I believe they will—I think we shall be able to take it.

I think that on the basis of public discussion which will take place in this country in the next 48 hours on the veto, the message, and on the procedure in the Senate, the American people will have a much clearer understanding of what is in hand and involved in this labor bill than if those of us in the minority had not been willing to "lead with our chins," so to speak. Of course when we are in the minority that is one of the prices which has to be paid in politics. One cannot "lead with his chin" without its getting hit now and then. Usually, sooner or later, a knock-out blow is delivered politically. The important thing to remember about most men who fight a minority fight is that that does not bother them. They know that that is reasonably certain to be the final price for the exercise of independence of judgment on issues as the minority sees them.

Of course, we must have a sense of humor, Mr. President, with reference to some of these blows on the chin. We also must have a sense of humor about some of the blows delivered beneath the belt. It certainly is true that politics frequently is not a very nice game; yet we all know that we must be willing to stand up and be counted. We must be willing to exercise honest independence of judgment on the merits of issues as we see them. We must be willing at times, under our representative system of government, to act against and vote contrary to the wishes of a temporary majority. I discussed that at some length on June 5, Mr. President, and I shall not now repeat it.

After that speech I got a little wallop, not very high up in the anatomy, figuratively speaking, but as in most such instances political bruises will heal in due course of time as the people come to understand the facts in regard to the subject.

In that speech of June 5 I pointed out that a considerable amount of pressure was being placed upon me both by labor groups, employer groups, and public groups generally, to take a position favorable to their respective points of view on the labor bill. I pointed out that from the communications which I had received it was being made pretty clear to me that apparently the majority of the people in my State as of that particular moment were of the opinion that I should vote for the labor bill. I explained in that speech that it was a very difficult situation in which to find oneself. I think the speech will show that I used the phrase that it was not "politically comfortable." But it raised the question, as I see it, under our representative form of government, as to what my real duty was. Was it my duty to vote on the basis of a Gallup-poll approach to the question and vote for a bill which I thought was bad legislation and would not carry out the objectives of the people of my State as they sought those objectives in labor legislation and which contained provisions which, in my judgment, were unconstitutional? Or should I take the position that I should be willing to

run the political risks involved and subordinate personal selfishness to the responsibility and obligation of voting on the basis of what I honestly believed and knew to be the fact in regard to the particuluar bill?

In that speech I developed the theme that it is the solemn obligation of a Member of this body to vote in accordance with what his best judgment tells him is legislation which will meet the desires and the objectives of the majority of his constituents, and then be willing to go before those constituents and give them his reasons for so voting. If the reasons are not sufficient to change the point of view they held prior to the time they learned of them, then, under our representative form of government, it is the privilege and the right of the constituents to defeat such an officeholder at the next election.

I said in that speech that that was the position I had taken and intended to continue to take in the Senate; that I believed it was the position that, upon reflection and analysis, my constituents would want me to take, and therefore, on the basis of that principle, I would not vote for the labor bill. However, in the course of that discussion I mentioned the telegrams I was receiving from home, particularly from employers who were urging me to vote for the bill. I related—and I think it is obvious from the RECORD that I did so in very good humor—the activities of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in my State in recent weeks, functioning through one of their advisers, a man by the name of Jacob Allen, who had been making speeches before audiences in Oregon—so far as I knew, largely chamber of commerce audiences. In fact, I read into the RECORD a newspaper item from the Capital Journal, published in the capital city of my State, reporting that Mr. Allen, the representative of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, had asked his auditors to urge upon me by communications that I vote for the bill; and in my speech I pointed out that he had been reasonably successful, at least, in getting a good many such communications sent to me. I read one example from a very good friend of mine in the lumber industry—in fact, not only a good friend of mine but one of my active and ardent supporters in the campaign. In that telegram he advised, in effect—I do not quote it exactly—that he believed that my constituents—farmers, lawyers, working people, and the public generally—wanted me to vote for this legislation.

Mr. President, I had been confronted with quite a mass of communications of that type, not many of which were worded in such a friendly vein as that in which that particular friend of mine worded his; but inasmuch as he is one of the outstanding leaders in the lumber industry in Oregon, I knew that a telegram going to him and making perfectly clear that I was not going to vote for that legislation would undoubtedly receive considerable circulation among lumbermen in the State, or I thought the chances were good, at least, that he would make clear to a good many employers with whom he came in daily contact that it was not going to do any good to try to get me to change my mind on this bill. So I sent him a telegram, and I put my reply in the RECORD for June 5. In that telegram I said:

> Thank you for your wire. Deeply regret that I cannot vote for conference report bill. I am satisfied that it is unsound legislation in its present form. However, if I knew that every person in the State of Oregon wanted the bill passed, I would still vote against it because my obligation in this job is to vote for what I consider to be sound legislation in the public interest and not for legislation which a temporary majority may think it wants when you and I know that a majority of the people of Oregon have not analyzed the weaknesses and limitations of this legislation. I can assure you that it is not an easy decision for me to make because I agree with you that undoubtedly a majority of my constituents think they want this legislation. However, what they really want is legislation which will check the major labor abuses and bring about a maximum degree of industrial peace. Unfortunately this legislation will not accomplish those objectives and hence I cannot and will not vote for it.
>
> Regards.

Mr. President, that is a fairly clear statement of an unequivocal position.

But, Mr. President, in my speech, after I read that telegram into the RECORD, I went on to say some other things; and I wish to read them into this RECORD before I make a comment regarding the use which was made of my telegram by the press.

I said, following the reading of that telegram:

> Mr. President, it is not at all pleasant, it is not at all politically comfortable, to find oneself in a position in which he is satisfied that the majority of the people of his State have been so propagandized with regard to a piece of bad legislation that they really believe it is the piece of legislation that should be passed.
>
> On the other hand, as I read the constitutional debates on the basis of which this Government came into being it was not contemplated that under a represenative form of government a man in the Senate of the United States should vote in accordance with the dictates of a majority as determined by a Gallup poll or some other method of determining a temporary majority opinion. Rather, the basic theory of representative government requires a Senator to assume the solemn obligation, intended by the founding fathers, and vote for legislation which he believes to be in the public interest, even though he knows that as of that moment a majority of his constituents would vote contrary to his judgment. Then it is his obligation of political leadership to stand up and tell his constituents why he took the action which he did. If his reasons are not satisfactory to them then it is their opportunity and privilege to remove him from his seat at the next election. I think the people of my State want me to represent them by exercising an honest independence of judgment on the merits of issues as I find them back here. They want me to weigh the views of those constituents who write and wire me, but cast my votes free of political pressures and unmoved by threats of loss of political support if I do not do the bidding of some pressure groups.

Let me digress a moment from that part of the speech—and I shall return to it in a moment—to say that I tried to, and I think I did, make as clear as the English language can make clear that it is our responsibility to weigh and carefully consider the views of our constituents who write and telegraph us. That is one reason why I think there should be a delay over the week end, for the final vote on the labor bill. First, I think our constituents have a right to make their views known to us, I think we have an obligation to give them that opportunity, and we have a duty to weigh and consider their views before we vote.

It has been said that it is not probable that any Senator would change his views on the basis of any home representation. I do not accept that, Mr. President. I think there is always the possibility that some point of view, which either has not been presented to us, or has not been presented to us in the light of all of its facets, might change our opinion. If that possibility did not exist, then we would be in a bad state of affairs in representative government in America. But I know the possibility does exist.

We have seen it illustrated on the floor of the Senate many times. On issues which appeared to be hopelessly lost, with no chance of saving them, we have seen an aroused public opinion on those issues present itself in such a clear form by way of giving to us unanswerable arguments, and pointing out to us things we had never thought about, that votes were changed in the Senate of the United States. So I say that with that possibility, of which I think we could almost take judicial notice, we owed it, and we still owe it, to the people of America, to give them an opportunity over this week end to consider the veto, and make known to us their views. Then, in accordance with the principles I enunciated in the June 5 speech, so far as I am individually concerned, I feel it my obligation to give full consideration to those views, and I shall then do what I think is best from the standpoint of passing sound legislation on the basis of the merits of the case, modified in whatever way my action should be modified by the merits of representations made to me by the people of my State and the American public.

In keeping with the spirit of that principle, I said this also in my speech on June 5:

> It is only on the basis of that principle of representative government, Mr. President, may I say from this platform today to the people of my State, that I desire to remain in the Senate of the United States. It was on the basis of that principle that I ran for this office and the people of Oregon elected me on the basis of that abstract principle. I believe they will keep me here to apply it.

I digress at that point to say how well I remember how I enunciated that principle in my campaign in 1944 before audience after audience. Neither one of those campaigns of mine in 1944 was an easy one. I campaigned against very able men. I campaigned against men who were just as determined to win as I was determined to win, with the result that I think we had a campaign, both in the primary and in the general election, which provided the State of Oregon with some very interesting discussions, not only on the then pending issues, but on the entire system of representative government. Before audience after audience I said in that campaign that I was

not making any political promises, that I did not want to go back to the Senate of the United States with my hands tied with any commitments.

I now say verbatim, Mr. President, what I said in many and many a speech. I would say to my audiences, "If you don't want me to exercise an honest independence of judgment on the merits of issues as I find them, and in accordance with the evidence as I believe it to be after careful study of the issues, then don't send me to Washington." Almost invariably my audiences would applaud vigorously that statement. Then I would laugh and say, "Yes; you like that, in the abstract, but let us be frank about it; you are not always going to like it, when I come to apply it to specific issues"; and then they would laugh, because they, too, recognized how truthful that statement was. But I said, "After all, in this campaign we are going to have to decide some great issues in the next session of Congress, so controversial in nature that if I laid them out on this platform tonight before this audience, we would not find the audience breaking up into two divisions, those that agreed one way or another way on these issues; it is not so simple as that. We would find a great variation of views among people in this audience, because the most of these issues are not either black or white; these issues have a great many mixed issues within them." They understood that, and I told them I thought it was a mistake for men to run for the Congress of the United States on the basis of a lot of promises and pledges as to what they were going to do in regard to specific issues, as times change too rapidly. Issues themselves take on new colorings, as human, economic, political, and world events change. My people understood that. It is no surprise to a majority of the people of the State of Oregon that I took the position that I took on June 5 on the floor of the Senate. That did not come as news to them, but what did come as news to them, Mr. President, was a very limited and a taken-out-of-text report of that speech. What happened? The press of Oregon carried an AP dispatch in newspaper after newspaper. I do not know how much of the speech the AP sent out, but, in newspaper after newspaper, this part of one sentence, and only this part of the speech, was quoted, and this partial sentence was taken out of the telegram which I sent to the Oregon Lumberman, in which telegram I sought to make as clear as I could that I felt this was bad legislation. And here is the part of the sentence, the only report of the speech carried in the newspaper stories, as follows:

> However, if I knew that every person in the State of Oregon wanted the bill passed, I would still vote against it.

I do not have to tell Senators that that partial sentence quotation used up a considerable amount of printer's ink and newspaper print in discussions of it in following issues of the newspapers, and in some instances the comments were highly critical, and were made prior to getting a full statement of the speech. Of course, as is usual under such circumstances, once a statement taken out of context such as that was taken out of context is printed in the press, the damage is done; there is not much that can be done about it, then and there, at least. It simply presents one with another case of where he must roll with the punches. But, Mr. President, that is what I had in mind when I said that sometimes the blows one gets in politics do not even get up as high as the chin, because, even if the full sentence had been quoted, an understanding of my position would have been much clearer; and, of course, if the remainder of the telegram had been quoted, a very clear understanding of my position would have followed. Let us look at the full sentence again:

> However, if I knew that every person in the State of Oregon wanted the bill passed, I would still vote against it—

Not "period," Mr. President, not "period." No period follows the word "it." The word "because" follows it. The very seeing of the word "because" should have served clear notice that reasons for, explanation of, clarification of, the first part of the sentence was about to be set out in the second part of the sentence. That is exactly what I did—

> because my obligation on this job is to vote for what I consider to be sound legislation in the public interest, and not for legislation which a temporary majority may think it wants, when you and I know that a majority of the people of Oregon have not analyzed the weaknesses and the limitations of this legislation.

That is the full sentence. That is why I said I was going to vote against the legislation, because I knew, and, as the sender of the first telegram knew, most of the people who were telegraphing me, most of the people who had been stirred up to put the political heat on me, acting on such advice as Mr. Jacob Allen, of the United States Chamber of Commerce, had so kindly given them, had not studied the weaknesses of the legislation; and it was my conviction, and it is now my conviction and firm belief, that not only a majority of the people of the State of Oregon, but an overwhelming majority, once they come to understand the weaknesses of the legislation, will take the position that I did exactly right in voting against it.

I am willing to give it a test, Mr. President, and I am going to test it in 1950, God willing. Do Senators know what I think? I think many of the businessmen who fell for Mr. Allen's United States Chamber of Commerce advice are going to be right in there backing me up in 1950 because they are just as interested as I am in perpetuating the American system of government with its economic democracy which rests upon sound principles of capitalism. They know when the dice are down, so to speak, that I can always be counted upon to fight for that form of government and its economic system of a private property economy.

So, I said in my speech on June 5 that when the United States Chamber of Commerce representative got to my home town of Eugene, Oreg., and suggested to my friends in the chamber of commerce there at their luncheon meeting, where he spoke, that he hoped they would send up a little prayer for me, that in effect—and I paraphrase, because I do not have the clipping before me—that in effect he hoped I would see the light and vote for the bill, I was indeed reverently moved. There are not very many progressives in America who have the United States Chamber of Commerce beseeching the Almighty to be of aid to them. But I am not fooled by it either, Mr. President. I believe, however, that in due course of time the businessmen who have temporarily—a majority of them, I think, in my State—been convinced that this labor legislation ought to be passed because they believe it will further their objectives, will express their approval of the action I have taken in opposing the legislation. So I said in the June 5 speech:

> If we cannot exercise that type of independence of judgment in representing the people of our States, then I want to say that I do not desire to serve in the Senate of the United States if I have to serve subject to yielding to the type of pressures that management and labor groups are seeking to bring to bear upon the Members of the Senate for votes on this labor bill. I have a hunch, Mr. President, that after the present wave of emotion passes and after the people of my State come to see in actual operation the effects of such legislation as is now being proposed, if it is placed on the statute books, a large majority of them will come to thank me for exercising the independence of judgment which I intend to exercise in casting my vote against this bill.

It has been interesting, Mr. President, to note the change in reaction in my State which has occurred since the newspapers have come to understand the full text of my speech of June 5. Early in the controversy the Portland Oregonian, one of the two largest newspapers in the State, very much exercised about the partial sentence which had been quoted out of context by the Associated Press, wrote an editorial saying that if such a hypothetical situation existed as I raised, then I should not go on the floor of the Senate and vote; that I should resign. That was a pretty strong statement, was it not. I read the editorial, and I am still here, and I intend to stay here until the end of my term, again, may I say, God willing. I will have an interesting little fight to come back, too. Far be it from me to predict what any newspaper might do in a campaign, but the Oregonian supported me last time; in fact, the then publisher of the Oregonian was the person who first suggested to me that I run for the position. He is now editor of the Denver Post, but he left behind him at the Oregonian a good many other men, Mr. President, who I am satisfied upon a further reflection on the full text of my speech cannot be nearly so disturbed about it as that editorial would seem to indicate. As I have made clear to them, it was their privilege to write the editorial; the people of Oregon will have to be the judges.

However, there have been other editorials of quite a contrary nature, based upon the full text of the speech. The Oregon Journal, a great democratic newspaper, opposed me in the campaign, both in the primary and in the general election—and how they opposed me. Some of their editorials, as they ex-

pressed, were dipped in my blood. But that was a campaign. Newspapers, too, sometimes become partisan, as the distinguished present Presiding Officer of the Senate [Mr. DWORSHAK] would agree, in private conversation, at least, because he is fully familiar with the problems which confront a newspaper editor in a political campaign, both as an editor and as a candidate. What newspapers say in a campaign when they have taken a partisan side and have decided to support certain candidates involves matters which require one to "roll" with the punches. There is no campaign in Oregon now. I shall send for the editorial from the Portland Journal. I wish I had it here. In fact, I shall be speaking long enough so that it can be brought to me. In essence, the editorial quoted at length from the speech and sustained the position which I took.

There is another newspaper in the State which published an editorial on the subject. I want to refer to that editorial too. The newspaper to which I refer is the Oregon Statesman, of Salem, Oreg. The publisher and editor is an outstanding public servant, with a record of public service in keeping with the name of his newspaper, the Oregon Statesman. He is a former Governor of the State, a fine man, a Republican progressive, according to my definition, a man of great independence of judgment. When he does not like some position I take in the United States Senate, he tells me so in unequivocal terms in an editorial in his newspaper; and when he approves of something which I have done, he likewise defends my position.

So in this instance, Mr. President, he, as did the Oregon Journal, wrote, from my standpoint, a splendid editorial in which he discussed the political theory raised by my remarks. He said, in answer to the position taken by the Oregonian, that a Senator who stands for such principles should not resign, but continue to exercise that type of judgment and carry his position to the people of the State in the next election, which is exactly what I intend to do.

I mention these things, personal though they may be, because they illustrate a part of the problem which has confronted some of us who have opposed this legislation. It has not been a popular stand in many quarters. In fact, taking the position which I have taken assures one of being hit from both sides—or shall I say all sides?

I did not say anything at the time, because I knew exactly what he had in mind and how he meant it, but I was interested in a little point which my good friend the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] made in his remarks some hours ago. As I understood him—and the RECORD will have to speak for itself—he referred to me as one who has sincerely and conscientiously performed many services for labor in the United States Senate. The Senator from Kentucky did not mean to be amusing, but it was an amusing statement. It was not an accurate statement. He had no intention of being inaccurate. Unquestionably he was thinking in terms of the fact that I have been opposed to this bill, and that in my opposition to the bill I had performed a service for the legitimate rights of labor. In my judgment the real service which I have performed has been for the public interest.

When I say that his statement is somewhat amusing, I mean this: Labor does not like my labor legislation proposals. I can supply ample evidence of that fact. Labor is highly critical of each and every one of the proposals I made in each and every one of the bills which I have introduced in this session of Congress. They have told me so, just as employers have given me their criticisms because, according to their sights, I have not gone far enough with legislation which would be drastic and punitive in nature.

I am used to that position too, because one cannot decide the number of labor cases that I have decided over the years, hand down decisions based upon the evidenciary record before him, and document his decisions to the evidence, as I always have done, and not find, in a labor case, that usually both sides, if it is a fair decision, do not like the decision. Whenever I found myself in a position, Mr. President, where one side liked it and the other side did not, if it was a complicated case involving many issues, I was worried about the decision, because I was afraid that I must have overlooked something in the record. More than once, even after the decision was handed down, I have gone through it again to make certain that I was right about it, because I found that one side liked it and the other side did not.

These cases, as I said earlier in this debate when I was asking questions of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], are not simple little legal cases. They are cases which go to all the economic problems that confront a plant or an industry or a transportation system. If they are decided on the evidence it will usually be found that on some issues the employers are right and on some they are wrong; on some issues labor is right and on some it is wrong. So I say I am used to being in a position where I get kicked by both sides. But untenable certainly is the charge that I am supposed to be prolabor because I have always spoken out against restrictive labor legislation which destroys legitimate labor rights for the simple reason, as the President said in much better language than I can use—though I shall use my faulty language—that we cannot legislate good faith; we cannot legislate into the hearts of men the desire to work cooperatively. They must do that for themselves.

In 1936 or 1937, when labor in my State was guilty of the most inexcusable abuses—rank racketeering, goon-squad methods, broken windows, burning of box factories, a program of direct action that can never be countenanced in this country by labor or any other group if Government by law is to be preserved—the people of my State became so aroused that a sufficient number of signatures were put on an initiative petition to have a referendum vote on an antipicketing bill.

It will be remembered that in 1936 and 1937 there was an epidemic of such laws. Several States passed them, but no State passed a more stringent one than did Oregon. Oregon passed it by a large vote. Oregon would not have passed it except for the votes of the workers and their families. It was perfectly obvious that the law was put on the books not only by citizens who were nonworkers in the sense of not belonging to organized labor, but it was put on the books by the votes of workers and their families, because workers are, first, Americans. They were striking at a practice which they knew was indefensible.

I was on the spot in those days, too, Mr. President. When one fights for government by law he frequently finds himself on the spot because he must hold out against a temporary majority opinion. I was dean of the law school of the State university, and I was interested in some labor arbitration work at the time. I studied that bill and took to the air after that study and the completion of my analysis. It was during the campaign for passage of the bill. I argued against its passage. To indicate how successful I was in my argument, Mr. President, the bill passed by an overwhelming majority.

What were the heart, the core, and the essence of my argument? I said, "This law is unconstitutional, and for these reasons." I took the position then that I take now, that we cannot justify passing legislation which we believe to be unconstitutional.

That speech can be evaluated in any way in which one wants to evaluate it. It can be said that I just had a lucky case. It can be said that my hunches proved to be true; or one can be more kind and say that my analysis of the unconstitutionality of the law was sound, because some little time after the law was passed, in the case of a similar law in another State, which was taken as a test case, the United States Supreme Court declared such legislation unconstitutional. Interestingly enough, the major points that I made in my radio speech against the Oregon antipicketing law were contained also in the theory of the Supreme Court's decision.

The heat was put upon me after that radio speech. I was paid by the taxpayers. The usual argument was made that no member of the faculty of the State university should be tolerated who took such a radical position as to argue against that law on constitutional grounds in a radio hook-up throughout the State.

Mr. President, I like the type of radicalism which is based on defense of the United States Constitution. That is pretty good radicalism, and we need more of it in America. It is quite a different type of radicalism from the philosophy of those leftists who are making so much propaganda these days to the effect that there is no hope for our economic system, that capitalism is doomed, that we cannot have a workable political and economic democracy in America. That is dangerous radicalism because it is based upon the notion of a state economy and a totalitarian government. The movement of the leftists in America in my humble judgment is a move which would take

us away from the guarantees of the United States Constitution, away from the individual rights and liberties of every person as guaranteed to us under the Constitution and its Bill of Rights. That is why I say to my progressive friends, "Have no part in the leftist movement in America, because if you become fellow travelers with them, even for purposes of political expediency, you betray true political progressive action," because, Mr. President, we cannot retain our representative form of government if we pay homage in any degree whatsoever to police-state methods or to the totalitarian philosophy of the leftists. They are of the same stripe, regardless of whether they are Communists or Fascists. Their end-object is the same, namely, to substitute the state as the dominant force operating the economy of the country, and to make the individual subordinate to the police-state methods of the leftists.

Mr. President, I have counted myself out, as clearly as I can, of any charge of "having any truck" whatsover with the leftists, and I shall continue to do so, because there is not a Member of the Senate who is more determined than I am to make democracy work. The leftist has no program of democracy. Whatever his brand of leftism, whatever label he wears, he stands for totalitarianism. That is a battle in the world today. We cannot afford to ignore it in the Senate of the United States, either. We cannot afford to play into the hands of propagandists who constantly agitate and seek to give the impression that we cannot make democracy work. I know we can. I know we can by the type of cooperation between and among all of us and all groups within our country, a type of cooperation for which President Truman pleaded so ably in his magnificent veto message.

Mr. President, we hear much about Americanism. Today I offer the President's veto message as my exhibit A of Americanism. In due course of time I wish to read to the Senate again the principles of the veto message because I do not think they can be read too frequently. The principles of the veto message show the President's understanding of and appreciation for the legitimate rights of labor and employer. They show his recognition of the fact that we are not going to have economic stability in the United States by enacting legislation which he believes, and which I believe, and which the opponents of this proposed law believe, will stir up labor strife rather than prevent it, and will intensify feelings of class consciousness in the United States. I think that is a serious matter.

Let me say, Mr. President, that I am very happy to see the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] return to the Chamber. I am very fond of him. I like his independence of judgment—a quality of which I have been speaking in defense of so much during the past few hours. I hope to hear from him later today as to his views in regard to this great veto message of the President of the United States.

But, Mr. President, to get back to the point I was making, I think the Senate of the United States and the people of this country should not overlook the dangerous implications of any growth of class consciousness in America. When there are classes pitted against classes, when there is instilled into the hearts of the working people of this country in any considerable number the feeling that a piece of legislation is unjust to them, as the President indicates in his splendid message, we make it much more difficult for true collective bargaining to be carried on between employer and employee. After all, when all is said and done, the most effective answer to our labor problems is to get into the minds of American emyloyers and workers an understanding of the fact that it is not possible to have true collective bargaining, good-faith relationships between the two, if one of the parties believes that the other has been given an unfair advantage by way of legislative weapons. That is what was wrong with the Wagner Act. That is why ever since 1937 I have taken the position that the Wagner Act should be amended. That is why in this session of Congress I proposed a series of amendments to the Wagner Act, and I am willing to stand on those proposals, and each and every one of them is opposed, so far as I know, by the major labor leaders of the country.

If we can be successful in sustaining this veto—and I still have hopes that we may—I shall proceed, as I stated yesterday, to offer anew and in revised form, based upon the constructive work that was done in the Senate committee, specific proposals for amendments to the Wagner Act.

I do not accept the indefensible proposition, Mr. President, that unless we pass the particular piece of legislation which is now before us for consideration there is no chance of labor legislation at all at this session of Congress. That is up to us. That is up to the majority party in this session of Congress. They cannot get away from the fact that if they have the will to, they can get through both Houses of the Congress within 10 days a new series of labor bills.

I am not one to say in any spirit of personal pride, "I told you so," but, Mr. President, on March 10 I made a 4-hour speech, I believe it was, on the floor of the Senate, setting forth my views and proposals for labor legislation. At some length I pointed out why I thought it was a mistake for us to pass an omnibus labor bill. At a later time I put into action the suggestions I made in that speech in opposition to an omnibus labor bill by moving to break up the Senate bill into four separate and distinct bills.

Many Members of the Senate told me I was right about that as a matter of principle and sound legislative policy, that I was wrong about it from the standpoint of Republican Party policy, because the majority party in the Congress had decided as a matter of policy that they would go for a one-shot bill, as some of them referred to the omnibus bill.

They had their way, but I think all the dangers and limitations of an omnibus bill which I pointed out in my March 10 speech are to be found in the final bill, and I am sure we could have avoided many of those dangers if we had taken these problems up, issue by issue. I am inclined to believe, in the light of developments, that we probably could have saved some time, too. Perhaps not, but I think so.

Mr. President, this legislation is not the answer to a preventive move so far as the development of class consciousness is concerned. I predict it will be provocative thereof.

I wish now to return to the editorial in the Portland Journal. I like it, Mr. President. After we read so many bad ones, we like to hear from somebody once in a while who recognizes that we are trying to do an honest job, acting in good faith, and doing what we think is best for the country.

I do not deny being human, so I like this editorial, in a way. I have liked it for many reasons. I suppose I like it because the newspaper in which it appears, which has not always written in such a kindly vein, did so at least on this occasion.

The editorial reads:

SENATOR MORSE AND THE VOTERS AT HOME

Oregon's junior United States Senator, WAYNE MORSE, probably read in his school days the motto of a famous frontiersman, David Crockett. Said Davy in the heat of the War of 1812:

"I leave this rule for others when I'm dead: Be always sure you're right, then go ahead."

Senator MORSE awoke quite a bit of comment, not all of it flattering, when in the Senate debate on the Taft-Hartley labor-control bill he declared: "However, if I knew that every person in the State of Oregon wanted the bill passed, I would still vote against it."

Pretty ostentatious affirmation that. Remindful of Fitz-James in Scott's Lady of the Lake:

"Come one, come all! This rock shall fly
From its firm base as soon as I."

But, just for the record, the single phrase quoted wasn't all that Oregon's junior Senator said. He had received from a constituent in Oregon (he said in the Senate on June 5) an appeal to join the Senate majority in support of the Republican labor-control bill. Senator MORSE then quoted his answer.

I think that is pretty good journalism, Mr. President, not only because I like it, but because I think it is just, fair, and decent. I continue the quotation from the editorial:

"Deeply regret that I cannot vote for conference-report bill. I am satisfied that it is unsound legislation in its present form. However, if I knew that every person in the State of Oregon wanted the bill passed, I would still vote against it because my obligation in this job is to vote for what I consider to be sound legislation in the public interest and not for legislation which a temporary majority may think it wants when you and I know that a majority of the people of Oregon have not analyzed the weaknesses and limitations of this legislation. I can assure you that it is not an easy decision for me to make because I agree with you that undoubtedly a majority of my constituents think they want this legislation."

More could be quoted. Enough has been repeated to suggest that Senator MORSE didn't intend merely to be pigheaded. The old copy books used to be filled with maxims about standing by the right whatever the cost. To stand out, one against all, creates the presumption that the total just can't be that wrong. But the indirect suggestion that Senator MORSE had better resign sits less well than his stanch opposition against

a labor bill in which a lot of other thoughtful people have found flaws. There will be plenty of time before Senator MORSE comes up for reelection in 1950 to exonerate or condemn his judgment on the labor bill. Whether the former or the latter, the voters will say it—with votes.

I agree with the last comment, Mr. President; I am perfectly willing to have the voters of my State "say it—with votes." I am not different from anyone else. If I am not truly representing the long time interests of the people of Oregon, they should remove me in 1950. But they are entitled to know, and I shall give to them, my views as to why I think the position I have taken on labor legislation is in their best interest, whereas the legislation that the President vetoed would not be in their best interest.

Now, Mr. President, I have this to say about the legislation, in addition to what I have already said. The RECORD very clearly shows, I think, my position on this legislation. As I have publicly indicated on several previous occasions, I shall vote to sustain the President's veto, because I see very little in this legislation that will improve and encourage the use of collective bargaining procedures and I see very, very much that will hamper it and even destroy it. And I must emphasize again, as I have so often in the past, that whatever tends to weaken or retard collective bargaining is bad, not only for workingmen and labor unions, but for employers and the whole country, because it will drive down wage and living standards, it will reduce purchasing power, and sooner or later it will throw us into another serious economic depression.

Ordinarily, having already made my position clear, I would not feel called upon to make any further comments at this time. However, events, since I last spoke on this subject, have seemed to me to emphasize and confirm the accuracy of my conviction that this bill is a very bad, unsound piece of legislation. I am now more than ever convinced that it will be impossible to administer it effectively and efficiently to reduce labor troubles, and that its over-all effect is going to be to destroy labor unions, to cause working men to resort to strikes and violence, to protect their rights and working standards, and that they will not go to the Board for elections or for correction of unfair labor practices by employers. In fact, Mr. President, I think one of the most likely dangers of passing this legislation is that strong unions will boycott the Board, that strong unions, because they do not like the procedures of the act, because they believe that the administration of those procedures will result in the destruction of their legitimate rights, will simply say to an employer, "You will have to bargain with us independently of any Board action." If he says, "Oh, no; I won't; you have got to go through the Board," I am afraid that there will be many unions that will say, "But we won't go through the Board; we aren't going to come under the jurisdiction of the Board." That is not going to lead to much industrial peace, either. John L. Lewis, of the United Mine Workers, has never gone through the Board. They do not ask the Board for any certification. As I say in this speech, I think that this legislation would cause a spread of that technique. I do not think that is going to be very good for American industry.

On the other hand, Mr. President, the bill will encourage antilabor employers who want to beat down the wages of their employees and it will encourage Communists and extremists in the labor movement. I do not think I would be doing my duty either to the people of my State or to the Senate if I let such legislation become law without raising my voice at every opportunity to oppose it and to point out its disastrous consequences as I see them.

I have never had the slightest doubt in my own mind that the bill did not deserve to become law. But I must confess that I was not always entirely comfortable in that conviction, because I did recognize that the bill was supported by many Senators and Representatives whose records certainly belied any anti-union bias. I recognize further that the proponents of the bill—because I worked with them on the Senate side, and I am sure that is true on the House side also—want to do what they think is in the best interests of labor and industry and the country as a whole. My difference with them is that I think they fell far short of the mark in their efforts to accomplish that purpose. I recognized that I could be wrong and they could be right about the bill. But we now have the views of others, including the President, whose public spirit and sincerity I also respect, as to the disastrous consequences of the bill. We now have the opinion of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and of such sincere and informed public servants and experts in labor relations as William Davis, Frank Graham, Lloyd Garrison, George Taylor, Edwin Witte, and Nathan Feinsinger, and many others whose names I have previously placed in the RECORD.

These people have no prejudices against labor legislation; they have no axes to grind; they have no personal, selfish interests that will be served if the bill does or does not become law. Nor are they men whose principles and judgments can be warped by pressure from private groups whose votes they need, or by other political considerations or party discipline. These men speak from free conviction and a sense of public duty and responsibility. Moreover, they represent the very top flight of men, who, serving as public members of the War Labor Board, held the balance of power between labor and management in developing and administering the country's successful wartime industrial relations policy.

Before I conclude, Mr. President, I want to read some of the outstanding decisions these men wrote during the war. They were great civilian generals. They made great contributions on the home front to a successful prosecution of the war. One cannot consider the magnificent production record that industry and labor made in the war without recognizing that those men, who now testify against the bill, made major contributions to industrial stability at home during the war. Later I want to read some of their opinions, not only in tribute to them but also because the opinions themselves, I think, show very clearly the types of problems involved in most labor disputes, and merely the reading of their decisions, I think, will make clear why the bill will not work, and will make clear how sound the President is when he says in his veto message that it is an unworkable bill.

Referring again to these experts who have made public statements in opposition to the bill, after an analysis of the bill, I wish to say that they have had almost unparalleled experience and responsibility in labor relations; they know what they are talking about; and, let me emphasize, they represent neither the narrow interests of labor nor of management; they have no political pressures on them; they speak only for the public interest as they see it.

Their unanimous view is that this bill is unworkable, inequitable, and unsound. They all agree that, on the whole, the bill will be a handicap to good management-labor relations, that it will be detrimental to the national welfare, and that it provides no real answer to the basic problem that gives concern: What shall we do to prevent or minimize the causes of strikes, especially strikes that endanger the national welfare?

As Senators know, the National Catholic Welfare Conference includes Catholic bishops all over the country. I do not need to dwell upon their high purposes. Certainly these Catholic bishops are opposed to communism, as I am; certainly they would be among the first to support any measures that will stamp out or minimize Communist influences in American life; certainly they have had practical experience in combating such influences. Their opinion is—and I am reading from an official statement they have issued, which, as I understand, has been sent to the President, the chairmen of the Senate and House Labor Committees, and the members of the conference committee:

> The provision in the bill which would deny official certification to a union unless all of its officers declare under oath that they are not members of the Communist Party and that they do not favor the forceful or unconstitutional overthrow of the Government is likely to lead to serious confusion. Likewise, it will prove to be very embarrassing to the great majority of sincere anti-Communists in the American labor movement.

Let me digress a moment at this point. Imagine how men like John Lewis, William Green, Dan Tobin, Philip Murray, and Walter Reuther will feel at being required to appear before a notary public to testify under oath that they are not members of the Communist Party and that they do not favor the forceful or unconstitutional overthrow of the Government. How would Mr. Avery, of Montgomery Ward, feel, or Mr. Charles E. Wilson, of General Motors, or Mr. Henry Ford? These gentlemen of management are not required, however, to suffer that indignity; only the leaders of labor are under suspicion.

Without any reference whatsoever to the leaders of industry just named, but because the thought comes to mind at this point, let me say that I think there

is some danger of communism in America. About an hour ago, or half an hour ago, I expressed my views as to why I thought we must be on vigilant guard against leftist movements. I think there is danger of facism, too. That is the point I wish to make. It will be our form of fascism. It will not take on the pattern of European fascism in toto.

But, Mr. President, there are certain misguided American businessmen. I am satisfied that they are a very small minority of American businessmen, because my contacts, experience, and association with American businessmen convince me that they are just as desirous as are members of this body or of the labor unions, the farm organizations, or any other group in the country, to preserve our American system, a system which recognizes the right of the individual, a right which will be lost if we have any form of economic fascism in America.

We have some bad actors among big business, and little business, too. We have men in this country who really are saying that there is no way out of the economic situation in America except through a depression. Their argument is that we should go through the economic wringer, devaluate the dollar, adopt a form of repudiation by cheapening the dollar, and by suffering all the economic hardships and cruelties which will be visited upon the masses of our people through another depression.

These few Fascist-minded businessmen—and I say that advisedly—who are arguing for a depression unknowingly, unwittingly—I believe, and hope, in most instances—are falling for a Fascist line. The end result if they should prevail would be the same as though the leftists were to prevail.

When we come to this bill, its Communist-control provisions are not going to work. That is not the right approach to the handling of either communism or fascism, except that so far as fascism is concerned it does not offer any procedure for control. It is supposed to equalize the procedures effective upon industry and labor.

But let me go back to the statement of the Catholic conference, because that is a most important and genuinely unbiased opinion of the effects of this bill. The statement says:

> Simply by refusing to sign the required affidavit, a single Communist officer could prevent an otherwise decent and legitimate union from being legally certified for purposes of collective bargaining. This provision of the bill is calculated, therefore, to play into the hands of the Communists, who thrive on confusion and disorder. * * * The bill reveals an uncritical tendency to try to solve complicated problems of industrial relations by an oversimplified legalistic approach; an approach which, in the present instance, is rejected as worse than useless by the vast majority of those who have had practical experience in combating the influence of the Communist minority in the labor movement.

As to the over-all consequences of the bill, considered in its entirety, the Catholic conference statement is equally condemnatory. Indeed, I know of no matter of recent public interest on which the conference has expressed its views so strongly and critically as on this matter. The statement says:

> The Taft-Hartley bill does little or nothing to encourage labor-management cooperation. On the contrary, it approaches the complicated problem of industrial relations from a narrow and excessively legalistic point of view. * * * Instead of encouraging labor and management to work together in harmony for the general economic welfare, the bill puts a number of legal restrictions on collective bargaining and particularly on the activities of trade-unions—restrictions which will almost inevitably lead to industrial strife and unrest. The bill is an open invitation to management to have recourse to the courts and to the Labor Board at almost every turn and thus to sidetrack or evade the normal processes of constructive collective bargaining. It will also result in strikes of all sorts during the long period in which the administration and the legality of the bill are being clarified. It will create the sort of confusion which prevailed in American industry during the period in which the National Labor Relations Act was being tested in the courts. There is no sufficient reason to risk such wholesale confusion at the present time.

I do not need to recite in detail why I agree with every one of these criticisms of this bill, and why I am convinced they are valid. I think the RECORD already clearly shows that. Nor shall I again document, by reference to the specific provisions of the bill, the ways in which these objections are deserved. The RECORD, I think, already clearly reflects my position and the positions of others who agree with me on that score.

The RECORD already shows how this bill broadens the liability of unions for the acts of agents beyond that contained in the Norris-LaGuardia Act, while it narrows that of employers in disregard of the realities of labor relations; how it enlarges the jurisdiction of the Federal courts in labor matters as to injunctions and suits for damages in such a way as to go far beyond even those dark days when unions were prosecuted as illegal conspiracies and the test of whether the activity was unlawful was the primary objective of the strike; now the strike is unlawful if any objective is improper. The RECORD already shows how it imposes hopelessly detailed registration requirements, as to which no proceeding can possibly be wholly immune from attack, before the Labor Board may take jurisdiction in a labor dispute or hold an election among the employees; how it enacts a so-called free-speech amendment, which certainly invites and encourages wholesale objections by counsel at all Board proceedings, as to the propriety of almost every question put to a witness which involves anything he may have said or written and makes many unfair labor practices virtually impossible to prove; how, at the same time, it requires the Board to follow the technical rules of evidence so far as practicable; how it exposes employees to discharge for union activities, if the employer can find some other cause for discharge that he can advance as a pretext; how it enacts an ambiguous and completely unclear provision prohibiting unions from asking an employer to pay for services which are not performed; how it redefines collective bargaining so as to excuse an employer from even discussing matters with the union unless a contract is made which covers it; and how in many other ways it invites and throws open the doors to lawsuits and legal proceedings at every step of union organization and collective bargaining. The record also shows how the administrative and procedural provisions of the bill shackle the National Labor Relations Board in a series of special restrictions and requirements unknown to any other administrative agency and inconsistent with the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 and that they are contrary to the basic concepts of sound administrative law.

I think that is one of the worst features of the bill, Mr. President. I opposed the principle of it in committee. I opposed an attempt to set up a so-called prosecution end of the Board in the Department of Justice. I got that washed out in committee. I proposed and insisted upon the following of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 as it relates to the Board. As the Presiding Officer knows, for 2 or 3 days it was in and out. It would be out one day, and we would come back and argue some more and would get it back in. We finally kept it in the Senate bill. I think it is basic. Either we are going to have an administrative law procedure or we are not going to have it. It should not be a hybrid. As I said in discussing the matter with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], I forget how many hours ago—it was sometime ago—this was an attempt really to do an administrative-law job primarily with common-law court procedure. It will not work. The President knows that. He told us so. I think we ought to ponder it. We not only change the procedures provided for in the Administrative Procedure Act applicable to all other administrative law tribunals, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Radio Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and all the rest of them, but we say, "Ah, here we have one. It deals with the rights of workers. We will make an exception. We did not mean it when we passed the Administrative Procedure Act in the Seventy-ninth Congress." It was a uniform Administrative Procedure Act, the product of many years' work, Mr. President.

No one should get the notion that the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 was the product of the work of the Seventy-ninth Congress. That work was done by outstanding legal and administrative law experts of this country for years, going back to the time that Justice Jackson was Attorney General. There was an Attorney General's Committee then. I am not sure of it, Mr. President, and I wish the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] were on the floor, because he could give us accurate information. That distinguished Senator is deserving of the highest tribute for the great work he did over the years on the Administrative Procedure Act. What I was about to say was that when Homer Cummings was Attorney General there was an Attorney General's Administrative Law Committee working on the problem of a uniform Administrative Law Procedure

Act so that a lawyer going before one administrative law tribunal under Federal jurisdiction would be bound to follow the same procedure. The desire was to make the rulings or the basis for the rulings uniform, the jurisdiction uniform, and the rules of evidence uniform. I shall say something about that in a minute.

The United States Department of Justice, through a series of Attorney General's committees, worked on that problem. Then, over that period of time, eminent scholars in the field of administrative law, such as another distinguished member of the Supreme Court of the United States, Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter, one of the recognized American authorities, in fact, one of the recognized international authorities, in the field of administrative law, did monumental work, as did legal scholars in many of the law schools, over the years, in the development of the uniform Administrative Law Procedure Act which the Congress passed in 1946, in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Then there was the work of the American Bar Association's Committee on Administrative Law, working in close cooperation with the United States Department of Justice and with the law schools and, I believe, also with the American Law Institute. That was no fly-by-night work, Mr. President; that was no bill that was laid and hatched in one session of Congress by Members of Congress. With the statesmanlike generalship that characterizes his work in the Senate, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] piloted that bill through this body.

Mr. President, if we study the debates of the Seventy-ninth Congress, as I have—I thought I recalled them, but I double-checked on them when we were having our discussions in the committee—we find there was no attempt to provide separate rules for the National Labor Relations Board, under that act when it was before us; not at all. In fact, when I made my argument in the Seventy-ninth Congress for the substantial evidence test, rather than the "some evidence" test, which heretofore had prevailed in too many of our administrative law tribunals, including the National Labor Relations Board, the record will show that I pointed out the great need for reform, in that respect, applicable to all these agencies. I was seated several rows back of my present seat in this Chamber and the Senator from Nevada had a seat almost in the same location, if not the same location, as his present seat; and I recall clearly that I raised a question about that matter because I wanted to have him, as leader in charge of the bill, make a statement which would make crystal clear to any court, in the case of subsequent court interpretation as to the congressional intent, what his intent was in regard to the meaning of the substantial evidence test, to be found in that bill. He made clear that it threw out the "some evidence" or "any evidence" or "scintilla of evidence" rule, and that it meant what the courts have held, namely, substantial evidence on the basis of the whole record.

I fought for that in committee, because I felt we had made a great contribution to administrative law procedure in the Seventy-ninth Congress, and I did not want to undermine it by passing a bill in the Eightieth Congress which made such a serious exception to the Administrative Law Procedure Act of 1946. Mr. President, I regret very much that the conference committee returned a bill which undermined, in my judgment, the Administrative Law Procedure Act of 1946. The President sees the danger of it. He pointed it out very clearly in his veto message, as I shall show when I read the veto message again.

But I was saying that perhaps the most serious and damaging of these changes in administrative law is the creation of a statutory office of general counsel. Mr. President, that general counsel will be the "super duper" of all general counsels in the Federal Government. His job is going to be some job; it will be not only a very valuable job from the standpoint of economic status, but a job of tremendous power, in fact, too much power for any one man in this Government to have, more power than any other general counsel has ever been given, and from the standpoint of the independence of the power within the jurisdiction of the office, more power than the Attorney General of the United States has. We do not give to the Attorney General of the United States, in his relation to the American judiciary, anything that bears any resemblance, in breadth of jurisdiction and power, to what we give to the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board in his relationship, under the bill, to the Board. The President saw that one, too. He nailed it to the floor in this veto message. He minced no words about it. That is another reason why I say this veto message is a great message of Americanism, and it is a great message that shows a deep understanding on the part of the President of the United States that we cannot afford to place and should not risk the danger in this country of placing in mere men such tremendous powers as are placed in the general counsel of this Board.

We talk about a government of laws rather than a government of men, and then we, the Congress, pass a bill which gives to one human being that vast power over the workers and employers of America? Not with my vote, Mr. President. It is independent power, sole power to determine what complaints shall issue and what shall not. Let a United States district attorney, let an Attorney General of the United States, seek to exercise administratively any such power as we specifically give to this general counsel, and he would have the Federal judiciary of this country down on his neck so fast that figuratively he would not know what hit him.

Let us take another look at these powers. All these restrictions are imposed at the very time when the Board is given a tremendous number of new and novel responsibilities, in connection with which it necessarily needs the utmost freedom and flexibility to devise satisfactory procedures.

Mr. President, in the case of the simple little procedure of the War Labor Board, in the midst of the war, a great many weeks yes, almost a year, were required to enable it to function. My colleagues might dispute that statement and say that it never really functioned effectively; and I do not think it was an effectively operating procedural body, with such jurisdiction as it had, small in comparison with the broad jurisdiction the National Labor Relations Board had. It took the better part of a year to get the machinery of the War Labor Board working even with creaks in it.

Mr. President, that is one of the bad things about this bill, the changes are so many, the new responsibilities so novel and sweeping, that naught but confusion will come out of it for a long, long time.

What is going to happen to labor disputes in the meantime? As I have said before, we are not going to change human nature one whit by passing legislation. We are not going to satisfy the workers of the country by advising them that, according to the statistics and the record of this debate, the Board is from 18 to 24 months behind, so far as its docket is concerned, in a simple certification case, with the result that the chairman of the board—and a very able chairman he is, too, Mr. President, Mr. Paul Herzog—when he testified before our committee at public hearings, said in his formal statement that there was no escaping the fact that the delays in the procedures of the Board were because of a good many strikes, not against the employer so much as against the Board itself for delay.

Why is that so? It is because men are human, because in many instances when feelings are high in a labor dispute, when the men think their cause is just and all they ask for is the determination of it on its merits, a labor leader has a difficult time selling to them the proposition that the only reason why they are not getting a settlement of the case is that the Board is so far behind in its docket. That does not go down in many cases. They say, "Well, we cannot wait for the Board. We are not going to wait 2 years for a decision as to whether or not we can be certified as having the right to bargain with this employer. You, Mr. President, of this union, make clear to John Doaks, our employer, tomorrow, that if he does not negotiate a contract with us, certification or no certification, in the next 10 days, we will hit the bricks." They move that in a union meeting, by democratic processes.

Oh, we hear much about labor leaders. Some of them, as I have said before, are bad actors, but there are not many such. When we take the totality of local unions throughout the country, and when we look into how they operate, it is surprising to find how many times a strike supposed to be called by one of the labor bosses is called as the result of a motion overwhelmingly or unanimously passed at a union meeting, in which the one who was on the spot was the union officer himself, who was subjected to most vigorous criticism on the floor of the union for not having the case settled months before, and who was told, "They are all fed up with the alibi that the National

Labor Relations Board was too far behind in its docket to give them immediate consideration of their case." I do not condone strikes against the Board. I will say that passing legislation which increases the delays will not reduce the strikes. That is another reason why I think this is an unworkable piece of legislation.

I was saying, Mr. President, so far as the general counsel is concerned, if all these restrictions are imposed at the very time when the Board is given a tremendous number of new and novel responsibilities in connection with which it necessarily needs the utmost freedom and flexibility to devise satisfactory procedure, the inevitable effect of this must be, and I think will be, to create confusion and uncertainty, and to let loose an avalanche of litigation, at the very time we need stability and certainty in labor relations.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. For what purpose?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I want to ask a question. If I can obtain unanimous consent to suggest the absence of a quorum, would the Senator from Oregon object, if I obtained unanimous consent for that purpose, and did not take the Senator off the floor?

Mr. IVES. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is raised. The Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. For future protection, Mr. President, because I do not want to be taken off the floor; I am in the position of being in the midst of my first speech on the bill. I feel fine. [Laughter.] I am going to make another speech tomorrow and I think, if within the rules, this protection is due me. I merely want to know hypothetically, if I had made the mistake of yielding for the purpose stated by my good friend the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and if my good friend from New York [Mr. IVES] had not objected, and, during a temporary lapse of clearheadedness, I might have gone along with that request, and a quorum had been called; would I then have made one speech?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that, had the Senator yielded for the purpose of a quorum, it would have been considered that he had made one speech; after the quorum call, he would be in his second and last speech.

Mr. MORSE. I thought so.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MORSE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair might further state that the Senator from South Carolina, however, had asked that that be done without loss of the floor by the Senator from Oregon. That could have been done by unanimous consent.

Mr. MORSE. Ah.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, that is why I objected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York objected to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MORSE. Ah! The Senator from South Carolina said it would be without my losing the floor. I might not have lost the floor if unanimous consent had been granted, but it was not included in the request that I not only not lose the floor, but that I not be counted with a second speech. One surely has to be watchful at the tail end of one of these situations, does he not? And, of course, my good friend from South Carolina was just trying to help me. I have some fine helpers here, Mr. President; Senators would be surprised at their number. In fact, I am looking forward to the time when, on some issue, my good friend the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and I are going to be on the same side. I think that is going to happen; I do not know how soon.

But now to proceed with my principal remarks, I must mention, Mr. President, in this connection the devious course of the legislative history of this bill, and how that, too, will aggravate even more seriously the proclivities of this bill to bring about litigation, court tests, and disputes. The President mentioned that, too, in his veto message. I confess, the more I think of that veto message, the more I marvel at how that man grasped the significance of the many weaknesses of the bill. I feel a little good about it too, Mr. President, because I notice that so far as the procedural objections to the bill are concerned, the message makes mention of most of the procedural objections to the bill which I raised in my speech on June 5; but they impress me more, Mr. President, when I find them supported by the President, because, just think of the responsibility that man had before he wrote that message. Stop and ponder for a moment the tremendous pressures that were on him—"Sign it!" "Don't sign it!" "Don't sign it!" "Sign it!" How he kept his head through it all, how he said he was going to study it, he was going to make up his mind on the basis of that study and do what he thought was in the best interest of the country; and that, I think he did. That is one reason it makes it such a powerful veto message. I think he did well to point out that the procedures under the bill and the jurisdiction given in the bill will be causative of much litigation.

As I once said, with respect to the effectiveness of a union, so far as protecting its members is concerned, in some particulars it can be said to be no stronger than its treasury. And, of course, all the grounds for litigation that are made possible under the bill, as I see it, are going to help break the treasury of a great many unions so that they will become weak unions. There are antilabor employers who are interested in having unions only if they are weak. I do not think, when those employers say they believe in collective bargaining, that they believe in unionism, or are shooting very fair, or are being very "crickety"; because, if they believe in free collective bargaining, they should believe in bargaining collectively with strong unions, capable of protecting the economic interests of their members. But one of the results of the bill is to give to such antilabor employers as there are—and there are too many of them, unfortunately—the power to litigate into weakness a great many unions; thus, once with a bankrupt treasury, they cannot be very successful in a strike, because strikers have to eat, too. If the union cannot pay strike benefits, there is not very much chance of winning the strike. I think clearly the President had that in mind when he wrote the veto message.

Mr. President, I think one thing must be perfectly plain to every Member from even a casual acquaintanceship with the bill and the debates. That fact is, that the language of the bill, on its face, should not be depended upon for its intended meaning or effect. As guides to its purposes, we must look, therefore, first, to the separate reports of the House committee and the Senate committee when the original bills were reported.

Mr. President, if I may be permitted, I desire to repeat the sentence. It was thoughtful of me to say, "if I may be permitted," though I suppose there is not much that can be done about it, but, at least, I want the Presiding Officer to know of my desire to be exceedingly gracious in the matter of repetition. I do not like to repeat. If I may repeat I will say then we must look to the debates on the floor of this body, with respect to the amendments made to the Senate bill before its passage. We must look, also, to the conference report printed as House Report No. 510, and which presumably also reflected the views of the Senate conferees who supported the bill.

Furthermore, we have a separate "Summary in detail" submitted by the Senator from Ohio, which, as I read it, contains many significant omissions and departures from the conference report. And finally we have a "Supplementary Analysis" of the conference bill, also submitted by my good friend, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

What do all these analyses mean? It is my judgment that quite obviously they indicate a feeling of uncertainty and insecurity on the part of the sponsors of the bill as to the real meaning of the bill or as to the meaning which the courts might give to the bill unless the record were filled with report after report after report as to what the bill means. They indicate also, I think, that many of the criticisms which have been made as to the unworkabilit. and ambiguities of this bill, as written, and as to its serious consequences on industrial relations, have struck home and have impressed even the sponsors of the legislation with the necessity of making some kind of legislative history that may at least blunt the edge of the criticisms. In some few instances, even, they have apparently tried to make legislative history that would tend to avoid the disastrous consequences that have been predicted. I doubt very much whether such statements, some made after the bill had passed both bodies of the Congress, carry any force as to the legislative intention. Certainly it is extremely doubtful that they can operate to override the plain language of the statu-

tory provisions, or to overcome statements contained in the House report, which apparently reflects the official views of the conference committee.

So far as I recall, most of the cases of the Supreme Court on legislative intention that I have ever read or studied stress the point that legislative intention must be determined by the committee hearings, reports, and conference reports, and the statements made during the debates on the floor of the two Houses of Congress, giving dominant weight, of course, and, when there is any conflict, controlling weight, to the views expressed by the Senator in charge of the bill on the floor.

So I say that I seriously doubt whether some of the reports which have been prepared subsequent to the passage of the bill can be given by the Supreme Court any controlling weight in determining the meaning of the legislation from the standpoint of congressional intent so far as legislative history is concerned. At least, I think it is a very mooted question, and although I am "curbstoning," which is not a very safe thing for a lawyer to do, I think I have quite clearly enough enunciated the standing which would have to be given to at least the reports which have been prepared by the Senate conferees subsequent to the passage of the bill.

But, putting that doubt aside, that is not the way to legislate on labor relations. That kind of legislation merely provides lawyers with a magic box of litigation, profitable for them, but disastrous for the country. I understand that at present lawyers generally throughout the country are doing pretty well. They do not need to worry about the future, because if this bill becomes law it will operate as a full employment bill for lawyers—that is, if the workers have any money left with which to pay them, so far as the labor lawyers are concerned.

I say that to emphasize anew the point that the bill will prove to be causative of much litigation.

To legislate in this way means that virtually every significant provision of this bill must be the subject of interminable and delaying lawsuits until its correct meaning can be determined by the Supreme Court. But what will happen to labor relations while all this is going on? The answer, of course, is obvious. The very nature and wealth of the legislative history which the sponsors have found it necessary to make, in and of themselves, will throw the country back into the lawless and reckless days between 1935 and 1937, when every action of the Labor Board under the Wagner Act was being fought through the courts. We simply cannot afford to go back to that kind of situation in the next few years. I do not see how we can possibly avoid it under this bill, however, because for every troublesome, litigious issue presented by the original Wagner Act, this bill presents a hundred.

I feel that I cannot let the record of my opposition to the bill close without a brief reference to several further aspects of the analyses of the bill's provisions. As I have said, I do not intend to burden the Senate with detailed discussions of specific provisions which are objectionable to me, where the RECORD is already clear as to my position. But I do want to make and emphasize certain further points.

I have tried to make my record clear. There is some evidence as to how hard I have worked in this session of Congress to have some labor legislation passed. I have made quite a few speeches on the subject, starting with a speech on March 10, 1947, one on March 14, one on April 17, one on May 2, one on May 7, one on May 8, one on May 9, one on May 13, and one on June 5. I think the RECORD will show some others which have not been reprinted.

What was my purpose in making all those speeches? I was trying to build a record containing sound objective data and arguments in support of legislative proposals which I thought would be helpful in checking the labor abuses which we all agree should be checked, and at the same time protecting the proper rights of labor and industry; and, of course, most important of all, giving to the American public the protection which it needs.

To be honest about it, I made them for another purpose, Mr. President, because I knew that in some quarters my position would be criticized, that even in some instances an attempt would be made—and it has been—to give the impression that I did not want any labor legislation at all. The RECORD answers that criticism; my vote for the Senate committee bill answers it; my vote on the floor of the Senate for the Senate bill answers it.

A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I have been observing the various positions which I have been taking in the course of this speech, and I wonder if it would be proper for me to inquire whether it is all right for me to lean against this desk so long as I keep my feet on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Rule XIX provides as follows:

> When a Senator desires to speak he shall rise and address the Presiding Officer.

The verb "rise" is the verb which the Senator must observe in this case.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the opinion of the Chair that when I lean against this desk and keep my feet on the floor I have risen?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not going to have an opinion on that question until the point is raised regarding it.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be very careful, Mr. President. I do want to say, however, for the benefit of the present occupant of the chair, that earlier in my speech—it was much earlier than I thought—the question was raised by my good friend the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who has left the floor, I see. I do not blame him. He stated, when I leaned forward on these books with the very obvious purpose of making my speaking a little more restful, that I was in violation of the rule, and the then occupant of the chair ruled that I was not in violation of it. So I am in this predicament now, as to whether I need to raise this inquiry as the occupancy of the chair changes from time to time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not consider that the last statement constitutes a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair will meet the issues as they are brought up, if they are brought up, in accordance with rule XIX which the Chair has just quoted.

Mr. MORSE. I do not mean to be facetious; I am in dead earnest about it.

I should like to put another parliamentary inquiry, and I am in dead earnest about it also.

I should like to know, after having received a favorable ruling as to my right to lean on these books so long as I kept my feet planted on the floor, whether I will thereafter have to run the risk of a reversal of that ruling upon a change of Presiding Officers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The only language on the subject is rule XIX, which the Chair has already quoted, but will quote again:

> When a Senator desires to speak he shall rise and address the Presiding Officer.

The Chair will be guided by that language when, as, and if the issue is raised.

Mr. MORSE. I just wanted to make my record on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I think the Senator has made his record.

Mr. MORSE. I was talking about these speeches of mine, and I want the RECORD to be perfectly clear that the points contained in the speeches were made before a vote on the bill was taken in the Senate, because I do not think that anyone, on the ground of innocence as to the defects of the bill, should be allowed to ignore the record which has been made against the bill from time to time by the junior Senator from Oregon.

So I say, Mr. President, I feel that I cannot let the record of my opposition to this bill close without a brief reference to several further aspects of the analysis of the bill's provisions. As I have said, I do not intend to burden the Senate with detailed discussions of specific provisions that are objectionable to me, when the RECORD is already clear as to my position, but I do want to make and emphasize certain further points.

My first point has to do with the jurisdictional strike provision in section 8 (b) (4) (D) of the bill. Originally, that provision would have prohibited jurisdictional strikes involving disputes between unions as to which of the unions was to do particular work. As I have said on many occasions, such strikes are wholly indefensible and should be prohibited. The section was amended in conference, however, so that it now prohibits strikes designed to force or require any employer to assign particular work to employees in a particular labor organization rather than to employees in another labor organization or in another trade, craft, or class. The Senator from Ohio has stated in the supplementary analysis of the bill, which was included in the RECORD on June 12, after the bill had passed, that this is intended not only to outlaw disputes between unions over work assignments, but also to prohibit a union from striking because

work is assigned to nonunion employees. He states, further, that all it does is make it illegal for unions to coerce employers into doing something which the employer is already prevented from doing under section 8 (3) of the present Wagner Act.

To me, this provision, as amended, involves so shocking and unfair a restriction on the legitimate and accepted rights and practices of labor unions, and one so readily conducive to destroying all craft unions, that I can scarcely believe a Congress of the United States, sitting in the year 1947, could enact it into law, if it understood all its implications as interpreted by the Senator from Ohio. Moreover, I am in complete disagreement with the Senator's statement that this is in effect a restatement of existing law.

Let me take a concrete example. Suppose members of the teamsters' union do both the hauling of freight by truck, and the loading and unloading, for employers in this city. Let us suppose, further, that one employer now decides to transfer the loading and unloading to nonunion men. Under this provision, if the teamsters' union struck in order to induce the employer by economic pressure to continue making such work available for members of the teamsters' union, they would be guilty of an illegal jurisdictional strike and subject to unfair labor practice charges, loss of jobs, a district court injunction, and suits for damages in the district court under section 303 (b) of this bill.

Mr. President, speaking at such length on the floor of the Senate has one thing to recommend it: A Senator who does so is not constantly called out to meet with this delegation or that delegation or this person or that person; at least he is able to follow his own line of reasoning without interruption.

I do not know for the life of me what so many Senators are here for at this time. I do not know why they do not go home and get some rest, for they will need it. We have another night and another day and Monday morning. That is a long time. I think everyone should get some rest. Of course, that is a gratuitous suggestion on my part; but it shows my human interest even in the opposition.

Mr. President, I wish to pause to say how much nicer it would have been if all of us could have cooperated on this matter and could have a unanimous-consent agreement to vote after the week end, on Monday or Tuesday or Wednesday or some other day after the week end, after the people of the country had an opportunity to focus their attention on the President's veto message, prior to final action by the Senate. I think that is the way it should have been done, and I said so at the time, and I say so now. I do not think the majority should have forced its will upon the minority simply because we did not immediately fall into line and accept the unanimous-consent agreement. I know the majority was motivated by just as sincere a desire for quick action as we motivated by a sincere belief that the President was entitled to a few days of public consideration of his veto message, before the Senate took final action. As I said earlier in my speech, I think he had that coming to him.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I think it should be made clear that another factor was involved, and I can see from the standpoint of parliamentary strategy why the majority wanted to force action by way of a unanimous-consent agreement to vote this afternoon at 5 o'clock.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. MORSE. For what purpose?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. For a question.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the Senator a question in order to clarify my understanding of his philosophy. I understand that the Senator is now criticizing the majority for attempting to handle the affairs of the Senate as the majority feels they should be handled. If that is the case, I wonder how the Senator from Oregon squares that philosophy with his philosophy, for instance, when the FEPC bill was before the Senate for consideration and when the Senator from Oregon caustically castigated the minority for interfering with the will of the majority. I fail to quite reconcile those two philospohies, except on the basis of the philosophy of whose ox is being gored.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think it was in the absence of the Senator from Iowa that I discussed that point, but I shall be very glad to rediscuss it.

I said earlier in this speech that I am opposed to filibusters. I will vote for a Senate rule that will outlaw filibusters. I have such a proposal in the hopper; it has been there all during this session of Congress. I also said I would vote for some changes under the unanimous-consent rule; I said that in my judgment, as that rule is now being practiced in the Senate, it takes unfair advantage of minorities in the Senate, because unless a Senator goes along and gives his consent in connection with such a unanimous-consent request, all the types of pressures which I have previously discussed in this speech and all the niceties of party discipline are brought down to bear upon a Senator.

Mr. President, I think we are overusing the unanimous-consent agreement. I think we are using it in such a way that, in practice, it is becoming a rule of limitation on debate which almost automatically is applied when it is requested, or else a Senator is frowned upon if he does not go along with the party majority and give consent.

So I said earlier in my speech that here, right on this floor, is the last great citadel of unlimited free speech among the parliamentary bodies of the world. I am willing to outlaw filibusters, and I am willing to put some limitations upon the unanimous-consent rule so as to make absolutely certain that there will be retained unlimited debate on the merits of issues.

I also said earlier in this speech that there are, probably, filibusters and filibusters. I said that, much as I am against filibusters, no Member of the Senate can begin to appreciate how difficult it was for me to participate in this filibuster. But so long as the filibuster practice is going to be permitted and so long as a majority attempts to do what this majority did when the unanimous-consent agreement was proposed, I am going to make the fight for the protection of two things—minority rights in the Senate and the right to have some time to discuss on the merits a matter of such fundamental importance to the people of the United States as is this labor bill and the veto message.

So I said, and now repeat, that it is one thing to use a filibuster to try to kill a bill by preventing it from ever coming to a vote. That is not our position. What did we propose? Just a week-end delay, to vote on the first of the week, after the country had had an opportunity to respond to the President's veto message.

When our motives were such, and when we made perfectly clear that there was no intention on our part to prevent a final vote by way of filibuster on the bill, I repeat what I said earlier, I think the majority owed it to the minority to cooperate with us and give us a unanimous-consent agreement for a vote after the week end.

Oh, this is no filibuster to prevent a vote on the labor bill. This is a filibuster, which necessarily had to take place in the light of the action taken by the majority, to assure the protection of unlimited debate on the floor of the Senate, and to give the people of this country an opportunity to respond to and react to the President's message, and also give to the Members of this body an opportunity to weigh and consider the views of constituents who might be heard from on the veto message.

Mr. President, I do not like the situation, but we did not need to have it, if that degree of comity and cooperation which I think should exist between us, even when we have differences of opinion, had prevailed in the Senate at the time the unanimous-consent agreement was offered and objected to. I gave at the time of my objection my reasons for objecting. As I have also said earlier in this debate, I do not stand alone in these objections, as evidenced by the fact that I have ample support to carry this battle over the week end, and after the week end I shall be ready, I say to the Senator from Iowa, to have a vote on the veto message.

I was in the process of pointing out another reason for objecting to the unanimous-consent agreement, and I was saying that I could see the parliamentary strategy on the part of the majority—and I think it was proper strategy, so far as it went—but I think it should have been abandoned when colleagues in good faith expressed their honest objections to the unanimous-consent agreement.

Let us look into the strategic position here on the floor of the Senate. This is my interpretation; I think it is correct: When the unanimous-consent agreement was offered for a vote on the bill this afternoon at 5 o'clock, the majority knew they had us licked. The individual Sen-

ators with whom I talked told me so, good naturedly, and I agreed with them. They had us licked. However, some Senators were away, and as I have said, I do not know that those absentees had the slightest idea that in being away they were running a risk of a vote on this question being brought up on the week end. I had no way of knowing what their views or wishes would be if they knew that danger existed. Here is a vital, a very vital issue, an economic issue, not without its political aspect. I do not want to see it a political issue, but I do not suppose there is anything any of us can do about that—it will become such.

Therefore, I felt that in accordance with a spirit of friendly cooperation with each other, we should not put any of our colleagues on the spot, so to speak, by going ahead with the unanimous-consent agreement before we knew of their wishes or their views in the matter, or before they had ample opportunity to return to the Senate.

I do not think that in the heat of the debate and in our zealousness to get this matter out of the way—and I mean no criticism by what I now say—or zeal to take advantage of a victory which the majority knew it had in the palm of its hand, if it could only get this matter to a vote by Saturday at 5 o'clock—I say, that I do not think that through zeal, when one good faith, sincere objection to the unanimous-consent agreement was raised, the agreement should have been pressed, and that the minority should have been required to go into this prolonged session.

Those things leave scars; they are bound to. Lean over backward as we will, when the smoke clears away from the battle and we go out in the cloakrooms and laugh about it from the standpoint of the fight we had to put up for our respective points of view, nevertheless, we are going to nurture down in our hearts—and I do not think there is any escaping it—a feeling, depending upon which side of the battle one is on, because we cannot get away from the fact that this is no minor skirmish in the Senate of the United States. There is bound to be nurtured in the hearts of Senators at least a feeling which should never have been brought about. If they are in the majority they will feel that the minority should not have called their hand, and if they are in the minority, the feeling is bound to be that the majority should not have taken advantage of a parliamentary situation and forced us into this battle.

Mr. President, I am extremely disappointed about it. I really do not think that we proceeded on the plane on which we should have moved. I do not think it is good for the spirit of cooperation in the Senate; I do not think it is good for the country; I do not think we should have been forced to do it, as I think those of us with the convictions we held were forced to do it for the reasons I have heretofore mentioned in my remarks.

Mr. President, I have talked about the strategy of the majority. The minority has not been without its strategy, either. As I said, I think there is one reason which has no relationship whatever to the strategy, which can stand alone, in support of the course of action the minority has followed in this battle; that is, that after the President of the United States hands down a veto of such major significance, dealing with a problem so vital to the economic welfare of the country as this veto on the labor bill does, we should have postponed final action on the veto until the country had had an opportunity——

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. MORSE. As soon as I finish my sentence—that we should have postponed the final action on the veto until the country had had an opportunity to respond to and react to both his veto message and to his Nation-wide broadcast. I feel that very deeply. My respect for that great office is such that I do not think it would have been proper treatment for us to vote within relatively a few hours after his appeal to the people of the Nation. I now yield—for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask this question of my able colleague from Oregon: Is it his position that when there has been ample notice that important business will be before the Senate of the United States at approximately the date when every Member of the Senate knew it would be before the Senate for consideration, 94 or 95 Senators should be delayed in transacting the public business because 1 or 2 or 3 Senators are away from their place of business in Washington?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to respond to the question. I may say that I think, even under such a case as the Senator from California suggests, we still have a very difficult time justifying holding the Senate in a Saturday session, which is very uncommon. We have had other very important legislation before this body, and as a practice we have not met on Saturdays; and so I say, in view of the fact that the Senators were away, and our practice is not generally to hold Saturday sessions, that it would have been the nice thing for us and the cooperative thing for us to have postponed action until Monday.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan merely desires to ask a question. Is there any doubt in the able Senator's mind that all Senators were advised that the message would come to the Senate on Friday?

Mr. MORSE. I understand that that was so.

Mr. FERGUSON. So there was plenty of warning that the message would come in on the last day, and that would be Friday?

Mr. MORSE. I understand that that was what the Senators who were away knew.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not true that Senators could not have been warned of a veto message, because nobody knew whether there would be one? Is it not true that we discussed here on the floor that in the event there was a veto message, it would have to come on Friday, but until the veto message was sent here, nobody could be certain that there would be a veto message?

Mr. MORSE. That is true; but I think, Mr. President, that this may be said, dealing with the point raised by both the Senator from California and the Senator from Michigan, that, so far as I know, Senators who were away understood that if the bill were vetoed, it undoubtedly would be vetoed on Friday; but it does not follow from that in my opinion that the majority was justified in taking the position that because the veto message came down on Friday, we should have a vote on Saturday; and that is where we part company.

I say that, at that point, the nice thing to have done, the cooperative thing to have done, would have been to say, "Well, we know that some of you fellows have these engagements of long standing. We know that one of your number is in Europe; it would take him some little time to get back; and we also know that this is a pretty vital issue, of interest to the country, and we think that some time ought to elapse from the time we received the message to the time we vote on it; the country ought to be allowed to respond to it or to react to it; and so we suggest that we vote on it after the week end." When one thinks of the many vital issues which have been pending before the Senate even in this session of Congress, on Friday nights, with not a suggestion made that we meet on Saturday, from time to time, I say I think that in view of that practice it is pretty difficult to rationalize forcing the minority either to agree to vote on Saturday at 5 o'clock, "or else." We have heard much in the debate, Mr. President, about the tactics of powerful unions against employers, who find themselves in the dominating position in a dispute. We have heard it pointed out, and rightfully so, that some of those unions, or their officials, go before an employer and "lay it on the line," and say "take this, or else." I say, Mr. President, we in the minority feel that we were accorded that kind of treatment when this unanimous-consent agreement was offered, and we objected to it. We were told, in effect, "take this, or else." We have taken it thus far.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have a question to ask. If the theory of the Senator from Oregon is carried out, do we not find ourselves in the position, in the case of a veto by the President, which takes a two-thirds vote to overcome, of having

94 Senators held up because the Senator from Oregon desires to protect the rights of one Senator who is in Europe, and who, as I understand, must have realized that a vote would come, and perhaps the rights of other Senators who are away? The Senator from Michigan could well have been away yesterday, but he realized that it would be necessary to be here, because a message one way or the other would be here. If the theory of the Senator from Oregon were carried out, would not the situation be as I have stated it?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to protect myself.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is protecting himself. This is a question.

Mr. MORSE. I want the Chair to assure me that I am protecting myself. I am perfectly willing to let the Senator from Michigan continue with extended remarks, with a question mark at the end, if the Chair so rules; but I want to be sure this is a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator does not desire to answer it, it is all right.

Mr. MORSE. O Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan does me a great injustice by that remark. I want to answer any question the Senator from Michigan desires to put to me, but I want to say to the Senator from Michigan that, before he came in, the junior Senator from Oregon recognized that he must be very careful about yielding for anything other than a question, and that, even though he yields for a question, should a Senator start talking in a form other than that of a question, the Senator from Oregon is fearful he might lose the floor. All the Chair has to do is to protect the Senator from Oregon in this matter, and rule that what the Senator from Michigan is asking is a question, and I shall be glad to hear him for an hour.

I think I know what the Senator from Michigan has in mind, and I am going to talk about it, and I think he will find my talk to be a response to what he wanted to ask. The Senator from Michigan and I are too good friends to get into any difficulty over a matter such as this.

Mr. FERGUSON. There will be no difficulty between us——

Mr. MORSE. For a question I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. FERGUSON. May I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to advise the Senator from Oregon that I do not wish to embarrass him at all? I wish to ask a question merely, and to place enough in it so that the Senator will understand what I mean, so he can explain to the Senate exactly what his philosophy is respecting the proposition he is now debating.

Mr. MORSE. I know, Mr. President, that that is the desire of the Senator from Michigan, and I may be overtechnical, but I think the Chair will appreciate my position. I have sat here and too many times have seen Senators taken off their feet on the floor of the Senate to take any chances. I am simply asking the Chair to protect me in these matters. I am going to make a statement and see if it does not answer what the Senator from Michigan has in mind. I want to say that I do not agree with the Senator from Michigan that any great inconvenience would have resulted to 94, or whatever the number was, other Senators in the Senate by our following our customary practice of not holding sessions on Saturday. We have adjusted our program pretty much to that practice, and I think the RECORD will show that usually the majority leader, some days before the Saturday session, notifies us of a Saturday session so that we can make our plans accordingly. Perhaps that was done in this instance; but if it was done, I missed it. We cannot catch everything that occurs in the Senate. One does not hear all the announcements made in the Senate. So I say, if it was done, I missed it.

Therefore, assuming for the moment that we were not given any considerable notice of a Saturday meeting, I fail to see how anyone would be greatly inconvenienced by the position taken by the minority that we should follow the ordinary practice and go over until Monday. There is nothing wrong about that. Mr. President, because of the fact that a veto message of such great importance came to the Senate, I think it was right and proper to delay acting upon it over the week end until the Senate and the President and the people of the country generally could see what the public reaction to the message was.

Mr. President, I have no intention of eliminating from the discussion the matter of floor strategy. That is there, too. It is true that as of this afternoon, as I said, we would be licked. We may be next week; I do not know. But as the old saying is, "While there is life there is hope." So long as we have not been licked yet, Mr. President, we are not licked. There is a chance—so some of my friends with the pencils have told me—there is a chance that we might win by week end delay. If that were the only contest, if that were the only factor involved, then from a purely parliamentary strategic point of view there is a defense that can be made, in my judgment, for the position taken by the majority in the case of an old parliamentary rule. To the extent that a defense can be made for the majority, Mr. President, on that ground, so likewise a defense rests with the minority for the position they have taken in that fight, because if it is reduced solely to winning or losing this fight, then both sides are entitled to apply the rules of the Senate in the interest of winning.

Mr. President, I wanted to place the matter on a plane much higher than that, because that is where I think it belongs. On that plane, Mr. President, I say, speaking the views of the minority, that I think it would have been more fair and reasonable and cooperative, once a good-faith objection was raised to the unanimous-consent agreement, to let the matter go over until Monday.

Why do we have unanimous-consent agreements? Let us analyze the purpose back of that question for a moment. Why do we require unanimous-consent agreements? As I understand the history of the Senate and its rules, here is a great parliamentary body which has sought over the decades to assure protection to the minority, and therefore, before we could modify the procedures of the Senate to the degree that the gentlemen of the majority wanted to modify them in this instance, our forebears in this body provided it had to be done by unanimous consent. I think that implies something. I think it implies, Mr. President, that unanimous consent should be respected, and that a minority which felt that it should not be applied as of a given day should have its rights protected. I think that is what it is bottomed on.

But has there been application of that principle in this instance? I do not think so, Mr. President. I want to say in all kindness and with complete parliamentary politeness to my friends of the majority, I do not think they have been just to the original intention of the unanimous-consent rule. I think they have overlooked the fact that it was put in the rules for the purpose of protecting the minority from being overridden by a dominant majority.

Our forebears in this body were aware of the fact that a dominant majority existing for a temporary period of time can be tyrannical. They were much concerned about the tyrannies of majorities. That is why they built up in this country a republican form of government, with checks and balances and safeguards which protect us from tyrannical majorities.

As I see this rule in particular, Mr. President, I think it was put in the Senate rules to cover just such a situation as existed here on Friday when the unanimous-consent agreement was offered, but the purpose of which was not carried out by the majority in this body. That is one reason why I objected, and that is one reason why I made up my mind that I would take my stand on this matter in two speeches, and I would fight for the principle of minority rights involved in this case if necessary, until I dropped upon the floor of the Senate of the United States before I would go down before the type of tactics employed by the majority in this body.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon whether he feels that his present position is entirely consistent with that which he expressed on February 6, 1946, in the Senate, when he used the following language:

> I still believe that the Journal should be immediately approved——

Mr. MORSE. Just a moment. Mr. President, is it perfectly proper to put a question in that form?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, it is up to the Senator from Oregon to decide, and to refuse to yield if in his opinion a question is not being asked.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will give me the language, I shall be glad to read it.

Mr. BREWSTER. I will hand the copy of the RECORD to the Senator. I hope he will read it with appropriate emphasis.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will stand behind me and poke me when he wishes me to emphasize, I shall be glad to do so.

As I understand the question, Mr. President, the Senator from Maine asks me if I believe that my present position is consistent with the language which I used on February 6, 1946, in a colloquy with my good friend the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], when I used these words—I shall read the entire paragraph.

Mr. BREWSTER. Very well.

Mr. MORSE. The language is as follows:

> Mr. MORSE. I understand that the purpose of the recess which is about to be taken a few minutes before 4 o'clock in the afternoon, is to enable the majority party to hold a conference in regard to the situation involving the FEPC bill which now confronts the Senate. I am well aware of the fact that the majority should perhaps hold a conference, but I regret that it is to be held at such an early hour. I wish the majority would hold its conference at a later hour in the day, because I am still of the belief that the Senate of the United States should proceed with the business now pending before it. I still believe that the Journal should be immediately approved, and that we should proceed, under the usual parliamentary procedure, to consider the merits of the FEPC bill. We should return to what I believe is to be the great obligation of the Senate, namely, that of voting, and thereby be enabled to proceed with other vital problems now confronting America. More important than that, Mr. President, the great Senate of the United States should be enabled again to return to the principle of majority rule.

Let me say that, on the face of it, its form is not consistent. I wish to say, however, that there are marked differences between the two situations, and I wish to explain my view as to those differences.

The FEPC filibuster sought to do what?

It sought to hold the Senate in a position where it could not transact business until there was an agreement to withdraw that legislation, or until there was a counting of noses which would make it perfectly clear to those who were conducting the filibuster that the bill could not pass.

There is no such attempt on the part of those of us who are conducting this filibuster. We are not seeking to prevent a vote on the veto message. We have been willing at all times to enter into an agreement to vote on it Monday. In the FEPC case we were dealing with a question which had been under discussion for a long time. In this case the veto message was presented to us on Friday afternoon. It was a long document. It deserved our careful study. The President had announced that he would speak to the Nation on a radio hook-up at 10 o'clock. We knew that the message and the talk would have a tremendous public discussion all over the land, and so we pleaded against the unanimous-consent request, asking that the vote on the veto message be allowed to go over the week end. I think there is quite a difference between the two sets of operative facts.

Let me say another thing. I recall the FEPC filibuster very well. As I remember, it lasted between 14 and 18 days. For a period of between 14 and 18 days the Senate was tied up in a filibuster on the FEPC, a filibuster which was made to kill a bill which a clear majority wanted. Night after night I stood on the floor of the Senate and pleaded that this body go into continuous session, 24 hours a day, for as many days as were necessary to break the filibuster. Where were my supporters? Not a single Senator supported me on the proposal to break a filibuster which sought to kill a bill, and which lasted between 14 and 18 days.

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

Mr. MORSE. I have one or two further sentences, and then I shall be glad to yield.

In this case, almost immediately after the veto message was presented we had a request for a unanimous-consent agreement. There were honest, sincere, and good-faith objections to it. What was the minority met with? Continuous sessions of the Senate, or a quick vote without any debate on the merits of the veto message. At the present time we must agree either to take such an arrangement or be held in session. We were held in session; last night speaks for itself. I do not like it. I think it was unnecessary. I do not believe that we ought to act that way toward each other.

Mr. President, there is an additional difference between the two cases. One was an out-and-out filibuster. In my judgment, this one was really provoked by a unanimous-consent request in connection with which, in my judgment, and speaking for myself alone, the majority lost sight of the original intention of protecting the minority in relation to unanimous-consent agreements.

So I believe that on the face of the quoted language there is an inconsistency. Earlier, when I believe the Senator was not present, I stated that it was very difficult for me to go into this fight, because I do not like filibusters. But I had to make a choice between a principle which I think is at stake in this fight, one about which I have just spoken, namely, the underlying purpose, spirit, and intent of the unanimous-consent rule when it was first placed in our rules by the framers thereof, and which I felt was being sacrificed, or was certainly not being observed by the majority in this instance, and on the other hand my honest, sincere belief that by rule we ought to abolish filibusters in the United States Senate. However, I think it must be said that so long as the rules permit them, when we are in a situation such as the one in which we found ourselves on Friday afternoon, we are justified, until the rule is changed, in using the rules to protect our position.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Do I correctly understand the position of the Senator from Oregon to be that there are good filibusters and bad filibusters, determined by the purpose or intent of the one who conducts the filibuster?

Mr. MORSE. I do not think there are any good filibusters, but I think there are differences in filibusters, and I think filibusters are differently motivated. I think they may be used, under the rules, to protect a right which accrues to the minority under another rule the spirit of which the minority feels is being violated. That is our feeling in this instance.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has the Senator from Oregon checked as to what has been the practice of the Senate in connection with voting on veto messages?

Mr. MORSE. No; the Senator from Oregon has not checked on that.

Mr. BREWSTER. It has been my impression, and I wondered whether the Senator from Oregon had any different impression, that it has been the usual custom here to vote upon veto messages rather promptly on their receipt. Has the Senator any recollection in conflict with that?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon will say that he has not checked it. I think that ordinarily veto messages have not involved such vital issues as does this one which has such tremendous public interest. I do not know of any other one since I have been in the Senate as to which, at the time it was delivered to the Senate, it became known that the President of the United States would discuss it on a Nation-wide hook-up that night. When that became known to us—I do not ask anyone to agree with me, but I think it is a very valid point and a decent point—when we did know that, I think that out of the respect that we owe to the office of the Presidency of the United States we should have said, "Let it go over until Monday and then vote on it."

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator recognize that there is any distinction between the appropriate time to consider a veto message of the President in a matter of this importance and the time involved in carrying on a crusade in the country, either by the President or any other group, in the matter of the deliberations of the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from Maine refers in that question to what I would call the rule of reasonableness. It is a question as to whether we were asking for a reasonable postponement of a final vote. I am willing to be judged on whether a request to postpone from Saturday at 5 o'clock to sometime on Monday afternoon is a reasonable request. I think most reasonable, prudent men, given that question, would say that the minority was clearly reasonable in its request, so far as the time element was concerned.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Oregon does not mean to imply, does he, that the time between Friday noon and Saturday afternoon was all that the Senate had given to the consideration of this question?

Mr. MORSE. The veto message?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am talking about the subject.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, no. We have had a prolonged discussion of the bill and we have acted on it. All that was left

to act upon was a veto message of some five thousand words, detailed, incorporating by reference various parts of the bill. But it is a complicated bill. I do not think the Senator will disagree with me—he knows this to be true—when I say that there are men in this body who say to us individually that they are not familiar with all the details of this bill. We have to place confidence in each other. Senator X will say, "Senator Y tells me this is a pretty good bill, and I kind of lean on him on this type of legislation, and am going along with him on it."

When it comes to the subject of forestry in my State I try to familiarize myself as best I can with forestry problems, but when I have one to handle I go to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] who I think is one of the best informed men not only in the Senate but in the country on forestry problems. I lean very heavily on him.

I think that is what has happened in the case of the labor bill. Although there has been prolonged debate on it it has been a restricted debate so far as both participants and auditors are concerned. Those of us who have been vitally concerned with it have done most of the debating and have listened to each other, and the Senate as a whole has not listened to a great percentage of the debate because of the fact that we have been leaning on each other, as I say. But there came a veto message. I say to the Senator from Maine that there are men in the Senate who have not been going along with me on the labor bill, but on Friday afternoon they came to me and said, "It makes me scratch my head." There was one Senator who said to me—he is not here at this time, but he was present not very long ago—"There is one large segment of this veto message that covers for the most part the major points you made in your speech on June 5." I said, "That flatters me. I thought I was right then; I am convinced that I am right now." He said, "It bothers me."

I simply cite that to show that there was one Member of the Senate who, following the veto message, had become perplexed. He was not so sure that his leaning on someone else had produced the best results. When I heard such expressions of perplexity I did not give up hope that maybe a little longer debate on it, a little further consideration of the veto message, might change some votes in the Senate. I do not think I should be criticized for that. That is my responsibility and also my obligation. But I say to the Senator from Maine that I do not think that from Friday afternoon until Saturday afternoon at 5 o'clock was ample time within which to consider the veto message. Reasonable men can differ on that.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator consider it any reflection to suggest that the President of the United States, with his preoccupation with many matters, particularly at this time, and with his very broad range of responsibilities, is not perhaps himself entitled to as much respect in consideration of a matter of this kind as is the Senator from Oregon who has devoted much of his life to these problems, has had a vast experience, and has contributed very greatly to the discussion of the question, as have other Members of this body who have given much time and study to it, and as have also Members of the other House? The subject had been very thoroughly explored. I say that not to deprecate the President's work, but to inquire whether the Senator from Oregon does not feel that the subject has been rather exhaustively surveyed by men of great competence in the Congress, so that the President contributed little that was new. Is not that a fair comment?

Mr. MORSE. I want to answer the question put to me by the Senator from Maine by saying that as between my own view and that of the President on this issue, I would rather take the President's view. I think we want to give full weight and consideration to what the responsibility of that job adds to a man. I think I know that over the recent weeks the President of the United States has been deeply concerned about this issue. I do not think that the veto message represents the views of someone else. I think the veto message represents the study and the considered judgment of the President formed after he had many and prolonged conferences with the labor experts within the administration.

I would have to say, in answer to the question, that after we had weighed the views of those in Congress who had worked on the legislation, we still owed it to our President to spend more time, on a message as carefully prepared as that one, than from Friday at noon to Saturday afternoon at 5 o'clock. But there, again, that is my judgment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator from Oregon think it at all pertinent to reconcile the President's views expressed a year ago when he desired us to enact legislation of as drastic a character as was ever proposed in this or perhaps in any other democratic body, a proposal to draft labor? What effect does that have upon the Senator's expression of his views?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Maine knows that the Senator from Oregon vigorously opposed the President of the United States on that matter. In fact, the Senator from Oregon was so shocked by the President's proposal in that instance that, as I said earlier in my speech in the wee hours of the morning, I felt that I expressed my opposition to the President's suggestion in language that was unfair to the President. I have said so on the floor of the Senate. I think the President made a terrible mistake; but I think he, as everyone else, learns by mistakes; and I think he has a better understanding of American labor problems as a result of the mistake. I think it has made him a much more careful student of American labor problems, during the intervening year.

All I say is that his veto message satisfies me that he has learned a great deal since the mistake he made in the railroad case. That is about all I can say in answer to the question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question? If he will, I shall not interrupt him again.

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able Senator from Oregon this question: With reference to his previous statement that the only request had been to go over until Monday, does not the Senator recall that our colleague from Idaho had suggested that the matter go over until perhaps Thursday? So, when the Senator states that his request was that it go over to Monday, he was not the only one, of course, entitled to consideration under the unanimous-consent request; and does not the Senator also recall that the matter that was finally before the Senate was whether it would go over until perhaps Thursday of next week or later?

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the Senator from California that I think it was right at that point that negotiations should have been started. I think we could have easily reconciled our differences. I recall that something to that effect was said by the Senator from Idaho; but so far as I know, we never talked it over with him, and I do not think any request was made to have the vote postponed until Thursday.

But I talked to the chairman of our conference, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. I wish he were here at this time. I told him, in the cloakroom, that I thought something should be done to iron out this difficulty. I talked to some other Senators, too. I said I thought we were making a great mistake, and that we ought to try to understand each other in this matter.

I wish to say to the Senator from California that I think the mistake was that we should have let some Senator proceed with a speech, and all other Senators involved should have gotten into a huddle and should have started right out with the premise, "We are not going to take the adamant position that unless we can get a unanimous-consent agreement now as to Saturday, there will not be any unanimous-consent agreement at all." I think that atmosphere and that attitude were created in the Senate at the very critical time when we should have been doing some collective bargaining.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. MORSE. For a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator recollect, however, that so far as concerns the session which began yesterday and lasted through the night and into today, a move was not made to do that until a threat had been made on the floor of the Senate of a filibuster that might continue well into next week?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, so much has transpired, and I have been on my feet so long, that I cannot recollect every conversation. But I wish to say that if it may be done without causing me to lose the floor or lose on any ruling that I shall have made more than one speech if the Senator from California does expound further on the matter, I wish the

Senator would refresh my recollection as to who made that threat, because I wish to say to the Senator from California that, for the life of me, in standing here now and trying to think back to the last few hours, I do not know of any threat that was made.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a question, I think I can frame the matter as a question, so that my colleague will not lose the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator from Oregon recall that our able colleague, the Senator from Idaho—I do not see him in the Chamber at this time—suggested on the floor of the Senate that a filibuster—and that word was used—might be necessary in order to carry this discussion over until Thursday? Does not the Senator recall that the Senator from Idaho made mention of the fact, if the Senator from Oregon will recall—and I am sure the Senator does recall—that certain Senators were out of town, that certain Senators were expected to return shortly, but that certain other Senators had to go to the southern part of the country—to Warm Springs, I believe; and at that point he suggested—if the Senator will recollect—that it might be necessary to conduct a filibuster until Thursday?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator from California says that statement was made, his assurance is good enough for me. I must have been engaged either in a conference or in a conversation, or else I must have been out of the Chamber at that time, for I did not hear that statement made.

But I say this: After the Senator from Idaho made that statement, then, again, I think it was the basis for quick negotiations and conferences with the Senator from Idaho, because—and let us be perfectly honest about the matter—all of us know that in the heat of debate on the floor of the Senate, when things are moving at a rapid pace, many men—each one of us, as a matter of fact, and certainly the present speaker is no exception—very frequently make statements—that they wish to have quickly modified—insofar as concerns what is going to happen if such and such takes place from the standpoint of strategy.

As I have said, what the Senator from California says was said is good enough for me. If he heard it, it was said. But my point is that I do not think that justified our taking an adamant position and for saying "Very well; we are going to keep going."

I think that what we should have done would have been to get the great pacifier on the other side of the aisle, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and a few other Senators on that side of the aisle and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Ohio, and the other leaders on this matter on this side of the aisle, including the Senator who objected to the proposed unanimous-consent request, to form a huddle, and then I think we could have threshed out the very reasoning we are talking about now on the floor of the Senate, almost a day later—it is not actually that much later, but it seems that way—and could have ironed out the difficulty. That is where we made our mistake. Let us be frank enough to admit it. I think we all made a mistake at that point. Something happened. One group went one way and the other group went the other, and there was no one to bring us back into wedlock. It was too bad. Let me say that it is not too late to have a unanimous-consent agreement for a vote on Monday.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Maine for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. It seems entirely evident that there would be no difficulty, as I understand the Senator from Oregon, in arriving at a unanimous-consent agreement——

Mr. MORSE. There never was.

Mr. BREWSTER. So long as it complies with the specifications of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I suppose if the Senator from Maine wants to take that position, that unless the Senator from Oregon accepts the unanimous-consent agreement which was offered for a vote on Saturday at 5 o'clock, then he is guilty of taking the position that the only unanimous-consent agreement that would satisfy is a unanimous-consent agreement to vote as of the hour he fixed on Monday. But I think that ignores every point I have made as to why I think Saturday is an unreasonable day, and some hour on Monday is reasonable. I wish the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] were present, because I would rather talk about the conference I had with him. I wish the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] were present, because the Senator from Ohio would have to testify that when he came over to my desk the suggestion was at one stage for a vote on Monday at 5 o'clock, then Monday at 1 o'clock, and I said, "Bob, I think Monday at 3 is a reasonable in-between figure. Why don't we agree on Monday at 3?" I do not know what he did with that, but I surmise that when he went back and tried to sell it, he did not have any buyers.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Oregon whether or not the question as to yielding to the views of the Senator from Oregon specifically was not warranted, because he not only disagreed with the majority on Saturday, but, as I understand him now, he apparently disagreed with his own colleague on the Thursday date. He felt there was just one time which was the ideal, which was what he had picked. The Senator from Idaho, who wanted the debate to proceed very much longer, was as much out of range on the agreement as the other Senators who wanted it to go on a more limited time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not think that is a correct interpretation of my position; at least, it is not the position I intend to take or mean to take. I never talked with the Senator from Idaho about the matter. I will say that when I first talked with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] I thought Tuesday was a better date, because I thought that on Monday whatever reaction there was to be from the country would be observed by the Members of the Senate, for whatever value it might prove to have, so far as affecting the final vote was concerned. So I preferred Tuesday. I was willing, very early, to take a Monday figure. But the Senator from Maine is correct, that I think the only thing which made it impossible to avoid this filibuster was the position of the majority, that we had to go along with a Saturday date at 5 o'clock, and, as I have said in regard to that—and I do not ask for agreement on it, but I ask for an understanding of my position, that is all—I do not think the majority was carrying out the real spirit and intent of the unanimous consent agreement rule.

If we could not get beyond the Saturday date, I think the Senator from Maine then is perfectly correct in saying that the Senator from Oregon refused to agree, unless he could have an agreement which would take effect after the week end. That was my position; it is my position now. I shall have to continue to talk, and talk tomorrow, if the only choice is an agreement which provides for a vote of 5 o'clock this afternoon, because my honest opinion is that that is not a fair agreement.

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

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it within protocol for either the Senator from Oregon or myself to have a unanimous-consent agreement for the insertion in the RECORD of four editorials from the leading newspapers of Washington and New York this morning dealing with the subject of this veto?

Mr. MORSE. I shall have to address that question to the Chair, and put it in the form of a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Maine wants to know whether it would be possible for us to agree to introduce into the RECORD four editorials, appearing in today's newspapers, with the unanimous-consent understanding that it would not in any way, shape, form, or manner affect the right of the Senator from Oregon to keep the floor, and to keep the position which he now occupies of being in the midst of his first speech on this question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Due to the fact that the able Senator from Maine has made the request, I do not like to object to it, but I shall be forced to do so, because I have objected to similar requests from other Senators on the floor of the Senate, and on a strict interpretation of the rules, without such unanimous consent, it would be intervening business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am sure that under those circumstances the Senator from Maine will understand I shall decline to yield.

I return to the point I was making on this hypothetical case.

Moreover, if the union believed that the working standards and jobs of its members in the entire city were threatened by the employer's action, and if it brought pressure to bear upon other employers in order to defend itself, it would be guilty of an illegal secondary boycott and subject again to all of the penalties mentioned, as well as a mandatory, immediate court injunction. And these penalties would be applied even though it turned out, a year or 2 years later, when the Board issued its final decision in the case, that the employer had deliberately transferred the work to the nonunion men in order to rid himself of the union and to provoke the strike.

I cannot believe that any fair-minded person would regard union action for that purpose and under such circumstances to be improper.

What are unions for if not to protect workingmen against that kind of treatment by employers? Nor is there anything in the present Wagner Act, so far as I can see, which would prohibit the union from taking appropriate action to protect itself and its members. Yet this bill leaves the union and its members completely helpless under the meaning given the conference amendment by the Senator from Ohio.

The supplementary analysis also attempts to defend the conference amendments that change the law with respect to the responsibility of labor unions and employers for the acts of officials or agents. The analysis states that the amendments are criticized in one breath as imposing too harsh a liability upon unions for the acts of their officers and representatives and as too mild with respect to the liability of employers for the acts of their managerial and supervisory personnel. "Of course," the analysis announces, "the definition applies equally in the responsibility imputed to both employers and labor organizations."

This attempted explanation and justification is, I believe, entirely unsound and, because of its specious reliance upon a spurious equality of treatment, even misleading. The effect of the amendment is, on one hand, to broaden the liability of labor unions, as now limited under the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and on the other hand, to narrow the liability of employers under the National Labor Relations Act, as now established by decisions of the Supreme Court. The rule of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, now changed by this bill, has its roots in years of bitter experience with the practice of some employers of hiring spies and agents provocateurs for insertion in union ranks to commit unlawful activities for which the union could be charged with responsibility in the courts The records of the La Follette committee are full of such abuses by employers and friendly courts. And the rule of responsibility of employers under the National Labor Relations Act has its firm roots in the realities of labor relations at the plant level, where the "boss" is not a distant corporation, or directors, or officers, but the foreman. No justification is shown for changing either of these sound rules of responsibility, now contained in the law.

A third comment contained in the supplementary analysis, which I believe is also specious and misleading, is that with reference to the free speech amendment of section 8 (c) of the conference bill. It is stated that the critics of the provision—including myself—are in error when they say that the prohibition against using expressions of opinion would prevent the Board from applying ordinary rules of evidence in its proceedings, and that it goes much further even than the rules with respect to admissibility in a criminal or civil trial. These critics overlook, the analysis asserts, the facts that the privilege of this subsection is limited to expressions of views, arguments, or opinions, and that it has no application to statements which are acts in themselves or contain directions or instructions.

Frankly, it embarrasses me to comment on statements like that, because I do not believe that they are intended to convey the meaning which, by interpretation, they may appear to convey. I think we ought to be perfectly candid with one another. Everybody knows that so far as an employee is concerned there may be very little difference between his employer's views, arguments, or opinions about unions and his instructions or directions. Anything an employer says can be couched in terms of views, arguments, or opinions. Yet in actual practice, the employee may well treat his statements as instructions or directions, depending on surrounding circumstances. And how can one draw a realistic line between statements of opinion which are acts and those which are not? I can only say that the effect of this bit of ex post facto clarification of the legislative history is to leave me hopelessly confused. But I do not think it will operate to diminish any of the serious consequences I see in this provision.

Another clarifying item in the supplementary analysis to which I must address myself is the attempt to justify the conference amendment to section 10 (c), pursuant to which trial examiners' recommended orders automatically become the Board's order if no exceptions are filed within 20 days. Critics of this provision, including myself, have pointed out that this would permit unsuccessful litigants to bypass the Board and go directly to the courts without giving the Board an opportunity to correct error of the trial examiner. The supplementary analysis attempts to meet this criticism by asserting, first, that this could not happen because section 10 (c) provides that "No objection that has not been urged before the Board, its member, agent, or agency, shall be considered by the court"; that, in any event, the attorney trying the case would presumably file exceptions; and, finally, that the general counsel would not go forward with enforcement if the order was erroneous.

Again, I can only express my concern at the specious and, in my opinion, irrelevant character of the comment. Here, again, we have an answer that seems plausible on its face, but, in my opinion, is found to be beside the point when its surface is scratched. In the first place, the case assumed in the criticism of the provision was one in which the objection had been made before the trial examiner, who had ruled erroneously. Accordingly section 10 (c) would appear to be complied with, even though the objection was not renewed by exceptions before the Board, for the objection would have been one that had been urged before an agent of the Board. That is all that section 10 (c) seems on it face to require.

Secondly, it is assumed by the criticism that the unsuccessful attorney desired to reverse the Board in the courts without giving the Board itself opportunity to correct the error, and the successful attorney could hardly be expected to or be in a position to file exceptions to a decision in his favor. Finally, it is entirely irrelevant to assert that the Board's general counsel would not proceed with enforcement, since the point of the criticism is that the unsuccessful private litigant would seek judicial review in order to set the order aside.

Still other confusing and even irrelevant statements made in the supplementary analysis have to do with my criticism of the amendments to sections 8 (d) and 7 of the conference bill. In answer to my point that section 8 (d) undesirably weakens collective bargaining when it redefines the duty to bargain during the term of a contract, the analysis replies in substance that the parties still may meet voluntarily and discuss changes in the contract, but that it is not an unfair labor practice for them to refuse to do so.

That is the crux of the matter. In fact, all through the bill, Mr. President, we see time after time rights of form but not of substance given to the worker.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; for a question.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to ask for information. The part of the bill that concerns me is the prohibition of expenditures for political purposes. I hold in my hand——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. AIKEN. It is going to be a question. I can assure the Senator I am seeking information. I want the right to ask——

Mr. MORSE. I know the Senator does, but he does not know how careful I have to be.

Mr. AIKEN. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. MORSE. Ask the question. The whole thing must be a question.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me ask this question, Mr. President. How in the world am I ever going to find out what I want to know if I cannot ask a question?

Mr. MORSE. That is what bothers me.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure no one on this floor will deny that it is a question when he hears it.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator may think so, Mr. President.

Mr. AIKEN. Perhaps I can get some of the proponents of the bill to answer the question.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont has not been in the Chamber recently and heard some of the exchanges which have taken place. If he were in my position, I am sure he would understand why I am exercising the great degree of care I am obliged to exercise. I wonder if he will not prepare a question to ask both the proponents and some of us who oppose the bill, and present his question to such Senators in the cloakroom.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I address the Chair long enough to say that that is exactly what I want to do.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator is making a parliamentary inquiry——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know that it is in the form of a parliamentary inquiry. I want to tell the Chair that what I intended to do was to ask both proponents and opponents of the bill the same question, but not in the cloakroom, because I want the answer on the record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I may say, because I want to be of assistance to the Senator from Vermont, that if he will write out his question and hand it to me and his statement in explanation of his question, I will read it, and I will answer it if I can answer it. But I am not going to take any chances of losing the floor, because I still think we can win this fight.

Repeating the paragraph, Mr. President, still other confusing and even irrelevant statements made in the supplemental analysis have to do with my criticism of the amendments to sections 8 (d) and 7 of the conference bill. In answer to my point that section 8 (d) undesirably weakens collective bargaining when it redefines the duty to bargain during the term of a contract, the analysis replies in substance that the parties still may meet voluntarily and discuss changes in the contract, but that it is not an unfair labor practice for them to refuse to do so. But the point of my criticism is, that we undesirably dilute and water down collective bargaining when we tell labor and management that if they have a contract they are not under any legal obligation to discuss changes in its provisions that will take effect during its term; and that they may engage in strikes, lock-outs, or lawsuits instead.

That is not going to produce labor peace. That is not going to promote the objective which I think the great majority of the people of the country want us to accomplish, namely, the objective of passing legislation which will promote industrial harmony, which will encourage the settlement of disputes through good faith collective bargaining, which will provide collective and workable procedure for the peaceful solution of disputes. That is not done, Mr. President, when there is set up a procedure such as I think has been set up in this measure, and in accordance with the point I have just made, that the real alternative is not collective bargaining at all under the provision, but the engaging in strikes and lock-outs or lawsuits instead.

Industry and labor had voluntary collective bargaining even before the Labor Relations Act. But my notion of the act is that its purpose was to make it legally compelling for the parties to bargain; that it was designed to foster, protect and encourage collective bargaining as a stubstitute for strikes and lock-outs. This amendment does not conform to that purpose; it contradicts it. I think it would be far better if the sponsors of the bill, who advocate such a provision, admitted frankly that it has that purpose and effect, and attempted to explain why they thought it was desirable to make the change. The bill would at least be less confusing, it would be subject to less misinterpretation, and it would be much less litigious.

The same point can be made of the comment in the analysis in answer to my objection to the amendment to section 7 of the conference bill, writing into the law a national policy to protect the right to refrain from collective bargaining. Of course, it is true, as the analysis says, that this is already the law and that the Board has so interpreted the present act. But the point is, that writing such a policy into the statute designed to encourage collective bargaining, will only confuse administration of the law, weaken its protections, and give lawyers and antiunion employers a handy tool with which to try to defeat union organizational campaigns.

I do not intend to catalogue all of the difficulties and the confusion I have with the various analyses and explanations of the bill. The examples I have given are enough, I think, to show how tortured the search for the correct meaning and effect of this bill will be if it becomes law.

These subtle legalisms, adroit arguments, and ambiguous words are suitable for lawyers; they are the currency of those who speak for special interests in advocacy of their causes. But businessmen and workers do not talk that language. They need candor and frankness, a belief in the sincerity and good faith of one another, a conviction that neither is out "to put one over" on the other. They need trust and fairness in their dealings. That is the way labor relations and collective bargaining operate; and it is the only way they can operate in a free democracy.

This bill is the very antithesis of fairness and candor. It puts all the cards under the table or up the sleeve of the lawyers for both parties. Such legislation will never receive my vote.

In closing this part of my speech, I must say that to me this is a tragic moment in American industrial history. I think we had a great opportunity. I think we still have a great opportunity in this session of Congress—perhaps an unparalleled one—to do something good and constructive. We had a great opportunity to write a fair, reasonable law, to improve collective bargaining, and to promote industrial peace. The whole country was looking to us, to the Republican Party, to correct and improve our industrial relations, in accordance with a sound party program. But I think, so far, Mr. President, we as a party holding majority control in the Eightieth Congress have muffed that wonderful opportunity; and I think it is a great and tragic loss for all Americans and for the economic stability and prosperity of our country.

Mr. President, it is not too late to recover the ball. It is not too late to make a touchdown in this game of industrial relations. It means that the Republican majority in this session of Congress must raise its sights. It must change its method of play. It must keep its eyes on the ball.

We must not be misled by certain elements in the cheering section, because I fear there are elements in the cheering section who are cheering when we muff the ball, because they want us to muff the ball. We can pass some good labor legislation if we have the will and the determination to do what it takes to pass it. As I said earlier in this speech, we can pass it in 10 days. We can pass it by sustaining this veto message and going to work at once, resubmitting to the committee separate pieces of legislation on the vital issues which are involved in the whole question of improved labor relations.

It is not going to require a considerable amount of time to get this bill back on the floor of the Senate. I think we can get it out of the Congress and into the White House, if we have the will to do it, on the basis of the rich experience we have had on labor legislation thus far in this session of Congress. I say I think we can do it in a period of 10 days; and I think we should do it. I think it is our obligation to do it.

Mr. President, in one letter which I have written on the problem of our responsibility to pass legislation I said this, after discussing procedural defects in the bill, as I pointed them out in my June 5 speech:

> In view of these procedural defects in the bill, I am at a complete loss to understand your support of the bill. To date I have read nothing on the bill except very weak rationalizations of what I consider are unsound procedural provisions. You make the point that the only choice there is is between this bill or no bill at all. Of course, you know better than that.
>
> I think that is the same line the Republican leaders in this session of Congress have been telling the American people. It is based upon what appears to me is subject to the interpretation of being a political threat that if the President does not let them have their way by signing the type of antilabor bill they want, they will sulk in their tents and pass no labor legislation at all. If this undesirable bill should be vetoed—

I wrote this letter before the veto—

> and I hope it will—and if enough Senators take the time to study its bad features and thereafter vote to sustain a veto, and I feel they could—a new and fair labor bill could be passed through the Congress within 10 days thereafter. That is, it could if the Republican leaders of this Congress are willing to put partisan politics aside long enough to serve the best interests of all the people of the country.
>
> Your argument that the defects in this bill can be corrected by the joint Senate-House

committee some time in the future is a very unsound premise on the basis of which to ask Members of Congress who are trying to do a conscientious job in the public interest to vote for any piece of legislation. In my judgment, no Member of Congress can justify hiding behind the face-saving rationalization you offer him because this bill is absolutely unsound and procedurally unworkable.

I wrote that, Mr. President, before the President's veto message was received, and I am very happy to find that my observation is shared also by him.

The letter continues as follows:

From the moment of its enactment great injustices to the legitimate rights of both labor and industry will start to accrue. No Member of Congress has any right to vote for a piece of legislation which is so imperfect that even its proponents admit its serious imperfections before it is passed—by attempting to justify their wrongdoing by standing up on the floor of the Senate, or by writing editorials based on the rationalization that some time in the future the injustices of the law should be corrected by modifications and amendments. Obviously it is the duty of Congress to pass sound legislation in the first place.

Those Members of Congress who are attempting to alibi for the serious, known defects and injustices of the Taft-Hartley bill should not be aided and abetted. The legislative principle you have adopted in your attempt to front for this legislation is so destructive of a sound legislative process that I hope you will not apply it generally to all legislation which comes before the Congress.

In the ordinary course of events the Congress will pass plenty of legislation with imperfections in it of which its Members are not aware at the time of passage, and which imperfections necessarily will need correcting in the future. However, in the name of good government it cannot pass legislation which it knows in advance is full of serious imperfections and gross injustices, and then try to excuse itself to the American people on the basis of the alibi that it provided within the bill for a committee to study the administration of the act and make recommendations in the future. Such a run-out isn't going to provide any comfort or protection to those unions and workers whose legitimate economic rights will be weakened or destroyed by anti-labor employers who are given such great advantages by the Taft-Hartley bill.

Such a postponement of correcting the many injustices which are inherent in this bill is not going to promote good employer-employee relations in this country. Right now is the time to pass labor legislation which does not include the injustices and imperfections of the Taft-Hartley bill. Right now is the time for the Republican leadership of the Republican majority in the Eightieth Congress to pass sound labor legislation so necessary to check labor and employer abuses.

Right now is the time for all great newspapers to make a fight for sound legislation, and to rationalize legislation which admittedly has serious imperfections in it.

Mr. President, I ask the Official Reporter to include in the RECORD only the parts of the letter I have just read, in accordance with the corrections and modifications I have made as I have gone along in reading it. I say that because I want the Official Reporter to understand that I do not want the name of the recipient of the letter to be shown in the RECORD, and also I made certain changes in reading the letter as I went along, which I am sure are made clear in the reporter's notes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in full in the RECORD?

Mr. MORSE. No, Mr. President, I do not want the letter to be printed in full. I am simply telling the Official Reporter that I have handed him the letter. I do not mean to have the letter printed in full in the RECORD. I simply have handed the letter to the reporter, for I thought it might be helpful to him to have the letter in his possession as he prepared the RECORD. But I wish to make clear to him that I made corrections as I read the letter, and I also wish to make clear to him that I did not mention the recipient of the letter. I think the Chair is quite correct, namely, that my statement sounded as if I wanted the entire letter printed in the RECORD. However, that is not my desire. I simply want the Official Reporter to understand that I wish him to put in the RECORD the verbatim statement I made, which he has reported in his notes. But I think he will find the letter helpful to him in going over his notes.

Mr. President, under date of June 20, yesterday, I received a copy of a letter which was sent to my good friend the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. The letter is signed by Mrs. Anna Lord Strauss, president of the League of Women Voters, with an office in Washington, D. C. I think she is known to most of us. I think her high standing and her objective attitude and her desire to have the Congress enact only legislation which will be in the public interest are also well known to us. I shall read this letter into the RECORD.

Mr. President, first let me make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I do not wish to seem always to be seeking advance rulings but I am going to read these communications, and my parliamentary inquiry is as follows: If I ask to have anything which is before me inserted in the RECORD, I shall have to obtain unanimous consent to that effect, and then I may be likely to get in trouble, may I not, on the ground that I am asking to have new business transacted, and some Senator will be able to object and have his objection sustained, and then I shall find myself in the position of being on my way to making a second speech?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, the Senator would run that risk if he made such a request.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Chair. I almost got caught that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not trying to catch the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, no, not the Chair. I would not say such a thing of the present occupant of the chair. I have nothing but love for the present occupant of the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is very appreciative.

Mr. MORSE. I know he will always try to give me fair and impartial treatment under the rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair will try to do so.

Mr. MORSE. And I have nothing but love and affection for the other Senators around me, too; but I know that some of them will try to catch me just the same. [Laughter.]

So, Mr. President, I think I had better read the letter, rather than run any risk:

DEAR SENATOR BARKLEY: In connection with the discussion of the Taft-Hartley labor bill (H. R. 3020), may I point out the following very serious aspect of one of its provisions which so far as we know has received no attention.

Mr. President, I digress from the letter long enough to say that I do not think that should surprise Mrs. Strauss. I imagine that there is quite a great deal in the bill that has not yet received any consideration. As the years pass by, if this bill becomes law, I think the lawyers will find newer and newer aspects of the bill which will receive, because of their diligent research, the serious consideration of a number of courts.

But, Mr. President, going back to the letter, Mrs. Strauss says further.

Section 304 of the bill forbids any corporation or any labor union to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with Presidential or congressional primaries or elections. The league has taken no position on the labor bill, either pro or con. However, we are informed by lawyers and experts who have worked on the legislation that this provision would apply to incorporated organizations such as the League of Women Voters. I am sure you are familiar with the nonpartisan election material, designed to stimulate a larger and more informed vote, which the league has been issuing for the past 27 years. This type of activity, which we consider of vital importance to the maintenance of a participating electorate, would, we understand, be prohibited by this section of the bill. This would affect not only the League of Women Voters but all other incorporated civic groups who have been accustomed to providing roll calls and other election tools for the benefit of the voter who seeks to cast an intelligent ballot.

We hope you may be able to point out to the Senate the extremely serious consequences which can emerge from such a stifling of our rights as active citizens.

Mr. President, I do not know whether she is right or wrong. I have not seen the letter before, and I have not taken time to study the problem she raises. But if she is right it is a rather serious situation, and of course it involves something that would have to be corrected. We shall certainly hear about it if she is right.

Mr. President, this little parliamentary situation is all over the President's veto message, and it all comes about because a majority insisted on a unanimous consent agreement to vote on the bill at 5 o'clock this afternoon.

Some of us felt that the request, under all the circumstances, was unreasonable, and I objected to it, although had I not objected, others would have.

I have already given my main reasons as to why I objected, but I wish to repeat that probably along with my reason that the President should have been shown what I consider to be a greater degree of consideration than the unanimous-consent agreement request for a vote at 5 o'clock today did show to him, was the reason that I do not think that under the unanimous-consent rule a ma-

jority should force its will upon the minority under such circumstances as are present in this case.

As I said earlier this afternoon, I think that when that rule was put into the rule book, it was for the purpose of guaranteeing the minority that no action was going to be taken or could be taken, under just such circumstances as those which are present in this particular case, unless all agreed. I think that is why the rule was adopted. I do not think it was put into the book with tongue in cheek. I do not think the propounders of the rule sought to protect the minority with the one hand and snatch their rights away with the other. I do not think the propounders of the rule had in mind that when the majority could not get unanimous consent, then it should consider itself perfectly free to drive the minority into a unanimous-consent agreement by forcing it either to accept the agreement or start a filibuster.

I cannot believe that. I think they were much more considerate of the minority. I think that rule was adopted, among other reasons, for the purpose of enabling the Senate to expedite its business by unanimous consent. That is why I think it was adopted. I do not think it was put into effect for the purpose of enabling a dominant majority to expedite the business of the Senate by saying to the minority, in effect, "You either accept this unanimous-consent agreement or start talking."

It is not reasonable to think that any such motivation or intent could have been entertained in the minds of those who wrote the rule book from period to period, in the interest of making this an effective and efficient parliamentary body, whereby the majority could transact business, but within reasonable restraints which protect minority interests.

There are other ways of doing business. It can be done by motion, and there are a great many other ways within the rule book, but for purposes of expedition and speeding up it was provided that the rules could be set aside by unanimous consent. I think it was a rule based upon a gentleman's understanding and agreement. That is the way I like to think about it. But, Mr. President, I think it is being abused; I think it is being terribly abused in this instance, and I think that if we do not show up anything else in this debate, we are going to add another chapter to the record in support of the argument that we need some revision of our rules so as to protect against abuse, including the abuse of filibustering, including the abuse of the unanimous-consent agreement.

We do not get an efficient, smoothly operating Senate out of following parliamentary practices and procedures which did not stem from a good faith, friendly, cooperative comity relationship between each other. That is what hurts me so much about this particular battle, Mr. President. That is what so deeply grieves me, because we are not together, on what I think is a clear objective of the rules. Surely there come times in the life of a parliamentary body when the lines of difference are so deeply drawn that the strictest application of the rules must be followed; but certainly not a time so short after the presentation of a veto message as was the case in this instance. But, along with this point of mine, I think—and again I present my views, and I reflect on no one; at least intentionally or meaningly—I think we have done violence to the unanimous-consent agreement rule in this case. I think violence was done to it when the majority took the position we had to vote Saturday afternoon or we were going into continuous session. I am sorry the majority did that. Something tells me that from down deep in the hearts of certain of my very good friends on the majority side, a message is going to their consciences, telling them that it would have been a great deal better if they had not been so insistent upon enforcing their technical power. I do not say rights, Mr. President, because I really am inclined to deny that, within the meaning of the rule, the right really exists; but the power to do what they are doing clearly is present; and because I know them to be fair-minded men, I have a hunch that already they know to their own satisfaction, even though they may defend their position " 'till the cows come home," as we used to say when I was a kid, I think they know that they are rather hard on the minority in this instance. But this, like other things, will pass, and we shall be working together again. Next time, as so characteristic of the Senate, we shall all be jumbled up, so far as alinements are concerned, and they will probably let their hair down, and I will, too, and we will admit what I tried to point out here a few minutes ago, that we did not engage in enough collective bargaining before we got into this mess. Of course, Senators know how it is. In the midst of a parliamentary battle, someone begins to see some great principle involved, and someone feels, as one Senator apparently felt when he talked to me today in the cloakroom, that "we have got to break you on this; we will break you if it takes to Monday morning." I do not know whether they are breaking us or not. I do not know what is meant by "breaking us."

Mr. LUCAS entered the Chamber.

Mr. MORSE. There is the Senator from Illinois. I am glad to see him.

Mr. LUCAS bowed his acknowledgment.

Mr. MORSE. May I say that I hope the Senator from Illinois will proceed to give very careful consideration to what has transpired since he was last in the Senate Chamber. Knowing him to be a man of great fairness, and also a determined fighter for the rights of the minority, in the Senate of the United States, perhaps after he catches up on the transactions of the Senate since he left, tomorrow morning about 4 o'clock I can get some help from the Senator from Illinois. I do not know of anyone, Mr. President, I would rather hear on this subject, about 4 o'clock tomorrow morning, than the Senator from Illinois.

Now, Mr. President, as I was saying, I think we are going to come out on this all right.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of the fact that the Senator from Illinois has been away, may I inquire of my able friend how long he has been speaking?

Mr. MORSE. I would not know. [Laughter.] Will the Chair inform the Senator how long I have been speaking?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It seems like a couple of weeks to the chair. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. MORSE. First, I should like to say to my good friend, the senior Senator from Michigan, who now occupies the chair, that if he feels that way now I wonder what his feeling will be about Monday morning?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Simply numb, about that time. [Laughter.]

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that the Senator from Oregon has been speaking 7 hours and about 50 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. That is not long enough.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is a matter of opinion.

Will the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MORSE. For a question only, Mr. President.

Mr. FERGUSON. Having been advised by the Chair of the length of time the Senator has been speaking, can he advise the Senate as to how long he will continue to speak?

Mr. MORSE. No; I cannot. I have a glass of milk here which I am going to drink. I am very fond of milk, and it has a very invigorating effect on me. [Laughter.] I do not know what might happen after I drink it. I shall wait for a few whispered instructions from certain of my colleagues, in the course of another hour or so. I may then be able to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MORSE. For a question, Mr. President.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of the fact that the distinguished President pro tempore has stated that it seems as though it has been 2 weeks that the Senator from Oregon has been talking, as a premise for the Senator's reply as to how long he might talk, can he give us any notion as to how long he might talk, in view of the statement made by the distinguished President pro tempore?

Mr. MORSE. It pains me very much to know that my friend from Michigan is suffering any fatigue as the result of my talking, because I think that is implied in his remarks. I do not blame him at all. He ought to be down here doing this job. He knows something about fatigue. I think I will talk for—oh, I cannot say.

I do not know, Mr. President, whether all Members of the Senate have been able to study and restudy and examine and reexamine the President's message, but that is what this battle is about. I think we ought to pause to reflect on it

from time to time. So, Mr. President—I had better make, first, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. There is nothing in the rules, is there, that would prevent my reading the President's veto message and commenting on it as I go along, even though it has already been read once into the RECORD by the clerk?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is quite safe in doing that.

Mr. MORSE. I want to reemphasize the message and call renewed attention to its provisions, because I have such great difficulty in seeing how people can study that message and not recognize that every presumption should be rendered in its favor, and vote to sustain it, and then get busy in the Congress in passing new legislation that will meet the objections that are raised in the message.

Thus, the President said to us in his veto message:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 3020, the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

I am fully aware of the gravity which attaches to the exercise by the President of his constitutional power to withold his approval from an enactment of the Congress.

I share with the Congress the conviction that legislation dealing with the relations between management and labor is necessary. I heartily condemn abuses on the part of unions and employers, and I have no patience with stubborn insistence on private advantage to the detriment of the public interest.

But this bill is far from a solution of those problems.

When one penetrates the complex, interwoven provisions of this omnibus bill, and understands the real meaning of its various parts, the result is startling.

The bill taken as a whole would reverse the basic direction of our national labor policy, inject the Government into private economic affairs on an unprecedented scale, and conflict with important principles of our democratic society. Its provisions would cause more strikes, not fewer. It would contribute neither to industrial peace nor to economic stability and progress. It would be a dangerous stride in the direction of a totally managed economy. It contains seeds of discord which would plague this Nation for years to come.

Because of the far-reaching import of this bill, I have weighed its probable effects against a series of fundamental considerations. In each case I find that the bill violates principles essential to our public welfare.

I. The first major test which I have applied to this bill is whether it would result in more or less Government intervention in our economic life.

Our basic national policy has always been to establish by law standards of fair dealing and then to leave the working of the economic system to the free choice of individuals. Under that policy of economic freedom we have built our Nation's productive strength. Our people have deep faith in industrial self-government with freedom of contract and free collective bargaining.

I find that this bill is completely contrary to that national policy of economic freedom. It would require the Government, in effect, to become an unwanted participant at every bargaining table. It would establish by law limitations on the terms of every bargaining agreement, and nullify thousands of agreements mutually arrived at and satisfactory to the parties. It would inject the Government deeply into the process by which employers and workers reach agreement. It would superimpose bureaucratic procedures on the free decisions of local employers and employees.

At a time when we are determined to remove, as rapidly as practicable, Federal controls established during the war, this bill would involve the Government in the free processes of our economic system to a degree unprecedented in peacetime.

This is a long step toward the settlement of economic issues by Government dictation. It is an indication that industrial relations are to be determined in the Halls of Congress and that political power is to supplant economic power as the critical factor in labor relations.

II. The second basic test against which I have measured this bill is whether it would improve human relations between employers and their employees.

Cooperation cannot be achieved by force of law. We cannot create mutual respect and confidence by legislative fiat.

From a literary standpoint those are two beautiful sentences. In addition, they represent a great truth which we Members of Congress and the people of this country should never forget. Says the President:

Cooperation cannot be achieved by force of law. We cannot create mutual respect and confidence by legislative fiat.

The President continues:

I am convinced that this legislation overlooks the significance of these principles. It would encourage distrust, suspicion, and arbitrary attitudes.

I find that the National Labor Relations Act would be converted from an instrument with the major purpose of protecting the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively into a maze of pitfalls and complex procedures. As a result of these complexities employers and workers would find new barriers to mutual understanding.

The bill time and again would remove the settlement of differences from the bargaining table to courts of law. Instead of learning to live together, employers and unions are invited to engage in costly, time-consuming litigation, inevitably embittering both parties.

The Congress has, I think, paid too much attention to the inevitable frictions and difficulties incident to the reconversion period. It has ignored the unmistakable evidence that those difficulties are receding and that labor-management cooperation is constantly improving. There is grave danger that this progress would be nullified through enactment of this legislation.

III. A third basic test is whether the bill is workable.

There is little point in putting laws on the books unless they can be executed. I have concluded that this bill would prove to be unworkable. The so-called emergency procedure for critical Nation-wide strikes would require an immense amount of Government effort but would result almost inevitably in failure. The National Labor Relations Board would be given many new tasks, and hobbled at every turn in attempting to carry them out. Unique restrictions on the Board's procedures would so greatly increase the backlog of unsettled cases that the parties might be driven to turn in despair from peaceful procedures to economic force.

IV. The fourth basic test by which I have measured this bill is the test of fairness.

The bill prescribes unequal penalties for the same offense. It would require the National Labor Relations Board to give priority to charges against workers over related charges against employers. It would discriminate against workers by arbitrarily penalizing them for all critical strikes.

Much has been made of the claim that the bill is intended simply to equalize the positions of labor and management. Careful analysis shows that this claim is unfounded. Many of the provisions of the bill standing alone seem innocent, but, considered in relation to each other, reveal a consistent pattern of inequality.

The failure of the bill to meet these fundamental tests is clearly demonstrated by a more detailed consideration of its defects.

1. The bill would substantially increase strikes.

(1) It would discourage the growing willingness of unions to include "no strike" provisions in bargaining agreements, since any labor organization signing such an agreement would expose itself to suit for contract violation if any of its members engaged in an unauthorized "wildcat" strike.

(2) It would encourage strikes by imposing highly complex and burdensome reporting requirements on labor organizations which wish to avail themselves of their rights under the National Labor Relations Act. In connection with these reporting requirements, the bill would penalize unions for any failure to comply, no matter how inconsequential, by denying them all rights under the act. These provisions, which are irrelevant to the major purposes of the bill, seem peculiarly designed to place obstacles in the way of labor organizations which wish to appeal to the National Labor Relations Board for relief, and thus to impel them to strike or take other direct action.

(3) It would bring on strikes by depriving significant groups of workers of the right they now enjoy to organize and to bargain under the protection of law. For example, broad groups of employees who for purposes of the act would be classed as supervisors would be removed from the protection of the act. Such groups would be prevented from using peaceful machinery and would be left no option but the use of economic force.

(4) The bill would force unions to strike or to boycott if they wish to have a jurisdictional dispute settled by the National Labor Relations Board. This peculiar situation results from the fact that the Board is given authority to determine jurisdictional disputes over assignment of work only after such disputes have been converted into strikes or boycotts.

In addition to these ways in which specific provisions of the bill would lead directly to strikes, the cumulative effect of many of its other provisions which disrupt established relationships would result in industrial strife and unrest.

2. The bill arbitrarily decides, against the workers, certain issues which are normally the subject of collective bargaining, and thus restricts the area of voluntary agreement.

(1) The bill would limit the freedom of employers and labor organizations to agree on methods of developing responsibility on the part of unions by establishing union security. While seeming to preserve the right to agree to the union shop, it would place such a multitude of obstacles in the way of such agreement that union security and responsibility would be largely canceled.

In this respect, the bill disregards the voluntary developments in the field of industrial relations in the United States over the past 150 years. Today over 11,000,000 workers are employed under some type of union-security contract. The great majority of the plants which have such union-security provisions have had few strikes. Employers in such plants are generally strong supporters of some type of union security, since it gives them a greater measure of stability in production.

(2) The bill would limit the freedom of employers and employees to establish and maintain welfare funds. It would prescribe

arbitrary methods of administering them and rigidly limit the purposes for which they may be used. This is an undesirable intrusion by the Government into an important matter which should be the subject of private agreement between employers and employees.

(3) The bill presents the danger that employers and employees might be prohibited from agreeing on safety provisions, rest-period rules, and many other legitimate practices, since such practices may fall under the language defining "feather bedding."

3. The bill would expose employers to numerous hazards by which they could be annoyed and hampered.

(1) The bill would invite frequent disruption of continuous plant production by opening up immense possibilities for many more elections, and adding new types of elections. The bill would invite electioneering for changes in representatives and for union security. This would harass employers in their production efforts and would generate raiding and jurisdictional disputes. The National Labor Relations Board has been developing sound principles of stability on these matters. The bill would overturn these principles to the detriment of employers.

(2) The bill would complicate the collective bargaining process for employers by permitting—and in some cases requiring—the splitting up of stable patterns of representation. Employers would be harassed by having to deal with many small units. Labor organizations would be encouraged to engage in constant interunion warfare, which could result only in confusion.

(3) The bill would invite unions to sue employers in the courts regarding the thousands of minor grievances which arise every day over the interpretation of bargaining agreements. Employers are likely to be besieged by a multiplicity of minor suits, since management necessarily must take the initiative in applying the terms of agreements. In this respect, the bill ignores the fact that employers and unions are in wide agreement that the interpretation of the provisions of bargaining agreements should be submitted to the processes of negotiation ending in voluntary arbitration, under penalties prescribed in the agreement itself. This is one of the points on which the national labor-management conference in November 1945 placed special emphasis. In introducing damage suits as a possible substitute for grievance machinery, the bill rejects entirely the informed wisdom of those experienced in labor relations.

(4) The bill would prevent an employer from freely granting a union-shop contract, even where he and virtually his entire working force were in agreement as to its desirability. He would be required to refrain from agreement until the National Labor Relations Board's work load permitted it to hold an election—in this case simply to ratify an unquestioned and legitimate agreement.

Employers, moreover, would suffer because the ability of unions to exercise responsibility under bargaining agreements would be diminished. Labor organizations whose disciplinary authority is weakened cannot carry their full share of maintaining stability of production.

4. The bill would deprive workers of vital protection which they now have under the law.

(1) The bill would make it easier for an employer to get rid of employees whom he wanted to discharge because they exercised their right of self-organization guaranteed by the act. It would permit an employer to dismiss a man on the pretext of a slight infraction of shop rules, even though his real motive was to discriminate against this employee for union activity.

(2) The bill would also put a powerful new weapon in the hands of employers by permitting them to initiate elections at times strategically advantageous to them. It is significant that employees on economic strike who may have been replaced are denied a vote. An employer could easily thwart the will of his employees by raising a question of representation at a time when the union was striking over contract terms.

(3) It would give employers the means to engage in endless litigation, draining the energy and resources of unions in court actions, even though the particular charges were groundless.

(4) It would deprive workers of the power to meet the competition of goods produced under sweatshop conditions by permitting employers to halt every type of secondary boycott, not merely those for unjustifiable purposes.

(5) It would reduce the responsibility of employers for unfair labor practices committed in their behalf. The effect of the bill is to narrow unfairly employer liability for antiunion acts and statements made by persons who, in the eyes of the employees affected, act and speak for management, but who may not be "agents" in the strict legal sense of that term.

(6) At the same time it would expose unions to suits for acts of violence, wildcat strikes and other actions, none of which were authorized or ratified by them. By employing elaborate legal doctrine, the bill applies a superficially similar test of responsibility for employers and unions—each would be responsible for the acts of his "agents." But the power of an employer to control the acts of his subordinates is direct and final. This is radically different from the power of unions to control the acts of their members—who are, after all, members of a free association.

3. The bill abounds in provisions which would be unduly burdensome or actually unworkable.

(1) The bill would erect an unworkable administrative structure for carrying out the National Labor Relations Act. The bill would establish, in effect, an independent general counsel and an independent Board. But it would place with the Board full responsibility for investigating and determining election cases—over 70 percent of the present case load—and at the same time would remove from the Board the authority to direct and control the personnel engaged in carrying out this responsibility.

Earlier in my speech, Mr. President, I pointed out what I considered to be the very dangerous implications of the section of the bill which gives sweeping and independent powers to the general counsel. I said than, in effect, that I was pleased that the President, too, had emphasized this particular point. I wish to emphasize it again. I repeat that I think it is highly dangerous to give to one mere man the tremendous power which this bill places at the disposal and under the jurisdiction of the general counsel of the new and revised National Labor Relations Board.

The language of the section condemns it. I do not know where we will find this superman in all America to be trusted with the arbitrary and highly discretionary power to say to American workers and employers, "I, and I alone, will determine whether or not a complaint shall issue in this case."

Mr. President, I have studied that section; I have tried to read it backwards and forwards and crosswise; I have tried to convince myself that I must be wrong, that it does not say what it seems to say; I have talked with other lawyers about it, and I am aghast that the Congress, within this democracy, would place such arbitrary and sweeping powers over the economic destiny of workers, and employers as well. It says he shall have this power independent of the Board.

Oh, I suppose a fight could be made alleging in some case that he was guilty of gross malfeasance in office, or guilty of capricious and arbitrary action, the type of action which is brought against a Federal judge or other Government official sometimes; but that is not the point. The point is not whether by going around some legalistic barn we could find a door somewhere, and entering it, take away some of the power of this general counsel. That is not the point. The point the President makes is that the general counsel would "decide, without any right of appeal by employers and employees, whether charges were to be heard by the Board, and whether orders of the Board were to be referred to the court for enforcement. By virtue of this unlimited authority, a single administrative official might usurp the Board's responsibility for establishing policy under the act."

I do not see how that conclusion can be escaped. I think the general counsel is charged with the responsibility of doing that very thing. We say to him, "You shall act independently of the Board." What right has he, under that language, to go to the Board and say, "Now, you determine what the policy shall be." If he did that, Mr. President, in my opinion he would not be carrying out the powers we specifically and unequivocally give him in that language.

In this country, throughout our history, we have beeen surrounding public officials, and rightly so, with checks against arbitrary power. Why establish in this bill, Mr. President, a different principle? If we do, in other bills the precedent will be followed.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I cannot hear the speaker.

Mr. MORSE. I have missed the Senator from Indiana most of the afternoon. I am very glad he has returned.

Mr. JENNER. I am a nice man. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Indiana is a nice man, and I am very fond of him. I have worked with him on the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and he has been a splendid colleague on that committee. It goes to show that one may agree with a colleague in the Senate on some issues, and disagree with him on others. By and large, the Senator and I are pretty much in agreement in the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs. There are some minor differences. On the particular legislation we are now considering we are apparently poles apart. Nevertheless, I am very much complimented whenever the Senator from Indiana comes on the floor while I am speaking. I consider it a great personal tribute.

I was trying to convey the thought that so far as the particular section of the bill is concerned to which I have just referred, I think in this period of troubled times and conditions, internal and external, we must watch out lest the pattern be established in public thinking that these problems can be settled by some man, that what we need to do is to put the power in some individual and let him go to work on it, let him issue the orders, and let him make the decisions and checks, and our problems will be solved.

I do not want to labor the point, and I do not want to exaggerate it, but I shall not run away from what I think at this hour in the life of America is a very definite trend, that is, that there is already too much of a tendency in the United States to delegate arbitrary and discretionary and capricious power over the welfare of all our people to mere individual men.

I do not know where a better example could be found than in the section of the pending labor bill. Again I say, Mr. President, not with my vote. I shall never put that on my record. I do not propose to say to the employers of America and to the workers of America, "Whether or not you have got a case under the new law, we will allow you the issuance of a complaint on your petition claiming injury." It is going to be left up to a single individual, designated and empowered under the law, as the general counsel of the Board. We never have to worry about the strength and the perpetuation of our system of government. We are always careful to surround the creatures of government with the system of checks and balances that characterized the very foundation on which our Government structure was built. That was not done here, and I am not going to be a party to it, from the standpoint of the interests of the public, employers, and of labor.

I read further from the President's veto message:

(3) It would strait-jacket the National Labor Relations Board's operations by a series of special restrictions unknown to any other quasi-judicial agency. After many years of study, the Congress adopted the Administrative Procedures Act of 1946 to govern the operation of all quasi-judicial agencies, including the National Labor Relations Board. This present bill disregards the Procedures Act and, in many respects, is directly contrary to the spirit and letter of that act. Simple and time-saving procedures, already established and accepted as desirable by employers and employees, would be summarily scrapped. The Board itself, denied the power of delegation, would be required to hear all jurisdictional disputes over work tasks. This single duty might require a major portion of the Board's time. The review function within the Board, largely of a nonjudicial character, would be split up and assigned to separate staffs attached to each Board member. This would lead to extensive and costly duplication of work and records.

(4) The bill would require or invite Government supervised elections in an endless variety of cases. Questions of the bargaining unit, of representatives, of union security, of bargaining offers, are subject to election after election, most of them completely unnecessary. The National Labor Relations Board has had difficulty conducting the number of elections required under present law. This bill would greatly multiply this load. It would, in effect, impose upon the Board a 5-year backlog of election cases, if it handled them at its present rate.

Of course, I think I should digress at this point to say that we have a very definite responsibility also, if we are to handle the backlog of cases, to provide the Board with adequate appropriations; which I think means increased appropriations, even if it were to continue to exercise only its present functions.

Under the Taft-Hartley bill, many questions of policy and procedure are to be developed, and the result will be increasing delay in handling cases, which means, as I see it, Mr. President, that, in all fairness, we are going to have to make substantial increases in the appropriations, so that they can increase their staff at the very beginning of operations, under this new act, in the interest of speed and in the interest of cutting down direct action taken by to handle their cases expeditiously and without undue delay. I do not think that, on the basis of the action that has workers against the Board for its failure been taken, from an appropriation standpoint, the Board can do the job that needs to be done, even under the old act, from the standpoint of reducing the time that it takes a case to go through the procedures of the Board.

Oh, I think this is an excellent message, Mr. President. I thought it was a powerful message the first time I read it. I was even more greatly impressed with it the second time, and now, my third time through, I want to say that I think the American people should be proud of the fact that we have at the head of our Government a man who will make the penetrating analysis he has made of a piece of major legislation of such a character as this, and with the forthrightness which characterizes the message, state why he thinks it is unworkable legislation and decidedly not in the public interest.

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

Mr. MORSE. For a question.

Mr. TAYLOR. For a question only. I want to ask the Senator if he does not feel, as I stated here last night, that if the American people have an opportunity thoroughly to become acquainted with President Truman's message it will cause a great turn-over in their feelings toward this misrepresented bill?

Mr. MORSE. I think so. I hope so.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MORSE. After I finish the sentence. I may say to the Senator from Idaho that one of the reasons which I have presented here several times for conducting the filibuster against the bill is that I think the American people have the right to have time to study the bill and make known their wishes to the Senate before we finally vote upon it.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question, Mr. President.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon this question: Has it not been a rather simple matter heretofore in the Senate to obtain agreements to vote at a definite time ahead on different pieces of legislation, with a provision that we could then proceed in the interim and take up other legislation? Is it not the fact that this is the first time Senators have ever insisted on voting immediately upon the reading of a President's message? Is it not true that some Senators wanted to vote on the question even before the President could go on the air with his message, and is it not further true that we will probably reach an agreement now to vote at some time later, and would it not have been just as sensible to have reached that agreement in the first place?

Mr. MORSE. I think I can answer all those questions in one reply. I made a statement today at a time when the Senator from Idaho was resting from the splendid job he did last night, when he made the same fight for the protection of minority rights in the Senate that I am attempting to make by this speech. I have not had a chance to see the Senator from Idaho since that speech. I not only commend him for the fight he is making in this instance, but I want to say to him that, despite the brickbats and criticisms we will receive from those who will not take the time to study the fundamental principles for which we are making this fight, he can always live with the record he made in this fight. He can know that, irrespective of what political fortune may bring to those of us who are making this type of fight in the Senate of the United States, at least we were true to what we believed to be important principles affecting minority rights in the Senate of the United States, principles which ought to be protected, and which in our judgment were not being protected by the unanimous-consent agreement which had been requested.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to ask the Senator from Oregon if he does not agree with the Senator from Idaho that he would rather not be a Senator than not be able to stand up and fight for what he thinks is right regardless of what the political consequences may be?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon hours ago in his speech discussed that point at considerable length because of certain developments in his State since his speech of June 5 on this floor, in which he made the very point, which he reiterated again today, that he thinks it is his primary obligation, under a representative form of government, to sit here in the Senate of the United States and exercise an honest independence of judgment on the merits of issues as he finds them here, and then make his decisions and take his stands on those issues at all times to the people of his State, and be willing to defend himself before them and rely upon their judgment, whatever it may be, at election time as to whether he shall be returned or removed from the Senate.

I think that is our primary obligation as representatives under our form of government. I am perfectly willing to stand

on my record so far as labor legislation is concerned in the present session of Congress, and I am convinced that when the people of my State come to understand my record, criticisms will change to approval.

(5) The bill would introduce a unique handicap, unknown in ordinary law, upon the use of statements as evidence of unfair labor practices. An antiunion statement by an employer, for example, could not be considered as evidence of motive, unless it contained an explicit threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit. The bill would make it an unfair labor practice to induce or encourage certain type of strikes and boycotts, and then would forbid the National Labor Relations Board to consider as evidence views, argument, or opinion by which such a charge could be proved.

(6) The bill would require the Board to determine jurisdictional disputes over work tasks, instead of using arbitration, the accepted and traditional method of settling such disputes. In order to get its case before the Board a union must indulge in a strike or a boycott and wait for some other party to allege that it had violated the law. If the Board's decision should favor the party thus forced to violate the law in order that its case might be heard, the Board would be without power over other parties to the dispute to whom the award might be unacceptable.

Oh, I think it is a serious mistake, Mr. President, to place the settlement of jurisdictional disputes within the Board. I want to tell the Senate no more tough case can go to any officer functioning in an administrative law capacity than a jurisdictional dispute. On that point, Mr. President, I can speak with some experience. Feelings are tense in those cases. The issues are exceedingly complicated. In many such cases it is necessary to dig back through years of contracts. It is necessary to trace the history of work practices and past practices in an industry, frequently 10, 20, or 30 years back. When the arbitration of a jurisdictional dispute is finished the record is usually so voluminous that by comparison it makes the material about my desk look like a simple little memorandum. Frequently the records consist of thousands of pages. Usually long hearings are conducted—so far as my arbitrations were concerned, under a temporary work order whereby we could go ahead and get the job done, and arbitrate the merits of the dispute while we worked.

The unions do not like that. In every arbitration into which they are forced, or which they finally agree to enter in connection with a jurisdictional dispute, they say, "We are arbitrating away our very existence as a union."

Under our procedure I cannot ask any questions, but it would be very interesting to hear the testimony of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] on the question of handling jurisdictional disputes. He knows about the problems. I am willing to venture the suggestion that on the basis of the jurisdictional disputes which he has seen in operation he would at least say, "There is some merit in what MORSE says."

As a result of my experience I can testify that there is much merit in it. Many union officers are kicked out of their union offices at the very next election because of the resentment built up over those officers agreeing to a voluntary arbitration contract, or by reason of their going into an arbitration on a jurisdictional dispute. They feel very deeply about the matter of jurisdictional disputes. They have no love for the man who decides one of them, either, after it is over. They do not run to him with open arms and ask him to come back and arbitrate something else. They are through with him. Jurisdictional disputes are pretty basic in labor relations.

As I have said, there is no excuse for any economic action on the part of unions in settling a family quarrel between themselves. I do not countenance it. I shall point out again momentarily what I propose to do about it, which is not done in the bill.

The bill would allow the Board to decide the question. Under other provisions of the bill the Board could not begin to do within a reasonable period of time all the work that we are imposing upon it.

We made another mistake in the bill. Instead of having a seven-man board, as I proposed—which proposal I got through the Senate committee and through this body—we came out of conference with a five-man board.

What is the advantage of a seven-man board? The advantage is crystal clear, Mr. President. With a seven-man board it is possible to have two departments, consisting of three members each, sitting week after week, functioning on a departmentalized basis, leaving the seventh member of the Board to fit in here and there as a relief member and to carry on the major administrative work of the Board. Such an arrangement would have given effective machinery for breaking down the huge backlog of cases. But oh, no; for reasons which I cannot make out from the conference report, the number was reduced from seven to five. How could two three-man departments be made from that number? If it was done in the interest of economy, it was a wasteful change, because seven members are required really to operate a two-department board. It cannot be done effectively with a five-man board. A man cannot be in two places at once. Moreover, if there is one place where proxy voting should never be tolerated, it is in a quasi-judicial tribunal. I shall not go into that question now, but I do not think it ought to be permitted in Senate committees, either. The members ought to be present and hear the evidence before they vote. If they are not present to hear the entire evidence, they should not be allowed to vote in the committee. My friend the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and I agree on that point, I think, because he and I have stood together in our opposition to proxy voting in the United States Senate. I have told him that I will always go along with him on any committee on which he and I happen to be serving together, in trying to get a rule through the committee that there shall be no voting by proxy.

Mr. President, when it comes to the handling of a labor case we do not want any proxy voting. Therefore, with a five-man Board, I do not see how it would be physically possible to function with a two-department, three-man board organization, because a man cannot be in two places at once and someone would have to exercise his proxy. That simply cannot be countenanced, in my opinion, in a judicial process. So I believe it was a great mistake to reduce the number of members from seven to five.

We gave to the Board jurisdiction over the troublesome jurisdictional dispute cases. If that is the way to enable the Board to make friends and influence people, I can think of no better way of weakening the prestige of the Board with the labor organizations which will come in under its jurisdiction in jurisdictional cases. Such a system will develop antagonism and loss of confidence on the part of the union which feels that basic jurisdictional rights have been taken away from it by some board decision.

Furthermore, Mr. President, do not forget that whereas you and I as private citizens may go before an individual common-law judge in a civil court once—and probably never again—these labor people go before the Board year in and year out. They will not look kindly, in many instances, upon a board which is charged with the responsibility over jurisdictional disputes. Furthermore, I think it will be another cause of tremendous delay in the Board. Priorities should be given to jurisdictional disputes for the quickest possible determination. That means that in the meantime many other cases will have to be sidetracked. I think that provision will prove to be absolutely unworkable. Yet, I am in complete agreement that something must be done by way of procedure in the case of jurisdictional disputes.

I think there is much loose thinking, Mr. President, in regard to the effectiveness of injunctions in jurisdictional disputes. In some instances the operative facts of the case get into a certain type of pattern so that a temporary injunction might be of some help; but they are quite different from the secondary-boycott case in which the injunction is more helpful. The question is, Who is going to do the work? The poor employer is caught in between and throws up his hands and says, "I do not care who does the work; but will not someone do it? Will someone tell me how I should negotiate this contract? Will someone please tell me who has the right to do the work?" There not only have been hundreds of employers, but thousands of them who have been faced with that problem, and in too many cases there is great economic loss to them.

I became involved in a row last summer over jurisdictional disputes at Coos Bay, Oreg., between the A. F. of L. and the CIO. The fight involved the question of who should load and unload the vessels that came into that great lumber port. Prior to that dispute, there was being shipped out of that port more lumber than from any other port on the Pacific

coast. It gives some indication of the importance of that port to the veterans' housing program, for example.

In the latter part of June until well into November, not a single ship loaded a stick of lumber in that port; not a ship left that port with lumber. Lumber was piled high all along the docks while two great labor organizations participated in an absolutely inexcusable war between themselves as to who should do the work. It did not make sense. I said so, and I sent a telegram to Dr. John R. Steelman, a very good friend of mine, a man for whom I have a very high respect, a man who has a great record in the field of labor relations. He was for many years the head of the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor, and in a very real sense was one of my tutors on this question of labor arbitration. He is one of the close advisers to the President of the United States. I sent him a telegram asking him to call the attention of the President of the United States to this very serious jurisdictional dispute at Coos Bay, and to suggest to the President that, in my opinion, he should call upon the parties to accept an arbitrator to be appointed by him or by the Secretary of Labor, and one of their own choosing, to arbitrate a settlement of that case. I released the telegram to the press, as I thought the parties were entitled to it. I received just the type of response that is always received as the first response in these jurisdictional disputes. That is, "Why, you have suggested to the President of the United States that we agree to arbitrate the very existence of our union."

I replied to the president of that union, in effect, "If you are so sure of the merits of your case you do not have to worry about the existence of your union being preserved under arbitration. If you have a case that will hold water, do not worry about arbitration. But you have no right from the standpoint of the public interest to continue this economic warfare and cause these great losses to the veterans' housing program." The boys kicked that one around for a while. I know their tactics. I know their thinking. I know that when they know they are "behind the eight ball"—and they knew I had them "behind the eight ball" on that occasion—they might agree. The American Federation of Labor accepted the proposition, but the CIO continued to kick me around in the press.

It was a little interesting to some of my critics who think I am the fair-haired boy of labor. If they would read some of my mail and observe some of the abuse I take by following a course of action in which I say to labor, when it is wrong, "You should be required to do what is right," and the same to employers, they would have a little better understanding of my conviction that our only hope in the field of labor relations is to make clear to both employers and unions that they must stop turning to the Government to solve all their problems for them and get busy around a collective-bargaining table in good faith and do some of the things for themselves. Many employers now want the Government to do things for them under this bill, just as the President of the United States so cogently points out in his grand message.

In the Coos Bay case they did not go to arbitration, but they finally got the matter worked out on a compromise basis for themselves, but not until after great loss was suffered by the people of the United States. Businessmen in Coos Bay will be years recovering from the losses incurred because the inexcusable jurisdictional strike victimized them. It never should have been tolerated, in my judgment, by labor leaders if they deserve the name of industrial statesmen.

I use that case as a little example, Mr. President, of my views as to how I think jurisdictional disputes should be handled. Let me tell you, Mr. President, it is not a mild remedy, and let me tell you that I know of no labor leader in the country who approves of it; but that does not make one whit of difference to me, because they are wrong, dead wrong, 100 percent wrong in their attitude on jurisdictional disputes.

But, Mr. President, I have proposed that procedure in the bill I have introduced, Senate bill 858. I have discussed it in speech after speech, not only here in the Senate, but all over the country. I have been before labor audiences that have hissed me when I have proposed it. I am used to that. Hisses do not hurt a person, they simply reflect on those who hiss. It was put in into practice on the War Labor Board. I have told some Senators that story before, but I have to say something to kill time, so I might as well repeat it.

Of course, Mr. President, the conditions on the War Labor Board were very favorable, because we had great power. Talk about arbitrary power, Mr. President. Talk about giving to mere men tremendous power. We had it, and I never liked a moment of it. We must not countenance it in peacetime. As I said in several decisions, this is an awful power that we wield, in the dictionary sense of the term "awful." But we were at war, and the underlying and fundamental principle on which we acted—as I said in decisions, because the parties were entitled to know it—was not to give precise justice, we did not give it, we could not. Time did not permit. The legion of cases we had to decide almost instantly did not permit of that. But we did justice from the standpoint of equity and good conscience. On that principle we bottomed our decisions—and the ones to which I now refer are only a part of the decisions; they are the ones which were rendered in 1942-44, before I left the Board. The Board was greatly enlarged after I left. I surmise that the total decisions of the Board, including the decisions of the regional boards which were sustained by the so-called big Board in Washington, are probably three times that many, if not more, in number.

But I said in many of those decisions that the parties should understand that the guiding principle of that Board was to adjudicate those cases in a manner which would result in the most effective prosecution of the war.

Mr. President, that was all right for wartime; the chips were down. We could not take the time to deal with all the niceties of legal theories and technicalities that the parties wanted to advance before us. We had a job to do, and we kept saying to them, "And you have a job to do. Your job is to get to work on a friendly and cooperative basis in accordance with the principles of free collective bargaining, and aid in the maximum production of war materials."

I had the worst job, I think, on the Board; every one of my colleagues always admitted it. I had the hatchet job, the job of being the enforcement officer, in addition to being one of the judges of cases.

Sometimes we had to be arbitrary. Talk about whether they would or would not arbitrate cases, with men dying by the thousands, the world around, wearing our uniform. Talk about whether they should arbitrate a case. Well, Mr. President, I did not like the role, but sometimes I was very arbitrary. I always said so on the record, because the parties were entitled to know that I knew what I was doing from the standpoint of using the maximum possible degree of the war powers which were available to the Board. So sometimes I had to say, "All right, either arbitrate the dispute or we will take the case to the White House with the recommendation that we will have to seize the plant."

Mr. President, do you think we liked that? This gives me a good opportunity to make a statement on the record which I do not think has been officially made, and is long overdue—namely, that as the enforcement officer of the War Labor Board, after the Board voted in a defiance case that there was no other course but seizure to recommend to the President, there was not a single one of those cases in which Franklin D. Roosevelt did not insist that everything possible short of seizure be done to get the case settled. He never willingly signed a single seizure order that I took to him. He deplored it, and he had to be convinced, and it took some tall convincing, sometimes, that there was no other course of action. I remember one case which had a little streak of humor in it, as it turned out, although it was not very funny to us at the time. It was a case dealing with a certain railroad. We could not get the railroad to accept arbitration. We did everything, but we could not even get them into a hearing, on one occasion. The officials of the railroad made it perfectly clear that they were not going to arbitrate the case. It was one of our early defiance cases. We were working out the procedure and policy to be followed in those cases. Our authority was not too clear. I am going to read the Little Steel case before I close. We used that case thereafter as the pattern case in these defiance matters.

The railroad in question merely said, in language not nearly so polite as this, I can assure the Senate, that we could just "go to," that they were not going to arbitrate the case, and so we had to take the case to the White House. Will Davis went with me that night, and I

will never forget it. I prepared all the papers, had them checked with the Department of Justice, and got the Attorney General's approval, and he, too, shook his head. He did not like it, either, nor did I. We knew that if a single employer ever got by with a successful defiance of that Board, we were through, and with that Board out of existence we knew that the country would lose from the standpoint of the machinery of the Board, the only workable procedure available for the settling of wartime labor disputes. We knew also that if a union got by with a defiance of the Board, the prestige and influence and effectiveness of the Board would be greatly damaged. I shall have something to say about that later, too. I can talk more easily of this right now than about anything else.

In speaking of this now, I am directing attention to some very fundamental principles we should not forget in connection with the handling of labor disputes, this whole problem of getting away with arbitrary power in peacetime, such as the President talks about in his message.

We went to the White House with the papers. The President said he did not think it was necessary, he could not believe in the seizing of a railroad in time of war in order to promote the most effective prosecution of the war. We outlined the record to him, showed him defiance after defiance. He finally said, "Will you send one more wire?"

We said, "Yes, but it will not do any good, Mr. President."

He said, "Let us try it once more. Wire that you are here at the White House. I prefer not to sign the papers. I should like to have a final word from him as to whether he will not give a favorable reply to you about arbitrating the dispute."

In this case, as in so many cases, there were other parties watching what we did, because this was the one up against the gun, so to speak.

As I recall, it was about 7:30 o'clock when the answer came back from the railroad, addressed to the President of the United States, a 17-page wire, as I recall, sent collect. The President had a good sense of humor about it. He laughed and said, "You win. Give me the pen," and he signed the papers.

I make these statements because there are forces in America who have been pretty unkind to Franklin D. Roosevelt in regard to his exercise of war powers and who have sought to give the impression that he just itched to seize a plant. It is a falsification of that man's real attitude in regard to seizure cases. He knew the danger, he fully recognized the undesirability of wartime precedents of seizure. He knew they had to be guarded against with the greatest of care, and he was quite right.

He was always putting us on the defensive and making us prove beyond the question of a doubt that there was no other course of action. We took the railroad, and we had to hold it for the remainder of the war.

Once it became pretty clear that we were establishing a pattern and insisting upon carrying out the orders of the Board, the task was easier. The senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is present.

He was one of my distinguished colleagues on the Board for a time, and let me say to the credit of the labor and industry members of the Board, Mr. President, that even though in a specific case they would vote against our decision—perhaps it was a decision against a union and the labor men might vote against it, or a decision against the employer and the industry men might vote against it—that was not always true. In fact, I think the statistics show that at one time for about a 2-year period that 12-man Board, the big Board, was unanimous in about 85 percent of the cases, minus the union-security cases, and that is a pretty remarkable record for any quasi-judicial tribunal.

I remember one case which illustrates my point as to how the employers backed us up in our defiance cases. Again I think this bears out what I want to call attention to; that is, the complicated nature of the labor cases. They are not simple little court cases. They run the gamut of economic problems and business problems.

I remember the fishing boat cases. That was not the exact title, but it was a case involving fishing boats in Boston, Mass. The two Senators from Massachusetts will be interested in this case. In fact, I think the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] was probably governor at the time. It involved a fleet of fishing boats, about 50 or more. They really were operated by what amounted to an employers' association or a fishing-boat owners' association, and they had an interesting arrangement with the workers in regard to how they divided up the profits from the take of the fish. They were having their troubles, and we heard them, and of course in the early days of the Board the fight was on jurisdiction. What right did we have to take jurisdiction over a case that involved fishing boats running out of Boston? It was not an easy one to decide, but we knew the policy that had to be followed; and that, after all, was already in wartime. It was impossible to distinguish between the cases that were affected by the war, so far as the prosecution of the war was concerned and those that were not. But we were feeling our way. The advice of counsel and the arguments in hearings as of that time had convinced the majority of the Board that we had to find some relationship between the business that was involved in the dispute and the war effort. I "went fishing," so to speak, Mr. President, on that one. I found that they used the livers of the fish for medicinal purposes, and they were used by the Army and the Navy in great quantities. So I said to the Board, "I think that is enough" and the Board sustained me unanimously; so we ordered an arbitration of the dispute. The employer-owners of the boat, or, rather, the secretary of the employers' association, who really had had delegated to him all the duties of management over the boats, said he would never arbitrate. We knew that was a very tough one. What were we going to do with 54 fishing boats? We had heard that they were trying to sell some of them to the Maritime Commission as submarine observation boats and for Coast Guard duty, so we got an order stopping those negotiations until we could get compliance with our decision. Their counsel made very clear to us that they were going to defy, and we would have to take the case to the White House. I did not want to take that case to the White House. I felt I could not see the President taking 54 fishing boats. He would say, "What are we going to do with 54 fishing boats?" And I knew I would have to say, "Well, Mr. President, that is not the important issue. The important issue is, What are we going to do with the War Labor Board if it is ever successfully defied by any labor group or by any employer group? That is the issue."

I got a tip, and ran it down to get the real owners of the boats. I shall not mention any names, but it was an interesting list, on which were the names of two very prominent officials, and so we named them, along with others. I sat in the board office of Roger Lapham, now mayor of San Francisco, and I heard him talk over the telephone to one of the owners who had taken great exception because of the fact that he was receiving publicity, owing to the fact that an association subsidiary was operating one of his boats, but from which he was getting his profits, in defiance of the War Labor Board. Lapham said, "Tomorrow we will take the case to the White House, and your name will be on the orders." He said to Lapham, "What can we do to settle the case immediately?" Lapham said, "You can accept the decision of the Board to arbitrate the case." He agreed to get in touch with the other owners and within 24 hours the agreement to arbitrate was entered into.

I cite these cases not only to kill time, but because I think they involve one principle which I want to emphasize in connection with these jurisdictional disputes, and that is, that when the parties reach such loggerheads they simply cannot as two unions negotiate a settlement between them then they owe it to the employer concerned, whose livelihood, whose economic well-being, after all, is determinative of economic well-being of the unions too—they owe it to the employer and they owe it to all the rest of us, the public, to agree to enter into voluntary arbitration of such disputes, and the great labor organizations of the country should have an agreed upon arbitration procedure, and a tribunal of their own selection to settle their disputes. That trend is current; there is more of that than there was a few years ago. I think one of the valuable contributions the War Labor Board made was that it succeeded in giving great impetus to voluntary arbitration agreements. I think an analysis of the record will show that through the good offices of the Board, and particularly the regional boards, a great many such agreements were entered into during the war and carried over after the war. They had voluntary arbitration clauses in them. That is the perfect way, that is the best way, that is the desirable way. The $64 question,

Mr. President is, What are we going to do when they will not agree to voluntarily arbitrate? We, the public, and the employer should not have to take it on the economic chin, merely because unions in jurisdictional disputes lack the foresight and the statesmanship industrially to work out peaceful procedure for settlement short of strike action. So there comes a time, Mr. President, when all voluntary procedures break down, and there is still a dominant public interest that needs protection.

It is my view, and I have said it many times, that under those circumstances any government that deserves the name "Government" and can be trusted with the rights and freedoms and liberties of its people owes the duty to its people to step in by compulsion of government to the extent that it can be helpful and successful in the voluntary settlement of such disputes and insist upon a compulsory determination of the issues.

No one dislikes compulsory arbitration more than I do. No one could be more opposed to it in disputes between employers and workers than I am. That is why I have said to employers and labor unions innumerable times, "Do not support compulsory-arbitration tribunals for the settlement of disputes over wages, hours, and conditions of employment under any plausible bill, I do not care how innocently worded, that seeks to offer you a Utopia by way of compulsory arbitration, because if you go for it you will lose your economic shirt."

Why? Because, Mr. President, when to an arbitrator, or to a board of arbitration, or to a court of arbitration, by legal authority and sanction, is given the power to determine what wages shall be paid and under what conditions American workers shall work and receive wages, what policies the employer shall follow, what production methods he shall use—when that power is given to an arbitrator functioning under the authority of compulsory arbitration in disputes between workers and employers, there has been put into operation the most effective instrumentality for taking over the economy of the country by government. That is why I am opposed to it. Set up a compulsory-arbitration tribunal to determine wages, hours, and conditions of employment, Mr. President, and there has been set up an agency which will take away from both employers and workers the precious thing we call a private-property economy in this country, because the private property will be used only in accordance with the dictates of such a tribunal.

There is a strong movement in America for that. That movement must be watched. Again, it may be said a plausible case can be made out for it. It is a short cut to the job of working out by free collective bargaining the complex disputes between workers and employers, but it is dangerous. I cannot begin to emphasize sufficiently how dangerous I think it is. It can lead to a modified form of totalitarianism in this country. It can lead to a type of economic fascism. The greatest feeling of comfort that I have in regard to it, Mr. President, is that there really is little danger of it going too far in this country because it will not work. The parties will soon become sick and tired of it.

It may be said, "How in the name of consistency and logic can you argue so strongly against compulsory arbitration in determining questions of wages and hours and conditions of employment, and then answer the $64 question as to what you are going to do with jurisdictional disputes by saying, 'Well, if all these voluntary procedures will not work, my final proposal is that the parties must by operation of law be required to submit their disputes to compulsory arbitration' "? The two situations cannot, in all respects, be distinguished. I think that has to be frankly admitted. But there are such differences as I believe make them clearly distinguishable and throw the balance in favor of my proposal for compulsory arbitration of jurisdictional disputes in contrast with what I think is the unworkable proposal contained in the pending labor bill.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Oregon, without losing the floor, may be permitted to yield to me for the purpose of submitting a unanimous-consent request for fixing the time to vote upon the pending measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the preliminary request made by the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none.

The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, without making a speech on the whys or wherefores of a proposal, I immediately submit to Members of the Senate the unanimous consent request that the Senate vote upon the pending measure at the hour of 3 o'clock on Monday, June 23; that upon the convening of the Senate at 12 o'clock, and between that hour and 3 o'clock, p. m., the time be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the bill, the time to be controlled on behalf of the proponents by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and on behalf of the opponents by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will say frankly to the Senator from Nebraska that personally I would prefer to fix the hour at 5 o'clock instead of 3 o'clock, for reasons which I have explained to the Senator from Nebraska. However, inasmuch as yesterday I myself made the proposal for a unanimous consent agreement to vote at 3 o'clock on Monday, I shall not object. I cannot speak for any other Senator. Frankly, still under the reservation, I hope that we may be able to make the agreement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement as entered into was reduced to writing as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Monday, June 23, 1947, at the hour of 3 p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon the question, Shall the bill H. R. 3020, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Ordered further, That the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate and the said hour of 3 o'clock on said day be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the bill, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I wish to say that it is our intention to continue in session, because there are three or four speeches yet to be delivered in the Senate this afternoon, all of them of deep importance. Because we have the unanimous-consent request, that does not mean that we should not give these speeches our fullest consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me to propound a question——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very happy to yield the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wanted to ask the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], or both of them, whether, in view of this agreement, it is the intention to try to hold the Senate in session late tonight.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I defer to the Senator from Nebraska, who has conducted the negotiations up to this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is not our intention to remain in session any longer than is asked by Members of the Senate. It is certainly not our intention to hold the Senate in session later than midnight in any event. There will be no session tomorrow, Sunday.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am sure that all of us would like to give consideration to the desire of Senators who have expected to address themselves to the Senate on this subject. There are several Senators now in the Chamber who had anticipated addressing the Senate this afternoon. The time on Monday to be divided between the proponents and the opponents will be limited, and I think Senators would like to be courteous to their colleagues by giving them an opportunity to speak at their pleasure.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with the Senator. My inquiry was prompted by the desire to know, if possible, within some reasonable limitation, how long it was expected to hold the Senate in session tonight.

Mr. WHERRY. The only limitation I can indicate without further consultation is that the session will not be extended beyond midnight.

Mr. BARKLEY. But the Senator hopes that it will not be extended that long.

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly do.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Nebraska has clearly stated the sentiment on this side. It is felt that Senators who have speeches which they wish to deliver on this general subject matter should have a rea-

sonable opportunity this afternoon; but it is also very definitely the hope on this side that at some reasonable hour we may take a recess until Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure that that is as definite a statement as I can get.

THE BREAKING OF FILIBUSTERS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I had intended to read this article on the floor of the Senate. However, in view of the agreement which has been reached, I shall merely ask to have it printed in the body of the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article appearing in Collier's magazine for June 15, 1946, entitled "How To Bust a Filibuster," the author being the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I shall read the few lines which precede the article in Collier's magazine:

In this article Senator MORSE issues a call to battle against dictatorship in Congress. He has evolved a plan based on parliamentary procedures which offers hope to all legislators who have fumed while the activities of Congress were stopped by Senators who wear down the majority by reading for days from cookbooks and telephone directories. These minorities, who on occasion can subvert the will of the majority, must lose their power if democracy is to be returned to Congress, Senator MORSE holds. His plan, which is aimed at both the filibuster in the Senate and the Rules Committee in the House, may be successful if he can muster sufficient congressional support.

The article follows, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From Collier's Magazine of June 15, 1946]

HOW TO BUST A FILIBUSTER

(In this article Senator MORSE issues a call to battle against dictatorship in Congress. He has evolved a plan based on parliamentary procedures which offers hope to all legislators who have fumed while the activities of Congress were stopped by Senators who wear down the majority by reading for days from cookbooks and telephone directories. These minorities, who on occasion can subvert the will of the majority, must lose their power if democracy is to be returned to Congress, Senator MORSE holds. His plan, which is aimed at both the filibuster in the Senate and the Rules Committee in the House, may be successful if he can muster sufficient congressional support.)

On the floor of the Senate a small band of willful men had been holding up Senate action on a bill to promote equal employment opportunity for all Americans, regardless of race, religion, or color. A clear-cut majority of the Senate favored the principles of the bill. President Truman, on behalf of the Democrats, had asked for the legislation. The Republican Party platform of 1944 had pledged itself to the principles of the measure. Nevertheless, a group of southern Democrats had banded together to talk the bill to death. Hearing it, a young veteran burst out to me:

"But, Senator, it's dictatorship."

The air in the Senate was fervid with oratory. Senator WALLACE WHITE, of Maine, the Republican leader, defended the filibuster, although not a party to it, by stating that: "There may be times and circumstances in which minorities can in one way alone successfully resist the power of a temporary majority."

My veteran friend was bewildered. "If the Senate's rules allow a minority to control it," he asked, "where's democracy in Congress?" And if we don't have democracy in Congress, how can we preserve democracy in the United States?

Millions of people are asking these same questions. Not only because they have witnessed the disgraceful spectacle of filibustering in the Senate, but also because in the House of Representatives they have seen the principle of majority rule stifled by the small but powerful Rules Committee.

It is common knowledge that 7 members of this 12-man committee wield what amounts to dictatorial power over the entire House. These men have time and time again prevented important measures from being properly considered in debate by the House as a whole, or even from reaching the House floor.

The theory behind the Rules Committee is that it should act as a traffic director on the legislative highway. In actual fact, the committee has become an obstruction to orderly traffic. Like fuedal barons who levied a toll upon those who used their roads, the committee often allows bills to come before the House only on the condition that certain amendments be written into them. It frequently usurps the functions of the regular legislative committees by conducting hearings on bills that already have been carefully studied by the proper legislative committee confining itself, as it should, to questions of procedure.

UNFAIR CONTROL OF LEGISLATION

There have been notable occasions when the Rules Committee, in effect, has originated legislation, although it was never contemplated that it should exercise this privilege. Recently, it will be recalled, the House Labor Committee approved the kind of bill it thought would contribute to labor peace. But a majority of the Rules Committee favored the Case bill, which the legislative committee had rejected. So it ruled that the Case bill be considered by the House rather than the Labor Committee's bill.

The job of the Rules Committee is to report to the House, in conjunction with a bill, a resolution setting the terms of debate upon the measure. Often the committee blocks the legislative road completely by failing to give a bill the right of way to the House floor under any rule of debate. Sometimes the committee works its will upon the entire House membership by imposing "gag rules" that restrict the time allowed for debate and the circumstances under which amendments may be offered.

There is no hope for government by the majority in Congress until the rules are thoroughly overhauled to free the House and the Senate from the legislative tyranny of a willful minority in either branch. These two infections of the body politic—the powers of the Rules Committee and the filibuster—are sources of intolerance and reaction. The Rules Committee must be assigned its original role of traffic director for House bills, and the Senate must adopt rules empowering a majority to end a filibuster.

It must be made clear to the voters that their substantive rights in the passage of all sound legislation needed in the interests of the general welfare cannot be separated from their procedural rights in attaining passage of such legislation. The people must be made to realize that the archaic rules of Congress permit self-seeking minority blocs to defeat legislation the people want without letting it come to a vote.

Most writers dip their pens in despair when they attempt to make suggestions for remedying these two evils. They point out that any resolution to reform the House Rules Committee would be referred to that committee itself—which group could be expected to protect its dictatorship by quietly filing the proposal.

They call attention to the fact that the rules of the Senate have been carefully devised to protect the filibuster. A third plus one of the Senators can now prevent cloture—put a limit on the length of time a Senator may talk—thereby allowing a filibuster to continue until the legislation against which it is directed has been withdrawn or emasculated. Thus most critics say it is almost hopeless to propose a resolution to eliminate the filibuster because the proposal itself would be subject to the filibuster technique.

The Senate has a Rules Committee, too. Although it does not have the sweeping powers possessed by the House Rules Committee, it does have jurisdiction over any proposal to change the rules and procedures of the Senate. Judging from the past, this committee could be counted upon to bury alive any proposal referred to it which seeks to reform the procedures of the Senate in the interest of majority rule.

EXAMPLE IN SELF-DEFENSE

A good example of the way the Rules Committees of both Houses protect what they believe to be their vested interests is the action which they took in passing upon the resolution setting up the La Follette-Monroney committee to make recommendations for the reorganization of Congress.

Since early 1945 this committee has been making an exhaustive study of various proposals for the reorganization of Congress, and it recently submitted a splendid report on the subject.

However, although the report presents sound proposals for reorganizing most other congressional committees, it makes no recommendations whatsoever in regard to the House Rules Committee, and says nothing about the colossal waste of congressional time occasioned by the filibuster. The omissions are startling, but no fault of the La Follette-Monroney committee.

The resolution that set it up was rewritten by Senate and House Rules Committees specifically to prohibit the special committee from making "any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedures, practices, and/or precedents of either House."

But the problem is not as hopeless as the experts seem to think it is, provided enough Members of the Congress have the will to make the fight. The situation calls for a two-front attack in both Houses of Congress. The time to attack is on the first day of the new Congress next January.

On the first day of a new Congress the House adopts the rules that will guide it for the next 2 years. Usually the rules of the last Congress are accepted without change, by a routine motion. But that need not be the case. During that brief period on the opening day between the time that the Speaker of the House opens the session of the new Congress and the time when the House passes a motion adopting the rules of its previous session with whatever changes it may wish to authorize, the Rules Committee is temporarily stripped of power.

Hence it is at this time that the proponents of majority rule must strike their blows against the dictatorship of the committee. They must be prepared to offer at precisely the right moment an amendment to the rules depriving the committee of its broad powers over legislation, limiting it to the task of directing legislative traffic on the House floor.

This proposal would become pending business of the House, open to full debate on the floor and not subject to reference to the Rules Committee. The changes would become effective if approved by a majority of the House.

If the majority of the Members of the new Congress elected next November really want to establish majority rule in the House and be freed from the dictatorial domination of the Rules Committee, let them stand up and be counted on the opening day of the new session.

A similar fight for democracy should be waged in the Senate on the first day of the next session of Congress. On that day all Senators who believe in the establishment of majority rule in the Senate should support a resolution aimed at preventing any future filibusters. By a majority vote such a resolution can be made the subject of Senate business and disposed of without reference to committee. There is little doubt, of course, that the introduction of such a resolution will be vigorously opposed by the defenders of the filibuster. The sponsors of Senate rule by the minority already have made themselves clear. During the recent FEPC filibuster, Democratic Senator TYDINGS of Maryland stated: "The rule of the majority. The rule of votes. Majority to Hades * * *. Let us not fool ourselves with the silly thought that majorities are always right."

Democratic Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, rejected the idea of "a pure democracy, where every man's vote would be counted on every issue," and then later referred to the filibuster as a "bulwark against oppression by a mere popular majority."

WILL USE OBSTRUCTIVE TACTICS

It is clear that these Senators will wage a last-ditch fight against antifilibuster legislation with their customary weapon, the filibuster. However, a filibuster can be defeated. The recent FEPC filibuster could have been broken if a serious attempt to do so had been made by the Democratic Senators.

At that time the Democratic majority in the Senate, supported by many Republicans, recessed the Senate between 4 and 6 o'clock each afternoon during the filibuster, and on Friday afternoons recessed until each following Monday at noon. The Democratic administration made public statements in support of the FEPC, but took no effective action against the filibuster. No Democratic Senator and only a few Republican Senators were willing to join in my suggestion at that time to hold the Senate in continuous session for 24 hours a day for as many days, weeks, and months as might be necessary to break it. An opportunity to establish, once and for all, majority rule in the Senate was passed up. It should not happen again.

Under the filibuster, with all its insidious effrontery, the principle of rule by a majority is denied the people in the determination of congressional policy. I do not say that the majority is always right; but I do say that under our form of representative government a minority of Senators should not be permitted, by means of the filibuster, to block legislation favored by the majority. If the majority passes legislation which the people of the country do not favor, it must answer to the voters of the country for their action on that legislation, and the voters will then have a chance to send men to the Senate under instructions to repeal any legislation that the people do not want.

There is no way to smash a filibuster but to exhaust the filibusterers by forcing them to speak day after day for 24 hours a day.

In a very real sense a filibuster is an endurance test. If a majority of the Senators really want to free themselves from the dictates of a willful minority, they must be willing to take the time and undergo the physical strain that may be necessary to abolish once and for all the filibuster travesty.

If a majority of the present Senate really doesn't want to make that fight, then the voters should start finding it out in the 1946 elections. They should see to it that they send back to the Senate men pledged to make that fight. For my part, I am determined that the fight shall be made. But it cannot be made without the assistance of Senators in both parties. It will not be a pleasant fight. But with demonstrated public backing, it undoubtedly would end quickly.

FOR THE DIGNITY OF THE SENATE

When continous sessions were proposed as the only effective method of beating the recent FEPC filibuster, the criticism was made that the procedure was beneath the dignity of Senators. That, of course, was pure nonsense. Nothing could be more undignified than the manner in which the Senate record is disgraced with long-winded ranting and meaningless talk during a filibuster. My proposal for continuous sessions of the Senate has been criticized as too dramatic. That argument is without weight. It is highly important that this issue be fully dramatized in order to impress upon the American people its vital importance to their legislative rights.

There are two reasons why it is important that the fight to pass an antifilibuster resolution should be waged at the beginning of the next session of Congress: First, it should be conducted concurrently with the fight to establish majority rule in the House in order that public attention may be focused on the same basic issue; namely, the need of democracy in both Houses of Congress.

Second, if the resolution is followed by a filibuster, it will not hold up any other legislation, since none will be ready for Senate action. It would be very difficult to break a filibuster near the close of a session, because the unity of action required on the part of Senators is difficult to obtain when so many of them are anxious to recess and go home. It is likewise difficult to wage a successful fight against a filibuster in the middle of a session, since the argument is always made that taking the time to defeat a filibuster blocks action on other legislation vital to the welfare of the country.

One rule in political strategy, as in boxing, is never to telegraph your punches. But this fight involves more than political strategy. This is a fight to establish the people's rights to democratic procedures in their Congress, and it is important that the people themselves should become understanding participants. Everyone should know months ahead of time that January 7, 1947, or whatever day Congress reopens will be D-day on Capitol Hill—Democracy Day for reasserting and reestablishing majority rule in the Congress of the United States; Duty Day for all Members of Congress to restore representative government to the legislative processes of Congress.

If majority rule is to characterize the procedures of Congress, the voters of this country must make that clear to congressional candidates in November. Either we are going to reestablish the principle of majority rule in our Congress or we are going to continue to drift into government by minority interests and bloc pressures. This is another test of liberalism versus reactionism.

It is important that the American people recognize that our form of government can protect their rights only so long as they keep it strong and effective. Representative government is not a machine that works automatically. It is but a set of rules and principles which the people by their own consent have decreed shall be binding upon their own conduct. These principles cannot work unless they are administered by men and women responsive to the will of the voters who elected them.

The people must be ever watchful against institutions, like the filibuster and powers of the House Rules Committee, which permit the perversion of free government by self-seeking men. If the people relax their vigilance, they may lose the fruits of democracy which promote the greatest good for the greatest number within the framework of our private-property economy.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3444) to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HEARINGS OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to announce the program of the hearings for the Senate subcommittee on the Government corporations appropriation bill. The schedule for hearing the various agencies is as follows:

Tuesday, June 24, 2 p. m.: Panama Canal, followed by the Export-Import Bank and the Inter-American Affairs and Inter-American Educational Foundation.

Wednesday, June 25, 2 p. m.: Tennessee Valley Authority.

Thursday, June 26, 9:30 a. m. and at 2 p. m., if necessary: National Housing Administration and constituent agencies.

Friday, June 27, 9:30 a. m.: Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, followed by Federal Intermediate Credit Bank, Production Credit Corporation, Regional Agriculture Credit Corporation and Federal Prison Industries, Inc.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the national defense by increasing the membership of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITION

Mr. PEPPER presented a resolution of the Senate of the State of Florida, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 14

Resolution by the Senate of the State of Florida requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact into law immediately the necessary legislation requiring the Forest Service of the United States Department of Agriculture or any other governmental agency having title thereto, to sell or exchange certain lands in the Apalachicola National Forest

Whereas the Apalachicola National Forest has within its boundary approximately 55 percent of the total acreage of Liberty County, Fla., and practically all of the lands that are suitable for agricultural and improved pasture purposes; and

Whereas it is absolutely impossible for any progress to be made in the agricultural and livestock industry, or any other industry in this entire area due to the fact the Government will not sell or otherwise dispose

of any of its fertile lands in the Apalachicola National Forest; and

Whereas the United States procured the lands in question approximately 10 years ago from large landowners at a price of from $1 to $2.75 per acre; and

Whereas this property has never at any time been made available to the citizen of small or average means for the development of farms or improved pastures; and

Whereas this land in question has always been sold in large blocks, which prohibited the average citizen from acquiring the same and the development of farms and pastures were thereby prevented; and

Whereas the United States Forest Service has sold and permitted to be cut and removed from the lands in question a sufficient amount of merchantable saw timber, pulpwood, tar wood, etc., to more than reimburse the Government for the original purchase price, plus all improvements; and

Whereas a considerable amount of these lands are ideal for growing tobacco, sugarcane, potatoes, corn, beans, and many other general agricultural products, also ideal for improved pastures for cattle; and

Whereas during the 1947 session of the Florida Legislature the adjoining counties of Gadsden and Leon passed a local no-fence law; and

Whereas it is obvious to the members of the Senate of the State of Florida, also to the general public of Florida, that in the very near future the State of Florida will have what is known as a State-wide no-fence law; and

Whereas all livestock will have to be placed under fence, and within the area of the Apalachicola National Forest which includes practically all the lands in the south half of Liberty County, there will be no lands owned by individuals, and it will become necessary that the many thousands of cattle, hogs, etc., now in the area will have to be disposed of as there will be no lands available upon which to graze cattle; and

Whereas the financial structure of Liberty County and Wakulla County, Fla., need additional lands for tax purposes as well as for development and progress within the area which will give the counties in question a balanced economy, and as long as the areas that are suitable for development are owned by the Federal Government and cannot be used for any purpose toward the development of the area, the counties will never make any progress and development; and

Whereas it is the expressed desire and urgent request of the citizens in the area that United States Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, United States Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, and Representative BOB SIKES, of the Third Congressional District of Florida, recognize the deplorable conditions now confronting their constituency in this area, and take immediate action to comply fully with the provisions contained in this resolution by introducing and enacting into law at the earliest possible date the necessary legislation to meet the objective: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida:

1. That the Congress of the United States be requested to pass the necessary legislation requiring the Forest Service of the United States Department of Agriculture or any other governmental agency having title to said lands, to sell or exchange said lands to and with individuals, firms, or corporations, however, only to such applicants as may be approved by a committee which shall consist of three members, namely, the clerk of the circuit court of the county in which the lands are located, one member of the board of county commissioners in which commissioner's district the lands are located, and the State senator of the fifth senatorial district of Florida, any acreage from 1 acre to 2,560 acres, but not to exceed 2,560 acres to any one individual, firm, or private corporation, at a price not to exceed the original purchase price which the United States Government paid for such lands as hereinafter described in the Apalachicola National Forest, to wit:

All that part of the Apalachicola National Forest in Liberty County, Fla., that is south and west of the following line: Begin at the northwest corner of section 4 of township 3 south, range 8 west, and run east to the northeast corner of section 1 of township 3 south, range 8 west; thence run south on the range line between ranges 7 and 8 west to the southeast corner of section 12 of township 5 south, range 8 west; thence run east to the northeast corner of section 17 of township 5 south, range 7 west; thence run south to the Liberty-Franklin county line.

All that part of the Apalachicola National Forest that is now in Franklin County, Fla., however, a bill has been introduced in the 1947 session of the Florida legislature to put it into Liberty County, Fla., that is west of the following line: Begin at the one-half section line between sections 29 and 30 of township 5 south, range 7 west, and run south along the east line of sections 30 and 31 of township 5 south, range 7 west, and sections 6, 7, 18, 19, and 30 of township 6 south, range 7 west, to the southeast corner of said section 30 of township 6 south, range 7 west; thence run west along the south line of section 30 of township 6 south, range 7 west, to a point where Fort Gadsden Creek intersects the south line of section 30 of township 6 south, range 7 west, thence run down the center of Fort Gadsden Creek in a meandering westerly direction to the center of the mouth of Fort Gadsden Creek.

2. That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to each of the following: Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER and Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, both United States Senators from Florida, and the Honorable BOB SIKES, Member of the House of Representatives of the United States from the Third District of Florida.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Civil Service, to which was referred the bill (S. 203) to increase the equipment maintenance of rural carriers 2 cents per mile per day traveled by each rural carrier for a period of 3 years, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 337) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1488. A bill for the relief of Louisa B. Sank; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 1489. A bill to renew and extend certain letters patent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN (by request):

S. 1490. A bill to transfer the Panama Railroad pension fund to the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3444) to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT ON VETO OF LABOR RELATIONS ACT

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator TAFT on the veto of the Labor Relations Act on June 20, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CLAYTON ACT—ADDRESS BY ED. WIMMER

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address relating to the bill to amend the Clayton antitrust law by Mr. Ed. Wimmer, vice president of the National Federation of Small Business and editor of Forward, America, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—VETO MESSAGE

The Senate resumed the reconsideration of the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to join my distinguished colleagues in congratulating our President upon his carefully studied and courageous action in vetoing the Taft-Hartley bill. Every line of his able message breathes a spirit of fairness to employers and employees and a genuine concern for the economic and social future of our country.

During the debates on the Taft-Hartley bill, we have had frequent occasion to turn to two other able Presidential statements touching labor: His veto message returning the Case bill in 1946 and his state of the Union message of January 6 of this year. In those documents the President outlined, and now repeats, a program of labor-management relations which has won the confidence of, and will continue to commend itself to, the country.

The people know that the President is not a partisan in labor matters. He speaks in the name of the whole of the American people. I am confident that the rank and file of our citizens who have not had the President's opportunity to study this bill will be guided by his views.

Time has now elapsed, since passage of this measure, for a maturer view to make itself felt. On June 13 I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, an important religious, and certainly impartial, body, which said:

> The Taft-Hartley bill does little or nothing to encourage labor-management cooperation. On the contrary, it approaches the complicated problem of industrial relations from a narrow and excessive legalistic point of view.

It confirms our view that enactment of this measure would mean a renewal of the violence and warfare which characterized a shameful era in American labor relations before passage of the National Labor Relations Act.

The former Chairman and the public members of the National War Labor Board have denounced the measure. A distinguished group of labor lawyers and economists is reported by the New York Times of June 19 to say:

> This omnibus bill includes many provisions which are extremely unwise, unfair, or

unworkable. It goes far beyond the legitimate purpose of curbing union abuses or providing equality of bargaining rights and duties.

These are impartial experts talking. They confirm everything we have said about this measure. And now the President, in an able and forthright statement, has adopted, once again, the fair and frank course. His message is consistent with all that he has heretofore said. He has shown that he can be unimpressed by the synthetic din which has been raised to drown out this assault upon the rights and liberties of the citizen.

The people will long owe a debt of gratitude to the President for his courage and statesmanship on taking this step to preserve from emasculation the large body of laws, which have been developed at great sacrifice, for the fair and equitable adjustment of disputes growing out of labor-management relations. Every fair analysis of this bill supports the President's veto, and the best interests and welfare of our country demands that it be sustained.

Mr. President, on Thursday, June 12, 1947, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 6858, a supplementary analysis of the Taft-Hartley Labor bill. That analysis was intended as an answer to an analysis prepared by the Labor Relations Board at my request and placed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks on June 6, at page 6501.

This matter was brought up on the floor yesterday, and I want to call attention to the remarks made at that time by the Senator from Ohio. He said, at page 7370 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. TAFT. The veto message goes over, point by point, the points raised in a memorandum put into the RECORD by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], to each item of which the Senator will find an answer which I put into the RECORD. Does not the Senator think that the veto message substantially and in detail follows the Pressman memorandum which the Senator from Montana put into the RECORD?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to correct that statement. I did correct it in a Nationwide broadcast which I made last night. There are two memorandums. The one prepared by Mr. Pressman was put into the RECORD in the House by Mr. MARCANTONIO, and there is the memorandum which the Senator from Montana put in, which does not show its origin. My impression is that it came from the National Labor Relations Board, or perhaps from members of their staff. I wish to correct the statement to which the Senator referred. I am sorry I made the mistake, but it was corrected to the whole country last night.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for the correction, because it would be unfair to let that impression stand. Of course, when the statement was made by the able Senator from Ohio it was immediately taken up by the press and highlighted in the newspapers. People all over the Nation were led to believe that the analysis which I had filed in connection with my remarks on that occasion was prepared by Lee Pressman, which, of course, as the Senator now acknowledges, is not the fact. The statement which I submitted with my remarks was a statement prepared for me, at my request, by the National Labor Relations Board, and it was inserted in the RECORD at the close of my remarks on that occasion.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I happened to be called off the floor for a few minutes before the present discussion. I was a little surprised last night that the Senator from Ohio repeated the statement about the Pressman analysis that was put into the RECORD by the Senator from Montana, in view of the fact that I understood the Senator to say in his radio speech last night that the Senator from Montana had put the Lee Pressman analysis in the RECORD in the Senate, and that Mr. MARCANTONIO had put it in in the House.

Mr. TAFT. No; the Senator is mistaken. I just put my last night's broadcast into the RECORD today. I referred to a different memorandum in the broadcast last night.

Mr. PEPPER. I heard the able Senator's speech last night, and I find it before me in the Evening Star. If the Senator from Montana will yield further——

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Maybe the Senator did not so intend it, but in the context it does leave that impression. It says:

The President's message follows in many details the analysis of the bill prepared by Lee Pressman, general counsel of the CIO, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 3 by Congressman MARCANTONIO, and another memorandum inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 6 by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana.

The proximity of the two led me to infer that the Senator meant to say it was the same memorandum.

Mr. TAFT. No; it was not.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad to hear the Senator make that clear.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am very glad the distinguished Senator from Ohio has made the correction here today. However, I regret very much that it was not made yesterday, so that it would have been carried over the newspaper wires and published broadcast throughout the Nation. I realize that the Senator from Ohio did not intend to make any misrepresentation of the facts. He probably was honestly and sincerely misled. Nevertheless, a great injury is done by incorrect statements of that kind. People should be a little more careful about making statements attributing to another Member of this body an action which he did not commit.

But I am very glad now that it has been cleared up here on the floor, at least, although I do not believe it is completely cleared up in the country, because when a false impression goes throughout the country by means of the press of the Nation, it is usually very difficult to overcome it. Of course, I think we have done the best we could to correct the false impression, and we shall have to let the matter stand as it is.

Mr. President, I should like to consider for a while the analysis which was presented by the Senator from Ohio, by which he seeks to bolster up this reactionary bill and justify it as sound legislation.

At the outset, the Senator from Ohio stated that certain arguments which we have directed at specific provisions of the bill are not justified either by the text of the bill or the background of decisions against which it was written and claimed that certain completely erroneous statements had been made. I have read the analysis presented by the Senator from Ohio and I have considered it in the light of the arguments which we have previously made against the bill.

Upon considering the whole matter, I am convinced that the analysis introduced by the Senator from Ohio is subject to serious reproach on the ground that its statements and arguments are not justified and that it contains many erroneous statements.

First, with respect to the amendment of section 2 (2) of the National Labor Relations Act exempting Federal Reserve banks from the coverage of the statute, the statement of the Senator from Ohio contains significant omissions. The Senator's statement does not point out that all of the stock of the member Federal Reserve banks is held by privately owned banking institutions and that the Board of Directors of each Federal Reserve bank is in large part elected by the private banks which hold such stock. While these banks do perform certain functions which are useful to the United States Government, that is also true of many other private corporations and is true of our entire national banking system. All the arguments which could be made for exempting Federal Reserve banks from the coverage of the act could also be made with respect to private national banks. While the Board of Governors in Washington exercises a supervision over the member banks in the Federal Reserve system, there are large areas in which collective bargaining may be both feasible and practicable.

With respect to the amendments to section 2 (2), 213, and 301, concerning the definition of the word "agent," it is stated that the amendment merely restores the definition of "agent" as it existed at common law.

The treatment of the matter of agency illustrates to my mind in the clearest fashion the bias which lies behind this bill. In the first place, as this so-called supplementary analysis, the report of the conferees, and the entire legislative history of the bill indicate, it is proposed to weaken the responsibility of management for the acts of its foremen and superintendents in dealing with the men under them, so that a foreman or superintendent must now be shown to be act-

ing within the actual or apparent scope of his authority before the employer may be held responsible for what he does. The vice in this approach is that under modern industrial conditions the worker who receives his orders from and is solely responsible to his foreman, who never has an opportunity to see any company official of higher than superintendent rank, considers that these men are management, as they in fact are, for the purposes of directing work and supervising the work of the employees under them. Quite obviously the worker who is dependent for his daily wage upon those immediately superior to him, who stands in a master and servant relationship, in effect, to his superiors, cannot be treated on an equal footing with an independent representative for the purposes of arms-length dealing. Yet the common-law doctrines of agency were developed, not in connection with management-labor relations, but with those social and economic relationships which involve bargaining between parties of equal economic strength and equivalent bargaining power. The legalism with which this problem is now approached as a means for justifying a weakening of the protection of workers is typical of the specious view of industrial relations which underlies the whole bill.

While, on the one hand, responsibility of the employer for acts of foremen and supervisors is to a large extent removed, section 2 (3) removes supervisors from the coverage of the act. The principal reason asserted for doing so was that management was responsible for the actions of its supervisors and therefore should have an absolute and unfettered control over their activities. I need not point out that the principal reason for eliminating supervisors fails, if management is no longer to be responsible for the activities of its supervisory employees, unless those acts are specifically authorized. Hence, management, from this point on, may have it both ways; in the first place, they can, by the easy device, of posting a notice disclaiming any responsibility for what their superintendents or foremen do, avoid any responsibility for their actions; and, on the other hand, they may deny to supervisory employees the rights they should have on the plea that they are responsible for the actions of their supervisors.

Let us now consider the responsibility of unions for the acts of their agents. To begin with, I suggest that it is fundamental to this whole problem to point out that, although the Senator from Ohio may not think so, there are differences between corporations and labor unions. A corporation is organized for profit. It is normally a tightly controlled hierarchy, with complete power in top management to dismiss from its employment any person who fails to follow orders issued by the top echelons. Persistent disregard of instructions invariably leads to disciplinary measures which insure the careful carrying out of orders. On the other hand, trade-unions are not organized for profit. They are voluntary groups of individuals, and their ranks are open without discrimination, except in the rarest cases, to all employees in an industry. Their officers are elected at all levels. The only power which the top officers have over subordinate officers or the rank and file of the union is the power of persuasion, and again, in all but the rarest instances, they have no powers of discipline or removal. Policies are fixed, not as a result of decisions of a few individuals, but in national conventions including representatives of all members of the union.

We have had over the years some experience with the common law rules of agency as applied to trade-unions. The La Follette committee showed with what persistence and with what success management had succeeded in placing labor spies in prominent positions in unions, and showed further how those labor spies have deliberately used their positions of power to commit or encourage the commission of illegal acts, in order to bring discredit upon the union, though such individuals were in reality agents of management, not agents of the union. It was frequently held, prior to the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, that the union was responsible for the acts of its agents. Further, the courts in many cases found it unnecessary to resort even to common-law rules of agency; by treating the union as a conspiracy for an illegal purpose, they were able to hold each member and officer of the union as both the agent and principal of all the others. The result of these doctrines were the outrageous results in the Danbury Hatters, Bedford Cut Stone, and Duplex and Deering cases, which set up a wave of agitation, culminating in passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. Yet now, in the case of unions, it is proposed to restore those infamous doctrines in order to charge the central treasury of a union with responsibility for the acts of any officer or agent, whether actually authorized or ratified or not.

Inequality can be obtained quite as well by applying the same rule to different types of organizations as it can be by applying different rules to similar organizations. I have pointed out that by applying similar standards of responsibility for acts of agents to organizations as diverse as corporations and labor organizations, inequality of treatment has resulted; but this bill does not stop there. If management is, because it is entitled to their wholehearted allegiance, to be absolved of responsibility for the actions of its supervisors, then, if the same rule were to be applied, trade-unions should be absolved of responsibility for the acts of their subordinate officers. Yet, as I have pointed out, not only are they to be charged with such responsibility—as they now are—if the action of the subordinates has been authorized or ratified, but they are to be charged with it if any basis exists which might lead a court to conclude that an apparent agency existed. Thus, with respect to the single problem—responsibility for acts of agents—this bill gives employers a dual protection, but it visits a penalty upon trade-unions. I insist that this is patently unfair, clearly biased, thoroughly unworkable, and is done in a specious and legalistic fashion.

With respect to section 3 (d) of the bill, which is designed to accomplish a separation of functions within the Board, the supplementary analysis points out that a person aggrieved by the refusal to issue a complaint in a case may appeal the matter to Washington. It contains the statement that "the assumption that the Board itself presently reviews these appeals, however, is utterly erroneous." I have checked this matter with the National Labor Relations Board, and I find that the procedure, which is set forth publicly in the Federal Register for September 11, 1946, is that these appeals are considered in the first instance by a committee consisting of the Director of the Field Division of the Board and the associate general counsel in charge of litigation. This committee prepares recommendations to the Board itself, which presently reviews all such recommendations, and on fairly frequent occasions reverses the action of the appeals and review committee. The action of the committee does not become final until approved by the Board. It is by this means that the integration of policy with prosecuting functions which is the objective of administrative procedure is achieved.

It is obvious that this is no longer to be the case. The report of the statement of the managers on the part of the House says at page 37 that the "general counsel is to have the final authority, and in the name of, but independently of any direction, control, or review by, the Board in respect of the investigation of charges and the issuance of complaints before the Board. By this provision, responsibility for what takes place in the Board's regional offices is centralized in one individual." It is the clear legislative intent that the Board shall have nothing to do with these matters which opens the way to the evils, which we have previously described, of dispersion of authority, uncertainty in the meaning and application of the law, overzealousness in the prosecution of cases, harassment of employers and trade-unions, and the other disadvantages which the Attorney General's committee on administrative procedure pointed out necessarily flow from such separation of functions. The report of the House managers makes clear a congressional insistence that the general counsel is to have that "unfettered discretion" which the supplementary analysis of the Senator from Ohio denies to exist.

The supplementary analysis presented by the Senator from Ohio denies that section 7 is intended to revive the "yellow dog" contract. The supplementary analysis states that this language is contained in the Norris-LaGuardia Act. I assume that section 2 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act is referred to, and I should like to quote the full context:

> Whereas * * * the individual unorganized worker is commonly helpless to exercise actual liberty of contract and to protect his freedom of labor and thereby to obtain acceptable terms and conditions of employment, wherefore, though he should be free to decline to associate with his fellows, it is necessary that he have full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of his own choosing, to negotiate the terms and conditions of his employment, and that he shall be free from the

interference, restraint, or coercion of employers of labor, or their agents, in the designation of such representatives or in self-organization or in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection; therefore, the following definitions of, and limitations upon, the jurisdiction and authority of the courts of the United States are hereby enacted.

The supplementary analysis would lead one to believe that there is something in the Norris-LaGuardia Act which protected the right of persons to refrain from joining any trade-union activity. Such is simply not the case. That right has not been threatened from any source. On the contrary, the employers of this country, banded together in the Associated Industries and the National Association of Manufacturers, have for years thrown their vast economic power into protecting that right. If an employee has the right guaranteed by law to refrain from union activity, and if that right is as a matter of public policy deserving of public protection, I cannot see how any court could say that an employee no longer had the right to enter into a contract agreeing to refrain from such union activity. This act succeeds the Norris-LaGuardia Act by 15 years; in many respects, it intends to and does supersede or wipe out the protections of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. As the expression of the latest congressional intent on the subject, it may well be designed to override the Norris-LaGuardia Act in this important respect as well. If, as I think, this bill presents a real threat of the revival of the yellow-dog contract, the matter is not concluded there. Senators will recall the decision of the Supreme Court in the Hitchman Coal & Coke case, where the Supreme Court held that a person in attempting to organize workers who had signed yellow-dog contracts was seeking to induce a breach of such contracts, and therefore might be enjoined from proceeding with efforts at organization. If workers were thrown into concentration camps and surrounded by picket fences it would not have been a more effective device to prevent organization, for both employees and organizers could be summarily punished for contempt for breaking or inducing a breach of such a contract.

Further, when read in connection with section 8 (b) (1), the supplementary analysis conceded what is the obvious intent of the legislation, namely, that this is intended to "apply to coercive acts of unions against employees who did not wish to join or did not care to participate in a strike or a picket line." This makes it clear that the Federal Government is now to take on the responsibility of guaranteeing that employees who did not wish to participate in a strike and strikebreakers are to be escorted through picket lines by Federal officials under the protection of the Federal courts.

The report of the House managers at page 40 states that—

It is apparent that many forms and varieties of concerted activities which the Board, * * * regarded as protected by the act will no longer be treated as having that protection.

The report of the House managers states that—

This provision of the Senate amendment in its general terms covered all of the activities which were proscribed in section 12 (a) (1) of the House bill as unlawful concerted activities.

Section 12 (a) (1) of the House bill included among unlawful concerted activities the use of force or violence or threats thereof to prevent any individual from quitting or continuing in the employment of or from accepting or refusing employment by any employer; or preventing any individual from freely going from any place and entering upon an employer's premises or leaving such premises; or picketing an employer's place of business in numbers or in a manner otherwise than is reasonably required.

By this kind of legerdemain the House managers have indicated their belief that section 8 (b) (1) has carried into the completed bill those extreme provisions of the Hartley bill which have been so strongly denounced by the country at large.

Further, at page 42, the report of the House managers pointed out that the House bill allowed such activities to be "enjoined upon suit by a private employer, specific provision was made for suits for damages on the part of any person injured thereby, and employees participating therein were subject to deprivation of their rights under the act." The House managers then make this significant assertion:

The conference agreement, while adopting section 8 (b) (1) of the Senate amendment, does not by specific terms contain any of these sanctions.

The failure of the House managers to deny that they recede from their position that injunctions at the suit of private employers were not outlawed by the conference agreement indicates a clear legislative intention on the part of the House, at least, that the door has not been closed on suits on private injunctions obtained by employers contrary to the Norris-LaGuardia Act under this provision of the conference report. The assurances given by the Senator from Ohio as to the meaning of this bill are pleasant to the ear but it is obvious that he alone is not the sole author or sponsor of this bill and that the legislative history in the coordinate branch is far more important as a matter of legislative history than a statement introduced by the Senator from Ohio a week after enactment of the bill. Despite the assurances that the Hartley bill has been laid to rest it is entirely clear that the managers on the part of the House, do not think it has been, nor is there anything in the legislative history in the Senate to disclaim this.

The supplementary analysis provided by the Senator from Ohio attempts to answer the arguments so ably presented by the senior Senator from Kentucky concerning the requirement that under section 8 (a) (3) of the bill a majority of those eligible to vote, rather than a majority of those voting, are necessary to authorize the validity of a union security agreement. The supplementary analysis states that "an average of over 90 percent of the eligible employees participate in Board conducted elections and a 100 percent vote is not unusual." I have checked this figure with the National Labor Relations Board and find that actually the percentage of eligible employees voting in Board elections is 83 percent and further that a 100 percent vote is quite unusual. Be that as it may, it is apparent that under present Board rules the employer has no motive for keeping employees away from the polls; indeed employer campaigns against unions are almost invariably directed at appeals to employees to get out and vote since there is a widespread feeling that union members are more apt to vote in such elections than nonunion employees. Precisely the opposite would result under this act. While it is true, as the supplementary analysis states, that Board elections are frequently conducted on company time and property, this must obviously always be done with the employer's consent.

Such consent is usually forthcoming because of the employer's desire that all employees vote. By insisting that employees who do not vote in effect vote against union-security agreements, it will be apparent that the employer will have every interest to see that such elections are held under conditions which make it onerous for employees to vote since, if less than a majority vote in the election, the defeat of a union-security clause is assured.

The supplementary analysis in its discussion of section 8 (b) (4) dealing with illegal strikes and boycotts confirms our worst fears concerning the intent in changing the language of the section in conference. As passed by the Senate it was stated that a strike or boycott was illegal if it was for the purpose of certain practices. The conferees changed this to read, "where an object thereof if." The supplementary analysis states, "the intent of the conferees was to close any loophole which would prevent the Board from being blocked in giving relief against such illegal activities simply because one of the purposes of such strikes might have been lawful."

To begin with, it is nonsense to talk here of closing loopholes which would prevent the Board from being blocked in giving relief since the injunctive provisions with respect to these practices are mandatory upon the Board, which therefore has no discretion in the matter. Further than that, however, our objection to this change was premised upon the ground that it removed the primary objectives tests which was developed by the Supreme Court under the Sherman Antitrust Act in order that every strike would not be considered illegal; manifestly there may be several purposes in any strike and various strikers may have different motives. The Supreme Court therefore developed the doctrine that it would look to the primary objective and not to all objectives. I know of no assertion which has

been made on the Senate floor, as the supplementary analysis states, that even if one of the strikers had an improper motive he would thereby make the union liable for an unfair labor practice and to an action for damages brought by the employer; and I ask the Senator from Ohio to point to any such assertion made on this floor. We have insisted and continue to insist that a single strike may have several motives or that a considerable group of strikers may have motives other than those which impel the majority to strike.

The supplementary analysis confirms our argument that this throws the law back beyond anything which the courts have ever held. I do not understand the relevance of the argument made in the supplementary analysis that the hidden motives of the union or the employees would be immaterial. We have not argued that these motives would be hidden, but the point of our argument has been that an entire strike may be enjoined because some group of strikers or union leaders had a motive which some court might feel was improper.

The supplementary analysis, in discussing section 8 (b) (5) relating to the power of the Board to supervise initiation fees charged by the unions does not meet the arguments we raised. While it is true that, as stated by the supplementary report, this applies only to cases in which a union has received a union-shop or maintenance-of-membership agreement, such agreement now covers approximately 70 percent of the employees under contract, and I know of no union which does not at some point hold a union-security or maintenance-of-membership agreement. Hence, every union would be subject to the supervision of the Board in the fixing of the amounts of its initiation fees. The supplementary report states that this provision was included because unless such a provision was inserted, the restrictions on a union shop in section 8 (3) could be easily circumvented. The speciousness of this argument must be immediately apparent, for under section 8 (a) (3) "no employer shall justify any discrimination against an employee for nonmembership in a labor organization (a) if he has reasonable grounds for believing that such membership was not available to the employee on the same terms and conditions generally applicable to other members. Hence, if union members wish to exclude a person from membership under a union-security agreement they would be required to charge themselves the same initiation fees charged applicants for membership. Such an argument requires the conferees to assume that the vast majority of union members would be willing to tax themselves to exclude a few persons whom they did not desire to take into membership. We insist that the existence of such power in the hands of the Government is an open door to control of all union affairs since, if the Government controls the purse strings of the union, it will be clear that it will control all activities of the union.

The supplementary analysis in discussing section 8 (b) (6), the provision of the bill outlawing so-called featherbedding practices again confirms our fears concerning the meaning of this section. It states that:

> What is prohibited is extortion by labor organizations or their agents in lieu of providing services which an employer does not want.

Let us suppose a group of 10 men working on an assembly line would decide that it is physically impossible for them to keep production going without extra aid. If they request the employer to provide additional help and the employer says he does not want them, they are, under the bill as clarified by the supplementary analysis, engaging in a feather-bedding practice. If the employer does not wish to maintain a safety man below a heavy overhead crane in a factory to warn employees of impending danger the union would be guilty of a feather-bedding practice.

The supplementary analysis attempts to answer the argument that under the free speech provision statements of an employer could not be used in evidence. That such was its explicit intent is clear from the statement of the senior Senator from Ohio during the debate which preceded the passage of the bill, to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, June 5, 1947, at page 6446. The Senator from Florida stated that—

> Under the criminal law at the present time any statement a man may make prior to a given act which the court may try to evaluate may be admitted in evidence as having some relationship to his intentions. But the conference report deliberately excludes statements of that sort, unless the statement contains an actual threat, thereby depriving the Board of the full evidence in the case.

In response the senior Senator from Ohio stated:

> So long as the Board has a practice of that kind the employer's mouth is practically shut. In case he makes a speech later on and is charged with some unfair or unlawful labor practice, and that can be considered in evidence, it means that he cannot afford to speak at all. Without that provision there is not freedom of speech.

I need not point to the distorted concept of freedom of speech which is contained in the statement of the Senator from Ohio. From time immemorial the law has recognized that while a man may have a right to speak as he wishes he cannot escape responsibility for what he said under the laws of libel and slander. The use of any statements in evidence, liability for fraud, or misrepresentation, have not at any time been thought to infringe the right of freedom of speech. To deny the use of such statements as evidence in Labor Board proceedings is to give employers a license possessed at no time by any group in the community.

The supplementary analysis adopts a curious distinction in saying that this section "has no application to statements which are acts in themselves or contain directions or instructions. These, of course, could be deemed admissions and hence competent under the well-recognized exception to the hearsay rule." But the rule governing the use of admissions in evidence is applied only to admissions against interest. If an employer states that, "I do not like labor unions and consider them bad for my boys," it would be obvious on its face that this was not an admission against interest. It could not therefore be received in evidence as stated by the supplementary report. Further, I call attention to the fact that the supplementary report does not draw any line—and I am confident no such line can be drawn—between "views, arguments, or opinions" and "statements which are acts in themselves or contain directions or instructions." Even if such a distinction could be drawn it would have farcical results. It means that clear language explaining a direction or instruction would not be admissible even though the direction or instruction might be.

The supplementary statement distorts the record in yet another way. It states that—

> The Board has permitted employers' expressions of opinion on unionism to be used to sustain the theory that he was guilty of violations of the National Labor Relations Act.

While this is true and, in my judgment, proper, the supplementary report neglects to state that the Board has also used employers' expressions of opinion about unionism as a basis for acquitting an employer of a charge that he has violated the act. It must be remembered that while statements hostile to unionism are excluded by this action, statements of employers friendly to unions are also excluded, relevant as they may be in determining the employers' attitude and motives.

The supplementary analysis also neglects to mention the impact of this section on the unfair labor practices by unions which the bill would reach. In its very nature a boycott is hardly more than a statement of views, argument, or opinion which a union circulates in an effort to inflict an economic loss upon an employer. Yet, under this absurd provision such leaflets or other material would not be admissible in evidence.

In discussing section 8 (b) (4) (D), dealing with jurisdictional strikes, the Senator from Ohio again concedes the validity of the argument which we have made that this went far beyond the prevention of jurisdictional strikes by stating that—

> I have no hesitation in saying that this subsection applies not only to strikes over the assignment of particular work to one union rather than another, but also to the assignment of work to one union rather than another group of employees.

The Senator from Ohio, however, attempts to justify it by saying that it would be an unfair labor practice for an employer to assign work to nonunion employees in an effort to defeat a union, and by the same token that it should be an unfair labor practice for a union to attempt to compel assignment of work being done by nonunion men to themselves.

The Senator from Ohio misses the essential point which we made in our argument. By defining such disputes as jurisdictional disputes the injunctive provisions of the act may be brought into play. This section as now drafted defines as a jurisdictional strike an effort of employees to prevent an employer

from assigning work to nonunion employees in order to protect themselves. Hence, if such employees strike against employer action, which the Senator from Ohio concedes would be an unfair labor practice, they are guilty of a jurisdictional strike and subjected to the penalties of injunctive relief, suits for damages in the Federal courts, and probable triple damages under the Sherman Antitrust Act. If employees can strike against such unfair labor practices of employers only under such penalties we may confidently anticipate that antiunion employers will seize upon this as a device for breaking up any craft union.

We had previously criticized section 8 (d) of the act on the ground that it eliminated by its explicit provisions any duty on the part of the parties to meet and discuss modifications of an existing contract. The supplementary analysis points out what is perhaps true that "parties may meet and discuss the meaning of the terms of their contract and may agree to modifications on change of circumstances, but it is not mandatory that they do so." In the first place it must be evident that the inclusion of such a provision in the law will encourage employers who wish to remain adamant in their construction of the meaning of the contract to refuse to meet and discuss such meaning of the provisions of the contract since there is now an explicit statutory mandate that they need not do so. We have previously pointed out that existing law does not require the employer to agree to any changes and requires no more than that the parties meet and discuss the matter. We have no hesitation in saying that meetings and discussions between management and employees to discuss outstanding differences are highly desirable and industrially important. It is indeed the basic premise of the entire statute. Why in this area it should be less desirable than in the negotiation of the agreement itself the supplementary report leaves completely unexplained.

We had criticized section 9 (c) (4) as forbidding the Board from holding prehearing elections, a useful device which is now being used in some 800 cases a year coming before the Board. In only 15 percent of such cases do hearings result; if the union loses the election the matter normally ends there, and if the union wins the election the employer is very frequently willing to recognize them without further hearing. Since the Board holds approximately 5,000 to 6,000 elections a year it is obvious that this is not an "inconsequential percentage of cases" as the supplementary report states and it is statistically untrue, as the supplementary report states, that "more often than not a subsequent hearing was still necessary."

The Senator from Ohio attempts to answer our criticisms of the prohibition on use of the "extent of organization" theory by stating that "it is sufficient answer to say that the Board has evolved numerous tests to determine appropriate units, such as community of interest of employees involved, extent of common supervision, interchange of employees, geographical considerations, etc., anyone of which may justify the finding of a small unit." This suggestion is an invitation by the Senator from Ohio to the Board to make this provision work by disregarding it and instead of frankly resting its decisions on the extent of organization theory, to find some subterfuge by which the impact of this provision can be discounted. While I agree that the bill is an open invitation to subterfuge if employers, unions, and the Board are to continue its work, it seems to me undesirable for proponents of the measure to suggest a kind of deceit in its administration.

The extent of organization theory is criticized on the ground that "its use has been particularly bad where another union comes in and organizes the remainder of the unit which results in the establishment of two inappropriate units." Consider the situation in the coal-mining industry. The Progressive Mine Workers, strong in certain areas of Illinois, West Virginia, and Indiana, have for years waged a bitter battle against being represented by the United Mine Workers. If under the bill the Board were required to find a unit appropriate apart from the extent of organization, it would be in the position of forcing employees who desire to be represented by the Progressive Mine Workers of America into being represented by the United Mine Workers in order to meet the intellectual desires of the proponents of the measure. Herrin, Ill., was the scene of a small civil war on this issue; there was a pitched battle with much loss of life between miners who wished to be represented by the Progressive Mine Workers of America and others who wished to be represented by the United Mine Workers. Sitting in their ivory tower, it is well enough for the proponents of the measure to suggest that by disregarding the extent of organization theory the Board should in effect compel the renewal of that civil war.

The supplementary analysis undertakes to answer only a minor argument which we made against the provision which requires all union officials, international, local, and others, to certify that they are not Communists; namely, that this would create delay. The analysis in effect admits this to be true, since it says, "There is no delay unless an officer of the moving union refuses to file the affidavit required." It is, of course, precisely in this situation that we pointed out that delay would result.

Delay will result for still another reason. The section as drafted is now sufficiently broad to include officers down to the level of shop steward. This is a large and fluctuating group; the illness, absence from the country, negligence, of any single union officer would defeat the union's right to resort to governmental processes. Further, new officers are constantly being elected or replaced; to maintain such a voluminous file of affidavits continually up to date will obviously impose the most serious burdens upon unions.

Another problem arises in this connection. The bill requires that these affidavits be filed not only by the local officers but by "the officers of any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit." The American Federation of Labor has for many years been affiliated with the International Federation of Trade Unions, which includes representatives from many countries throughout the world. I am not at all sure of the political affiliation of each member of the IFTU but I rather surmise a Communist might be found among them and might be found among its officers. Are all American Federation of Labor unions thereby deprived of the right to file petitions with the Board? The railway brotherhoods have recently affiliated themselves with the International Transport Workers, an organization representing transport workers throughout the world. I know that the orientation of that organization has been strongly anti-Communist, but it is entirely possible that some Communist representing some group of transport workers somewhere in the world is an officer of that organization. The Congress of Industrial Organizations has been affiliated for some time with the World Federation of Trade Unions in which the Soviet trade unions are represented. Does the bill require that as a condition of filing cases with the National Labor Relations Board every CIO affiliate have on file an affidavit by the Russian officials of the WFTU that they are not Communist Party members? While such absurd consequences may not follow, the real point, of course, is that the filing of these affidavits has nothing to do with the function which our national labor policy has entrusted to the National Labor Relations Board; namely, the encouragement of collective bargaining.

We criticized section 10 (b) of the bill, which requires that proceedings shall "so far as practicable," be conducted in accordance with the rules of evidence applicable in the district courts of the United States. The Senator from Ohio attempts to explain away this provision by stating that "this is more a preventive measure than one to cure existing abuses" and that the use of the words "so far as practicable" gives to the trial examiner considerable discretion as to how closely he will apply the rules of evidence. The House conferees, however, had a quite different view of the matter. Their report states, at page 53, that "if the Board is required so far as practicable to act only on legal evidence, the substitution, for example, of assumed 'expertness' for evidence will no longer be possible." The House managers thereby indicate a clear intention that only such evidence shall be admitted, unless there is some overwhelming reason to the contrary, as would be admitted in a court of law in a case being tried by a jury. It is interesting that the sponsors of this measure in the Senate have not even denied the House statement that the Board is no longer to use its "expertness" in deciding cases. This ambition to replace informed and careful judgment with inexpertness has not, so far as I am aware, previously been made with respect to any governmental function.

Our criticism of section 10 (c), which allows an order of a trial examiner to become final in the event no exceptions are filed before the Board, was directed at a real danger. If, as occasionally

happens, a trial examiner filed an erroneous report granting a union, let us say, full relief, the employer could by waiting 20 days take his case directly to court without giving the Board an opportunity to correct the error committed by its trial examiner. The supplementary report answers that the "general counsel in any event would not go forward with enforcement if the order was erroneous"; but our argument rested squarely upon section 10 (f) of the Taft-Hartley bill, which allows any person to obtain a review of such order. The general counsel, of course, would have no power to prevent a review of such an order. Nor is there any answer, as the supplementary report states, in section 10 (c), which forbids the court from considering any objection which has not been urged before the Board, its member, agent, or agency. The illustration which we gave rested upon the premise that an objection had properly been made before the trial examiner, but improperly disregarded by him.

We objected to section 11 on the ground that the bill directs the Board to issue subpenas regardless of the materiality or relevancy of the evidence sought. The language of section 11 states: "The Board or any member thereof shall upon application of any party to such proceedings forthwith issue to such parties subpenas requiring the attendnace and testimony of witnesses or the production of any evidence in such proceeding or investigation requested in such application." Nothing in this statement requires that the matter sought be relevant or material; that this is the clear intent of section 11 as now drafted is clear from the following sentence which allows the party subpened to petition the Board to revoke the subpena if "the evidence does not relate to any matter under investigation or any matter in question in such proceedings or does not describe with sufficient particularity of evidence whose production is required." We did not, as the supplementary report states, at any point disregard the remainder of the paragraph providing for revocation of the subpena but it is clear from our earlier arguments that our objection went to the requirement that the citizen be put to the trouble of coming in and defending himself even though the subpena is on its face frivolous or irrelevant.

In criticizing section 206 dealing with national emergency strikes we criticized the insertion by the conferees of language which would make injunctive powers available if the strike was one "affecting an industry or a substantial part thereof." The supplementary report states that we ignore the remainder of the paragraph which imposes the additional requirement that such strike imperil the national health or safety.

This is hardly accurate. Our objection went to the fact that by thus enlarging the circumstances under which an injunction might issue almost any strike could be brought within the terms of the bill. There was some slight safeguard against arbitrary or too frequent use of the injunctive process against strikes in the version of the bill which passed the Senate in that it was necessary that such a strike affect substantially an entire industry. Now, however, it is enough if in the judgment of the President or the Attorney General some segment of an industry is affected. Thereby the salutary safeguards of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, insofar as they are not already removed by other sections of the bill, are by this section largely taken away.

I have dwelt at some length upon the supplementary report because I think it illustrates so typically the manner in which the full scope and content of this measure has been concealed from the Senate and from the public generally. The clearest legislative history found in the bill itself, or in the report of the House managers, or in the report of the majority of the Senate conferees, is on the floor of this body twisted, distorted, or concealed in such a manner as to lull the Senate into a feeling of security that none of the results which we prophesy will follow from this measure.

Perhaps no piece of legislation which has ever passed the Congress has had a more voluminous legislative history. Merely in the topics upon which I have touched there is material for extensive litigation for the next 10 years. The mere assurance by the Senator from Ohio that a certain intent was embodied in the bill or that a certain result will flow from it is far from being the whole story. The report of the managers on the part of the House is a particularly glaring example of the way in which matters which we have thought laid to rest are again revived. It is clear that the report of the managers on the part of the House read in connection with the conference bill makes this measure stand exactly where the Hartley bill stood when it passed the House. I do not, of course, insist that the courts would treat the report of the House managers as the entire legislative history of this measure; I do insist that in any consideration of the bill by the courts that report is a vastly more important part of the legislative history of the measure than are the individual views of the Senator from Ohio, particularly when stated for some days after enactment of the bill. If the bill becomes law we may be certain that the major portion of the views expressed by the House managers in 20 pages of fine print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will, in most cases, prevail, since in a great bulk of instances the positions asserted by the managers on the part of the House have not been denied by the Senate conferees either in their report or on the floor of the Senate.

It is important that the Senate understand that as the legislative history of the measure now stands we are voting for what is with only the rarest and most minor exceptions the Hartley bill, a bill which has been denounced from one end of the country to the other as being too harsh and which the chairman of the House Labor Committee admitted was drafted only for the purpose of wringing further concessions from the Senate. The Senate must understand that even those Members of this body who voted for this measure with reservations but with the hope that it could somehow be patched up in administration or by subsequent congressional action have had the wool pulled over their eyes by the House conferees.

It is interesting that those Senators who feel that the joint congressional commission provided by this bill offers an opportunity for correcting the defects which they concede are contained in this measure, are themselves in a minority within their own party. On some issues they made a valiant fight to exclude some of the worst proposals, yet it was only with the support of Senators on this side of the aisle that they were able in a few cases to defeat a number of vicious provisions. For that group now to suppose that they will have the assistance of their party in correcting this measure is thoroughly illusory. If anything, in the event this bill becomes law, they will find themselves faced with fights to ward off even more repressive and unjustified action on the part of a majority of their colleagues.

We, of the minority in the Labor Committee, have consistently offered our services on a bipartisan basis to sit down and draft a measure following the procedures so successfully adopted by the junior Senator from New York before he reversed his position after coming to this body. We have introduced legislation to implement that proposal we made; legislation which may still be passed at this session of the Congress and which I feel sure would be gladly signed by the President since it contains his own recommendations in his state of the Union message. For the comfort and well-being of the United States, the Senate would do well to admit its mistake, to concede that, as Chairman HARTLEY put it, "There is more in this bill than meets the eye," to start afresh on a bill of the kind which we have proposed, and to advance into this tortuous, complex field slowly and step by step, gaining a secure foothold before we move to the next step.

Mr. President, I think it would be appropriate at this time for me to call attention to the fact that the National Association of Manufacturers has been the principal organization behind this legislation.

We have witnessed in this present attempt to pass a vicious and pernicious labor bill the machinations of a power combine of big business, the NAM. How it works in behalf of monopoly big business, while at the same time fooling the vast majority of even its own membership among manufacturers, has been disclosed once more by two articles appearing in the last two issues of the official paper of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, the Trainmen News.

I call attention to these articles, and ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

SPENDS MILLIONS TO UNDERMINE LABOR—NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS: A TOOL OF MONOPOLY-MINDED BIG BUSINESS

(Part I)

The National Association of Manufacturers, bitter, powerful, and relentless foe of organized labor, has been at its job trying to beat back labor's advances for a long time now.

Since it was first organized in 1895 NAM has performed a great many services for its monopoly-minded big-business owners who shell out millions that go into its propaganda machine and come out as "influence" exerted on thousands of unknowing and unsuspecting voters.

The NAM was never so effective as just now when its long years of skillful efforts and its vast expenditures of money are paying off in the Republican reactionary Congress' support of the Taft-Hartley labor bill.

WORK FOR CORPORATION BIGWIGS

When an organization has been around doing business for half a century we begin to take it for granted. Having satisfied ourselves at one time or another of the character of the NAM, we have it "tagged" as a vicious, labor-baiting, reactionary tool of the handful of hard-boiled corporation millionaires—du Pont of the vast du Pont family interests, oil man Pew, Republican bigwig of Pennsylvania, Colby of General Foods, Weir of Weirton Steel, Hutchinson of Chrysler Corp., Hargrave of Eastman Kodak Co. and Hook of American Rolling Mills.

These men, with a few others of the same stripe, sitting in the top executive committee of NAM, pull its strings, make up the special programs to influence legislation, and find the money to pay their costs. But how they work is seldom revealed to the public. Let's take a look behind the scenes.

NAM's public relations chief probably revealed much more than his bosses would like when he boasted in a December 21, 1946, interview with Editor and Publisher of the propaganda program carried on by NAM during last year. That program cost slightly less than $3,000,000 and an even larger amount is budgeted to be spent during 1947. Judging by the way in which NAM is spending money right now, its propaganda campaign in putting over the Taft-Hartley bill has cost them much more.

You can buy a lot of influence with $3,000,000, even in a big country like the United States, if you know how to spread it around. Here's how it was spread by NAM's bright boys.

There were two jobs NAM sought to put over on the American people in 1946. One was to prepare the ground still further for the fight to destroy the Wagner act during the 1947 Congress. The other was to kill off OPA so that the specially favored few manufacturers could reap lush profits from the sale of scarce goods at uncontrolled inflated prices. NAM takes credit for destroying OPA. Of course, it had considerable assistance in the United States Senate from TAFT of Ohio and WHERRY of Nebraska, the same two who are by some strange coincidence lending such leadership to the labor bill now being enacted by the Republican Congress.

"When NAM started the campaign (against OPA)," boasts Holcombe Parkes, its public relations man, "a survey showed 85 percent of the people believed OPA was absolutely necessary. In November, 1946, after the campaign spearheaded by NAM, only 26 percent of the people believed OPA was vital."

FOUGHT OPA PROGRAM

People's irritation with (1) the shortages of goods when peace came, (2) the offering of shoddy merchandise, and (3) the black market were fanned into emotional flames against OPA by 1,000 talks given to women's clubs, foremen's groups, civic organizations and the student bodies of high schools and colleges by well-coached NAM staff speakers. Working through some local manufacturer who held a respected position in the community, NAM organizers developed what appeared to be wholly impartial community conferences attended by the wives of leading businessmen, church, and civic leaders club officers and school officials. All got the same intensive cultivation from NAM headquarters, leading to the well-planned conclusion that OPA was harmful, that it must go if goods were to become of top quality and abundant, and that prices would not go high, and even if some of them did rise momentarily, they would soon come down.

NAM saw to securing its results by "tailoring" its publications to the special interests of particular groups.

Each group of opinion molders got its specific NAM propaganda. "Trends," a specially designed publication, went to a selected group of 37,000 school superintendents, principals, and teachers. "Understandings" went to 15,000 clergymen. "Farm and Industry" was sent regularly to 35,000 farm leaders. "Program Notes" was especially developed to be used by 40,000 leaders in women's clubs.

But while all this effort was calculated to get the ground well cultivated and fertilized for widespread acceptance of NAM's programs, "we must be sure that our stories are told exactly the way we want them told," said NAM's public relations head. "Paid advertising is the only sure way of doing this" So, over $1,500,000 went into direct advertising. How much good will such a juicy plum produces for NAM among the publishers of the Nation who receive a share of it is anybody's guess. But it makes doubly sure that good use will be made of NAM's clip sheet which feeds stuff all ready to go to print to 7,500 weekly newspapers, and its special publication Industry's Views which goes regularly to 2,500 busy columnists and editorial writers.

SOME NAM PROPAGANDA

NAM has made much of its devotion to the "American enterprise system." It tries hard to make this long-continued build-up pay off in its deft use of our traditional American opposition to monopoly by seeking to pin that label on organized labor.

But when these big businessmen talk so loudly about the American system of enterprise, how much do you hear them shouting about "free competitive" enterprise? Who are the corporations who used World War II as a means of further concentrating the wealth of the Nation into still fewer hands? Which corporation executives refused to expand production facilities even when their patriotism was appealed to by the President until they were guaranteed tax write-offs? Who are the corporations listed among the monopolies and near monopolies in the exhaustive studies of the TNEC? What corporations defy the Sherman and Clayton Antitrust Acts, drag out suits brought against them by the Federal Government to lengthen the time during which they can garner monopoly profits? Start naming these corporations, and see how closely they fit the roster of the inner circle of giant companies making and guiding the policies of NAM.

Let's read the record of NAM! Look at these black spots:

The NAM opposed the child-labor amendment. It fought for years to put over on the workers and the public the notion that their interests were best furthered by an open shop in industry and a company-sponsored welfare program calculated to achieve NAM's brand of corporation-dictated industrial democracy. When labor got stronger with the election of Franklin D. Rosevelt and the introduction of the New Deal, then NAM likewise found its treasury swollen by the contributions of those industrialists whose hatred of "that man" was so intense.

NAM used the money to influence voters and their elected representatives to oppose workingmen's compensation, the social-security program of old-age pensions and unemployment compensation, bank-deposit insurance, the Wages and Hours Act, legislation offered to strengthen independent competitive small business, public-health programs, and Federal aid for public schools, and other measures which have proved so beneficial not only to the common people of this country but to the very business community which opposed such legislation.

DOESN'T FIGHT FAIRLY

The NAM has every right in our democracy to oppose openly such proposals, if it chooses. For that is the straightforward, American way of fighting. But a congressional investigation showed that the NAM didn't fight fairly and in the open. On the contrary, says the La Follette committee, it "blanketed the country with a propaganda which in technique has relied upon indirection of meaning, and in presentation upon secrecy and deception. Radio, speeches, public meetings, news, cartoons, editorials, advertising, motion pictures, and many other artifices of propaganda have not, in most instances, disclosed to the public their origin with the association."

And what the committee considered most dangerous to our democratic form of government was the fact that the NAM's campaign of propaganda stems from the almost limitless resources of corporate treasuries. Not individuals but corporations constitute the membership of the association and supply its funds.

Probably few of the people subjected to the barrage of propaganda last year in the 1,600,000 pamphlets and booklets, sent to schools, libraries, and individuals, the more than 46,000 showings of NAM films, viewed by over 600,000, and a Nation-wide weekly radio broadcast, could see through the skillfully designed curtain of secrecy to distinguish the guiding hand and selfish purpose of a few dozen giant corporation executives who manipulate NAM so largely for their own ends. Yet, this is exactly what happens. How it takes place, and with what results, will appear in a second and concluding article.

WHAT IS THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS?

(Part II)

In the previous article on NAM's program of propaganda we traced how big business $3,000,000 was spent in 1946 to cultivate the grassroots of the Nation and influence the Congress to repeal OPA and prepare for the passage of the Hartley-Taft-Ball slave labor bill in the 1947 Congress. Here we sketch the way NAM is set up to do such dirty work for a handful of powerful corporations which dominate American business.

NAM was established in 1895, incorporated in New York State as a nonprofit organization. Just now it boasts its greatest membership, slightly more than 15,000 manufacturing businesses. While only manufacturing firms can belong, the interlocking tieups with utilities and trade groups make NAM the "front" and guiding spirit of the powerful leaders in most branches of American business. But more of this later.

How NAM gets and holds onto its members is of first importance. For members spell both political pressure and money for NAM's work. No individual belongs to NAM. A membership is sold to a manufacturing company, and memberships are sold as low as $25 a year. Dues are based on the number of employees in the firm. Here is one key to where the power is lodged in NAM, for the old adage applies—"he who pays calls the tune." The big boys heading corporations having thousands of workers set its antilabor policies and guide its reactionary program.

While NAM has some 15 salesmen in the field contacting manufacturing firms all the time, selling memberships, the real pressure that produces results is what is known inside the shop as the chain membership program. This is the tough bludgeoning device which few even of the most independent smaller businessmen can afford to resist for long. Here is how it works. The NAM staff prepares a letter on the stationery and for the signature of one of its big members,

say for example, Alfred Sloan of General Motors Corp. He explains in the letter that as a member of a special promotional committee of NAM he wants to tell the firm to which the letter is being sent just why it is important to that firm to belong to NAM. He asks the head of the firm to write him personally his decision. He very kindly includes in the letter a scale of membership fees to guide his correspondent in making out his check to NAM.

When such a letter goes out to the heads of all the companies which sell to or have important business dealings with General Motors, such pressure gets results. Under such pressure manufacturers become members of NAM—but what kind of members? Are these 15,000 firms active members? Do they shape the policies and approve the programs carried on by NAM? Should they be forced to bear the brunt of public disapproval of NAM, even though they are really only silent, and probably many are unwilling members in that organization?

In American business a man doesn't often get to the head of a manufacturing firm of sufficient size to be pressured into membership in NAM without having learned one important rule of the game—to take what is handed out by the bigger and more powerful above him without protesting too much. So, whether he likes the reactionary anti-labor program of NAM or not, he seldom questions the right of the handful of men who run NAM to impose such a program, even by dictatorial, Fascist-like methods. For NAM is not set up to operate as a democratic organization expressing the will of its membership. To be sure, it has a board, composed of some 60 members, which is selected to cover the various sections of the country and give the outward impression of being a representative body.

The board meets once a month, usually in the swanky Waldorf-Astoria in New York, except for some few winter meetings held at some favorite spot in Florida or in the horsey country of Virginia where a few of the more powerful members may be sojourning away from the inclement weather of New York. But even these board meetings, which are attended by a couple of dozen regulars who make it their business to always be on hand, are more in the nature of the window-dressing, giving outward approval of the program and policy already agreed to by the small, well-knit executive committee of big business officials.

Formerly, big corporation executives held the high offices in NAM and spoke for the organization. Then, they began to heed the advice of smart public relations promoters, and went underground. They developed a well-studied plan of window dressing calculated to impress the public with the representative character of NAM. One feature was to deliberately select a president of NAM who was the head of some comparatively small but quite reputable manufacturing firm. The scheme has worked well, for many businessmen are led to believe that NAM is not the tool of a handful of giant corporations, but their own organization.

The public hears from NAM's president as the representative of a vast number of manufacturers who are banded together to preserve and strengthen the free-enterprise system and the American way of life. While the real power in NAM affairs rests securely in the handful of likeminded, likepurposed big corporation executives who compose its inner circle in the executive committee. Here the program to kill OPA was hatched. Here the budget was agreed to for spending some $3,000,000 getting ready to put over the Hartley-Taft-Ball labor bill. It is this group that has fought over the years against the abolition of child labor, the enactment of Social Security, the levying of taxes based on the ability-to-pay principle.

It is within this inner circle that the big funds are pledged and raised to pay for NAM's program of propaganda, funds which, by the way, are tax-exempt contributions, for by some means NAM has succeeded in convincing the Internal Revenue Bureau that it is a nonprofit organization engaged in nonpolitical, philanthropic, educational work.

Once agreed to in the executive committee, passed on by the Board in which these executive committee members are the dominant figures, NAM has its program and budget. The rest is a job of promotion, done most skillfully by a staff of some 300 in New York, about 30 in Washington, D. C., and lesser numbers scattered strategically over the country in offices in the larger industrial centers.

Described thus, NAM appears much like many other pressure organizations. But NAM is more subtle and devious than that. When it found that the public, and even the business community, had its organization tagged as being reactionary and out of step with American needs, it cooked up a scheme for hiding itself and widening its influence by working through other more local groups. So the National Industrial Council was created. Sweetened in recent years by an annual contribution from NAM of some $200,000 to defray certain expenses, NIC federates and coordinates the political-legislative program of three constituent bodies, (1) the State manufacturing associations such as the Illinois Manufacturing Association, the Associated Industries of New York, the Iowa Manufacturers Association; (2) the various employers' associations, such as the Employers Association of Cleveland, the Open Shop Association of Atlanta; (3) the trade association group, which is a federation of most trade associations, such as the National Electrical Manufacturers Association and the Lumber Dealers Association.

The degree of control that NAM has over these several groups varies. On some of the most important issues, such as the program to destroy OPA last year, or the Taft-Hartley-Ball labor bill just now, there is almost 100 percent agreement.

NAM looks upon the various State manufacturers' groups as the means of fighting labor within the several States, and as a grass-roots contact which is maintained year round. Many of these State groups have memberships from the public utilities, which affords NAM a means of cross-fertilizing, of bringing influence to bear on these powerful business groups, and securing the support of their substantial political organizations both in national and local fights.

The local employers organizations, while powerful in their own towns or States, often lack broad program materials and research reports, especially dealing with national issues. Here, again, NAM finds a profitable alliance ready to serve its purposes.

The national trade associations on NAM's list number about 300. While independent of NAM, they hold their annual trade association group meeting in conjunction with NAM's. Broad policy agreements are effected. NAM works through these trade associations when it is advantageous to do so. For example, in the 1946 OPA fight, NAM was able to get the trade associations to spearhead the job, particularly at the local contact level, for each association was anxious to make the record of having destroyed OPA and thus secure higher prices for its members. Usually, however, trade associations shy away from activities which might label them as lobbyists. Hence, they are quite willing to let NAM do that part of the job.

The NAM doesn't just throw into the common "kitty" its $200,000 annual contribution to the National Industrial Council. Its money is spent to maintain the central office in New York, to pay the salaries of the staff there and of the council's office in Washington, D. C. Thus, NAM has a direct hold on the activities of the NIC. To further tighten this hold, the representative of State and local groups in NIC are brought to Washington once a month where they are addressed by NAM's staff officers, meet with selected Members of Congress and Government officials. Plans for supporting or opposing pending legislation are formulated at these meetings.

It must be borne in mind that the keynote of all these meetings is anti-New Deal, and particularly antilabor. One long-time member of these meetings asserts that, conservatively estimated, three-fourths of the time is devoted to labor problems.

NAM doesn't stop here in exerting pressure on the people and Congress. It has an excellent means of approach to individual Members of Congress which affords its lobbyists a ready welcome by working through industrialist friends of Senators and Congressmen who are members of NAM. If you haven't seen Congress in action, with its Members, especially the influential ones, carrying a stupendous load of work that allows them little free uninterrupted time, you can't appreciate how important it is for the NAM lobbyist to have access to the ear of Senator T and Congressman H.

NAM staff men have developed great skill in using this entree, for they don't want to wear out their welcome or embarrass their friends in Congress by a too obvious show of such close relationships. But even more important is NAM's desire to preserve its status as a tax-exempt, nonpolitical organization. That is why a very few amongst its large paid staff so reluctantly registered under the new lobbying law, for, if NAM is adjudged because of that to be an organization engaged primarily and directly in influencing legislation and supporting candidates for office, the very attractive bait of tax exemption held out to its heavy contributors won't be possible any more.

Shorn of its big contributions, NAM would lose its greatest means of effective action, for NAM doesn't depend primarily on the dues collected from its manufacturing-firm memberships for its program. That way it raises and reports to its members an annual budget of from $1,000,000 to $1,500,000. But it has a sponsored subsidiary organization, the National Industrial Information Committee. That organization raises some $3,000,000 or more a year directly from industry to finance its far-flung program of propaganda. To get that sizable budget, each State is assigned its quota, and the industrial leaders pledge their share of these tax-deductible contributions.

This recital would not be complete without mention of the role played by so-called impartial scientific research conducted by NAM's own research organization, and by other affiliated bodies or kindred research bureaus. One of these, the National Industrial Conference Board, publishes basic studies on a wide range of social-economic subjects. They are often done by scientists of reputation. They frequently make substantial additions to our knowledge. They find much use as teaching materials in our schools and colleges. They are quoted widely by public speakers. They become important data in labor negotiations and court actions.

Supported by contributions from the same group of financial giants as operate NAM, working on subjects of great significance to NAM, it's small wonder that the product of such research agencies bolsters NAM's views. They provide scientific facts and the feeling of profundity that gives NAM such advantage when it quotes scientific research in support of its position. For NAM has learned the value of a big research program, and it makes good use of it.

In the passage of the Hartley-Taft-Ball labor bill by the 1947 Congress, organized labor faces one of the most hazardous and chaotic periods of its existence. It will inevitably be forced more and more into politics to make its position fully understood by

the American voters. In this arena of publics affairs, it will meet NAM head-on. In its relentless fight against organized labor, NAM will not be satisfied even if this vicious Taft-Hartley labor bill becomes law, but will press for the complete emasculation of the Wagner Act. Should NAM be fortunate in the 1948 elections and a reactionary Republican administration be voted into office, that is exactly what can be expected. For NAM was organized by American big business to fight labor. That is what its highly paid staff of experts gets paid to do. That is what it spends in excess of $3,000,000 a year in devious and oft-times deceitful propaganda to accomplish.

In our type of democratic government NAM, and any other pressure organization, has the right to bring every legitimate influence to bear on the voters and their elected representatives. The utmost freedom of action of citizens to organize, to express their views, to petition for redress of grievances, to show their approval or disapproval of their elected officials, are absolutely essential to the vigorous functioning of American democracy.

But any pressure organization like NAM must accept the consequences of its acts. The very foundations of representative democratic government are threatened by the secret, evasive action of an organization which fears the light of full disclosure of its sources of funds, its membership, its true purposes, its techniques of exercising influence, its paid representatives, how much it spends, to whom it accounts for these expenditures, and its connections with other organizations, dummy and real.

Any group formed to influence public decisions must be forced by law to work in a goldfish bowl. No group intent upon directly lobbying for or against legislative measures has the right under existing law to be supported from tax-exempt contributions.

In many of these respect NAM is guilty, for, as the La Follette Senate investigating committee pointed out, it "blanketed the country with a propaganda which in technique has relied upon indirection of meaning, and presentation upon secrecy and deception."

Once forced into the open, where the general public, the members of State legislatures, and the Congress of the United States can see NAM's trade-mark on all its wares, it will be exposed as a tool of a handful of industrial giants who have long sought to destroy the gains of labor and thwart the advances made toward greater social security and economic prosperity in the United States. Once exposed, even the huge funds at the disposal of NAM's bright boys will not be fearsome, for the plain people have an almost uncanny ability to make up their own minds in their own interests. And they will soon find that their interest runs counter to that of the big business corporation leaders who run NAM.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, there has been much misunderstanding in the country as a result of the propaganda which has been put forth in connection with this legislation. I have received letters from my own State of Montana insisting that I should vote for the legislation, but when the matter was explained to my constituents I frequently found that I received letters telling me that they were entirely in accord with my judgment in the matter, since they were led to believe that the bill was not a repressive bill, and that all it sought to accomplish was to correct the few evils which existed in the field of labor relations. I shall not take the time to read any of those letters at this time, but there is considerable misunderstanding in the country. However, I wish to call attention to some statements which have been made by well-known businessmen in regard to legislation of this kind.

Here is a statement which comes from a Cleveland manufacturer, Mr. Alexander Printz, president of the Printz-Biederman Co., of Cleveland, and chairman of the National Coat and Suit Industry Recovery Board, at the June 20 session of the twenty-sixth convention of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union at the Public Auditorium in Cleveland. This is a lengthy statement, and I shall not take the time to read it in detail. I call attention to a few excerpts from it. During the course of his statement Mr. Printz said:

In those industries in which the worker-employer concord has not reached a point at which a program such as that of the recovery board can be introduced and developed, a beneficial purpose would, in my opinion, be served through joint conventions of representatives of labor and management. This would constitute a forum for the interchange of views and ideas, not under the stress of contract negotiation, but in the spirit of mutual enlightenment. * * *

Advancement toward an equitable management-labor relationship in industry in general cannot be achieved through depriving conscientious labor groups of their effectiveness. It is true that jurisdictional disputes, secondary boycotts, and similar actions have evoked much justified criticism but it would be everlastingly regrettable if, in attempting to curb these, the very life of wholesome unionism were to be endangered.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire statement be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

MANAGEMENT SPEAKS TO LABOR

(Address by Alexander Printz, president of the Printz-Biederman Co., of Cleveland, and chairman of the National Coat and Suit Industry Recovery Board, at the June 20 session of the twenty-sixth convention of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union at the Public Auditorium in Cleveland)

It is, indeed, an honor to be invited to address this great convention. I look upon the invitation as tendered to me not as an individual employer, nor even as chairman of the National Coat and Suit Industry Recovery Board, but as symbolizing the admirable progress that has been made over the years in harmonious management-labor relationship in the industries with which your organization is identified.

As a Clevelander, who has been in the garment-manufacturing business here for more than half a century, it is a source of particular pride to me that this city should be the scene of your triennial meeting. I want to join with other of my fellow citizens and the industry members of this city in bidding you welcome and in expressing the confidence that you will find Cleveland so satisfactory a meeting place that you will come here soon again.

I had the privilege of speaking at your convention in Atlantic City more than 10 years ago and again at your noteworthy gathering in Boston in 1944.

Each time you have asked me to speak I have accepted your courteous invitation, not because I felt that I could make any significant contribution to your deliberations but because it seemed to me that it was fitting and proper that a representative of management should, when afforded the opportunity, report to labor on matters of common concern.

The fact that there is a community of purpose between management and labor in the wholesome functioning of an industry was cogently expressed a number of years ago, at a time of grave depression, by the late Morris Hillquit, the able counsel to your union and a truly distinguished figure of his time. He declared that labor was interested in the creation of proceeds by industry; that, without such proceeds, there would be nothing with which to give adequate remuneration to labor.

AN INSIGHT INTO MANAGEMENT'S ROLE

It would, I sincerely believe, aid in the consistent improvement in worker-employer relationship for management to accord to labor an insight into management's role in the operation of an industry. Such an insight is made possible in the coat and suit industry through the National Coat and Suit Industry Recovery Board, which serves as a medium of common consideration of industry affairs by management and labor. The meetings of the executive committee of the board, which comprises representatives of your union and the employers' associations in the various coat and suit manufacturing centers throughout the Nation, has been aptly described by your president, David Dubinsky, as the "Parliament of the industry."

This is an attitude free of the isolationism that precipitates controversies and that causes the waste inherent in suspicion and in conflict. It is a form of relationship in which neither side surrenders its individuality nor dilutes its partisanship but which recognizes the sound precept that labor and management are not traditional enemies or ingrained adversaries.

It requires courage for union leadership to take part in such a program as that represented by the recovery board. It is not as dramatic or colorful as are more belligerent forms of union activity; it does not have the popular appeal of fist brandishing or saber rattling. It is a broad-visioned pattern for peaceful progress worthy of the widest possible emulation.

CONSTRUCTIVE INTERCHANGE OF VIEWS

In those industries in which the worker-employer concord has not reached a point at which a program such as that of the recovery board can be introduced and developed, a beneficial purpose would, in my opinion, be served through joint conventions of representatives of labor and management. This would constitute a forum for the interchange of views and ideas, not under the stress of contract negotiation, but in the spirit of mutual enlightenment.

Not to presume upon your kindness in inviting me here today, I do, however, wish to dwell for a moment upon the true character of management's role as the marketing agent of the grist of the skill and effort of an industry's workers. An outline of management's duties in the apparel industry quickly discloses it to be a many-sided, arduous job that merits the respect, not of labor alone, but of the public as well.

It is management's task to utilize to the utmost its knowledge and ingenuity, not merely in intraindustry competition but in the broader intercommodity rivalry.

Management in the apparel industry does not rest upon laurels of the past; it recognizes the fact that each season poses a separate challenge. Fabric and other resource markets must be exhaustively studied and conclusions concerning them must be supported by substantial investment. Management must direct extensive styling activities, hazarding a sizable part of its capital in the preparation of its lines. Management must engage in intensive merchandising and dis-

tribution procedure and must underwrite and coordinate a great many other functions that make for lasting good will and for product improvement.

STABILIZED LABOR CONDITIONS ESSENTIAL

To enable management to center its attention upon the capable performance of its manifold duties, orderly and stabilized labor conditions are not merely desirable; they are unquestionably essential.

It is, indeed, my opinion that the weakening of constructive unionism would be as injurious to conscientious employers as it would be to labor itself. In an industry such as ours, made up of numerous comparatively small firms, a responsible labor organization is necessary to prevent an unreasonable and unfair minority of employers from undermining those who depend for survival upon the merit of their product and their service.

Advancement toward an equitable management-labor relationship in industry in general cannot be achieved through depriving conscientious labor groups of their effectiveness. It is true that jurisdictional disputes, secondary boycotts, and similar actions have evoked much justified criticism but it would be everlastingly regrettable if, in attempting to curb these, the very life of wholesome unionism were to be endangered.

The fact that there has been some unsavory union leadership does not justify any generalizations that ignore the role of organized labor in our Nation's march of progress.

LEADERSHIP OF HIGH INTEGRITY

You of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union are to be congratulated upon the leadership of your organization—men of high integrity and proven ability. They give aggressive representation to your great organization and although we, as employers, disagree with them on many occasions, they have our sincere and enduring respect.

In closing, let me voice my belief that there is an awareness among reasonable and capable employers that strong unions, led by men of vision and probity, are indispensable to industrial orderliness and stability.

Speaking out of my own experience, I withstood the unionizing of my firm for a quarter of a century—from 1910 to 1935. Now, after 12 years of conducting a union plant, I feel that, despite the occasional problems and differences that are inevitable in any relationship, I would not want to revert to a nonunion status and I would view with regret any developments that would place unionization in our industry as a whole upon a demoralizing defensive.

The task of making way for a better tomorrow in our Nation is, properly, a joint endeavor of us all. It is the common goal of worker and employer—of management and labor. Drastic curbs upon either labor or management will not attain this eagerly desired objective.

Mutual confidence and good will, as exemplified by your extending to me the privileges of this platform, are the basic essentials for lasting betterment for ourselves and for the generations to come.

NATIONAL COAT AND SUIT INDUSTRY RECOVERY BOARD.

Mr. MURRAY. Reference has been made during the course of the debate to a statement made by Mr. Cyrus S. Eaton, of Cleveland, Ohio. I wish to call attention to his complete statement. I do not think it has been placed before the Senate during the debate. It has been printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, but it has never been discussed during the course of the debate.

Mr. Eaton is one of the country's leading industrialists and financiers, one who has taken a great pride in the development of industry in the United States, and he is recognized as a man entitled to speak on behalf of American industry. In an article which he has contributed to the Chicago Law Review he has much to say with reference to the proposed labor legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Eaton's statement be printed in full in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

CYRUS S. EATON BIDS CAPITALISTS PLACATE LABOR—INDUSTRIALIST WARNS AGAINST LEGAL CURBS, CALLS FOR MUZZLING OF THE NAM

CHICAGO, June 14.—Cyrus S. Eaton, Cleveland industrialists and banker, said today that "to avoid extinction" capitalists will "have to make immediate and radical changes in our attitude toward labor and our methods of dealing with labor."

"We will have to begin by muzzling such organizations as the National Association of Manufacturers and by recognizing and sincerely regretting that there is bad feeling on both sides," he said.

In an article entitled "A Capitalist Looks at Labor," published in the current issue of the University of Chicago Law Review, he discussed labor legislation, saying, "Let no businessman be naive enough to believe * * * that restrictive legislation will be any more effective in bringing about industrial harmony than the Volstead Act was in discouraging drinking."

WARNS CAPITALISM

Mr. Eaton, who has broad interests in the iron-ore, steel, coal, and railroad industries; asserted that "capitalism cannot survive without the support of labor." He added:

"The casualness with which we capitalists seem willing—nay, even eager—to invite the collapse of our economic system in almost every industrial dispute for the sole purpose of thwarting labor is utterly incomprehensible. Labor not only produces the goods and consumes a large part of them; labor also has the votes. * * *

"Eventually (labor) unity is practically a foregoing conclusion. The prospect of labor united should be sobering to even the most embittered and embattled capitalist.

"I also believe we may ultimately see a strong alliance between labor and the farmer, accompanied by a tremendous expansion of the manufacturing and selling coperatives. The effecting of such a formidable combination awaits only the magic touch of some dynamic personality.

"Then, if capitalism has not already gone by the board, its continued existence will be completely at the mercy of an estranged 95 percent of the electorate."

LAUDS LEWIS FOR RESTRAINT

He credited John L. Lewis, head of the United Mine Workers, an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor, with exercising wisdom and restraint during the soft-coal controversy last fall and accused the mine owners of working "under cover * * * feverishly night and day to keep a torrent of abuse turned on the miners and their leaders through every channel of publicity and to urge all three branches of Government—executive, legislative, and judicial—to crack down on labor."

"Throughout the entire time," he added, "John L. Lewis never uttered a syllable of complaint and never issued a statement criticizing anybody."

Mr. Eaton said the Supreme Court decision against the miners "will be productive of untold evil in the whole field of labor relations."

In an article in the same publication Senator WAYNE MORSE, Republican, of Oregon, said the American people are "expecting entirely too much of labor legislation as a panacea for industrial ills."

"I am afraid that to many, both in and out of Congress, have misled themselves into thinking that a maximum of industrial freedom in this country can be attained by putting American labor in a strait-jacket," he added.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I call attention to an article published in the New York Times of last Sunday, written by Mr. C. F. Hughes. Mr. Hughes says:

With respect to the labor bill, the early enthusiasm of industrialists for a restrictive measure has more or less evaporated as they view the prospect for more confusion in their labor relations and the promise of endless litigation if the bill becomes law. It has been called a field day for lawyers in the analyses which have been circulating among business concerns.

Mr. Marquis Childs, the well-known columnist whose column appears in the Washington Post, on June 11 called attention to the fact that the legislation would be a feast for lawyers. In his statement Mr. Childs said:

MEAT FOR THE LAWYERS

(By Marquis Childs)

The flood of comment on the labor bill has been in terms of (1) politics, and (2) the changes which it will, or will not, bring about in our system of industrial relations over a period of years. It would be well to consider for a moment what will happen during the next 2 years.

The first prospect is for a test in the courts. We sometimes forget that we have a third coordinate branch of our Government. Harsh and cynical critics have called the Supreme Court a House of Lords which has power to veto or ratify legislation approved by Congress.

Organized labor is certain to challenge the provisions of the new law in Federal court. The machinery of the law courts grinds slowly and the Supreme Court is not likely to hand down a decision before 2 years from the present date.

That means 2 years of comparative uncertainty while the enlarged National Labor Relations Board is trying to administer a complicated new law. The members of the Board will naturally learn a great deal in the next few months about the workability of the law. Presumably they should be able to go to reasonable men on Capitol Hill—men such as Senator IRVING M. IVES, of New York—to report what they have discovered and then to make the necessary changes.

But next year is a Presidential election year. In the political football game of '48, labor legislation will be one of the issues to be kicked around. Neither side—the Democrats in the executive branch nor the Republicans in Congress—will be able to make any concessions to reason and workability.

A great deal has been said about who will benefit by the new measure. "Slave labor," says the AFL in tones of anguish paid for at the full advertising rate. A charter of freedom for the workingman says Senator ROBERT A. TAFT in solemn self-congratulation.

There is one group, however, that will benefit beyond a shadow of a doubt—those are the lawyers. A vast new realm of law has been created and battalions of lawyers will be required to interpret it.

The fact is that, in conference between Senate and House, a lot of the so-called modernation was taken out of the measure adopted by the Senate. This was done in part by complicating the legal machinery.

A good case for a veto can be made on the cumbersomeness of the bill sent to the President for his approval or disapproval.

One of the most experienced men in the labor-relations field, whose position has been moderate and who has suffered under attacks from the unions, made a careful study of the effects of the bill. He concluded that the functions of the Labor Board are so weighted down with new legal restrictions that labor might prefer to strike rather than resort to such circuitous and difficult procedure.

One of the curious things the new bill does is to create an independent "general counsel," to be appointed by the President. This general counsel has final authority over the investigation of charges and the issuance of complaints. This man can become a czar over all labor, if he chooses, since he can decide what cases should and what cases should not be heard by the Board. There is no appeal from his decision either to the Board or to the courts.

In a variety of ways, the bill puts new hedges around the collective bargaining process Most of them apply only to employees. Some apply to employers as well. These are in many instances so technical that only lawyers specializing in the labor field will comprehend what they do.

In the last analysis, you can say that the leaders of organized labor are to blame for what is about to happen to them. Their foolish, unyielding, ostrich-like attitude has brought the omnibus bill. If they had been able to agree on certain minimum steps to correct flagrant abuses, Congress would in all likelihood have adopted a less complicated and restrictive measure.

The proof of the cake will be in the eating of it. One test will be the degree of industrial peace which follows. Let no one suppose that it is a magic wand waved over the industrial battlefront. The Labor Board, including its regional offices, has 5,500 pending cases under the present law, more than 500 waiting final decision by the Board in Washington. Under the complicated new law, we may see even more industrial strife than we have had in recent months. There is no final formula in law that will guarantee peaceful collective bargaining.

Mr. President, another article which I should like to call to the attention of the Senate is one appearing in Harper's magazine for June 1947, at page 510. This is an article by Mr. Charles Luckman, president of Lever Bros. Co. Mr. Luckman has given a great deal of study to labor-management relations, and has written a very able article discussing the road to industrial peace. In the closing part of the article he says:

In the end we must accept one glaring truth: Labor unions are here to stay, and, whatever our private thoughts on the matter, we are going to have to get along with them if our Nation is to prosper. We can fight them, and curse them, and legislate against them, and otherwise belabor the surface of the problem to our hearts content; but we know deep down that this superficial attitude is not going to accomplish any constructive results. For our own sake, for our children's sake, for the sake of the Nation, and very likely for the sake of a goodly portion of the world, we are going to have to cut right down to the fears and prejudices and pride and ache for security that made people form unions in the first place.

I sincerely believe that much can be done to allay fears, remove insecurity, and stir latent pride by adapting to the varying needs of different industries those programs that have almost invariably proved successful in the creation of healthy industrial relations.

There are a great many large corporations in this country which have sound labor relations. Some of them have not had a strike for 30 years. That is because of the enlightened attitude which they take in regard to the problems of labor relations. Mr. Stuart Chase, in the Reader's Digest for May 1947, has an article on this subject entitled "The Road to Labor Peace," in which he gives some examples of how several large corporations have handled their labor relations problems, showing that with a wise treatment of this subject, and careful dealing with the unions, the unions can be brought to cooperate and to greatly aid the corporations in increasing production and maintaining peaceful relations.

I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point:

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

THE ROAD TO LABOR PEACE

(By Stuart Chase)

We were talking about the annual contract between the union and the management which was about to come up for renewal. The man across the table from me was big and bald, with kindly blue eyes. He was a pipe fitter for the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, and one of the union officials who would negotiate the contract.

"Suppose you can't agree, and the whole collective-bargaining machinery breaks down?" I asked.

He scratched his head. "Well, it never has broken down."

"But suppose for once it did."

"I don't think it would make a great deal of difference. We'd carry on all right."

"Why?"

"Well, you see, we trust each other."

It sounded natural and commonplace enough the way he said it. But what a vista that remark opens up on labor relations all over America today. "We trust each other." They do not trust each other in the coal fields, or in the automobile plants, or on the water front, in the packing plants, or even on the railroads, to judge by recent troubles.

A big strike ruins mutual trust for a long time to come, no matter how the contract reads. They can't call one another "profiteer" and "exploiter," or "Communist" and "agitator"—and expect to kiss and make up in a few minutes, after the picket lines have been withdrawn. Union leaders and company executives have to live with each other; hate caused by the struggle and the name calling does not soon blow over.

Yet, until workers and managers can operate together as a producing team, can anything ever be really settled? Peter F. Drucker puts it this way: "What is needed is a radical change in the basic concept that management has of the worker—a change from the rabble hypothesis which regards him as an economic automaton to respect for the worker as a human being."

Leaders of big unions will have to shift their attitude, too. And Congress, in considering new labor laws, should aim at making it easier for men and management to trust each other. To legislate revenge against John L. Lewis might cause most Congressmen to feel better, but if the legal artillery which knocked him out should also infuriate 15,000,000 trade-union members and their families, the price would be too high. It could bring the country close to a general strike, which is another name for civil war.

The labor genie is now out of the bottle, and he cannot be stuffed back into it. People in all walks of life are prepared to quit work for what they consider to be their rights. The vitality of this mass movement can hopefully be led into constructive channels, but it cannot be suppressed by passing laws. It is too late for that.

I would like to see Congress make a careful investigation of the labor problem. The industrial woods are full of good labor-management programs; some have been operating for many years. All kinds of helpful plans are available if one has the patience to look for them.

Take, for example, the experience of the men's clothing industry, where the union took the initiative for industrial peace, and the experience of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, where management took the initiative. In neither case has there been a serious strike for 30 years.

In the first instance, the late Sidney Hillman led the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, after years of violence in a sweated business, into a policy of actively cooperating with employers to keep the industry prosperous. A sick industry means unemployment and low wages. Management and union under Hillman's urging combined to hire production engineers to increase efficiency. The union did not stop making demands, but it went easy on employers who were in financial difficulties. On one occasion it loaned a large clothing manufacturer a substantial amount and saved him from bankruptcy. Why not? A bankrupt employer means men on the street.

In Standard Oil of New Jersey, management took the lead. Somebody had to do something, for labor relations in 1916 were spectacularly bad. Two big strikes within a year had flared into pitched battles, with dead and wounded on both sides. One of the demands of the strikers read: "We request humane treatment at the hands of the foremen and superiors in place of the brutal kicking and punching we now receive without provocation." This charge may or may not have been true, but the men felt that it was.

Yet, in 1946 a pipe fitter could tell me that worker and company could get along, no matter what happened to the collective-bargaining machinery, because "we trust each other." That is a big change.

My chief impression as I visited the Jersey Standard refineries recently was the absence of tension. Seldom have I found a company with such a friendly and democratic atmosphere. Nobody seemed to be pushing anybody around.

My impressions were backed up by a series of worker-opinion polls conducted by Elma Roper, who sampled about 12,000 employees with some 35 questions. The results showed clearly that the workers liked their jobs, their fellow workers, the top management, their foremen, the promotion system, and the company benefit policies. Though Negro workers, women workers, and technicians were somewhat less satisfied than the others, it is impossible to study the reports without being convinced that men and management have somehow established a unique atmosphere of mutual trust.

In the fall of 1945, 60,000 oil workers declared a strike. It hardly touched Jersey Standard's many plants; one small plant in Texas shut down for 3 days, and that was all. We also note that 92 percent of all former employees in the armed services have headed back to the company upon release. The ratio for all American companies is about 50 percent. We find labor turn-over rates phenomenally low at Standard. In one refinery 75 percent of the men have been with the company for more than 20 years.

How did this all come about? First, no manager is long retained who doesn't like people, and so does not know how to get

along with them. Workers are not "hands" at Standard, not commodities to be bought as cheaply as possible; they are human beings and are respected as such. No matter how competent a boss may be in the technology of oil, if he is not competent in human relations he does not hold his job.

Secondly, management has been on its toes to invent not only new methods for cracking gasoline but new methods for dealing fairly with people. Here is a partial list:

1. Provision for regular joint conferences between management and workers' representatives.

2. Machinery for handling grievances rapidly—before they snowball to enormous proportions. Appeal can be taken by an aggrieved worker right up to the president of the company.

3. A personnel department charged with working out fair rules for hiring, firing, transfer, and for counseling workers, with no discrimination. Lists of specific offenses for which a worker can be discharged are published for all to see. For offenses that are not on the list a foreman cannot arbitrarily fire a man.

4. Real collective-bargaining machinery for the independent unions and the six CIO and four AFL locals.

5. A firm policy of paying prevailing wages or better.

6. Generous sickness, accident, death, and disability benefits.

7. Training schools for workers who want to better their positions.

8. Promotion according to both ability and seniority.

9. A special savings plan for workers, to which the company makes substantial contributions.

10. A coin-your-ideas plan, to stimulate improved methods and inventions by employees.

11. A policy of letting employees know well in advance of unavoidable lay-offs.

12. A policy of printing all major provisions concerning labor-management relations, and distributing the list to employees, so that they have the company's promised word in black and white.

There are still disagreements at Standard, of course, but no abiding hate. "Sure we get mad at each other," said a plant manager to me. "I get mad as hell. And John here—pointing to the president of the union—he gets mad as hell. But we're careful not to get mad at the same time."

It must be remembered that all this has taken place in an expanding industry. More and more cars on the roads have meant more and more gasoline. Managers can afford to be generous and human when they are not constantly bedeviled by red ink. Things are different in the coal business, where losses are the order of the day for many companies. Except in wartime, coal miners are lucky to get 200 days' work a year.

This points to the fact that one excellent recipe for stopping strikes is steady employment. When the worker feels secure in his job he finds it hard to "hate the company." If something can be done about helping to maintain secure employment at a reasonably high level, a great step forward in labor relations will have been taken.

But even more fundamental is the attitude of managers toward men. The master-servant relationship is out the window. Only a fraternal attitude, where nobody looks up and nobody looks down, where men and managers look horizontally across the table at one another, can be depended on in this democracy.

This is a long way from the doctrine of the class struggle. The Communists hold that the boss is a special kind of devil, never to be trusted. If he seems decent, beware—it is only a subtle plot to draw the worker deeper into his clutches. According to the Communists, the only solution to the labor problem is to toss the boss out, and let the workers run the plant.

This idea may or may not have been justified in Europe when Karl Marx wrote a hundred years ago. But it certainly makes no sense in the America of 1947. Modern, high-speed, mass-production economy cannot operate, much less maintain high living standards, without cooperation among all groups—workers, farmers, businessmen, government.

The only possible road to labor peace lies through mutual trust between men and management.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed a statement signed by 642 prominent religious leaders from all parts of the country.

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 17.—A statement signed by 642 prominent religious leaders in all parts of the country urging a veto of the Taft-Hartley labor bill will be presented to President Truman today. Representing the National Clergymen's Committee on the Taft-Hartley bill, a four-man delegation bearing the petition will arrive at the northwest gate to the White House at 2:15 p. m. The delegation will include the Reverend John Duffy, of New York City; Rabbi Ira Sud, of Arlington, Va.; Father Charles Owen Rice, of Pittsburgh; and the Reverend Sheldon Rahn, secretary of the committee.

Among those supporting the delegation are Bishop William Scarlett, of Missouri; Father William Kelly, of Brooklyn; Dr. David De Sola Pool, of New York City; Dr. Sidney E. Goldstein, of New York City; Dr. Liston Pope, of New Haven, Conn.; Father Wilfrid Parsons, of Washington; Rabbi Bernard Segal, of New York City; Rev. Donald Harrington, of New York City; Rabbi Julius Mark, of Nashville; Bishop Charles K. Gilbert, of New York City; Rev. Ernest Fremont Tittle, of Chicago; Bishop Edward L. Parsons, of California; Bishop Francis J. McConnell, of New Haven; Rev. William Lloyd Imes of Dundee, N. Y.; Father Richard B. Lavelle, of Brooklyn; Dr. Howard Thursman, of California; Father Joseph F. Buckley, of Brooklyn; Rabbi Manuel Laderman, of Denver; Father M. Sidney Rushfort, of Brooklyn; Father Philip Dobson, of Jersey City; Dean Walter Muelder, of Boston; Father Joseph Hammond, of Brooklyn; Rev. Edwin McNeill Poteat, of Rochester, N. Y.; and Bishop Walter Mitchell, of California.

Catholic members of the committee pointed out today that strong opposition to the Taft-Hartley bill has been voiced by such leaders as Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, of San Antonio; Bishop Bernard J. Sheil, of Chicago; and many priests in local communities throughout the country. The National Catholic Welfare Conference, representing America's Catholic bishops, in opposing the bill, has said it "will almost inevitably lead to industrial strife and unrest."

The formal statement of Protestant and Jewish leaders follows:

"We appeal to you to veto the Taft-Hartley labor bill because it would violate human freedoms essential to the ethic of both democracy and religion. Basically it substitutes Government regimentation for sound collective bargaining and wise attention to the fundamental economic and psychological causes of industrial strife. It is a measure calculated to destroy the real strength of a free labor movement by undermining basic principles of collective bargaining, making the Government of the United States a ready instrument of employer resistance to legitimate needs of workers, and subjecting unions to a process of decimation and frustration under Government control.

"The closed shop and the union shop developed historically as a defensive union measure against determined employer resistance to independent unions. Many industries, such as clothing, have combined closed shops with some of the best and most constructive industrial relations in America. But in addition, just as every town resident must share the costs of community services by paying taxes, so every worker in the industrial community bears an obligation to share the costs of collective bargaining through the agency designated by a majority of the employees. Just as some towns have occasionally enforced tax collections under tyranical administrations, so a few industries have had closed shops under tyrannical and dishonest union controls. But the remedy lies, not in abolition of compulsory union dues or town taxes, but rather in the enlightened concern of free community and union members. This legislation would destroy constructive industrial relations already achieved.

"We look to you for a vigorous veto message."

SIGNERS OF VETO APPEAL

Alabama: Rev. A. B. Carlton, Geneva; Rev. C. C. Garner, Stockton; Dr. Howard I. Kerr, Huntsville; Rev. William H. Marmion, Birmingham; Rev. John Bransford Nichols, Prattville; Rev. Andrew S. Turnipond, Montgomery; Rev. Cullen B. Wilson, Fairhope.

Arizona: Rabbi Nathan Barach, Phoenix; Rev. Francis T. Brown, Phoenix.

Arkansas: Rev. S. F. Freeman, Jr., Little Rock; Rev. John P. McConnell, Fayetteville; Rev. Glenn F. Sanford, Conway.

California: Rev. Gross W. Alexander, Redlands; Rabbi Elliot M. Burstein, San Francisco; Rabbi S. A. Dalgin, Los Angeles; Rev. Alfred G. Fisk, San Francisco; Rev. Owen M. Geer, Los Angeles; Rev. John M. Hestenes, Fresno; Rabbi Harry Hyman, Huntington; Rabbi Louis Kaufman, Sacramento; Rabbi Jacob Levine, Los Angeles; Bishop Walter Mitchell, Rancho Santa Fe; Rev. Hu C. Noble, Los Angeles; Rev. Edward W. Ohrenstein, Berkeley; Rev. Kirby Page, La Habra; Bishop Edward L. Parsons, San Francisco; Rev. Edwin P. Ryland, Los Angeles; Rev. Alfred F. Schroeder, Oakland; Rev. Howard Thurman, San Francisco; Rev. George A. Warmer, San Diego; Rev. Hugh Vernon White, Berkeley; Rabbi Bert A. Woythaler, Los Angeles.

Colorado: Rabbi Manuel Laderman, Denver; Rev. Samuel W. Marble, Denver.

Connecticut: Rev. A. N. Avrutick, Hartford; Dr. James Good Broun, Ansonia; Rev. J. George Butler, Hartford; Rev. Merrill F. Clarke, New Canaan; Rabbi Hyman Cohen, Meriden; Prof. John W. Darr, Middletown; Rev. Lewis H. Davis, Torrington; Rabbi Maurice J. Elefard, Hartford; Rev. Meredith F. Eller, Hartford; Rev. Richard A. G. Foster, New Haven; Rev. George B. Gilbert, Middletown; Rev. Donald Hamblin, Hartford; Rev. Emerson G. Hangen, Meriden; Rev. Earl C. Heck, Hartford; Rev. Charles X. Hutchinson, Hartford; Rev. Edgar N. Jackson, Bridgeport; Rev. Fleming James, Sr., North Haven; Rabbi M. Aaron Kra, Ansonia; Rev. Roderick MacLeod, Winsted; Rev. Sidney Lovett, New Haven; Rev. Harry L. MacKenzie, Greens Farms; Rabbi Moses S. Malinowitz, New London; Rev. Edward L. Peet, Hartford; Dr. Liston Pope, New Haven; Rabbi Stanley Rabinowitz, New Haven; Rev. Richard H. Ritter, Southington; Rev. W. Glenn Roberts, Hartford; Rev. Alfred Schmalz, Darien; Rabbi Aaron Shuchatowitz, New Haven; Rabbi Morris Silverman, Hartford; Rev. Elsie F. Stowe, Seymour; Rev. Willard Uphaus, New Haven; Rev. Wallace T. Viets, Hartford; Rabbi Max R. Wasser, Torrington; Rev. C. Lawson Willard, Jr., New Haven; Rev. Loyd F. Worley, Stamford; Rabbi Harry Zwelling, New Britain.

District of Columbia: Rabbi Samuel H. Berkowitz; Rabbi David Pruzansky.

Delaware: Rabbi Joseph I. Singer, Wilmington.

Florida: Rev. Floyd M. Irvin, Eustis; Rev. Edward Maxted, Warrington; Rabbi M. Mescheloff, Miami Beach; Rabbi Sanders A. Tofield, Jacksonville; Rev. Edward W. Ulirich, Miami; Rev. G. W. Washington, Jacksonville.

Georgia: Rabbi Hyman R. Friedman, Atlanta; Rev. David N. Howell, Atlanta; Rabbi Charles M. Rubel, Macon; Rabbi Abraham I. Rosenberg, Savannah.

Illinois: Dr. James Luther Adams, Chicago; Rev. J. Frank Anderson, Tinley Park; Rev. Karl Baehr, Chicago; Rev. Frederic E. Ball, Seneca; Rev. Ray E. Bond, Chicago; Rev. H. N. Brockway, Oak Park; Rev. Hugh Elmer Brown, Evanston; Rev. Albert W. Buck, Chicago; Rev. Edwin T. Buehrer, Chicago; Rabbi E. Louis Cardou, Springfield; Rev. William Clark, Chicago; Rev. Harold E. Craw, La Grange; Rev. Paul B. Deferson, Chicago; Rev. Herbert J. Doran, Urbana; Rev. Clifford Earle, Chicago; Rev. Fred Eastman, Chicago; Rev. Robert Worth Frank, Chicago; Rev. Herbert George, Chicago; Rabbi David Graubart, Chicago; Rabbi Philip Graubart, Chicago; Rev. Armand Guerrero, Chicago; Rev. George Halsted, Chicago; Rev. Louis U. Huber, Jerseyville; Dr. Homer Jack, Chicago; Rabbi Solomon Kahn, Chicago; Rabbi Monroe Levens, Oak Park; Rev. C. Sumpter Logan, Lawrenceville; Rev. William N. Lovell, Chicago; Rev. Harold L. Lunger, Oak Park; Rev. Hugh S. Mackenzie, Chicago; Rev. Douglas V. Machan, Chicago; Rev. Frank B. McCulloch, Chicago; Rev. William O. McGill, Chicago; Rev. J. B. McKendry, Oak Park; Rev. John Magill, Monmouth; Rev. Paul L. Meacham, Carmi; Rev. Carl T. Michel, Chicago; Rabbi Jacob J. Nathan, Chicago; Rev. Clyde K. Newhouse, Cobden; Rev. Duane Nichol, Chicago; Dr. Victor Obenhaus, Chicago; Rev. Douglas Patterson, Chicago; Rev. Leslie T. Pennington, Chicago; Rabbi Shlomo Rapoport, Chicago; Rev. Conrad Reiner, Chicago; Rev. Frederick W. Ringe, Franklin Park; Rev. Orville Sampson, Chicago; Rev. John T. Shaefer, Elgin; Rabbi H. Schamban, Chicago; Rabbi Mordecai Schultz, Chicago; Rabbi Ralph Simon, Chicago; Rabbi Harold P. Smith, Chicago; Rabbi Melford E. Spiro, Evanston; Rev. Howard E. Spragg, Chicago; Rev. Frederick K. Stamm, Chicago; Rev. Leroy Stanford, Chicago; Rev. Rolland C. Stone, Chicago; Rabbi Shmaryahn Swirsky, Chicago; Rabbi Julius Hyatt, Peoria; Rev. Walter Telfer, Chicago; Rabbi Benjamin L. Teller, Chicago; Rev. Leonard Tinker, Chicago; Rev. Ernest F. Tittle, Evanston; Rev. David Todd, Chicago; Rev. Alva Tompkins, Chicago; Rev. Bernard Vanderbeek, Deerfield; Rev. Philip VanZandt, Chicago; Rev. H. Walter Yoder, Chicago; Rev. James A. Crain, Chicago.

Indiana: Rev. F. E. Davison, South Bend; Rev. Newton D. Fowler, Gary; Rev. Aron S. Gilmartin, Fort Wayne; Rev. Leonard R. Hall, New Castle; Rabbi Eli J. Kahn, East Chicago; Rabbi David Korb, Whiting; Rev. R. Lehrmann, Evansville; Rev. Hugh F. McGlasson, East Chicago; Dr. E. Burns Marten, South Bend; Rabbi Maurice Parzen, South Bend; Rabbi Aaron M. Rine, South Bend; Rabbi Harry Z. Schectman, South Bend; Rabbi David S. Shapiro, Indianapolis; Rev. Walter W. Shea, Indianapolis.

Iowa: Rev. Fred Coley, Council Bluffs; Rev. Elmer C. Djerks, Iowa City; Rev. M. E. Dorr, Dayton; Rev. Alped S. Nickless, Davenport; Rabbi Irving A. Weingart, Des Moines.

Kansas: Rev. Ray B. Bressler, Turou; Rev. Drury H. Fisher, Manhattan; Rev. Sam Hedrick, Baldwin; Rabbi C. Manelew, Wichita; Rev. J. D. Schmidt, Whitewater; Chaplain Harold H. Wilke, Topeka.

Kentucky: Rabbi B. Brilliant, Louisville; Rev. T. B. Cowan, Lexington; Rev. Charles E. Craik, Jr., Louisville; Rev. C. M. Hanne, Louisville; Rev. Myron Taggart Hopper, Lexington.

Louisiana: Rabbi Leo Brener, Shreveport; Rabbi Irving L. Goldman, New Orleans; Rabbi Moses I. Goldberg, New Orleans; Rev. A. J. Scherer, New Orleans.

Maine: Rev. Lindley J. Cook, Portland; Rev. William E. Gardner, Bangor.

Maryland: Rev. Charles L. Carhart, Chevy Chase; Rev. R. T. Dickerson, Baltimore; Dr. Nathan Drazin, Baltimore; Dr. Eddy L. Ford, Baltimore; Rabbi Mayer Greenberg, College Park; Rev. John F. McClelland, Silver Spring; Rabbi Uir Miller, Baltimore; Rabbi Jacob Pearlmutter, Baltimore; Rabbi Manuel M. Poliakoff Baltimore; Rabbi Morris D. Rosenblatt, Annapolis; Rev. S. Paul Schilling, Westminster; Rabbi Ephraim F. Shapiro, Baltimore; Rev. Gottlieb Siegenthaler, Baltimore; Rabbi I. Tabak, Baltimore.

Massachusetts: Rev. and Mrs. Harry Abbe, Newtonville; Rev. Philip E. Anthes, East Boston; Rev. Clarence F. Avey, Athol; Rev. Fred I. Cairns, Needham; Rev. Colin J. Cameron, Amesbury; Rev. Clarence Carr, Great Barrington; Rev. Gardiner W. Day, Cambridge; Rev. T. Chipman Day, Littleton; Rabbi Morris V. Dembowitz, Boston; Rev. Earl Douglass, Boston; Rev. Frederick May Eliot, Boston; Rabbi Alexander Friedman, Worcester; Dr. Earl H. Furgeson, Cambridge; Rev. Bradford S. Gale, Salem; Rabbi Sidney Guthman, Worcester; Rev. Clement S. Hahn, Worcester; Rabbi Israel I. Halpern, Greenfield; Rev. Albert K. Herling, Natick; Rev. L. Earl Jackson, Somerville; Prof Paul E. Johnson, Boston; Rabbi Israel J. Kazis, Salem; Rabbi Isaac Klein, Springfield; Rev. Earl Knudsen, Plymouth; Rev. James H. Laird, Peabody; Rabbi Arnold H. Lasker, Holyoke; Rev. Samuel L. Laviscount, Roxbury; Rabbi Mendell Lewittes, Dorchester; Rev. John K. Montgomery, North Quincy; Rev. Garfield Morgan, East Lynn; Rev. Walter G. Muelder, Boston; Margaret Munsterberg, Boston; Rabbi Judah Nadich, Brookline; Rev. Donald B. Nedrich, Dennis; Rabbi Isaac I. Nelson, Fall River; Rev. George L. Paine, Boston; Rev. Prentiss L. Pemberton, Boston; Rev. Robbins Ralph, Northampton; Rabbi Gershon Romanoff, Chelsea; Rabbi Joseph Rothstein, North Adams; Rabbi Samuel S. Ruderman, Fall River; Rev. Victor F. Scalise, Lowell; Rev. George Selleck, Cambridge; Rev. Frank C. Seymour, Lancaster; Rev. Edwin M. Slocombe, Lexington; Rev. Arthur B. Soule, Marlboro; Rev. Howard D. Spoerl, Springfield; Rev. John H. Taylor, Sandwich; Rev. Fleleree Uluch, Leominster; Rev. Charles C. Wellman, Rockport; Rev. William E. Wimer, Boston; Rabbi Shalom S. Yellin, Newburyport.

Michigan: Rabbi Morris Adler, Detroit; Rev. Paul J. Allured, Deckerville; Rev. Edward H. Bean, Detroit; Rev. Edward W. Blakeman, Ann Arbor; Dr. J. Burt Bowman, Lansing; Rev. Oviatt E. Desmond, Battle Creek; Rabbi Nathan Gaynor, Pontiac; Rev. Paul Silas Heath, Kalamazoo; Rev. Charles A. Hill, Detroit; Rabbi Jacob Hurwitz, Flint; Rev. Charles C. Jatho, Royal Oak; Rev. William Klerekoper, Detroit; Rev. Joseph Lindsay, Flint; Rev. F. H. Littell, Ann Arbor; Rev. C. H. Loucks, Ann Arbor; Rev. N. U. McConaughy, Iron Mountain; Rev. F. Ricksford Meyers, Detroit; Rev. Paul E. Robinson, Harbor Springs; Rev. Philip L. Schenk, Ann Arbor; Rabbi Edward M. Tenebaum, Saginaw; Rev. Thomas S. Vernon, Bay City.

Minnesota: Rabbi David Aronson, Minneapolis; Rev. Warren C. Behar, Minneapolis; Rabbi Morris C. Katz, St. Paul; Rev. Karl W. Mahle, Medelia; Rev. F. A. Spong, Minneapolis; Rev. C. A. Wendell, Minneapolis; Rev. W. A. Werth, Fairmont.

Mississippi: Rabbi W. J. Goldman, Gulfport; Rev. Bert R. Johnson, Jackson.

Missouri: Rev. Ralph C. Abele, St. Louis; Prof. Elmer J. F. Arndt, Webster Groves; Rev. Gene E. Bartlett, Columbia; Rev. Clark W. Cummings, St. Louis; Rabbi Gershon Hadas, Kansas City; Rabbi Abraham Halpern, St. Louis; Rev. J. H. Horstmann, Maplewood; Rabbi Robert E. Jacobs, St. Louis; Rev. S. D. Press, Webster Groves; Rt. Rev. William Scarlett, St. Louis; Rev. Sidney E. Sweet, St. Louis; Rev. Edwin Winnecke, Pilot Grove.

Nebraska: Rabbi Myer S. Kripke, Omaha.

New Hampshire: Rev. A. Brownlow Thompson, Bristol; Rev. J. Lester Hankinow, Dover; Rev. Norris E. Woodbury, Madison.

New Jersey: Rev. Bedros K. Apelian, Fair Lawn; Rev. Henry Reed Bowen, Glen Ridge; Rabbi Eliezer Cohen, Hillside; Rev. James Dykema, Paterson; Rev. Norman D. Fletcher, Montclair; Rabbi Israel Gerstein, Passaic; Rabbi Hirsh Goldberg, Jersey City; Rev. J. Edward Gonzales, Plainfield; Rabbi Nisan Heifetz, South River; Rev. George G. Heneveld, Wyckoff; Rev. Chester E. Hodgson, Newark; Rev. Richard Jones, Kearny; Rabbi Reuben Kaufman, Paterson; Rabbi Gilbert Klaperman, West New York; Rabbi S. Joshua Kohn, Trenton; Rabbi Sischa Levy, Perth Amboy; Rabbi Philip L. Lipis, Camden; Rev. L. W. McCreary, East Orange; Rabbi Bernard Medwick, Union City; Rabbi Raphael Melamed, Elizabeth; Rev. Fred E. Miles, Nutley; Rabbi Jacob Nislick, Freehold; Rabbi Ahren Opher, Paterson; Rev. Don Ivan Patch, Westfield; Rev. Harry R. Pine, Trenton; Rev. Theodore A. Rath, Frenchtown; Rev. Walter E. Roughgarden, Clifton; Rabbi Mordecai J. Simekes, Kearny; Rabbi Benjamin Sincoff, Summit; Rabbi Joseph Smith, Burlington; Rev. Seaman W. Townsend, Perth Amboy; Rabbi Baruch I. Treiger, Hoboken; Rev. Charles Unger, Plainfield; Rabbi B. Reuben Weilerstein, Atlantic City; Rev. Luke M. White, Montclair.

New York: Rev. Leon M. Adkins, Schenectady; Rabbi Abraham D. Barras, Monticello; Rabbi Henry J. Benn, Haverstraw; Rev. Walter L. Bennett, Lowville; Rabbi Jeremiah J. Berman, Yonkers; Rev. Joseph R. Bogle, Schenectady; Rev. Paul F. Bollen, Far Rockaway; Rabbi Ben Zion Bokser, Forest Hills; Rabbi Philip Brand, Queens Village; Rev. Charles E. Byrd, Poughkeepsie; Rabbi Jonah E. Caplan, Long Island City; Rev. Harold L. Clark, Rochester; Rabbi Jacob Cohen, Tarrytown; Rev. Edwin T. Dahlberg Syracuse; Rabbi Josiah Derby, Rego Park; Rabbi Gershon Feigon, Tuckahoe; Rabbi Theodore Friedman, Elmhurst; Rev. John Gass, Troy; Rev. Leo Gates, Livonia; Rabbit M. M. Gold, Cedarhurst; Rabbi Robert Gordis, Rockaway Beach.

Rabbi Solomon Gordon, Jamaica; Rabbi Benjamin H. Gorrelick, Albany; Rabbi Aaron Greenbaum, Yonkers; Rev. Herman J. Hahn, Buffalo; Rev. Charles P. Harder, Greenville; Rev. John H. Hatt, Pleasant Valley; Rev. Ralph N. Helversen, Ithaca; Rev. Paul C. Hoffman, Lancaster; Rev. E. Robert Hughes, Franklinville; Rev. Paul Hydon, Gloversville; Rev. Wm. Lloyd Imes, Dundee; Rabbi Melvin Kieffer, Niagara Falls; Rabbi I. Usher Kirshblum, Kew Gardens; Rev. Howard A. Kuhnle, Rochester; Rabbi Israel Klavan, Mount Vernon; Rev. Felix D. Lion, Dunkirk; Rabbi Jerome Lipnick, Utica; Rev. Gilbert Lovell, Buffalo; Rev. Frederick C. Maier, Baldwin; Rev. Antonio Marino, Mount Vernon; Rabbi Chaim Meskin, Long Island City; Rev. Charles C. Noble, Syracuse; Rabbi William Nowek, Lynbrook; Rev. Robert W. Packer, Greene; Rabbi Menachem M. Perr, So. Ozone Park; Rabbi Frank D. Plotke, Kingston; Dr. Edwin McNeill Poteat, Rochester; Rabbi H. Elihu Rickel, Buffalo; Rabbi Stuart E. Rosenberg, Rochester; Rabbi Moses Rosenthal, Suffern; Rev. Cuthbert R. Rowe, Cicero; Rabbi Edward T. Sandrow, Cedarhurst; Dr. Paul M. Schroeder, Rochester; Rabbi Charles J. Shoulson, Elmira; Rabbi Reuben Slonim, Troy; Rev. H. Otheman Smith, Yonkers; Rabbi Mordecai A. Stern, Richmond Hill; Dr. George L. Tappen, Binghamton; Rev. Donald B. Tarr, Syracuse; Rev. Harry B. Taylor, Syracuse; Rev. Robert B. Thomas, Peru; Rev. Ralph S. Thorn, Jr., Rhinecliff; Rev. Charles E. Vermilya, Binghamton; Rev. Carl G. Vogelmann, Buffalo;

Rev. Wheaton P. Webb, Binghamton; Rev. David Rhys Williams, Rochester; Rev. Wm. H. Willits, Elmira; Rabbi Aaron M. Wise, Rabbi Joseph H. Wise, Staten Island.

New York City: Rev. Paul Abrecht, Rev. Charles B. Ackley, Rabbi Abba Abrams, Rabbi Philip R. Alstat, Rev. Wade Crawford Barclay, Rev. John C. Bennett, Rabbi Morris J. Besdin, Rabbi Abraham J. Bick, Dr. Beverly Boyd, Rev. Clarence E. Boyer, Rabbi Alexander J. Burnstein, Rev. Dwight J. Bradley, Rabbi Abraham M. Cassel, Rev. Allen Knight Chalmers, Rabbi Jack J. Cohen, Rev. John W. Darr, Jr., Rev. Mark A. Dawber, Rev. Robert C. Doggett, Rev. John F. Duffy, Jr., Rabbi Mitchel S. Eskolsky, Rabbi Morris H. Fine, Rabbi Sol B. Friedman, Rabbi Joel S. Gaffen, Bishop Charles K. Gilbert, Rabbi Morris Goldberg, Rabbi Jacob D. Gordon, Rabbi Simon Greenberg, Rev. Donald Harrington, Rabbi Isidor B. Hoffman, Rev. Ambrose Hering, Dr. John Haynes Holmes, Rev. George L. Hood, Rev. Charles W. Iglehart, Rabbi Leo Jung, Rabbi Max Kadushin, Rabbi Mordecai Kaplan, Rabbi Abraham J. Karp, Rabbi Harry Katchen, Rev. William C. Kernan, Rabbi Morris Kertzer, Rabbi Simon G. Kramer, Rabbi Joseph H. Looksh, Rev. Edgar Love, Rabbi Nathan Lublin, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Rabbi Bernard Mandelbaum, Rev. John A. Maynard, Rabbi Israel Miller, Rabbi Joseph Miller, Rabbi Abraham E. Millgram, Rev. Arthur C. Moore, Rev. A. J. Musto, Rev. James Myers, Rabbi O. Neichel, Rev. Robert Hastings Nichols, Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, Dr. David De Sola Pool, Rev. Sheldon Rahn, Rabbi Herschel Schacter, Rev. Paul Scherer, Rev. Marshal S. Scott, Rabbi Bernard Segal, Rev. Guy Emery Shipler, Rev. H. Norman Sibley, Rabbi Solomon N. Skaist, Rev. E. Harold Smith, Dr. Stanley I. Stuber, Rev. Arthur L. Swift, Jr., Rev. John M. Swomley, Rabbi Milton Tittlebaum, Rabbi Nathan Toragin, Rev. Theodore D. Walser, Rabbi Max Vorspan, Rev. Eliot White.

Brooklyn, N. Y.: Rabbi S. H. Barenholt, Rabbi Abraham Berstein, Rabbi Jacob Bosniak, Rev. John M. Coleman, Rev. Lewis A. Conois, Rev. David M. Cory, Rabbi L. William Drazin, Rabbi B. Faikelson, Rabbi Samuel Finkel, Rabbi Alfred Fruchter, Rabbi H. Z. Gottesman, Rabbi Harry Halpern, Rev. L. H. R. Hass, Rev. John Paul Jones, Rabbi Herschel Koenigsberg, Rev. John Howard Lathrop, Rabbi Israel H. Levinthal, Rabbi Mordecai H. Lewittes, Rabbi Isadore Marine, Rabbi Morris Schatz, Rabbi Isador Signer, Rabbi Mordecai H. Simon, Rabbi Philip Fatz, Rabbi D. Steigman, Rabbi A. Werkeim, Rabbi Solomon Wind, Rabbi Simon Zipper.

North Carolina: Rev. A. Wilson Cheek, Hickory; Rev. Moses N. DeLaney, Raleigh; Rabbi Elliot Erickam, Durham; Rev. D. L. Fauts, Weldon; Rev. Charles Jones, Chapel Hill; Rev. Thomas Kilgore, Raleigh; Rev. Henry V. Lofquist, Sr., Asheville; Rev. D. McGeachy, Montreat; Rabbi A. Manskon, High Point; Rev. Henry G. Ruark, Chapel Hill; Rev. Lee C. Sheppard, Raleigh; Rev. Thomas P. Inabinett, Wilson; Rev. R. E. Walston, Grifton.

North Dakota: Rabbi Abraham H. Allen, Minot; Rev. Marvin R. Brandt, Fargo; Rev. Hubert N. Dukes, Grand Forks; Rev. Paul G. Hayes, Bismarck.

Ohio: Rev. Edwin Bobbitt, Warren; Rabbi Moshe V. Goldblum, Mansfield; Rev. Stewart H. Butter, Salineville; Rev. George Gardner, Toledo; Rev. Alva Cox, Akron; Rev. B. F. Crawford, North Lewisburg; Rev. R. C. Ditter, Cleveland; Rev. N. S. Elderkin, Akron; Rabbi Louis Engreby, Cleveland; Rev Gerson S. Englemann, Cincinnati; Rev. Gustav F. Hansser, Spencerville; Rev. Robert W. Holmes, Lucasville; Rev. Eldred Johnston, Marion; Rev. M. O. Johnston, Chillicothe; Rabbi Nehemiah Katz, Toledo; Rev. Reuben M. Katz, Akron; Rev. Huber F. Klemme, Cleveland; Rev. James W. McKnight, Marblehead; Rev. H. Laurence McNeal, Dayton; Rev. H. P. Marley, Dayton; Rev. W. W. Mathias, Corncant; Rev. Kenneth L. Maxwell, Granville; Rev. Leon D. Sanborne, Columbus; Rev. John Sommerlatte, Cleveland; Rev. Alden L. Stone, Dayton; Rev. E. H. Wierth, Marion.

Oklahoma: Rev. Jackson E. Smith, Tulsa.

Oregon: Rabbi Philip Kleinman, Portland; Rev. Lloyd B. Thomas, Hood River.

Pennsylvania: Rev. George J. Baisler, New Kensington; Rabbi Solomon M. Barsel, Philadelphia; Rev. Herman D. Beatty, Chambersburg; Rabbi Samuel Blinder, Williamsport; Rev. Ward B. Booker, Clymer; Rev. James E .Bristol, Philadelphia; Rev. Burns Brodhead, East Lansdowne; Rev. James H. Brown, Parkesburg; Harold Chance, Philadelphia; Rabbi Hyman Chanover, Philadelphia; Rabbi Elias Charry, Philadelphia; Rabbi Pinchos J. Chazin, Philadelphia; Rev. C. W. Clodfelter, Lancaster; Rev. Rodney F. Cobb, Smethport; Rabbi Mortimer J. Cohen, Philadelphia; Rev. Robert H. Eads, State College; Rabbi Amos Edelheit, Lansdale; Rev. K. S. Ehrhart, Brodbecks; Rabbi Maxwell N. Farber, Philadelphia; Rev. W. Arthur Faus, Clearfield; Rev. Edward S. Frey, Lemoyne; Rev. Harmon M. Gehr, Philadelphia; Rabbi Morris S. Goodblatt, Philadelphia; Rev. Maurice R. Gortner, Lansdowne; Rabbi Solomon Grayzel, Philadelphia; Rabbi Sidney Greenberg, Philadelphia; Rabbi William Greenburg, Allentown; Rev. Walter D. Howell, Philadelphia; Rabbi Benjamin Kahn, State College; Rabbi Harold M. Kamsler, Norristown; Rabbi Jacob Kabakoff, Philadelphia; Rabbi Maurice I. Kliers, Philadelphia; Rabbi Max H. Leader, Washington; Rabbi N. Levinson, Philadelphia; Rev. Walter Longstreth, Philadelphia; Rabbi Reuben J. Magil, Harrisburg; Rev. Willis S. Mathias, Allentown; Rabbi David Matt, Philadelphia; Roy McCorkel, Philadelphia; Rabbi A. Elihu Michelson, Altoona; Rev. Ralph N. Mould, Philadelphia; Rev. R. Roland Ritter, Warriors Mark; Rev. Charles D. Rockel, Philadelphia; Rev. William K. Russell, Wilkes-Barre; Rabbi Melech Sehachter, Philadelphia; Rabbi Morris Schnall, Philadelphia; Rev. Dewees F. Singley, Philadelphia; Rabbi M. N. Stiskin, McKeesport; Rev. Newton H. Swanson, Girard; Rabbi Benjamin H. Tumum, Philadelphia; Rev. Fred D. Wentzel, Philadelphia; Rabbi A. N. Winokur, Wilkes-Barre; Rev. Arthur Yeagy, Newtown Square.

Rhode Island: Rabbi Israel M. Goldman, Providence; Rev. Hinson V. Howlett, West Warwick; Rabbi Jules Lipschutz, Newport; Rev. Horace M. McMullen, Providence; Rev. U. Stanley Pratt, Rumford; Rev. Richard W. F. Seebode, Providence; Rev. Frank W. Thompson, Cranston.

South Carolina: Rev. Pierce E. Cook, Dillon; Rev. F. Clyde Helmo, Columbia; Rabbi S. W. Rubenstein, Charleston.

South Dakota: Rev. Clay E. Palmer, Yankton.

Tennessee: Rev. H. D. Bollinger, Nashville; Rev. W. J. Faulkner, Nashville; Rabbi Isador Goodman, Memphis; Rev. Bernie H. Hampton, Athens; Rev. William P. King, Nashville; Rev. Lyndon B. Phifer, Nashville; Rev. Alva W. Taylor, Nashville; Rev. Marshall Wingfield, Memphis.

Texas: Rabbi Rath DeKween, Austin; Rev. John C. Granbery, San Antonio; Rabbi Emanuel D. Rothenberg, Waco; Rabbi David Tamarken, San Antonio.

Utah: Rev. Ed F. Irwin, Provo.

Virginia: Rabbi Jesse J. Finkle, Newport News; Rev. Harold E. Kettering, Stanardsville; Rabbi Nathan Kollin, Richmond; Rev. Eugene W. Lyman, Sweet Briar; Rabbi Max Koufustein, Danville; Rev. William Reed, Luray; Rabbi Tobias Rothenberg, Roanoke; Rabbi Ephraim Shimoff, Richmond; Rabbi Ira Sud, Arlington.

Vermont: Rabbi Jacob Hanchen, Rutland.

Washington: Rabbi Solomon Maimon, Seattle; Rev. Fred W. Shorter, Seattle; Rabbi Lee Trepp, Tacoma.

West Virginia: Rabbi Samuel Corps, Charleston; Rev. Albert C. Hofrichter, Jr., Martinsburg; Rev. F. J. Waldrop, Weston.

Wisconsin: Rev. Oscar M. Adam, Madison; Rev. George R. Bell, Reedsburg; Rev. W. Hess Cramer, La Crosse; Rev. August Grollmus, Black Creek; Rabbi Irving Miller, Racine; Rabbi Harry Shapro, Kenosha; Rev. Moran W. Van Tarrell, Greendale.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, it seems to me that much can be done by corporations working along the lines set forth in Mr. Chase's article, and there is a movement in the country now to encourage programs of that kind.

In view of the lateness of the hour, I do not care to continue the discussion at any great length. I think that I have sufficiently shown by my analysis of the bill that the bill is a dangerous one, and that if enacted it will create chaos and trouble in the field of labor relations, and the proper course we should follow would be to sustain the President's veto.

Mr. IVES. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a few editorials apearing in today's newspapers. One is from the New York Times; one is from the New York Herald Tribune; one is from the Washington Post; one is from the Evening Star of Washington; and one is from the Philadelphia Inquirer. They are all most pertinent in connection with the subject under discussion and, I think, should be before the Members of the Senate when we convene next Monday. I suggest to all the Members of the Senate that they read these editorials very carefully.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the New York Times of Saturday, June 21, 1947]

UP TO THE SENATE

In the congressional elections of last November the American voters revolutionized the political complexion of the House of Representatives through the recall of 51 Democratic Members and the election of 57 additional Republicans. Even in the Senate, where change is normally a more or less gradual process, the results were almost as emphatic. The Democratic Party, which had dominated that Chamber by the comfortable margin of 55 to 38 in the Seventy-ninth Congress, suddenly found itself in possession of only 45 seats to the Republican 51.

No realistic person could possibly have misunderstood the significance of that national political upheaval. In allocating the responsibility for the Democratic Party's heavy losses among the administration's various individual policies there may have been areas of disagreement, but there was little room for doubt that the returns reflected a widespread protest against the reluctance of the administration to lay hold of the thorny problem of labor strife.

So sweeping was the popular verdict that the President himself publicly announced his acceptance of the decision at the polls and pledged his full cooperation with the new Congress in a nonpartisan spirit. Said he:

"The people have elected a Republican majority to the Senate and House of Representatives. Under our Constitution the Congress is the lawmaking body. The people have chosen to entrust the controlling voice in this branch of the Government to the Republican Party. I accept this verdict in the spirit in which all good citizens accent the results of any fair election."

How has the President kept that high-sounding statement of faith in the American system of democratic government?

Last Monday they cooperated with the Congress by vetoing a tax-reduction bill—the first time a President has had the temerity to invalidate such a measure in the entire history of the Government of the United States despite the fact that it had passed in the House by a more than two-thirds majority and in the Senate by a margin only slightly less. He accompanied his veto with a message which was palpably weak and unconvincing.

Yesterday Mr. Truman went even further. Because the Republican majority interpreted the November elections as a clear-cut mandate to do something about the labor problem, it has devoted more than 5 months of time and effort to the formulation of legislation in this field. In the process it listened to scores of witnesses and took thousands of pages of testimony. The measure was deliberately tempered to the possibility of a Presidential veto, which had been talked of even before the bill was written. It was gone over with a fine-tooth comb in committee in both Houses, and particularly in the Senate, where members of decidedly pro-labor tendencies held the balance of power between the Republicans and the opposition. It was debated on the floors of both Houses. And, finally, it was checked in conference, where features still regarded as being controversial were weeded out. Then it went back to the two Houses for final approval. The Senate endorsed it by a heavily one-sided count of 3 to 1 and the House passed it by the overwhelming majority of 4 to 1.

Throughout all these months the President made no move to cooperate with Congress. Yet yesterday this Executive under whose administration the record of labor-management strife has been far and away the worst in the Nation's history, and who in the course of 2 years in office has shown no evidence that he had any labor policy of his own or any intention of developing one, figuratively slapped the Congress in the face by issuing his second veto of the week. With the veto went a 5,500-word message which can best be described as a catch-all for every discredited argument advanced against the bill over the past several weeks.

From the time this message was laid before Congress yesterday the details of the labor bill ceased to be the primary issue. By the course which he has pursued throughout the history of this legislation, culminating in yesterday's violation of his own professed acceptance of the "verdict of the voters" last November, the President has raised an issue and presented a challenge more important than the merits of the bill itself.

The House is to be applauded for the unhesitating and decisive manner in which it accepted that challenge yesterday, when it reiterated its position on the measure by a count of 331 to 83. The Senate cannot do less and still preserve its self-respect.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 21, 1947]

THE ISSUE IS POSED

President Truman, it is reported, penned his veto of the labor bill "more in sorrow than in anger." The tone of his message, indeed, was not rhetorical; it dealt with the bill in great detail and with every appearance of reasonableness. It was not convincing to the House, to be sure, as the swift repassage of the measure there, by only 1 vote short of 4 to 1, demonstrated. But enactment of the bill over the President's veto, despite the great practical importance of such an outcome, would not give the whole measure of the significance of Mr. Truman's action. It would not gage all the prestige he has lost among the public at large, nor assess all the political consequences which are certain to flow from his recent course.

Mr. Truman did more than point out certain objectionable features in the Taft-Hartley bill. That would have been easy; the measure is not perfect. He did more than conclude that the sum of the bill's errors made it impossible for him to sign. Although he involved himself, often enough, in contradictions, there was one fairly clear line that ran through the veto message. The President attacked so many of the principles and practices involved in the bill that at the end there seemed little possibility of Presidential approval for any labor legislation that would alter the status quo. His only constructive suggestion was the lame and familiar one—a new investigation from the ground up.

This is a far cry from the stringent "emergency" legislation which Mr. Truman advocated during the railroad strike, just a little more than a year ago. It is almost as far removed from the considered judgment of the American people, which has been formed on the basis of so many investigations of the labor situation, so many illustrations of the unbalanced state of labor laws today. Mr. Truman's erratic labor policy appears typical of the schizophrenia which afflicts his party, whose right wing flagellates organized labor while the left wing caresses it.

The issue which is now posed was not of Republican making. That party has its own divisions, but it has endeavored, with great success, to compromise them in bringing forth the Taft-Hartley bill. The Democratic split, however, whereby the administration apparently hopes to win credit both for the veto and for the passage of the bill, virtually destroys any hope of constructive legislation so long as the present relationship of the parties endures. While the Republicans are still seeking to carry out, in good faith, the pledges made in 1946, the Democrats have preferred to open the campaign of 1948. Mr. Truman has in effect renounced any further effort to guide, or work with, the present Congress; he has defied the verdict of the last elections and the wishes of a large segment of those who voted for Democratic candidates. He has precipitated a wasting, paralyzing struggle that can only end when a Republican Congress and a Republican President can cooperate to create a coherent administration.

[From the Washington Post of June 21, 1947]

VETO OF THE LABOR BILL

"The first major test which I have applied to this bill," President Truman wrote in his message vetoing the labor bill, "is whether it would result in more or less Government intervention in our economic life." He found that it would entail more such intervention—that it would run contrary to what he calls our "national policy of economic freedom." This argument has often been made by industrialists and labor leaders. We did not expect it to be brought forward as the chief justification for the President's veto of the labor bill, for, if it is taken seriously, it would not only seem to close the door to any comprehensive legislation dealing with labor-management relations but would also call for repeal of the Wagner Act.

The Government became "deeply injected" into the relations between employers and their employees when it set up the National Labor Relations Board. It did so on the theory that governmental intervention was essential to protect the rights of workers and to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes burdening interstate commerce. The NLRB has corrected a great many abuses. Under its protection organized labor has become a great and powerful force in the Nation—so great and so powerful that it is now trampling under foot some of the rights of employers and individual workers, which, in any democratic society, ought to be protected. But when Congress now legislates to correct these abuses, the President rejects the measure as an interference with our economic system. We think that is a shabby resort to sophistry.

If the President really believed that the Government should not "superimpose bureaucratic procedures on the free decisions of local employers and employees," he ought to call for repeal of the Wagner Act. But he makes no such suggestion. On the contrary, he agrees with Congress that some sort of labor legislation is necessary. His message refers specifically to his request of last January for legislation to prevent strikes from crippling the entire country. He also asks for a "thorough and nonpartisan investigation * * * covering the entire field of labor-management relations." What would be the point of such an investigation if the Government were going to withdraw from the labor relations field? In other words, the President's chief argument against the bill simmers down to a careless use of emotionally charged words.

Another test applied by the President is that of fairness. He finds that the bill applies unequal penalties for similar offenses. Perhaps the bill errs in making the penalty for some unfair labor practices on the part of employees too severe. They could be fired for failing to abide by the rules of fair bargaining. Of course, it is impossible to fire an employer. He can only be ordered to cease and desist from unfair practices, the order being enforced by the courts if necessary. Would the President prefer similarly to use court injunctions against employees violating the rules of fair bargaining? That would, of course, run contrary to his objection to further use of the injunction, and it would substitute governmental action for direct employer-employee action, which he also opposes. But the major point here is the insignificance of the unfairness to which the President refers beside the gross unfairness of prosecuting only employers for offenses against the collective bargaining code and giving unions blanket exemption. That is the situation that the President would perpetuate by his veto.

We think that some of the President's detailed objections to the bill are well founded. The bill would deny supervisory employees all protection of the NLRB. It was not necessary to go that far to prevent rank-and-file unions from encroaching upon the functions of management. The tendency of the bill to substitute damage suits for grievance machinery, to which he points, must also be deplored. We think the President makes some telling points, moreover, about the weakness of the provisions designed to cope with national emergencies of the type that John L. Lewis is wont to inflict upon the country. Even this inadequate section, however, would enable Mr. Truman to use the fact-finding and public-pressure technique during the 75-day period in which strikes imperiling the national health and safety could be halted by injunction. If the veto is sustained, it will leave him stripped of any statutory power to cope with such emergencies.

One other disturbing fact about the message is that the President was not satisfied to object to the real weaknesses of the Taft-Hartley bill. He lambasted even such reasonable provisions as that for the regulation of union welfare funds. And he stooped to the technique of putting the most extreme interpretation on some provisions of the bill in order to make them appear obnoxious. Some experts say there is no warrant for his assumption that the bill would force unions to strike or to boycott if they wished to have a jurisdictional dispute settled by the NLRB. Mr. Truman saw danger of safety provisions and rest-period rules being thrown out under the provision making "feather bedding" an unfair labor practice. He says the way would be open for dismissal of

employees on the pretext of a slight infraction of shop rules. But these complaints seem to us an insult to the NLRB, which would administer the act. One has to assume that any measure will be administered intelligently and not in the most arbitrary fashion conceivable.

If the President's views, particularly on the section of the bill dealing with national emergencies, had been expressed months or even weeks ago in a conference with Senate leaders, they might have resulted in some improvement in the bill. But the President did not initiate such a conference, and congressional leaders did not seek his cooperation. Not until yesterday did he call a group of legislators to the White House for a frank discussion, and that eleventh-hour bid for support can have little bearing upon the outcome. For even Senators who may be amenable to persuasive arguments before they have publicly voted can scarcely afford to reverse themselves after a visit to the White House.

We cannot escape the conclusion that the President has played his cards with singular lack of skill. The weakness of his position was indicated when the House voted nearly 4 to 1 to override his veto. We think the Senate will be well advised to do likewise. It is apparently impossible now to keep this economic issue out of 1948 politics. But we suspect that the fight will be less turbulent and less damaging to our economy and our position of democratic leadership in the world if the labor bill becomes law.

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 21, 1947]

A POLITICAL VETO

There is nothing in the President's veto of the Taft-Hartley labor bill which counteracts the impression that his disapproval rests primarily on political considerations.

On Tuesday Mr. Truman said that he had not yet read the bill as finally passed and that his mind was still open. Two days later he had made up his mind against the bill and was drafting a 6,000-word veto message which consisted for the most part of sweeping and unsupported generalities. Congress spent months working on this measure. But the President found in it not a single provision worthy of commendation. He simply denounced it from beginning to end.

It is not feasible here to review either the bill or the veto message point by point. But there is one point which serves to illustrate the character of the bulk of Mr. Truman's statement.

He denounced as being ineffective and discriminatory the section aimed at major strikes which imperil the national health and safety. It is true that this section does not prohibit and would not necessarily prevent such strikes. In its essentials, however, it provides for a board of inquiry to investigate and report publicly on the facts of the dispute; it empowers the Attorney General to obtain an injunction which would postpone such a strike for a maximum of 80 days, and it authorizes a secret vote by the workers as to whether they wish to accept the employer's last offer of terms.

If this verdict were in the negative the strike could be called. The President condemns this as ineffective, although the only effective alternative would be compulsory arbitration, which he also opposes.

In this connection, it is interesting to turn back to a "fact-finding" proposal which the President himself made some 2 years ago, and which he discussed in January of 1946 in a radio address.

With respect to strikes vitally affecting the national public interest, the President asked authority for a Government commission to step in, ascertain all the facts and report them to the people. Meanwhile, he wanted Congress to impose by law a 30-day "cooling off" period in which the workers could not strike. And he was confident that the force of public opinion, once the public knew the facts, could assert itself in "a practical way."

Now there is no important difference between that proposal, desired by the President 2 years ago, and the provision in the Taft-Hartley bill, for which he has not a single good word to say. Yet in 1946 he chided the legislators for not giving him what he wanted. "I had hoped," he said, "that the Congress either would follow my recommendations or would at least propose a solution of its own. It has done neither."

But the President was even more emphatic later on in that speech when, referring to his labor plan and other legislative proposals, he declared: "If the measures which I have recommended to accomplish these ends do not meet the approval of the Congress, it is my fervent wish—and I am sure that it is the wish of my fellow citizens—that the Congress formulate measures of its own to carry out the desired objectives. That is definitely the responsibility of the Congress What the American people want is action."

When Congress acted, however, what did the President do? When the legislators passed the Case labor bill, shortly before last year's elections, he vetoed it. Now that the Taft-Hartley bill has been passed, and with a Presidential political campaign beginning to take form, he vetoes that. And this in the face of the fact that the people, through their Representatives in the House, have expressed repeatedly for 9 years their desire for new labor legislation—only to be thwarted time and again by an administration-controlled Senate Labor Committee or a Presidential veto.

The strength of this sentiment for a change is shown by the crushing House vote to override this latest veto—331 to 83. On this issue the President could not even muster a majority of his own party, the Democratic vote being 106 to override and only 71 to sustain the veto.

These are facts and figures which argue persuasively that the President is catering to pressure groups and ignoring the wishes of the people of the country. The people want a new deal in labor legislation. There is real need for a revision of the labor laws. The Senate should see to it that the change is made by joining with the House in overriding this political veto.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer]

HOUSE OVERRIDES A POLITICAL VETO

For the second time within a week President Truman has used his veto to play politics with the country's welfare.

He got away with it in blocking tax relief. Yesterday he received a sharp rebuke when the House gave a thunderous "no" to Mr. Truman's attempted dictation by overriding his veto of the labor-reform bill with a vote of 331 to 83.

To their credit, 106 members of the President's own party joined with their Republican colleagues in refusing to cringe before the threat of the labor-union bosses.

As for President Truman, he has opened his campaign for reelection a year ahead of time. In typical New Deal fashion he has made a bold bid for support by a special group of the electorate which seeks to maintain its exclusive privileges that have wrought grave injury to the rest of our people.

Never before has the Nation witnessed such a powerfully organized pressure drive as has been waged for weeks and months against this imperatively needed legislation.

Never in our history has there been such an outpouring of misleading propaganda, fraudulent on its face, as that utilized by opponents of labor relations reform and brought to bear, first upon Congress and then upon the occupant of the White House.

And never, be it said, had Mr. Truman, since he assumed his high office, a clearer opportunity to make good his pledge to cooperate with Congress "for the welfare of all our people."

By his action yesterday that pledge has become a mere scrap of paper. By his surrender to the organized labor pressure group he has launched his own drive for the votes which he hopes will keep him in his position of power.

This conclusion, aroused by the President's veto of tax relief which he was unwilling to have granted this year by a Republican Congress, is confirmed by his attempts to torpedo relief from the gross abuses perpetuated by our unfair labor laws.

As for Mr. Truman's wordy message to Congress, in which he tries to justify his latest antipublic veto, it is less a message than a mess—of quibbling technicalities about the new set-up of the NLRB, of charges that it would be difficult to enforce, that it would give rise to endless litigation, and so on.

He does grudgingly admit the need for "some" new labor legislation and "heartily condemns" abuses by either unions or employers. But from start to finish there is not one word about the constant invasion of the rights of employers and the public by the labor monopoly which present one-sided laws have so firmly intrenched.

On the contrary, Mr. Truman's chief complaint against this bill is that it would reverse our national labor policy." A policy that says labor can do no wrong, that the employer has no standing before the Labor Board except as a defendant, that unions can indulge in practices for which any other group or individuals would be punished, needs to be reversed.

He asserts that this bill would cause "more strikes, not fewer." How about the tripling of strikes under the Wagner Act? He says this measure would cause confusion by nullifying thousands of existing contracts. Did he read the bill? It provides for continuance of closed-shop contracts until they expire. If signed during the first 60 days after the bill becomes a law, they could continue for a year.

Whatever the ultimate fate of this first attempt by a Congress in many years to reestablish labor relations on a basis fair to all, to open the way for the peaceful adjustment of disputes before they reach the strike stage and imperil the general health and safety and the Nation's prosperity, President Truman's record of opposition to these pressing reforms will still stand.

He has made his choice. It is to put politics above the people's welfare, to choose the worse, not the better part. His eyes are fixed on 1948. And it will be a sad day for the country if his ambitions are fulfilled.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have some material here which I had desired to insert in the RECORD by reading it, but inasmuch as the Senate has already agreed on an hour when the vote on the bill will be taken, I do not deem it necessary to take up any extended time of the Senate; but I do wish it made clear at this time the position I take in regard to the veto by the President.

I have contended all along that the proposed legislation would not perform the miracle which a great many people thought it would, or at least said it would. I am one who believes it is going to bring about a great deal of confusion in the labor field. I entertain that feeling because I am fully convinced, from personal experience, that it is not possible to force a human being into agreeing with another against his will.

Another thought is that problems, as between capital and labor, cannot be

solved by legislation. That is a foregone conclusion, so far as I am concerned. I speak again from personal experience, having been a laborer for 10 or 12 years, and having observed the feeling that exists between capital and labor.

That feeling cannot be broken down by one piece of legislation. When an attempt is made to pass legislation taking away the rights of the laboring people, at this particular time, when they have done such a wonderful job in the past in building up the United States, so that today it is one of the richest and most outstanding nations in the world, I fear it will be a step backward if we vote otherwise than to sustain the President's veto. I think the President in his message to Congress has explained in a great many ways how this legislation will bring about confusion and chaos in the field of labor and management.

This measure, House bill 3020, has been returned by the President to Congress without his approval; and I, for one, am going to vote to sustain his veto. I urge upon this body that it join with me and do likewise.

I am going to try to prevent this bill from becoming law because I think it is a viciously misleading measure. It is long and complicated, and the skill of expert draftsmen has been lavished upon it, so that its true antilabor character is masked behind technical language that only a trained lawyer can understand, and then only after careful study and painstaking analysis. Although its proponents, supporters, and sponsors have characterized it as mild, reasonable, and fair, its true purpose is to turn the Federal Government into an instrument of oppression against organized labor. This is no empty accusation, as I shall presently show.

Furthermore, it will not even accomplish what has been urged as its most immediate purpose. It will not enable the Government to deal effectively with a coal strike after the mines are returned to private ownership. We have been eloquently told that it is now or never; that if this bill does not become law the Government will be impotent in the face of the diabolical ingenuity of the head of the miners' union. I assert, Mr. President, that this bill will deliver the country directly into his hands.

In the first place, we are all well aware that coal mining is an unusually hazardous employment, even under the best of conditions. Stripping old mines is especially dangerous, as we have recently been reminded by the Centralia disaster.

Safety standards in mines, under State laws, are notoriously honored more in the breach than in the observance, and Federal standards are only advisory and may be ignored with impunity. When criticism was made of the Federal Government because of what occurred in Illinois, condemnation should have been made of the State of Illinois for its failure to do its duty in the inspection of the coal mines. That condemnation should not have been directed against the Federal Government.

But this bill provides that if workers quit work in good faith singly or collectively, because of abnormally hazardous conditions at the place of their employment, their action is not a strike within the meaning of the bill. If Mr. Lewis calls his strike in July and keeps his miners out because their working conditions are unsafe, the emergency provisions of the bill would not even apply, unless, I suppose, it could be satisfactorily shown that the required good faith was absent. In view of the facts concerning the hazards of coal mining, of which the courts might well take judicial notice, I submit, Mr. President, that such a challenge to the good faith of the miners would be difficult to sustain.

But even if the strike involves declared issues other than safety, and even if the emergency provisions are invoked, will they keep or restore the peace between miners and operators and keep the Nation supplied with coal? They will not, and I shall show you why.

Suppose the strike is called and begins in the middle of July. The President, forthwith appoints an emergency board of inquiry with subpena powers, which investigates the situation and makes a report. The miners are still out at that time, so the President directs the Attorney General to apply for an injunction to send them back to work. We can estimate that thus far 2 weeks have been consumed. Now the parties are required to sit down and bargain, with the Federal Mediation Service as intermediary, and to try to settle their dispute in 60 days. Can we imagine that they will succeed? The employers will not have the incentive to bargain through to a closed deal, because they will know that the miners are powerless to strike during that period. The miners, for their part, will be free to assume that any offer made them during the 60 days will not be the best they can get, and will therefore be inclined to hold out. I think that would be the natural tendency. I think the recommendations of the Mediation Service are in no way binding on the parties. At the end of the 60-day period, the miners and the operators are still stalemated.

During all this time, the Board of Inquiry has been reconvened, and at the end of the 60 days it reports to the President the current status of the dispute, the positions of the parties, and the employer's last offer of settlement. We may note, by the way, that the Board has no power to make any recommendations at any time.

The dispute being no nearer settlement, the National Labor Relations Board within the next succeeding 15 days is required to take a secret ballot of the employees of each employer separately, to determine whether they wish to accept his last offer as stated by him. I commend the childlike confidence of the sponsors of the bill in the efficacy of a ballot of this kind as a deterrent against strikes. It requires more courage than I confess I have, to fly in the face of experience in that way, ignoring the dismal record of the failure of similar provisions of the War Labor Disputes Act to accomplish this effect. But perhaps there is more in this than meets the eye. Perhaps it is a deliberate strategy to permit, or even encourage, the breakdown of any progress that might have been made toward settlement by industry-wide bargaining in the 60-day period by requiring separate offers from each employer to be voted on by his employees.

After the balloting has been concluded, the National Labor Relations Board certifies the results to the Attorney General within the next 5 days. He then moves the court to dissolve the injunction, and the motion is granted.

Let us now review the timetable of these proceedings. We have assumed a 2-week period for the initial investigation and securing the injunction, which brings us to the end of July. Sixty days for negotiations, and further investigation carries it over to close to the end of September; another 15 days for voting brings us to the end of the second week in October; and 5 days to secure the dissolution of the injunction makes it the third week in October by the time the barest minimum requirements of the law have been fulfilled. By the third week in October, fall is well under way, and the cold-weather season is approaching. Mr. Lewis is now free to call his miners out again, and the Government could hardly have chosen a better time for him to do so.

Of course, what I have said so far has left entirely out of consideration the possibility that there might be some issue involved that would further complicate matters—a union security demand, for example. Even if there were no opposition from the employers to this particular demand, the Government could not possibly sponsor a settlement and a contract until the union was qualified to ask for union security. This would place the Government in a neat dilemma. It would either have to postpone using its emergency powers until two elections had been conducted by the National Labor Relations Board—one to qualify the union as bargaining representatives and one to establish its eligibility for union security—or risk exhausting the emergency powers before the union was in a legal position to agree on all contract terms. I would not venture to predict the time these proceedings would consume. I think, however, that I have effectively shown the uselessness of this bill in the face of a possible coal strike, except as an elaborate exercise in expensive futility.

The reason I mention the coal strike is because the Nation today is led to believe that if the pending bill is enacted into law all matters connected with coal strikes will be taken care of. I want the people of the Nation to know that the bill will not become law and go on the statute books with my approval, with the people believing that they are getting something that will prevent John L. Lewis from calling a coal strike. They are getting nothing in that particular field.

I shall go on now to discuss in further detail my principal objection to this bill: That it will not do for labor-management relations what its proponents claim, and that it is a misleading, antilabor measure, full of traps and pitfalls for unions and escapes for employers. The bill was misnamed when it was called a labor bill. It should have been

captioned in every newspaper of the land as the antilabor bill.

It will not be necessary to exhaust the provisions of the bill; some representative examples should suffice to show what I mean.

I will take as my first instance the "closed shop" provisions of the bill. These have a delayed action, both because of the clause saving the validity of existing closed-shop contracts and because of the 60-day grace period during which new closed-shop agreements can be made, to run for a year. I should expect that if this bill becomes law there will be a wave of new agreements made and old ones renegotiated during the 60 days. The closed shop is not always regarded as an abuse by employers; indeed, many prefer it as a means of inducing stability in their collective-bargaining relations and securing the assistance of the unions in matters of plant discipline. Employers have found that they can operate their concerns in a great many instances better if they have a closed shop. So they look to the union entirely to take care of employee matters. A great many employers believe in the closed shop.

But what does H. R. 3020 do with respect to new union security agreements, where, for one reason or another the parties have not made one within the 60-day grace period?

In the first place, the employer need not even consider such a proposition by a union unless two conditions are fulfilled in addition to those concerning filing of information: The union must be the certified bargaining representative of the employees involved, and, if it is, it must present a petition to the National Labor Relations Board, alleging that 30 percent or more of the employees in the covered bargaining unit want a union security agreement, and must then secure a majority vote, not of these voting but of those eligible to vote, in an election by the Board, in favor of making such an agreement. The majority rule in this provision is a novelty indeed, and shows a far more tender concern for the rights of workers absent from the polls than has ever been shown for the rights of absent Senators or for those of absent voters in any election to public office, whether municipal, county, State, or Federal.

I wonder how many Senators would be in the Senate today if they were obliged to receive 50 percent of the votes of all eligible voters in their particular States.

It may seem frivolous to suggest that the employer might stage a counterattraction simply to keep his employees from voting. Of course the necessity for at least one and possibly two votes wherever union security is an issue will interpose time-consuming delays in the collective bargaining process.

Having hurdled these obstacles, the union can now, if the employer is willing, gain its union-security agreement, for whatever that may be worth. I am inclined to think, Mr. President, that it is not worth much.

If we read on a little further in section 8 (a) (3) of this bill, we find that an employer may not, under the agreement, discriminate against a nonmember of the union if he has reasonable grounds to believe that membership was not available to him on the same terms and conditions as to other members generally, or that he lost his membership for any reason other than nonpayment of dues or initiation fees. Note, Mr. President, that the employer is not even required to ascertain the truth of the situation. He can disregard the agreement on the simple ground that he "had reasonable grounds to believe." And further on, in section 8 (b) (2) it is made an unfair labor practice for a union to attempt to cause an employer to discriminate against an employee whose union membership has been denied or terminated on grounds other than nonpayment of dues or initiation fees. Thus from an effective weapon to enforce plant discipline the union-security agreement becomes merely an instrument to enforce the payment of union dues. The union may have expelled a member for rank dishonesty, even criminality, for acts violating the letter or spirit of a collective-bargaining agreement, violent conduct, troublemaking, or any one of a number of other excellent reasons, but it could not go to the employer and ask that the man be fired so long as he has paid his dues, even where it would be manifestly in the employer's interest to comply with such a demand. If I were a union leader, I think I should scorn to make a union-security agreement which was such a mockery.

Finally, as if to add insult to injury, the bill would not even establish a uniform national policy with respect to union security agreements. The policy of the bill would override State policy where it was liberal in favor of union security, but jurisdiction would be ceded to those States whose laws are more restrictive than the rules here laid down.

Does that look as though they are trying to look after the welfare of labor? No, Mr. President, they do quite opposite everywhere they can.

As we all know, the chief recommendation that this bill has had is that it will restore equality and redress the balance between employers and unions. This slogan has had wide currency here in these halls, and has been enthusiastically picked up and echoed by much of the press. I do not know what ideas of equality and fairness are held by those who cry the slogan; I know that the bill fails to satisfy any of my own. Prejudice, of course, does not readily emerge from dry technical language, and still less easily does it appear from provisions which apply to both sides alike. Yet upon digging into this bill, I am irresistibly reminded of Mark Twain's famous comment upon the equality of a tax policy: "The rich man pays a dollar and the poor man pays a dollar. What could be equaler?" Senators on the other side of the aisle must have been thinking about that when the tax bill was passed this year. Or of another equally well-known expression of the equality between rich and poor: One is as free as the other to sleep on a park bench.

To prove that these observations concerning the bill will stand scrutiny, let us first look at what this bill does about company unions. "Company unions," I might say, is an ugly term, and it is not used in the bill, which discreetly refers to nonaffiliated unions. If one were to tell a laborer that he must belong to a company union he would almost be willing to fight. During my political activities in my State I have heard much about company unions and employees would want to have a union called almost anything else than a company union.

The bill would decree equality between affiliated and nonaffiliated unions by requiring that the National Labor Relations Board use the same kinds of evidence and precedents in establishing company domination of the one as of the other. If it fails to do so, it must include the nonaffiliated union on the same ballot with the affiliated union in representation proceedings.

If the nonaffiliated union really represents the free choice of the employees, I suppose no harm is done by allowing them to vote for it and giving it an even break on the ballot. But it is within the memory of all of us that the company union—misnamed independent—was a favorite device used by employers to prevent their employees from joining an outside union whose policies and behavior the employers could not control. Employer encouragement to the inside union took many forms, and it was entirely reasonable for the National Labor Relations Board to deny such unions a place on the ballot where it had found such encouragement to exist, and to take note of the obvious differences in circumstances between the company union and the outside union in making such a finding. By legislative fiat, however, this bill would now establish as a rule of law that there is no difference between a company union and an outside union. To me this is as absurd as making a law that there is no difference between night and day. But it is worse than that, because, under the guise of securing employees their freedom of choice of a union, this provision secures to the employer the whip hand over his employees—and the whip is the company union. Down home we used to say, "You belong to the Red Apple Club." Many such organizations sprang up.

Another example of spurious equality appears in the free-speech provision of the bill. I believe with all my heart that free speech should be guaranteed to everyone, but that is not what this provision does. It does not say that utterances shall not be unfair labor practices unless they are actual threats or promises. It says that they shall not even be evidence of unfair labor practices unless they contain threats or promises. When a man is charged with first-degree murder, a capital offense wherever capital punishment exists, his relevant statements can be used to establish his intention to do the act of which he stands accused. But it will be noticed that a provision is placed in the bill that it must be an actual threat or promise. Any lawyer within the sound of my voice will have to acknowledge that that is something new in the field of law, especially in the field of criminal law—not to be able to go back behind what was taking place, what utterances

were made, in order to prove what actually had happened. But when the employer is brought before the National Labor Relations Board to answer charges of unfair labor practices, his statements, propaganda, or utterances of any kind are ruled completely out of the hearing unless he has made actual threats or promises. Brief consideration of this provision in connection with the provisions on company unions will show to what extent this grant of free speech gives the employer the advantage. Acts of gentle persuasion on his part, directed to encouraging employees to join the employee-representation plan—incorporating no threat or promise but merely expressing a preference on his part—cannot be used as evidence of interference with the exercise of rights by employees. What such golden opportunity is open to the outside union seeking to organize a plant for the first time? The employer may even engage in a violent antiunion campaign, with posters, leaflets, speeches, and any other kind of publicity representing the union as a menace to the community, but so long as he influences his employees' minds without threats or promises, his immunity is complete. Has the union any chance equal to this? I think not, for the simple reason that the employer, not the union, is the source of the weekly pay check, and it is axiomatic that he who pays the piper calls the tune.

Still another case of superficial fairness appears in the simple provision that employees on strike who are not entitled to reinstatement may not vote in a representation election during the dispute. "For ways that are dark and for tricks that are vain," this provision stands convicted, as I shall demonstrate.

Strikers who are not entitled to reinstatement may fall into many categories, and one of them is the category of those who strike for economic reasons—wages, hours, contract terms, and so forth—and who have been replaced by the employer with other help. For present purposes let us make the likely assumption that the strike has been called by the duly certified bargaining representative, and that the employer has not refused to bargain but has merely refused to grant what the union regards as important demands. The strike promises to last awhile, as the union has been strong in the plant and is insistent, so replacements are hired to man the idle machines, and with nearly a full complement the plant goes back into operation. I have seen this happen many a time, even prior to the enactment of the Wagner Act.

The employer now reflects that his lot will be easier if the pertinacious union is off his back. Accordingly, he petitions the Board for a new election, on the ground that some individual or some other labor organization is now claiming recognition as bargaining representative. Or, in the alternative, he suggests to some of his new employees—which he may do, since his freedom of speech is guaranteed—that they petition the Board either for a regular representation election or for an election to "decertify" the former bargaining representative. The Board conducts the election, as it is required to do, and the strikers are barred from the voting. It is inevitable that the union loses its majority status, since it is unthinkable that the strike-breaking employees would be members of the striking union. Thus, while formerly a union on strike for higher wages had a good fighting chance to keep a majority throughout the strike and possibly, in the end, to gain some concessions from the employer in the course of the ordeal by battle, it now would have the unpleasant alternatives of failing to protect the welfare of its members or striking and losing all claim to bargain with the employer on their behalf. I presume it is not unfair to suggest that there are at least some employers who would welcome the opportunity to break up a union by the means outlined.

For the information of the Senate, prior to the Wagner Act going into effect I witnessed many examples illustrating how much employers wanted to break down unions. I have heard employers confess that they employed a thousand or more employees while a strike was in progress. One employer engaged a Pinkerton agency to tell him exactly how to break the strike. He confessed to me, as Governor of South Carolina, that he would have a little girl come into the community, and they would go into the homes selling stockings. He would enter the home, and, of course, the lady of the house would say, "We cannot buy any stockings. We are on strike." He would say, "I have heard something about that strike. It is a bad thing. You could be making much more money if your husband and children were back at work."

He would go to the next house, spreading the same propaganda in every home in the mill village, and to every worker.

He did not stop there. That employer confessed to me that billiard cues were cut off to make billies about a foot and a half long, and that some of those who came in from outside the State of South Carolina used them in order to break the strike. Those men stirred up fights and discontent.

While I was Governor of the State of South Carolina, to illustrate how attempts were made to place the responsibility upon unions for things that were done, one man was employed at $125 a month. He was permitted to drive a taxi and make all the money he could out of the taxi. He would tell the workers that he was with them. He had two little boys working with him, and they were to burn down the grandstand at the baseball field. It was arranged that the three of them would be caught just about the time they got there. The taxi driver was the leader. They were immediately rushed into court and two of them were convicted. The taxi driver was released.

How did I find it out? The taxi driver was such a criminal that in a few short weeks thereafter he drove some other men over and robbed a bank. He was caught and tried and in a few short months he found himself in the penitentiary. The company had no better sense than to send a check to the penitentiary for the work which he had done in trapping those little boys and trying to break up the strike and the union.

How did I find that out? When the check came to the penitentiary the superintendent called me. I called the man into the office at the penitentiary and discussed the matter with him. He acknowledged the purpose for which he had received the check and acknowledged what had taken place. Immediately the other two boys were released from the State penitentiary. The leader is probably still there serving his sentence for robbing the bank.

Mr. President, I am citing some illustrations showing the extremes to which employers will go to try to break up unions. I say that the bill does not treat the laboring men of this Nation justly. I believe in square deals. I believe that the unions have brought us to the high pinnacle on which we stand today. The income of this Nation amounts to approximately $176,000,000,000 a year—almost three times the amount it was when the Republicans had charge of our Government, and approximately three times the national income when the Wagner Act went into effect. As I see it, the Wagner Act has not hurt the United States. I believe that if it were to continue in effect wages would continue to increase.

I remember the days when there were no unions. I remember when I worked for 30 cents a day—not 8 hours, but 10 and 11 hours a day—year in and year out. I remember working many days for 50 and 60 cents a day when there were no unions. I do not want to go back to those days. I want to protect any agency that will improve wages and living standards among our workers. I do not want to do anything that might make life harder for the laboring people of this Nation. I believe that anyone within the sound of my voice who has read the bill must confess that he believes that the bill will not protect labor as it has been protected in the past, and that it would give the employer greater power to handle labor than he has had in the past.

I am willing to meet Senators who vote to override the President's veto anywhere at any time and discuss with them and with the people the workings of the bill, and let the people judge.

I warn Senators that the bill will have a great effect upon the election of 1948. I believe that it will be the determining factor, and that the result will be that there will be more Senators on this side of the aisle than there are now, because I believe that it will be found that the bill will not work, and will not give workers what they expect. At the same time, it will punish labor. How any laboring man could ever be friendly with any Member of Congress who voted for a bill of this kind, I cannot conceive.

To add to the list I have already compiled, there are provisions in the bill which make employers and unions responsible for the acts of their agents, and which declare that in establishing an agency, the question of actual authorization or subsequent ratification of the acts complained of shall not be controlling. Those provisions on their face show what equity judges call "mutuality," but it takes some knowledge of the

realities of labor relations to show the gross unfairness they perpetrate.

In the first place, we learn from the conference report that these provisions are meant to repeal section 6 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. This section requires that before a person can be held responsible for the unlawful acts of another, there must be clear proof that he actually authorized or ratified those acts. The reason for this section was that in many Federal courts it was the rule that labor unions could be presumed guilty on the basis of ex parte allegations by the employer of unlawful acts by members. The unions were helpless in the face of this rule, since many employers were given to planting their own under-cover agents—often hired detectives—to do or to provoke the acts for which the union was held to be responsible; and, of course, the greater the skill of the employer in planting such people in the union, the more difficult it was for the union to disprove that these men were its agents. The labor spy practice was one of the ugliest and most shameful that marked the area of "government by injunction." H. R. 3020, by repealing section 6 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, gives promise of reviving it in all its former strength.

I have saved for the last one of the most shocking instances of inequality in the whole bill—an inequality and unfairness scarcely even hidden except by the complexity of the language in which it is phrased and the scattering of the relevant provisions in various places in the bill. I refer to the inequality of treatment as between unions and employers.

Section 8 (b) 4 of the bill makes it an unfair labor practice for a union to engage in certain kinds of strikes, boycotts, or other concerted action. Without going into detail as to which particular acts are so proscribed, I will merely mention that they go far beyond what is needed to correct existing abuses. But I am here concerned only with the remedies that the bill provides.

Here, in a nutshell, are the remedies available against the union for committing these acts. First, the employer may file a charge with the Board. If the Board considers the issuance of a complaint warranted, it is under a mandatory duty to go to a Federal district court and get an injunction against the union. This of itself virtually gives the employer the same right to an injunction that he had before the Norris-La Guardia Act; I cannot see that it matters very much whether he or the Board is required to give the employer's charge priority over everything on its docket except similar charges, and if the evidence sustains the complaint, it issues a cease and desist order against the union, possibly requiring the union to pay back-pay to employees of the employer.

This remedy is, however, not exclusive, for a separate provision gives a right to sue for damages for the acts complained of: not only to the employer, but to outsiders to the dispute who may have been injured. Even under the old law, under the antitrust laws, injuries to outsiders were usually damnum absque injuria but under this bill outsiders, too, may join an employer in his drive to break the union or drain its treasury dry.

Let us see what redress the union may obtain. It has, as before, the opportunity to file a charge with the Board, but it has no right to an interim injunction. When the union files the charge, the power of the Board to seek an injunction is discretionary only, not mandatory. Ultimately, however, the Board may issue a cease-and-desist order against the employer. I say ultimately, because the union's charge gets no priority, and may have to await the determination of a number of charges by employers before it is even reached for hearing.

The union has no right to sue for damages under the bill, and it is significant that it can secure no protection against outsiders to the dispute—vigilante groups, citizens' committees, and the like—who, out of their natural sympathies, commit unfair labor practices on the employer's behalf. Such protection was available under the National Labor Relations Act, because the definition of employer included anyone acting in his interest. H. R. 3020 would narrow this down to include only persons acting as the employer's agents. So, although the union would be responsible to outsiders for its own misbehavior, they would in no way have to answer to the law or the union for theirs.

I want it plainly understood that I believe that we should have some labor legislation this year.

It will be recalled I offered an amendment to the bill on the floor and there was a record vote on it. That is proof that we wanted some labor legislation, we thought it was necessary, but we did not believe that it was necessary to take everything away from labor that it had gained in the past and give a great many things to the employer that we do not think are necessary. But the controlling powers in the Senate and in the House thought it an excellent opportunity to take advantage of the situation in America and take away from labor the rights manufacturers and employers wanted to have taken from them. This is a manufacturers' bill; it is an employers' bill. I started to say I would like to know exactly who wrote it. I would like to know who advised the sponsors in every move they made. I can see some handwriting in it. Having represented labor in many cases I can see that all the places were closed where labor had a resting place.

Mr. President, I hope I have unmasked enough of this bill to show it for what it is, and to prove my original contention that it is a vicious, vindictive, anti-labor measure. I trust enough Senators will agree with me to sustain the President's veto.

All I am asking is that when Senators go home tonight they will give thought to what they are to do Monday. We will adjourn soon. I came here prepared to speak for 10 or 12 hours, but we have agreed on a time to vote. I do not see many Senators present, and I do not know how many will read my speech, but I ask Senators to do what I think is only fair and just tonight before they lie down to sleep, ask their Heavenly Father to guide and lead them in the votes they will cast on the bill. Then, if they follow the dictates of their Maker, I have no fear of the outcome of the vote on Monday. I think that is fair enough to anyone, and if they will just go to sleep with their consciences and ask the help of God, they will come to the Senate Monday and cast a vote that will be fair to capital and fair to labor, and if necessary will vote for other legislation that may cure some of the evils that we all agree there are. Then we will have plenty of time to pass the necessary legislation, what the President of the United States wants and what I know the majority on this side of the aisle would agree to, and we would make all the people of the United States, instead of those benefited under the pending legislation, the beneficiaries of our action.

This is a serious thing we are considering doing. It is more far reaching than a great many of us would ever think it could be. Mr. President, legislation of this kind affects our economy. If we cut down the purchasing power of the Nation, we jeopardize every bond the people hold and we jeopardize the price the farmer will receive for his cotton. Mr. President, we gave away $3,750,000,000 to Great Britain in order to increase her purchasing power, so that she could purchase things from us. I say that if we pass this bill, I fear the result will be to cut down the purchasing power of this Nation, and in a few short years we shall have, first, a recession. Watch and see whether my predictions come true, Mr. President. See how true they will be shown to be. First the laboring people will begin to have their wages cut. Next, they will be unemployed. Whereas some mills today are running three shifts, at that time they will have only two shifts; and some which now have two shifts will have only one shift then. The man who sells his produce today will have to throw it in the ditch then, for he will have no buyer.

Then what will come next? Unemployment will spread over the Nation. It will be possible to purchase things cheaply, but our people will not have any money with which to make purchases—the same circumstances which existed in 1933 when Roosevelt went into office.

Mr. President, when I was called upon to speak last year, just before the election, I went to Ohio. The other day I did not have an opportunity to complete my statement about this matter, so I shall do so now. I went to Ohio, where I was to appear at a forum with a Republican, and we were to answer questions. But the Republican did not appear; he hid out. What were the questions that were asked? We were told, "We want meat. Why can't we get meat?" Mr. President, do you know the way I answered that question? I said, "If I remember correctly, when the Republicans were in office in 1931, 1932, and 1933, the cry was, not 'more meat,' but 'more bread.'"

Mr. President, many a time during those days a man would walk into my office, and take a seat across from where I was sitting, and, with tears rolling down his cheeks, would say, "Olin, I haven't a bit of flour in the barrel at

home. I haven't any money to buy flour with. Can you let me have—give me—I hate to ask it—50 cents to buy some flour to feed my wife and children?" He did not even have milk for his little children. He had no job.

I predict that if the Senate follows the advice of the Senators on the other side of the aisle and passes legislation such as that which is before us at the present time, there wil be a recession. A strong economy cannot be built up in that way. There will be a recession; and after the recession, if the Democrats do not get back in control, there will be a depression. That is what will occur.

That is why I am fighting this legislation, because I believe that by doing so we do what is best for all the United States and what is best for building up a strong economy, whereby we shall be able to pay off the enormous debt of $258,000,000,000. Mr. President, with this year's expenditures added to that debt, the total will be more than has been collected in taxes since the beginning of the United States. All the taxes do not amount to that much, plus this year's running expenses.

So we must keep up the income of this Nation if we are to save ourselves. We can bond ourselves, we can go into debt; there will be a stopping place unless we keep up the national income. We cannot cut it back in the good old Republican way and expect to meet our obligations that are outstanding at the present time.

Mr. President, it hurts me to think that the leaders of the United States cannot see those things and cannot appreciate them and cannot understand that bills of this nature are liable to bring chaos in their wake.

We hear much about Communists, Mr. President. If we ever go back to the days of 1933, with the enormous debt we now have, if anyone can tell me how to keep out of the hands of the Communists then, I should like to know it. That is the danger we are facing today; and we are putting wood on the fire when we pass such legislation as that which we have before us at this time. Mr. President, my wish is that God may guide the Senate in its vote on next Monday.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) on Saturday, June 21, 1947, the Senate took a recess until Monday, June 23, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 20, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God of Hosts, who art the soul of the universe and the mind of man, we do not fear nor tremble in Thy presence. By infinite right, blessing, honor, and glory belongeth unto Thee. We therefore praise Thee.

We are grateful, our Lord, that we live in a land of freemen, where opportunities and privileges give us food, clothing, and education. The past lives in the throbbing heart of the present. Grounded in the glorious liberty which is our blessed heritage, enable us to stand fast in the purpose of Thy will. Enjoin us that through grateful love of country, not coercion nor pressure, and without threat, we are enabled to preserve a sound and healthy America, without which there is little hope for the world. To this end we would fear God and keep His commandments, for this is the whole duty of man.

Through Christ our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House in the enrollment of the bill H. R. 3203 to make certain changes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for the erection in Grant Park, Chicago, Ill., of a Marine Corps memorial.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1230. An act to amend sections 2 (a) and 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 254) entitled "An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MOORE, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. MCGRATH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3203) entitled "An act relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations, to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 814) entitled "An act to provide support for wool, and for other purposes."

TO AMEND SECTION 251 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 3444, to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to income from sources within possessions of the United States) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"(i) Prisoners of war and internees: In the case of a citizen of the United States taken as a prisoner of war while serving within a possession of the United States as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, and in the case of a citizen interned by the enemy while serving as an employee within a possession of the United States—

"(1) if such citizen was confined in any place not within a possession of the United States, such place of confinement shall, for the purposes of this section, be considered as within a possession of the United States; and

"(2) any compensation received within the United States by such citizen attributable to the period of time during which such citizen was a prisoner of war or interned by the enemy shall, for the purposes of subsection (b), be considered as compensation received outside the United States."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 3444 is to restore to United States citizens certain legal rights and exemptions under the law when they became interned in Japanese prisons outside of the possession of the United States. It refers particularly to those engaged in trade and in the military and naval service in the Philippine Islands who were captured by the Japanese and incarcerated in prisons outside of the territory of the Philippine Islands.

Under a statute enacted about 1921 to encourage trade in the Philippine Islands, at a time when to be stationed there, or were there to establish a trade, was inimical to life and health, it was provided that persons engaged in trade or employed in business or trade should be relieved of the burden of their income tax provided that at least 80 percent of their income was derived from sources within a possession of the United States, and if at least 50 percent of their gross income was derived from the active conduct of a trade or business within a possession of the United States. Later, by regulations, this provision was expanded to include citizens serving in the military and naval forces of the United States who were stationed in the Philippine Islands.

When the "death march" started, several thousand American citizens were marched out of the Philippines by the Japanese at the point of a bayonet. They suffered indescribable indignities; some, of course, falling by the wayside from exhaustion never to recover. Under the 1921 law the income-tax exemption granted was denied to thousands of military people and civilians who were

incarcerated in prison outside the Philippine Islands. The exemption will continue to be denied to these unfortunate people unless H. R. 3444 is enacted into law.

What our people suffered at the hands of the Japanese in their prisons is best described in the book The Three Came Home, written by Mrs. Agnes Newton Keith, who with her husband and small child spent three and a half years in a Japanese prison camp. I quote from Mrs. Keith's book:

At the end of the first month the children came down with what we called dysentery, although no laboratory examination could be made. They became nauseated, had diarrhea, passed mucus and blood, and lay about the barracks very limply. Most of them were past the diaper age, and we had no provisions for stopping the wet ends. The camp became a trail of blood stools left in the wake of weeping children, who in their turn were followed by creeping infants who crawled through mud and gore. And after the infants would come some childless woman with dainty tread to report to the mother, "Mrs. So and So, your child has had an accident. Please clean it up."

But we had no waste cloths to clean anything up with. In addition to dysentery, they had influenza, they had worms, they had impetigo, they had malaria, and always they had colds. We didn't have medicines unless we smuggled, traded, or stole them. After a few months in camp I developed beriberi, a disease of undernourishment and vitamin deficiency. My legs and face swelled. By evening my legs were so numb that I could not stand on them. The doctor said I must eat all the green stuff I could get hold of. From there on throughout camp life I collected greens, ferns, weeds of any sort, and boiled and ate them.

H. R. 3444 has the approval of the Ways and Means Committee. I introduced this bill May 13, 1947, and I urge its passage in order to do justice to 30,000 of our service people and 10,000 civilians. The great sacrifices they made and the suffering they experienced in Japanese prison camps should not be aggravated by permitting their rights to be sacrificed at the point of Japanese bayonets. I am sure that there will be no objection or opposition to the passage of this bill by unanimous consent.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—PERMISSION TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight Saturday night to file certain reports on certain bills.

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

There was no objection.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 334)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 3020, the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

I am fully aware of the gravity which attaches to the exercise by the President of his constitutional power to withhold his approval from an enactment of the Congress.

I share with the Congress the conviction that legislation dealing with the relations between management and labor is necessary. I heartily condemn abuses on the part of unions and employers, and I have no patience with stubborn insistence on private advantage to the detriment of the public interest.

But this bill is far from a solution of those problems.

When one penetrates the complex, interwoven provisions of this omnibus bill, and understands the real meaning of its various parts, the result is startling.

The bill taken as a whole would reverse the basic direction of our national labor policy, inject the Government into private economic affairs on an unprecedented scale, and conflict with important principles of our democratic society. Its provisions would cause more strikes, not fewer. It would contribute neither to industrial peace nor to economic stability and progress. It would be a dangerous stride in the direction of a totally managed economy. It contains seeds of discord which would plague this Nation for years to come.

Because of the far-reaching import of this bill, I have weighed its probable effects against a series of fundamental considerations. In each case I find that the bill violates principles essential to our public welfare.

I. The first major test which I have applied to this bill is whether it would result in more or less Government intervention in our economic life.

Our basic national policy has always been to establish by law standards of fair dealing and then to leave the working of the economic system to the free choice of individuals. Under that policy of economic freedom we have built our Nation's productive strength. Our people have deep faith in industrial self-government with freedom of contract and free collective bargaining.

I find that this bill is completely contrary to that national policy of economic freedom. It would require the Government, in effect, to become an unwanted participant at every bargaining table. It would establish by law limitations on the terms of every bargaining agreement, and nullify thousands of agreements mutually arrived at and satisfactory to the parties. It would inject the Government deeply into the process by which employers and workers reach agreement. It would superimpose bureaucratic procedures on the free decisions of local employers and employees.

At a time when we are determined to remove, as rapidly as practicable, Federal controls established during the war, this bill would involve the Government in the free processes of our economic system to a degree unprecedented in peacetime.

This is a long step toward the settlement of economic issues by Government dictation. It is an indication that industrial relations are to be determined in the Halls of Congress and that political power is to supplant economic power as the critical factor in labor relations.

II. The second basic test against which I have measured this bill is whether it would improve human relations between employers and their employees.

Cooperation cannot be achieved by force of law. We cannot create mutual respect and confidence by legislative fiat.

I am convinced that this legislation overlooks the significance of these principles. It would encourage distrust, suspicion, and arbitrary attitudes.

I find that the National Labor Relations Act would be converted from an instrument with the major purpose of protecting the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively into a maze of pitfalls and complex procedures. As a result of these complexities employers and workers would find new barriers to mutual understanding.

The bill time and again would remove the settlement of differences from the bargaining table to courts of law. Instead of learning to live together, employers and unions are invited to engage in costly, time-consuming litigation, inevitably embittering both parties.

The Congress has, I think, paid too much attention to the inevitable frictions and difficulties incident to the reconversion period. It has ignored the unmistakable evidence that those difficulties are receding and that labor-management cooperation is constantly improving. There is grave danger that this progress would be nullified through enactment of this legislation.

III. A third basic test is whether the bill is workable.

There is little point in putting laws on the books unless they can be executed. I have concluded that this bill would prove to be unworkable. The so-called emergency procedure for critical Nation-wide strikes would require an immense amount of Government effort but would result almost inevitably in failure. The National Labor Relations Board would be given many new tasks, and hobbled at every turn in attempting to carry them out. Unique restrictions on the Board's procedures would so greatly increase the backlog of unsettled cases that the parties might be driven to turn in despair from peaceful procedures to economic force.

IV. The fourth basic test by which I have measured this bill is the test of fairness.

The bill prescribes unequal penalties for the same offense. It would require the National Labor Relations Board to give priority to charges against workers over related charges against employers. It would discriminate against workers by arbitrarily penalizing them for all critical strikes.

Much has been made of the claim that the bill is intended simply to equalize the positions of labor and management. Careful analysis shows that this claim is unfounded. Many of the provisions of the bill standing alone seem innocent but, considered in relation to each other, reveal a consistent pattern of inequality.

The failure of the bill to meet these fundamental tests is clearly demonstrated by a more detailed consideration of its defects.

1. The bill would substantially increase strikes.

(1) It would discourage the growing willingness of unions to include "no strike" provisions in bargaining agreements, since any labor organization signing such an agreement would expose itself to suit for contract violation if any of its members engaged in an unauthorized "wildcat" strike.

(2) It would encourage strikes by imposing highly complex and burdensome reporting requirements on labor organizations which wish to avail themselves of their rights under the National Labor Relations Act. In connection with these reporting requirements, the bill would penalize unions for any failure to comply, no matter how inconsequential, by denying them all rights under the act. These provisions, which are irrelevant to the major purposes of the bill, seem peculiarly designed to place obstacles in the way of labor organizations which wish to appeal to the National Labor Relations Board for relief, and thus to impel them to strike or take other direct action.

(3) It would bring on strikes by depriving significant groups of workers of the right they now enjoy to organize and to bargain under the protection of law. For example, broad groups of employees who for purposes of the act would be classed as supervisors would be removed from the protection of the act. Such groups would be prevented from using peaceful machinery and would be left no option but the use of economic force.

(4) The bill would force unions to strike or to boycott if they wish to have a jurisdictional dispute settled by the National Labor Relations Board. This peculiar situation results from the fact that the Board is given authority to determine jurisdictional disputes over assignment of work only after such disputes have been converted into strikes or boycotts.

In addition to these ways in which specific provisions of the bill would lead directly to strikes, the cumulative effect of many of its other provisions which disrupt established relationships would result in industrial strife and unrest.

2. The bill arbitrarily decides, against the workers, certain issues which are normally the subject of collective bargaining, and thus restricts the area of voluntary agreement.

(1) The bill would limit the freedom of employers and labor organizations to agree on methods of developing responsibility on the part of unions by establishing union security. While seeming to preserve the right to agree to the union shop, it would place such a multitude of obstacles in the way of such agreement that union security and responsibility would be largely canceled.

In this respect, the bill disregards the voluntary developments in the field of industrial relations in the United States over the past 150 years. Today, over 11,000,000 workers are employed under some type of union-security contract. The great majority of the plants which have such union-security provisions have had few strikes. Employers in such plants are generally strong supporters of some type of union security, since it gives them a greater measure of stability in production.

(2) The bill would limit the freedom of employers and employees to establish and maintain welfare funds. It would prescribe arbitrary methods of administering them and rigidly limit the purposes for which they may be used. This is an undesirable intrusion by the Government into an important matter which should be the subject of private agreement between employers and employees.

(3) The bill presents the danger that employers and employees might be prohibited from agreeing on safety provisions, rest-period rules, and many other legitimate practices, since such practices may fall under the language defining "feather bedding."

3. The bill would expose employers to numerous hazards by which they could be annoyed and hampered.

(1) The bill would invite frequent disruption of continuous plant production by opening up immense possibilities for many more elections, and adding new types of elections. The bill would invite electioneering for changes in representatives and for union security. This would harass employers in their production efforts and would generate raiding and jurisdictional disputes. The National Labor Relations Board has been developing sound principles of stability on these matters. The bill would overturn these principles to the detriment of employers.

(2) The bill would complicate the collective bargaining process for employers by permitting—and in some cases requiring—the splitting up of stable patterns of representation. Employers would be harassed by having to deal with many small units. Labor organizations would be encouraged to engage in constant interunion warfare, which could result only in confusion.

(3) The bill would invite unions to sue employers in the courts regarding the thousands of minor grievances which arise every day over the interpretation of bargaining agreements. Employers are likely to be besieged by a multiplicity of minor suits, since management necessarily must take the initiative in applying the terms of agreements. In this respect, the bill ignores the fact that employers and unions are in wide agreement that the interpretation of the provisions of bargaining agreements should be submitted to the processes of negotiation ending in voluntary arbitration, under penalties prescribed in the agreement itself. This is one of the points on which the National Labor-Management Conference in November 1945, placed special emphasis. In introducing damage suits as a possible substitute for grievance machinery, the bill rejects entirely the informed wisdom of those experienced in labor relations.

(4) The bill would prevent an employer from freely granting a union-shop contract, even where he and virtually his entire working force were in agreement as to its desirability. He would be required to refrain from agreement until the National Labor Relations Board's work load permitted it to hold an election—in this case simply to ratify an unquestioned and legitimate agreement.

Employers, moreover, would suffer because the ability of unions to exercise responsibility under bargaining agreements would be diminished. Labor organizations whose disciplinary authority is weakened cannot carry their full share of maintaining stability of production.

4. The bill would deprive workers of vital protection which they now have under the law.

(1) The bill would make it easier for an employer to get rid of employees whom he wanted to discharge because they exercised their right of self-organization guaranteed by the act. It would permit an employer to dismiss a man on the pretext of a slight infraction of shop rules, even though his real motive was to discriminate against this employee for union activity.

(2) The bill would also put a powerful new weapon in the hands of employers by permitting them to initiate elections at times strategically advantageous to them. It is significant that employees on economic strike who may have been replaced are denied a vote. An employer could easily thwart the will of his employees by raising a question of representation at a time when the union was striking over contract terms.

(3) It would give employers the means to engage in endless litigation, draining the energy and resources of unions in court actions, even though the particular charges were groundless.

(4) It would deprive workers of the power to meet the competition of goods produced under sweatshop conditions by permitting employers to halt every type of secondary boycott, not merely those for unjustifiable purposes.

(5) It would reduce the responsibility of employers for unfair labor practices committed in their behalf. The effect of the bill is to narrow unfairly employer liability for antiunion acts and statements made by persons who, in the eyes of the employees affected, act and speak for management, but who may not be "agents" in the strict legal sense of that term.

(6) At the same time it would expose unions to suits for acts of violence, wildcat strikes, and other actions, none of which were authorized or ratified by them. By employing elaborate legal doctrine, the bill applies a superficially similar test of responsibility for employers and unions—each would be responsible for the acts of his agents. But the power of an employer to control the acts of his subordinates is direct and final. This is radically different from the power of unions to control the acts of their members—who are, after all, members of a free association.

5. The bill abounds in provisions which would be unduly burdensome or actually unworkable.

(1) The bill would erect an unworkable administrative structure for carrying out the National Labor Relations Act. The bill would establish, in effect, an independent general counsel and an independent Board. But it would place with the Board full responsibility for investigating and determining election cases—over 70 percent of the present case load—and at the same time would remove from the Board the authority to direct and control the personnel engaged in carrying out this responsibility.

(2) It would invite conflict between the National Labor Relations Board and its general counsel, since the general counsel would decide, without any right of appeal by employers and employees, whether charges were to be heard by the Board, and whether orders of the Board were to be referred to the court for enforcement. By virtue of this unlimited authority, a single administrative official might usurp the Board's responsibility for establishing policy under the act.

(3) It would strait-jacket the National Labor Relations Board's operations by a series of special restrictions unknown to any other quasi-judicial agency. After many years of study, the Congress adopted the Administrative Procedures Act of 1946 to govern the operation of all quasi-judicial agencies, including the National Labor Relations Board. This present bill disregards the Procedures Act and, in many respects, is directly contrary to the spirit and letter of that act. Simple and time-saving procedures, already established and accepted as desirable by employers and employees, would be summarily scrapped. The Board itself, denied the power of delegation, would be required to hear all jurisdictional disputes over work tasks. This single duty might require a major portion of the Board's time. The review function within the Board, largely of a nonjudicial character, would be split up and assigned to separate staffs attached to each Board member. This would lead to extensive and costly duplication of work and records.

(4) The bill would require or invite Government supervised elections in an endless variety of cases. Questions of the bargaining unit, of representatives, of union security, of bargaining offers, are subject to election after election, most of them completely unnecessary. The National Labor Relations Board has had difficulty conducting the number of elections required under present law. This bill would greatly multiply this load. It would, in effect, impose upon the Board a 5-year backlog of election cases, if it handled them at its present rate.

(5) The bill would introduce a unique handicap, unknown in ordinary law, upon the use of statements as evidence of unfair labor practices. An antiunion statement by an employer, for example, could not be considered as evidence of motive, unless it contained an explicit threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit. The bill would make it an unfair labor practice to "induce or encourage" certain types of strikes and boycotts, and then would forbid the National Labor Relations Board to consider as evidence "views, argument, or opinion" by which such a charge could be proved.

(6) The bill would require the Board to "determine" jurisdictional disputes over work tasks, instead of using arbitration, the accepted and traditional method of settling such disputes. In order to get its case before the Board a union must indulge in a strike or a boycott and wait for some other party to allege that it had violated the law. If the Board's decision should favor the party thus forced to violate the law in order that its case might be heard, the Board would be without power over other parties to the dispute to whom the award might be unacceptable.

(7) The bill would require the Board to determine which employees on strike are "entitled to reinstatement" and hence would be eligible to vote in an election held during a strike. This would be an impossible task, since it would require the Board arbitrarily to decide which, if any, of the employees had been replaced and therefore should not be allowed to vote.

6. The bill would establish an ineffective and discriminatory emergency procedure for dealing with major strikes affecting the public health or safety.

This procedure would be certain to do more harm than good, and to increase rather than diminish widespread industrial disturbances. I am convinced that the country would be in for a bitter disappointment if these provisions of the bill became law.

The procedure laid down by the bill is elaborate. Its essential features are a Presidential board of inquiry, a waiting period of approximately 80 days—enforced by injunction—and a secret-ballot vote of the workers on the question of whether or not to accept their employer's last offer.

At the outset a board of inquiry would be required to investigate the situation thoroughly, but would be specifically forbidden to offer its informed judgment concerning a reasonable basis for settlement of the dispute. Such inquiry therefore, would serve merely as a sounding board to dramatize the respective positions of the parties.

A strike or lock-out might occur before the board of inquiry could make its report, and perhaps even before the board could be appointed. The existence of such a strike or lock-out would hamper the board in pursuing its inquiry. Experience has shown that fact-finding, if it is to be most effective as a device for settlement of labor disputes, should come before the men leave their work, not afterward. Furthermore, an injunction issued after a strike has started would arouse bitter resentment which would not contribute to agreement.

If the dispute had not been settled after 60 days of the waiting period, the National Labor Relations Board would be required to hold a separate election for the employees of each employer to find out whether the workers wished to accept the employer's last offer, as stated by him. Our experience under the War Labor Disputes Act showed conclusively that such an election would almost inevitably result in a vote to reject the employer's offer, since such action amounts to a vote of confidence by the workers in their bargaining representatives. The union would then be reinforced by a dramatic demonstration, under Government auspices, of its strength for further negotiations.

After this elaborate procedure the injunction would then have to be dissolved, the parties would be free to fight out their dispute, and it would be mandatory for the President to transfer the whole problem to the Congress, even if it were not in session. Thus, major economic disputes between employers and their workers over contract terms might ultimately be thrown into the political arena for disposition. One could scarcely devise a less effective method for discouraging critical strikes.

This entire procedure is based upon the same erroneous assumptions as those which underlay the strike-vote provision of the War Labor Disputes Act, namely, that strikes are called in haste as the result of inflamed passions, and that union leaders do not represent the wishes of the workers. We have learned by experience, however, that strikes in the basic industries are not called in haste, but only after long periods of negotiation and serious deliberation; and that in the secret-ballot election the workers almost always vote to support their leaders.

Furthermore, a fundamental inequity runs through these provisions. The bill provides for injunctions to prohibit workers from striking, even against terms dictated by employers after contracts have expired. There is no provision assuring the protection of the rights of the employees during the period they are deprived of the right to protect themselves by economic action.

In summary, I find that the so-called "emergency procedure" would be ineffective. It would provide for clumsy and cumbersome Government intervention; it would authorize inequitable injunctions; and it would probably culminate in a public confession of failure. I cannot conceive that this procedure would aid in the settlement of disputes.

7. The bill would discriminate against employees.

(1) It would impose discriminatory penalties upon employers and employees for the same offense, that of violating the requirement that existing agreements be maintained for 60 days without strike or lock-out while a new agreement is being negotiated. Employers could only be required to restore the previous conditions of employment, but employees could be summarily dismissed by the employer.

(2) The bill would require the Board to seek a temporary restraining order when labor organizations had been charged with boycotts or certain kinds of jurisdictional strikes. It would invite employers to find any pretext for arguing that "an object" of the union's action was one of these practices, even though the primary object was fully legitimate. Moreover, since these cases would be taken directly into the courts, they necessarily would be settled by the judiciary before the National Labor Relations Board had a chance to decide the issue. This would thwart the entire purpose of the National Labor Relations Act in establishing the Board, which purpose was to confer on the Board, rather than the courts, the power to decide complex questions of fact in a special field requiring expert knowledge. This provision of the bill is clearly a backward step toward the old abuses of the labor injunction. No similar provision directed against employers can be found in the bill.

(3) The bill would also require the Board to give priority in investigating charges of certain kinds of unfair labor

practices against unions, even though such unfair labor practices might have been provoked by those of the employer. Thus the bill discriminates, in this regard, in the relief available to employers and unions.

(4) It would impose on labor organizations, but not on employers, burdensome reporting requirements which must be met before any rights would be available under the act.

(5) In weakening the protections afforded to the right to organize, contrary to the basic purpose of the National Labor Relations Act, the bill would injure smaller unions far more than larger ones. Those least able to protect themselves would be the principal victims of the bill.

8. The bill would disregard in important respects the unanimous convictions of employer and labor representatives at the national labor-management conference in November 1945.

(1) One of the strongest convictions expressed during the conference was that the Government should withdraw from the collective-bargaining process, now that the war emergency is over, and leave the determination of working conditions to the free agreement of the parties. This bill proceeds in exactly the opposite direction. In numerous ways the bill would unnecessarily intrude the Government into the process of reaching free decisions through bargaining. This intrusion is precisely what the representatives of management and labor resented.

(2) A unanimous recommendation of the conference was that the Conciliation Service should be strengthened within the Department of Labor. But this bill removes the Conciliation Service from the Department of Labor. The new name for the Service would carry with it no new dignity or new functions. The evidence does not support the theory that the conciliation function would be better exercised and protected by an independent agency outside the Department of Labor. Indeed, the Service would lose the important day-to-day support of factual research in industrial relations available from other units of the Department. Furthermore, the removal of the Conciliation Service from the Department of Labor would be contrary to the praiseworthy policy of the Congress to centralize related governmental units within the major Government departments.

9. The bill raises serious issues of public policy which transcend labor-management difficulties.

(1) In undertaking to restrict political contributions and expenditures, the bill would prohibit many legitimate activities on the part of unions and corporations. This provision would prevent the ordinary union newspaper from commenting favorably or unfavorably upon candidates or issues in national elections. I regard this as a dangerous intrusion on free speech, unwarranted by any demonstration of need, and quite foreign to the stated purposes of this bill.

Furthermore, this provision can be interpreted as going far beyond its apparent objectives, and as interfering with necessary business activities. It provides no exemption for corporations whose business is the publication of newspapers or the operation of radio stations. It makes no distinctions between expenditures made by such corporations for the purpose of influencing the results of an election, and other expenditures made by them in the normal course of their business "in connection with" an election. Thus it would raise a host of troublesome questions concerning the legality of many practices ordinarily engaged in by newspapers and radio stations.

(2) In addition, in one important area the bill expressly abandons the principle of uniform application of national policy under Federal law. The bill's stated policy of preserving some degree of union security would be abdicated in all States where more restrictive policies exist. In other respects the bill makes clear that Federal policy would govern insofar as activities affecting commerce are concerned. This is not only an invitation to the States to distort national policy as they see fit, but is a complete forsaking of a long-standing constitutional principle.

(3) In regard to Communists in unions, I am convinced that the bill would have an effect exactly opposite to that intended by the Congress. Congress intended to assist labor organizations to rid themselves of Communist officers. With this objective I am in full accord. But the effect of this provision would be far different. The bill would deny the peaceful procedures of the National Labor Relations Act to a union unless all its officers declared under oath that they were not members of the Communist Party and that they did not favor the forceful or unconstitutional overthrow of the Government. The mere refusal by a single individual to sign the required affidavit would prevent an entire national labor union from being certified for purposes of collective bargaining. Such a union would have to win all its objectives by strike, rather than by orderly procedure under the law. The union and the affected industry would be disrupted for perhaps a long period of time while violent electioneering, charges, and countercharges split open the union ranks. The only result of this provision would be confusion and disorder, which is exactly the result the Communists desire.

This provision in the bill is an attempt to solve difficult problems of industrial democracy by recourse to oversimplified legal devices. I consider that this provision would increase, rather than decrease, disruptive effects of Communists in our labor movement.

The most fundamental test which I have applied to this bill is whether it would strengthen or weaken American democracy in the present critical hour. This bill is perhaps the most serious economic and social legislation of the past decade. Its effects—for good or ill—would be felt for decades to come.

I have concluded that the bill is a clear threat to the successful working of our democratic society.

One of the major lessons of recent world history is that free and vital trade-unions are a strong bulwark against the growth of totalitarian movements. We must, therefore, be everlastingly alert that in striking at union abuses we do not destroy the contribution which unions make to our democratic strength.

This bill would go far toward weakening our trade-union movement. And it would go far toward destroying our national unity. By raising barriers between labor and management and by injecting political considerations into normal economic decisions, it would invite them to gain their ends through direct political action. I think it would be exceedingly dangerous to our country to develop a class basis for political action.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the transcendent importance of the United States in the world today as a force for freedom and peace. We cannot be strong internationally if our national unity and our productive strength are hindered at home. Anything which weakens our economy or weakens the unity of our people—as I am thoroughly convinced this bill would do—I cannot approve.

In my message on the state of the Union which I submitted to the Congress in January 1947, I recommended a step-by-step approach to the subject of labor legislation. I specifically indicated the problems which we should treat immediately. I recommended that, before going on to other problems, a careful, thorough, and nonpartisan investigation should be made, covering the entire field of labor-management relations.

The bill now before me reverses this procedure. It would make drastic changes in our national labor policy first, and would provide for investigation afterward.

There is still a genuine opportunity for the enactment of appropriate labor legislation this session. I still feel that the recommendations which I expressed in the state of the Union message constitute an adequate basis for legislation which is moderate in spirit and which relates to known abuses.

For the compelling reasons I have set forth, I return H. R. 3020 without my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 20, 1947.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY].

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, the contentions on both sides of this measure have been loud and long. It has been debated at greater length in the Congress, in the press, and over the radio than any other legislation in my memory. The veto message of the President raises no contention which has not been thoroughly explored and discussed. I do not see that any further debate will be material. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LESINSKI. I believe we are entitled to some time on this on the minority side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman insists on making the point of order that a quorum is not present, the Chair will accommodate him and count. [After counting.] Three hundred and forty Members are present, a quorum.

The previous question has been ordered.

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 331, nays 83, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

YEAS—331

Abernethy	Colmer	Hall,
Albert	Cooley	Edwin Arthur
Allen, Calif.	Cooper	Hall,
Allen, Ill.	Corbett	Leonard W.
Allen, La.	Cotton	Halleck
Almond	Coudert	Hand
Andersen,	Courtney	Hardy
H. Carl	Cox	Harness, Ind.
Anderson, Calif.	Cravens	Harris
Andresen,	Crawford	Harrison
August H.	Crow	Hartley
Andrews, Ala.	Cunningham	Hays
Andrews, N. Y.	Curtis	Hébert
Arends	Dague	Hendricks
Arnold	Davis, Ga.	Herter
Auchincloss	Davis, Tenn.	Heselton
Bakewell	Davis, Wis.	Hess
Banta	Dawson, Utah	Hill
Barden	Deane	Hinshaw
Barrett	Devitt	Hobbs
Bates, Mass.	D'Ewart	Hoeven
Battle	Dirksen	Hoffman
Beall	Domengeaux	Holmes
Beckworth	Dondero	Hope
Bell	Dorn	Horan
Bender	Doughton	Howell
Bennett, Mo.	Drewry	Jackson, Calif.
Blackney	Durham	Jarman
Bland	Eaton	Jenison
Boggs, Del.	Elliott	Jenkins, Ohio
Boggs, La.	Ellis	Jenkins, Pa.
Bolton	Ellsworth	Jennings
Bonner	Elsaesser	Jensen
Boykin	Elston	Johnson, Calif.
Bradley	Engel, Mich.	Johnson, Ill.
Bramblett	Engle, Calif.	Johnson, Ind.
Brehm	Evins	Johnson, Tex.
Brooks	Fallon	Jones, Ala.
Brown, Ga.	Fellows	Jones, N. C.
Brown, Ohio	Fenton	Jones, Ohio
Bryson	Fernandez	Jonkman
Buck	Fisher	Judd
Buffett	Fletcher	Kean
Bulwinkle	Foote	Kearney
Burke	Fulton	Kearns
Burleson	Gallagher	Keating
Busbey	Gamble	Keefe
Byrnes, Wis.	Gary	Kerr
Camp	Gathings	Kersten, Wis.
Canfield	Gavin	Kilburn
Carson	Gearhart	Kilday
Case, N. J.	Gillette	Knutson
Case, S. Dak.	Gillie	Kunkel
Chadwick	Goff	Landis
Chapman	Goodwin	Larcade
Chelf	Gore	Latham
Chenoweth	Gossett	Lea
Chiperfield	Graham	LeCompte
Church	Grant, Ala.	LeFevre
Clark	Grant, Ind.	Lewis
Clason	Gregory	Lodge
Clevenger	Griffiths	Love
Clippinger	Gross	Lucas
Coffin	Gwinn, N. Y.	Lyle
Cole, Kans.	Gwynne, Iowa	McConnell
Cole, Mo.	Hagen	McCowen
Cole, N. Y.	Hale	McDonough

McDowell	Poage	Simpson, Pa.
McGarvey	Potts	Smathers
McGregor	Poulson	Smith, Kans.
McMahon	Preston	Smith, Maine
McMillen, Ill.	Price, Fla.	Smith, Va.
MacKinnon	Priest	Smith, Wis.
Macy	Rains	Snyder
Mahon	Ramey	Springer
Maloney	Rankin	Stanley
Manasco	Redden	Stefan
Martin, Iowa	Reed, Ill.	Stevenson
Mason	Reed, N. Y.	Stigler
Mathews	Rees	Stockman
Meade, Ky.	Reeves	Stratton
Meade, Md.	Rich	Sundstrom
Merrow	Richards	Taber
Meyer	Riehlman	Talle
Michener	Riley	Taylor
Miller, Conn.	Rivers	Teague
Miller, Md.	Rizley	Thomas, N. J.
Miller, Nebr.	Robertson	Tibbott
Mills	Robsion	Towe
Mitchell	Rockwell	Trimble
Monroney	Rogers, Fla.	Twyman
Morton	Rogers, Mass.	Vail
Muhlenberg	Rohrbough	Vinson
Mundt	Ross	Vorys
Murray, Tenn.	Russell	Vursell
Murray, Wis.	Sadlak	Wadsworth
Nixon	St. George	Weichel
Nodar	Sanborn	West
Norblad	Sarbacher	Wheeler
Norrell	Sasscer	Whitten
O'Hara	Schwabe, Mo.	Whittington
O'Konski	Schwabe, Okla.	Wigglesworth
Owens	Scoblick	Williams
Pace	Scott, Hardie	Wilson, Ind.
Passman	Scott,	Wilson, Tex.
Patterson	Hugh D., Jr.	Wolcott
Peden	Scrivner	Wolverton
Peterson	Seely-Brown	Wood
Phillips, Calif.	Shafer	Woodruff
Pickett	Short	Worley
Ploeser	Sikes	Youngblood
Plumley	Simpson, Ill.	Zimmerman

NAYS—83

Angell	Harless, Ariz.	Miller, Calif.
Bates, Ky.	Hart	Morgan
Bishop	Havenner	Morris
Blatnik	Hedrick	Morrison
Bloom	Heffernan	Murdock
Brophy	Holifield	Norton
Buchanan	Huber	O'Brien
Buckley	Hull	O'Toole
Butler	Jackson, Wash.	Pfeifer
Byrne, N. Y.	Javits	Philbin
Cannon	Johnson, Okla.	Phillips, Tenn.
Carroll	Jones, Wash.	Price, Ill.
Celler	Karsten, Mo.	Rabin
Clements	Kee	Rayburn
Crosser	Kennedy	Rayfiel
Dawson, Ill.	Keogh	Rooney
Delaney	King	Sabath
Dingell	Kirwan	Sadowski
Donohue	Klein	Sheppard
Douglas	Lane	Somers
Eberharter	Lanham	Spence
Feighan	Lemke	Thomas, Tex.
Flannagan	Lesinski	Thomason
Fogarty	Lynch	Tollefson
Folger	McCormack	Walter
Forand	Madden	Welch
Gordon	Mansfield,	
Gorski	Mont.	
Granger	Marcantonio	

NOT VOTING—15

Bennett, Mich.	Kefauver	Patman
Combs	Kelley	Powell
Dolliver	Lusk	Smith, Ohio
Fuller	McMillan, S. C.	Van Zandt
Gifford	Mansfield, Tex.	Winstead

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Van Zandt and Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Kefauver against.

Mr. Gifford and Mr. McMillan of South Carolina for, with Mr. Kelley against.

Mr. Fuller and Mrs. Lusk for, with Mr. Powell against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Bennett of Michigan with Mr. Winstead.

Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Combs.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago we listened to the reading of the veto message of the President upon H. R. 3020, the Labor-Management Relations Act. Immediately following the reading of the message, as provided by law, the roll was called. The question submitted was, Shall the House pass the bill notwithstanding the veto? Three hundred and thirty-one voted "aye," and 83 voted "no"—4 to 1. Only 71 Democrats voted to sustain the veto—4 to 1 to override the veto.

The President states:

> I share with the Congress the conviction that legislation dealing with the relations between management and labor is necessary. I heartily condemn abuses on the part of unions and employers, and I have no patience with stubborn insistence on private advantage to the detriment of the public interest.

The President agrees with the Congress that legislation was and is necessary and that three groups have a vital interest in the legislation—labor, management, and the American people as a whole. I have always insisted that—

First. Labor has rights that should be and must be respected and protected.

Second. Management has rights that should be and must be respected and protected.

Third. The American people as a whole have rights that should be and must be respected and protected.

I have always believed that the workers of this country should have the right to organize to protect their just rights and interests and the right to bargain collectively with management and to have that high standard of wages that will make it possible for them and their families to maintain the high American standard of living for themselves and their families, and, proper working conditions and reasonable hours and also the protection of their health and old-age requirements. Every fair-minded consumer should be willing to pay such sum for food, clothing, shelter, and other goods and materials as will enable the producers to pay real American wages and a reasonable profit to those whose money is invested.

Many persons have the notion that Members of the House and Senate were born with a silver or a gold spoon in their mouths. This is not true. I am informed that more than 85 percent of the Members of the House and Senate earned their living and got their start in life by working with their hands. They came from the homes of families with few opportunities or from the great middle class of this country. They know what it means to toil on the farms, in the shops, mills, mines, and on the railroads of our country. I was born the son of a tenant farmer and worked in carshops, foundries, on the farm and the sawmills, in the log woods and at anything that I could find to do with my hands

that was honorable. For the most part, I did my own cooking and washing while trying to secure some education. I think I know something about the viewpoint of those who toil. In all of my years of practice of the law, I never took a case against an injured worker or against the widow and orphan of a deceased worker.

This bill was not written by a lot of corporation lawyers. It is the result of the efforts of a committee of the House that held hearings for more than 6 weeks and all those who desired to be heard were heard, giving to this committee facts and views. This included of course the workers and their representatives, management and its representatives, and many persons in every walk of life. The committee then considered the bill for weeks. The bill was considered for many days in the House. Every line of the bill was read, many amendments were offered and some were adopted and many speeches were made by each and every Member of the House who desired to express his or her views. On a roll call, the House then passed the bill by a vote of 307 to 108. The bill then went to the Senate where it was considered by a Senate committee and then on the floor of the Senate and I am glad to say that it was greatly modified in the Senate. I was frank to say that I was not for the Hartley bill as it was written and would have voted against it had it been the bill that was submitted for final consideration. The Senate, after many days of consideration, and after many amendments were offered and many were adopted, passed the bill on a record vote by an overwhelming majority. As there were differences between the House and Senate bills, they were referred to a conference committee, made up of 5 Senators and 5 Representatives from the appropriate committees of the House and Senate, and after long consideration, the conferees of the House and Senate submitted the final compromise bill. The conference report was considered in the House and adopted by a record vote of approximately 4 to 1. A majority of Democrats, as well as Republicans, voted for the compromise bill, in the Senate, and that is the bill that went to President Truman for his consideration and that is the bill that was vetoed today by the President and passed by the House by a vote of 4 to 1. I know of no piece of legislation that has received more thorough consideration, every word and every line in the bill, as this bill.

Now, the President in his veto message, undertakes to say that everything in the bill is wrong. In all of my years of service in the House and Senate, I have never read a veto message that was so unfair and that had so little regard for the facts and for reason, commonsense, and justice as this veto message. I am led to wonder if the President ever had the time or took the time to read this bill which they say contains scores of pages. Who wrote the veto message? I said on the floor today that in my opinion this veto is a political message and that it would not have been made but for the fact that former Vice President Henry Wallace has been speaking throughout the Nation to tremendous crowds who were paying from $1 to $3 to hear him speak, and in these speeches he was denouncing many of the policies of President Truman and was favoring a third party. This veto message, in my opinion, is an effort on the part of President Truman to appease the apparent strong following of Mr. Wallace, especially the radical element of that following and turn them away from Wallace to President Truman. He and his leaders, of course, realize the threat to his chances next year if Mr. Wallace continues in this course.

But, according to Mr. Truman, there is nothing good in this bill. There is no doubt but what the Members of the House and Senate have had one real purpose in mind and that is to bring out a bill that will be fair to management and labor and at the same time, protect the interest of the American people as a whole and promote the welfare of our Nation.

LEGISLATION NECESSARY

In his veto message, the President said that legislation was necessary. That appears to be the opinion of approximately 85 percent of the American people according to the Nation-wide polls taken and the Congress is in general agreement with the President that legislation is necessary, not only to bring about more just and fair relations between labor and management, but also in the interest of the American people as a whole. What is the record on this matter?

The records of the Government show that for the 6-year period before the adoption of NIRA—Blue Eagle—there was an average each year of 700 strikes involving on an average 270,000 workers. This average increased from year to year so that by the year of 1946 there were 4,985 strikes involving millions of workers with 119,000,000 man-days lost. We had a number of disastrous strikes last year which resulted in loss of billions in wages to the workers, tremendous losses to management, a curtailment of production and great inconvenience and loss to America. It is believed that all the fundamental essential rights of the workers have been preserved in this bill and it provides for equal justice between management and labor. It, in my opinion, strengthens conciliation and mediation of the differences between management and labor and if both sides will keep always before them the Golden Rule and realize fully what it means to be an American and have a part in this great country and what their joint efforts can do not only for themselves and for the American people, and be men of "good will" and not "ill will," I am very hopeful that this measure will benefit them and the American people as a whole. No one can claim perfection of this bill or any other bill of such vast importance. This bill provides that there shall be a thorough study made of this whole problem of labor-management relations in the hope that if the Congress has not done the best thing that could be done, that amendments may in due course correct whatever may be inequitable or unfair either to labor or management.

It grieves me very much that after so much sincere, honest, and faithful work has been put upon a bill that the President denounces all of this work, denounces the bill in toto, says it is all wrong and undertakes to say that the overwhelming majority of Congress has labored without results. The President seems deeply concerned about the workers. He had an opportunity the other day to sign a bill that passed the House by more than 3 to 1 and in the Senate by nearly 2 to 1 granting a 30-percent tax reduction to approximately 30,000,000 low-income taxpayers. These were largely made up of working people, teachers, and so forth. It would give considerably more relief than the 30 percent to 1,500,000 persons 65 years of age or over. It only gives 20-percent relief to the 17,000,000 more income-tax payers in the middle income brackets and 10½ percent to less than 1,000 of the top income-tax payers. The President could also do a lot for labor in bringing down prices of food, clothing, and so forth. Under his policy we are stripping this country of its meat, corn, wheat, fruits, clothing, equipment, and other supplies and shipping them to foreign countries either as gifts or on credits extended by our country, but which will never be repaid. With this money we are loaning to them they come into our country and our markets and compete with our own consumers and up goes the prices of almost everything we consume. Why does not the President show a little more concern in this regard for American workers?

THE RAILROAD LABOR ACT

This bill does not cover railroad workers, but the bill vetoed today in many respects follows the Railroad Adjustment Acts that were passed with the cooperation of the railroad workers of the Nation, and which acts have proved to be the finest and most satisfactory labor laws ever passed by the Congress. It was urged that the Hartley-Taft bill requires a cooling-off period where differences arising between labor and management in industries cause the stoppage of work which would endanger the public health and security of our Nation. This provision does not apply to the health and security of a community, but to the public health and security of the Nation as a whole. If either management or labor plans to have a shut-down of an industry when such action will impair the national health and national security, what reasonable man would not be in favor of a cooling-off period and give the parties ample opportunity to try to adjust their differences themselves with the aid of the mediation and conciliation services of the Government which is set up as an independent agency by this bill? It seems that such action would be in the interest not only of management but of labor as well, and in the interest of the health and security of our country. It is a very serious matter in peace or war for one of our great

Nation-wide industries to close down abruptly. It of course means a great loss and hardship not only to the particular hundreds of thousands or millions of laborers involved, but it is a real threat to the security of this country and the health of the people of the Nation as a whole; but this bill expressly provides that any worker can quit his work at any time; and it also expressly provides that no man may be compelled to work against his will; and this, of course, is not a slave bill and it violates no law of this country against slavery or forced labor. When a railroad or other industry or utility closes down, that threatens the health or security of the Nation as a whole; that not only stops that particular industry, but it closes down thousands of factories, shops, and mills and perhaps will throw several million people out of work who were in no way responsible for the shutdown of this particular industry; and, of course, it will affect the hospitals, the schools, the churches, the homes, and the activity of millions of Americans, and threaten their health and security.

This bill eliminates the so-called closed shop. The railroad adjustment acts that have worked so well do the very same thing. It has been in the law since the Railroad Adjustment Act was first passed more than 25 years ago. In fact, those acts expressly forbid the closed shop and the railroad workers, as a general rule throughout the Nation, have themselves opposed the so-called closed shop and the railroad workers have never asked for or been granted the check-off system. Membership in the railroad brotherhoods is entirely voluntary. I have talked with many of them and they claim that they try to run their organizations and make them so attractive that railroad workers will want to belong to them and receive the benefits provided by law. Many polls within the last year or two of the American people and also of organized labor have expressed opposition to the closed shop. In fact only 8 percent of the American people favor closed shops, and a majority of the union workers have expressed themselves against the closed shop.

This bill provides for a union shop and the right to bargain collectively through bargaining agents chosen by the workers themselves. It provides that if 51 percent of the workers in any shop or plant or industry express a desire to form a union shop they have the authority and right under this bill to form such a union shop and select their collective bargaining agent.

THE GOVERNMENT BY INJUNCTION

It has been urged that this bill authorizes the issue of an injunction in any and all cases. This is not true. The use of the injunction, in my opinion, is more limited than it is under the present law. It does permit the Federal Government to issue an injunction in cases where there is or about to be a stoppage of work in an industry which threatens the public health and security of the Nation. It must be in a Nation-wide dispute and it must be clearly shown to the court that the public health and security of the Nation are threatened. This injunctive proceeding is a matter of temporary relief. The purpose of it is to hold matters in abeyance until the differences may be adjusted by collective bargaining, and if this fails, to try to reach a settlement through independent conciliation and mediation boards that are provided for in this bill, and this injunctive process cannot be held for more than 80 days. This does not prevent, however, any worker from quitting his job at any time he may desire.

Where the disputes or differences arise in plants or industry that do not affect the public health or security, every opportunity and right is given to labor and management to adjust their own differences and, of course, in such cases some stoppages of work may be extended over a considerable period of time. It is the hope of the Congress that labor and management will, more in the future than in the past, respect the rights and the self-interest of their joint undertakings. Labor and management has always reminded me of a good team of horses. Where they pull together, the equipment is preserved and the load is moved. Where one horse starts to pull while the other balks, the equipment and harness are generally broken and torn and the load is not moved. Labor needs the jobs and the pay. Management cannot get along without labor. Great prosperity and unusual benefits are the rewards of management and labor when they pull together. Loss, misery, and unhappiness are the fruits of discord.

GOOD WILL AND ILL WILL

The Congress here has done its very best to pass a law that will do the job for men of good will, both of labor and management. It will improve present conditions if labor and management are of good will. No law on labor and management relations can be passed by Congress that will work successfully if those engaged in each group are men of ill will. Each group must bear in mind all the time that one cannot get along without the other and that their failure to make the most of their opportunities and get along result in loss to themselves and great loss to their neighbors and to their fellow Americans. Many of the important labor leaders of the country for some years have expressed great concern about the so-called jurisdictional strikes and sympathy strikes but these labor leaders have expressed the opinion generally that they have worked hard to cut out jurisdictional and sympathy strikes and that they will continue to do so, but they seem to be unable to carry out this purpose. President Truman has expressed disapproval of jurisdictional and sympathy strikes. A study of the facts show some interesting and almost unbelievable situations arising daily in this country by reason of jurisdictional and sympathy strikes. These disputes and strikes often occur in one or more of our large labor unions, one branch of the union striking against another branch of the same union, and sometimes the members of one great union strike against the action of another union. For instance, there has come to our attention that building equipment manufactured in a union shop where management and labor were getting along happily had been sent to some city to be installed in buildings and homes. These buildings were being constructed by union men belonging to another union and they refused to install this equipment and finish constructing the job because the equipment was manufactured by union men of a different union. It is surprising how many instances there are of this kind.

Now, there are the contractors and owners of this construction who must lie idly by because of this unusual and unfair, and I might say un-American, situation. Again some differences may arise in a union shop between management and labor, and the workers strike. While that strike is in progress the union men in some other part of the country belonging to a different union go on a so-called sympathy strike. The men in the latter shop have a good union contract and are getting along without any trouble with management. These two types of strikes are outlawed and if this law is followed and is properly administered, many strikes will be eliminated.

CONTRACT RESPONSIBILITY

For a number of years high, responsible labor leaders have stated over and over that they believe in the observance of contracts by both parties. One of the purposes of organizing and collective bargaining is to make a contract by management and the workers. This bill provides that management and labor each shall fairly and honestly live up to the terms of their contract and if either party breaks the contract and the other suffers loss or damage thereby, the party who is at fault must respond in fair and just damages. If the parties do not intend to live up to their contract, why should they take the time, trouble, and incur expense of making a contract? Ever since I have been old enough to know anything I have always believed that each party should keep his or her contract if it is reasonably possible to do so. It seems to me that this is simply old-fashioned honesty and square dealing. Of course, times are flush now and employment is plentiful but the time may soon come when conditions change and management may find it convenient to close down their plant and break their 1-year or 2-year collective-bargaining contract with their workers and shut down the plant and throw the workers out of employment. Would not the workers then be very glad to have a provision in the law that would protect them from any such conduct on the part of management?

FORBIDS VIOLENCE BY EITHER PARTY

This bill would protect the workers against unfair treatment and violence on the part of management and at the same time it would prohibit violence and the unlawful destruction of property on the part of workers. That is now the law, and it has always been the law in this country and, in this connection, this bill

is opposed to the so-called mass picketing. It preserves the right of the workers to engage in peaceful picketing. The courts of this country have denounced mass-picketing and violence. There have been cases in this country where literally thousands of persons have picketed a plant and engaged in violence. In my honest opinion, labor nor management never did help its cause by engaging in lawlessness, violence, and the destruction of the property of others, and under this bill and the law the company cannot mistreat, browbeat and engage in volence and lawlessness against the workers.

This measure undertakes to provide fair treatment and protection for both labor and management in all of their relations to eath other. The workers are allowed a union shop provided a majority of the workers vote for it. The polls show a majority of the union workers favor the union shop, but not the closed shop. Industry-wide bargaining is authorized. It is necessary in many of our Nation-wide industries. Welfare funds are allowed if jointly controlled by labor and management. This does not prohibit welfare funds heretofore created by collective bargaining. Union workers under this bill have greater rights and greater protection in their unions than they have under the present law. Supervisors, those who have the right to hire and fire and direct workers, are permitted to form and join unions, but they are not covered by the Wagner Act. The workers have the right to a secret vote as to whether they will accept the last offer by their employer. These elections are generally conducted by the Director of Mediation and Conciliation. The union cannot have so-called subversive union officers. It is found that Communists and other subversive groups have wormed their way into Government offices, the churches, labor unions, and other American organizations. This would mean the Congress is trying to aid the unions in ridding themselves of Communists.

FORBIDS EXPENDITURE OF STOCKHOLDER OR UNION FUNDS

This bill makes it unlawful for the officers of any corporation or business association to expend the funds of such corporation or association for political purposes for the election of a President, Vice President, Senator, or Representative. These funds belong to the stockholders, and the officers have been forbidden by law for years from using the stockholders' funds in an election for these Federal officers. This bill applies that same law to the officers of a labor union. They cannot use the funds of a labor union to aid in the election of Federal officers—President, Vice President, Senator, and Representative. These funds belong to the members of the union. The Congress is of the opinion that it is unfair to the members to use their funds to elect Federal officeholders. It was generally the case of some of the officers of the corporations or business associations belong to different political groups and not interested in the same man or party and, therefore, the law says that the officers cannot use the funds of these stockholders as it is in many cases to help elect men to office who are opposed by the stockholders or some of them. In almost every instance part of the members of the union favor one particular candidate or party while the other members are opposed to such candidate or party, and the question arises—Is is fair for some two or three officers of that union to use the funds to help elect their particular candidate or candidates and use the money against the candidate or party of the other members? The President urged that this provision is unfair to both labor and management and that we have no right to pass such a law. The laws as to corporations and associations have been on the books for many years. This will not prevent the publishers of labor papers and editors of such papers from expressing themselves freely whether they are a journal of business or labor. All of the lodges that I know anything about forbid the use of the funds of the lodge to aid any candidate or party. There again the funds belong to the members of the lodge and there is usually a division as to their political affiliations.

I might say that during all of my years of service I have never called on any business concern or labor organization to put any money into my campaign, and so far as I know they have never done so. They have at times spoken complimentary of me and my record in their journals, and I think they have under this bill the right to do whatever they have done for me heretofore.

This, of course, does not limit in any way any officer or stock-holder or any officer or member of a labor union from making such contributions out of his or her funds as is now provided by law to the candidate or party of his or her choice. The limitations of expenditures of the funds of corporations and others should have but one purpose and that is to make our elections as fair and clean as possible. I never heard one of our labor friends complain because the law forbids officers of corporations and business associations from making contributions to candidates or parties. All of us have agreed that has always been a good law as the great corporations could outspend the labor groups or individuals.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a survey by Kentucky veterans. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $568, but I ask that it be printed, notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in Foreign Commerce Weekly.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD regarding a bill he is introducing today.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in a New York newspaper.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Eric Johnston before the Young Men's Republican Club at Milwaukee and an editorial.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

WHITE HOUSE COOPERATION NEEDED

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much during the past 6 or 7 months about cooperation, and working together harmoniously. I fail to see where we are getting any cooperation whatsoever from the White House. It seems strange to me when the House of Representatives by a vote of 331 to 83 voted to override a Presidential veto, as it did this afternoon, that such a great majority would be wrong and the Chief Executive and 83 Members right. The Chief Executive seems to think he is the only one who is right. His promise to cooperate with the Republican House and the Republican Senate has gone out the window, and the only way the American people may hope for cooperation is to put somebody in the White House who will cooperate with the majority of the Members of the House and Senate of the United States.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Truman foreign policy and include an editorial on the same subject.

Mr. ROBSION asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD following the action on the veto and include some extraneous matter.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include certain excerpts in each.

THE LABOR BILL

Mr. ROBSION. 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 Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, we heard the message of the President urging us to kill the labor bill, and the House on a record vote here has voted 331 to override the President's veto and

83 in support of his veto. Only 73 Democrats voted to sustain the veto. I do not think we ought to be too hard on President Truman. He has had some hard problems, and his hardest problem is not in this labor bill, it is Henry Wallace. The vetoes on the tax bill and on this labor bill in my honest judgment are an effort to stop Henry Wallace. Former Vice President Wallace has been speaking to great audiences throughout the country, ranging from 5,000 to 30,000 people and the press reports that persons are paying from $1 to $3 to hear him speak. In these speeches, he vigorously criticized many of the Truman policies and has strongly indicated that he favors a third party. He spoke to a large audience here in Washington last Monday night and repeated his criticisms and stated more definitely his position on a third party.

Mr. Wallace's activity has caused Democratic leaders here and over the Nation to get busy and they have been urging the President to veto the tax-relief bill and the labor-management relations bill, and the President has now vetoed both bills. The tax bill failed by three votes to get a two-thirds majority, and 35 Democrats voted to override the veto on the tax bill and there will be no tax relief for the fifty million income taxpayers of America this year. The President's veto message on the labor-management bill disregarded the records and the facts and expressed opinions and stated conclusions that are certainly not supported by the record or the facts. I am strongly of the opinion, and I have heard many others express the same view, that he would not have vetoed either bill or submitted such an unfair and misleading veto message if he and many of his leaders were not deeply concerned over Mr. Wallace and his third party. Was he trying to take away the thunder and the supporters of Mr. Wallace? Only 73 Democrats were willing to follow and support the veto of the President. This bill could not have been passed over the President's veto by a 4-to-1 margin if it was not just and fair and supported by the record and the facts.

SHIPMENT OF OIL TO RUSSIA

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, news reports show that the loading of Russian tankers at San Pedro, Calif., is proceeding. The capacities of the 10 tankers which will carry our oil to the Russian naval base in Siberia indicate that the total amount of products will be in excess of one-half million barrels. Does this remind you of the days when oil and steel moved in great quantity to Japan?

Certain of the administration officials say our oil supply situation here is in precarious balance with demand, and that the utmost in good management is necessary to make the proper distribution of supplies. With one hand, we send money abroad to prevent the extension of communism and with the other, we provide the mother country of communism with our goods.

There is a law on the books providing for controls of exports. The control on oil shipments was removed months ago by the controllers. They were given authority to apply controls, or take them off as they pleased. I understand, it is an exercise of administrative will that oil is being permitted to go to Russia.

The administration is asking for a renewal of the authority. What better proof can be supplied of the dangers of unchecked discretion than the failure to apply the controls to diversion of our oil supply to Russia.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] has just made a disturbing observation relative to shipments of great quantities of oil to Russia, just revealed by the press. As chairman of Subcommittee No. 3 of the Armed Services Committee, I rise at this time to assure the gentleman and all other Members that I intend to stop these shipments if it is humanly possible. I have already summoned officials of the Office of International Trade to appear before my subcommittee tomorrow morning to explain why such shipments of oil to Russia are being permitted in the face of an apparent shortage of oil in America.

Mr. Speaker, we have an Export Control Act which is intended to protect the American people against the shipping abroad of items in short supply in this country. The Office of International Trade is now seeking an extension of that act, which expires June 30. My committee has held hearings on a bill to extend the act and has reported it favorably. I appeared before the Rules Committee 2 days ago to bring it before the House.

During the hearings tomorrow I intend to ascertain why the Congress should continue the Export Control Act if the Office of International Trade does not do what the act intends. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, a report of my findings next Monday. And let me add, unless these shipments of oil to Russia are stopped, I shall withdraw my support of any effort to continue export controls.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN—THE TAX BILL AND THE LABOR BILL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] I desire to say that he is far wide of the mark when he accuses President Truman of not cooperating with Congress, merely because he exercised his official prerogative in vetoing the so-called labor bill.

I voted to override the veto, because I think the people of the entire country, including organized labor, will be better off if the measure becomes a law.

But that does not mean I would accuse the President of refusing to cooperate with Congress merely because he did not agree with me on this particular measure.

Harry Truman is one of the most conscientious men who ever occupied the White House, and I am sure he was sincere in the stand he took on this bill, even though I disagreed with him.

I voted to sustain him on the tax bill, for the simple reason that it took too much tax off the big taxpayers and not enough off the little ones.

But for the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] to say that Henry Wallace intimidated or frightened President Truman into vetoing these two bills is just about as ridiculous as it would be to accuse a jack rabbit of chasing a bulldog out of the field, or a lightning bug of dimming the rays of the noonday sun.

In addition to being one of the most conscientious men I have ever known, Harry Truman has as much courage as any man who has ever occupied the Presidency—at least during your lifetime and mine.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. W. F. NORRELL at the fifty-sixth commencement exercises of the College of the Ozarks on May 25, 1947.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a very interesting article.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Alexander Printz on Management Speaks to Labor.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in four instances and to include certain extraneous matter.

THE HOUSING BILL

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inform the Members of the House that I have today placed on the Clerk's desk a petition to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of a resolution providing for the consideration of the long-range housing bill which has been introduced in the House of Representatives by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and in the other body by Messrs. TAFT, ELLENDER, and WAGNER.

Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly apparent that we are not going to have hearings on this bill. I do not mean at this moment to discuss the need for housing in the country. I think most of the Members are aware of the need for housing.

This bill will give Members an opportunity to show where they stand on this matter which is of the most vital importance to the people of America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

RELIGIOUS SITUATION IN EUROPE

Mr. COX. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Patterson, in arranging for a group of clergymen to tour Europe at Government expense and to report back on the religious situation in that part of the world, is playing into the hands of those who want to further appease Russia.

The Secretary has permitted the notoriously Red Bishop Oxnard, of the Federal Council of the Churches of America, to load down the mission with pro-Russians. While there are some good men in the group, the Oxnard crowd predominates, and it is a foregone conclusion that it will be a divided report that the group will make, which will provoke widespread controversy and do more harm than good.

I should like to know by what authority does Secretary Patterson authorize and arrange for this mischievous business? Is he taking over the functions of the Department of State, or is this a military mission? The trip should be canceled.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KERR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Evening Star of June 14, 1947, by J. G. Hayden.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FALLON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and a resolution.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of an editorial.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Senator WAGNER and a news article from the Syracuse Herald-Journal of May 22, 1947.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address recently made by Alexander Powell.

FOREIGN LIQUIDATION COMMISSION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, permit me to call the attention of the House to a very flagrant act on the part of the Foreign Liquidation Commission. One of my constituents complained of the treatment he had received after the transaction had occurred.

It was brought to my attention yesterday that bids had been heretofore requested looking toward the sale of part of the Canol property in Canada. One bid had been received, and the dead line for the effectiveness of the bid, as stated by the bidder, was 4 p. m. yesterday. My constituent, the second bidder, delivered his bid to the office of the Foreign Liquidation Commission about 3 p. m. yesterday. The bid was received and was in good order. Just a few minutes before 4 o'clock one of the bidders, while in one of the offices of the Foreign Liquidation Commission, received information by eavesdropping that his bid was $25,000 low. He immediately changed his bid and bid $1 more than the other bidder. Then this bid was accepted by the Foreign Liquidation Commission after 4 p. m.

The irregularities were called to the attention of Maj. Gen. Donald Connolly, Commissioner, and members of his staff of the Foreign Liquidation Commission who participated in the negotiations. They then threw out all bids, thus giving an opportunity to the eavesdropper to profit by his own unsavory conduct.

General Connolly and his staff took an uninterested attitude, and condoned the unfairness of the whole transaction by receiving the first bidder's changed bid after 4 p. m. had passed. I am wondering how many similar transactions have occurred like this where ordinary decency, fair play, and common honesty were ignored. I am also wondering whether this deal was cut and dried for the first bidder to get the award promptly at 4 p. m. This and other matters should be carefully investigated.

General Connolly's attitude is clearly in disregard of good business practices and fairness. No wonder the people are up in arms and are losing confidence in some of the Federal agencies. The general should resign his office immediately. And surely the Army should not take him back in good standing because his conduct has reflected upon his uniform and the two stars he wears. I have asked that an investigation be made of this transaction and of other transactions of the Foreign Liquidation Commission. The whole affair smells to high heaven.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, when the so-called Hartley bill, which was the original bill submitted to the House, was under consideration, I urged with all the sincerity at my command that it be rejected. At that time I informed the House that the bill was an ill-advised, poorly drafted, complex collection of thoroughly confusing policy considerations and unworkable administrative techniques. My opposition to the bill primarily was based on the fact that it would create rather than diminish industrial unrest and would ultimately lead to class warfare in our Nation.

Members of the House who have followed closely the press and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since that date are well aware that my position respecting the so-called Hartley bill found very substantial support in the editorial pages of the press of the Nation and, almost unanimous endorsement by students of industrial relations and the trade-labor movement. That bill was characterized with surprising unanimity as a harsh and a repressive measure that would lead to rather than avoid discord.

After the Senate enacted the so-called Taft bill, editorial comment, students of the subject of labor relations, even industrialists, members of the bar, and almost every informed group and association that commented characterized the Taft bill as a milder bill than the repressive Hartley bill. Comment was varied. Some had hopes; others fears. But at least it did not receive the condemnation that greeted the House bill.

After action by the Senate and the House, conferees of both chambers met and reached agreement on the so-called Taft-Hartley bill.

At the time this measure was before the House time did not permit me to call attention to the manner in which the so-called Taft bill had been made far more drastic and, indeed, very nearly as restrictive as the original Hartley bill.

Since passage by both Chambers of the conference bill, predictions that such a measure would result in industrial unrest and would be resented both by management and labor have been proved true. Witness the release of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, which is made up of all the Catholic bishops of the United States, who, as everyone knows, have neither political motives nor special interests to serve. Theirs is an unbiased, scholarly, high-minded and ethical approach to the most dynamic, domestic issue of our times. Their interest is directed not toward any one segment of society, but their concern is the welfare and well-being of all the peoples at all times. Their statement, which appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A2833, reflect my own views in a striking manner.

When the conference bill was last before the House, I was not permitted sufficient time to elaborate on my position and necessarily in the time permitted unhappily could only make limited observations to characterize the bill.

Although thereafter I reduced my position to writing with the intent of placing it in the RECORD, the statement by the National Catholic Welfare Conference so

accurately reflects my feelings and expresses them so pointedly that I can do nothing better than to adopt them as my own.

The President's message has said all that needs further to be said about the bill. If each of you will pause and reflect, if each of you will search your own hearts and minds, if each of you will weigh the serious implications of his message and its meaning to our domestic situation, our international situation, and the future of this great country, I think that you will conclude that today is not the time for hasty, ill-considered action on this subject and will take this opportunity to make haste slowly for the future generations to whom we owe so much. The Nation was blessed in its recent hour of crisis when labor and industry as a team, working in cooperation, accomplished miracles in the defense of democratic principles. Should the supreme misfortune of another such crisis confront this Nation, and God willing that it does not, our hope and our strength will be found in the hearts of our citizens and what we receive at that moment will be in direct proportion to the love and inspiration we find because of their feeling toward democracy. God willing, labor will still believe that it has a stake in America. Whether we inspire that feeling and belief is our choice today.

This is not to mean that labor has done no wrong, or is above reproach. There is a wide area in which corrective action is necessary—either by the house of labor itself or, if needs be, by the Congress. For many years I have informed the leaders of labor in America that the public will not long tolerate some of its practices, in particular the unnecessary boycotts and jurisdictional disputes; that so long as such conduct remains uncorrected by labor itself it will be the responsibility of Congress to take action in the interest of the public. But this measure goes too far—it strikes at the heart of collective bargaining. We cannot correct one wrong by committing another. We cannot remove the causes of industrial unrest by restricting the processes and agencies necessary to the adjustment of differences. If this measure corrected abuses only, I would support it. But I cannot, in the interest of correcting admitted abuses, join in further hampering the processes of collective bargaining.

I stand ready to support at any time any measure which will preserve collective bargaining and labor's rights but which will reach the abuses the President has so eloquently called to our attention. In the interest of America, it would be unwise to go further.

I consider the message of the President today one of the most constructive, courageous, and informative messages I have ever heard delivered to the Congress. I regret that his veto was not sustained. I hope the Senate will sustain his veto, and I predict that history will record that the best interests of America were served by the sound, courageous position taken by President Truman in vetoing H. R. 3020.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, President Truman, in his message vetoing H. R. 3020, known as the Taft-Hartley labor bill, delivered one of the most courageous and statesmanlike documents the Congress has received in a long time. Every American should read and study the President's veto message of this legislation.

Since the open hearings started on labor legislation in the Committee on Education and Labor February 5, volumes of propaganda has been sent over the country by newspapers and radio in an effort to prejudice the minds of the American people against labor unions generally. The strategy of this campaign was to drive a wedge between the labor union membership and its leadership. The facts and the true analysis of the final legislation which was passed by the Senate and House conferees has never been fully analyzed by the American public. If this legislation is enacted into law, it will not only set back labor's progress a quarter of a century, but it will promote industrial confusion and chaos in the heavy industries throughout the country.

President Truman, in his message, has clearly set out a number of provisions in this bill which will involve management and employees in highly complicated legal entanglements. One of the numerous involvements restrict even nonlabor newspapers from recommending or participating in political campaigns. It is unfortunate that the conference report was brought in before the House 2 weeks ago and the membership was compelled to vote on the seventy-odd pages without any opportunity of studying its contents. Had the message which President Truman sent to Congress vetoing H. R. 3020 been delivered to the American people over a month ago, so as to acquaint the public with the facts, I believe this legislation could not have passed the House in its present form.

Several years ago the so-called Smith-Connally bill was passed in Congress under the same conditions of speed, propaganda, and public frenzy, but today even its congressional sponsors admit that that legislation was a mistake and contributed nothing to management-labor relations.

President Truman's message is a factual masterpiece and when the American people have digested the facts of this legislation, the repercussions against the Taft-Hartley bill will be astounding. My only fear is that if it becomes a law, industrial production will have to suffer a period of chaos, confusion and strife until this legislation is drastically amended or repealed. America cannot afford to go through this period during these critical times.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that no time was allowed to speak on the President's veto immediately after it was delivered, so I rise at this time in support of the President's veto of the pending Taft-Hartley bill.

On page 6383 of the RECORD dated June 4, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY], the sponsor of this legislation, stated on the floor when he brought in the conference report:

> I call your attention to what is left in this bill, because I think you are going to find there is more in this bill than may meet the eye and may have been heretofore presented to you.

No truer words were ever spoken as anyone who has taken time to try and study this bill and conference report will know, because, in my opinion, should this bill become a law, it will be years before it will be clearly defined so that both labor and management will be able to understand it.

While there are some good and needed provisions in the Taft-Hartley bill, I have felt all along that the bill itself should have been divided into three sections: One to consider changes in the Wagner Act, and the other two dealing with the Conciliation Service and the emergency handling of utilities strikes affecting the national interest. Only by this means do I think any Member of Congress would have had a chance to understand the type of legislation voted on. As a matter of fact there was no attempt made in the House to divide the bill into sections so that we could achieve needed labor reforms this year. Furthermore, when the attempt was made in the Senate to consider the present labor bill in three sections, it was voted down by an overwhelming majority in that body. To me this indicated that the Congress was not interested so much in trying to enact legislation which would remedy the inequalities between labor and management but was in fact determined to pass an omnibus measure in which both good and bad legislation would be considered together and thereby create a situation which would bring no good to labor or management but in the long run would be detrimental to both.

Although there are some parts of the conference report having to do with needed reforms, which I approve, I cannot see my way clear to support this measure, because I feel strongly that the Taft-Hartley labor bill is unfair to organized labor and that the measure itself is a device for making unions so weak that they cannot carry out effective collective bargaining. The bill does not result in equalizing the rights of labor and management as it should, but under this measure management is given such an advantage over labor that it can prevent effective collective bargaining by unions.

The conference report was brought before the House and it was impossible for any Member to thoroughly analyze the 75 pages contained in it in the time allotted

to us. However, on the basis of my study—and I have gone through the report and the bill—I am completely convinced that it is an impractical and unadministrable law.

Virtually every amendment which has been made threatens the legitimate rights of the American workman, and the net effect is to discourage and stifle collective bargaining and to impede, if not make impossible, effective enforcement of the National Labor Relations Act.

Under the conference report every organizational drive by unions, every effort to achieve collective bargaining, and every strike could be met and defeated by destructive lawsuits in the courts.

In my opinion, any legislation that invites and encourages litigation over labor relations is not going to solve the problems of labor's unrest nor is it going to bring about harmonious relations between employees and employers.

Furthermore, although the contention made is that the Norris-LaGuardia Act is amended to bring about more favorable labor-management practices in effect and through indirection, the Norris-LaGuardia Act is set aside.

The measure passed by the House will be the cause of a series of United States Supreme Court decisions to interpret and iron out the ambiguities which run rampant throughout the entire measure. It will open wide the doors to employers to bring a multiplicity of suits which will empty the unions' treasuries because of the costs of litigations, and, in my further opinion, the act itself will be administratively unworkable.

Under this measure tremendous power has been given to the general counsel of the Board to administer this act and with such authority over the handling of labor-relations cases to such an extent that I do not think one man can handle the job nor do I think any one man should be entrusted with such a job.

The bill itself is unfair to labor. It is destructive of legitimate labor rights. In my opinion it will cause more labor strife and chaos and the net result will be, I repeat, not only injury to the American workman but in the long run injury to the American employer as well.

In addition to what I have already said, it forbids or removes collective bargaining on such vital issues as the closed shop, the union shop, the check-off system, health and welfare funds and it allows injunctions in a variety of situations.

It requires unions as a condition of seeking legal redress, to file reports so detailed and burdensome as to paralyze effective action. It makes it illegal for unions to expel from membership a labor spy or one who has stolen union funds or who has led wildcat strikes; it eliminates the power of unions to remain internally strong and united.

New provisions were put into the conference report which we were not allowed to debate even though points of order were raised against them. The Conciliation Service, despite its fine record, was removed from the Department of Labor. It leaves to the authorities in a State the question whether a Federal law shall be in effect in that State. It thus makes possible that any State legislature may nullify an act of Congress by passing a law of a different effect. This is something entirely new and radical and, in my opinion, extremely ill-advised.

It forbids labor papers, supported by dues-paying union members to print anyone's voting record. This is a denial of freedom of the press and of free speech.

The way to industrial peace lies partly through collective bargaining on a plane of equality and partnership between labor and management and partly in a Government policy which will eliminate the cause of industrial conflict. Only a domestic program based on a good wage policy, the lowering of the cost of living coupled with full production and full employment can give America industrial peace. This Congress has not done anything to meet its real responsibilities in many fields affecting the ordinary workingman, and the result is that the minimum wage remains at 40 cents an hour; the low-cost housing bills remain in committee; and the Labor Department has been starved for appropriations, with the result that child labor is on the increase, and the NLRB has a backlog of more than 5,000 cases.

No one really knows what this bill contains and no one, including the authors of this measure, have any idea of its full implications as has been aptly stated. If this bill is passed over the President's veto, it will give the lawyers of the country a field day, because practically every section of this act will have to be taken to the courts for final judgment. I am deeply sorry that the Congress has not seen fit to produce a bill which I could have consistently and conscientiously supported. I personally recognize the mistakes of labor as I recognize the mistakes of business too, but I do not see this bill as being any solution to the problem that it seeks to remedy. I shall, therefore, vote to uphold the President's veto.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Washington Post by George Gallup, showing how the American people approved the action on the vote taken to defeat the tax bill.

VOTE TO OVERRIDE THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE LABOR BILL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but extend to the Republican Members my deep-felt sympathy, because I know that most of them voted to pass the labor bill over the President's veto against their desire and against their best judgment, but being driven by that strong, powerful machine——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that those words be taken down. He is accusing the Republicans of voting because of the orders of some machine.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman withdraw the words?

Mr. SABATH. Which? The word "strong" or the word "machine"? I will just change it to "organization."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I ask that the words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed in order.

Mr. SABATH. The strong organization that the Republican Party has; and, of course, I myself believe in an organization, but I believe in an organization that works in the interest of the people of the country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLACKNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the State Journal, of Lansing, Mich.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article from the current issue of Newsweek.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the United Farmer.

Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Chicago Daily News.

PERMISSION TO FILE MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file minority views on the bill H. R. 1639, the Employers Liability Act.

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

There was no objection.

SOPHISTRY OF THE VETO MESSAGE ON THE LABOR BILL

Mr. MASON. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, after very careful consideration of the veto message I have come to the conclusion that it contains more sophistry and more misrepresentation than any message I have listened to from the White House in the 10 years I have been here. I say and I think I can say it without successful contradiction that President Truman in this veto message out-Roosevelted Roosevelt in every sense of the word.

ILL-ADVISED SHIPMENTS OF OIL AND GAS TO RUSSIA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, this business of shipping oil to Russia is a matter that should be given more than passing consideration from this Congress. When we consider that the Treasury Procurement Division reports that Russia today has a reserve of oil and gas ready for use of 150,000,000 barrels and that the United States ranks fourth among the nations of the world in oil reserves ready for use, having only 50,000,000 barrels, meaning that Russia has three times more than us, I think we should pause and consider whether we should continue shipping oil and gas to Russia at the rate of a million barrels per month.

Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad. I am wondering if we are not mad already in shipping 1,000,000 barrels of oil and gas to Russia when they already have a reserve of 150,000,000 barrels and we rank fourth among the nations of the world with only 50,000,000 barrels.

There is something rotten-smelling in Washington and we ought to do something about it. There are plans being formulated to reinstitute gas rationing in our Nation. Think of it—rationing gas to American citizens and shipping 1,000,000 barrels per month to Russia.

RESERVES

According to Treasury Department reports Russia today has a reserve of processed ready to use fuel oil and gasoline of 150,000,000 barrels. Of all the nations of the world in reserve oil and gas ready to use the United States is fourth with 50,000,000 barrels. I repeat Russia is first with 150,000,000 barrels. In case of war today to fly planes, and run ships and tanks Russia has a reserve of 150,000,000 barrels and we the United States have only 50,000,000 barrels, yet we are shipping oil and gas to Russia.

RUSSIA'S DEMANDS TODAY AS COMPARED TO PREVIOUS

Incidentally Russia is requesting from us today more oil and gas than she requested during the war.

The heads of our military in a communication to the committees in Congress has warned that the supply of oil and gas in the United States is only enough for normal military peacetime operations. In fact many normal operations have been cut out because of the small supply of oil and gas in America. The tragedy is that if war broke out today our military could not meet the emergency. This communication brought out the shortage in America will be critical until we get oil in abundance from Persia.

Government officials in Washington are warning that in the next 30 days it may be necessary to ration gasoline in the United States of America. At the same time a week ago in a Los Angeles harbor a Russian tanker sailed with 50,000 barrels of gasoline and oil. A few days ago two more Russian tankers were loaded with an equal amount. Ten more Russian tankers are waiting to be loaded with equal amounts in next 30 days. Almost 1,000,000 barrels in 30 days.

THE SHIPMENT OF OIL AND GAS TO RUSSIA

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include two clippings from the Chicago Journal of Commerce of June 17.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, supplementing what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] just said, I wish to call the attention of the House to the newspaper I have here. Under date of June 17, just a day or so ago, the Chicago Journal of Commerce reported three Russian ships loading in California harbors, with oil and gas for Vladivostok. Here is what the article says:

CALIFORNIA PORT LOADS RECORD OIL SHIPMENT TO RUSSIA

SAN PEDRO, CALIF., June 16.—Loading of what the Marine Exchange described as the largest shipment of petroleum supplies to Russia ever made from this port proceeded today.

The 50,000-barrel Soviet tanker *Elbrus* was loading with gasoline and oil. Two more 50,000-barrel tankers, the *Emba* and the *Krasnaia Armia*, arrived and were prepared to load. The 65,000-barrel *Taganrog* is due Thursday.

Two more Soviet ships, the *Maikop* and the *Belgorod*, have undergone repairs and are making ready to sail, and the exchange said eight other Soviet tankers were due in June.

Purchases were being handled through the Amtorg Trading Co. and consignments were to Vladivostok.

In the same paper there is an editorial entitled "Oil—Why a One-Way Iron Curtain?" It reads as follows:

OIL—WHY A ONE-WAY IRON CURTAIN?

(By Keith Fanshier)

A dispatch from an important west coast port tells of current record-breaking shipments from that point of petroleum products, consigned to the Soviet Russian port city of Vladivostok.

Considering the growing threat of petroleum shortage in the United States, large-scale exports of petroleum bound for destination in the Communist land itself have a strange aspect indeed.

So also the recent movement of pipe to Russia while the needs of American operators for that very pipe are contributing to the present supply stringency of the petroleum industry.

In Washington today high Government officials are taking time from their routine duties to study the short oil supply and its implications. Members of the industry too are deeply concerned with the same situation. Many key men have been appointed to groups named to study the threatening situation, as one phase of which the Government reports itself unable to obtain the petroleum needs of its military services.

Yet apparently not only materials and equipment needed by the petroleum industry, but also the very oil products themselves can move by the hundreds of thousands of barrels right through the iron curtain.

This would seem to be the very thing which the chairman of the National Petroleum Council recently protested as watering the roots of communism.

The White House professes itself to be outraged by recent developments on the continent of Europe which clearly are Communist-inspired and by which Red domination of nearby nations is intensified. This Government is supposed to be casting about for means to express its position.

Why would not a way to do this be to regard the iron curtain as a two-way rather than a one-way institution, and treat it as such?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. It should be brought out that there are rumors it may be necessary to impose gasoline rationing in the United States of America in the next 30 days.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Is it not true that the President has the power at the present time to control these exports?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Yes; that is my understanding. I think the gentleman's point is well taken.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO MESSAGE

Mr. MACKINNON. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, the President's veto message states that "labor-management cooperation is constantly improving."

Nothing is further from the truth according to the statistics published by the United States Department of Labor. They are as follows:

Year:	*Man-days idle through work stoppage*
1927	26,219,000
1928	12,632,000
1929	5,352,000
1930	3,317,000
1931	6,893,000
1932	10,502,000
1933	16,872,000
1934	19,592,000
1935	15,456,000
1936	13,902,000
1937	28,425,000
1938	9,148,000
1939	17,812,000
1940	6,701,000
1941	23,048,000
1942	4,183,000
1943	13,501,000
1944	8,721,000
1945	38,025,000
1946	116,000,000

Certainly an existence of more than three times as many strikes as ever before existed in the history of this country is not evidence of "labor-management cooperation." It is, however, interesting to note the President's use of the word "cooperation" because it was also cooperation that the President promised to

give this Congress. It is apparent from the President's actions with respect to the labor bill and the tax bill, and his use of the word "cooperation" in his veto message on the labor bill that his definition of cooperation does not fit that of any standard dictionary of the English language.

Mr. Speaker, I have read the veto message and I have heard it read, and I have one observation to make. The President has in every instance in which he construes the bill resorted to a specious construction of its provisions, and in no instance has he resorted to a reasonable construction of the language of H. R. 3020. In the President's veto message there are many misstatements of the contents of the bill and no one can read the President's message on this subject, his veto message of the Case bill last year, and conclude that he favors any legislation to cure any of the substantial evils which are presently existing in the labor-management field. His lack of any consistency in dealing with this problem is apparent particularly in his comments in paragraph 6 of his present veto message with respect to major strikes that effect the public health or safety. He objects to this provision and yet the President was the man who proposed drafting striking railroad workers into the Army. For the life of me I cannot understand a person who makes such a proposal and still objects to a reasonable proposal to allow mediation in such matters of great national concern. One can reach no other conclusion from his actions expect that he is against any labor bill that is not exactly as he wishes it. If this is coooperation I cannot know the meaning of the word.

The veto message is a vicious attack against the labor bill. With respect to that feature of his message I point out that if the bill were as drastic as his veto message attempts to paint it, then why did it take him so long to make up his mind as to whether he should veto the bill or sign it.

Mr. Speaker, it was for the foregoing reasons that this House of Representatives was thoroughly justified in its action of overriding the President's veto by 331 to 83. I am informed that this is the most stunning rebuke that any President of the United States has ever received on a veto message in the entire history of our country. A clear majority of the Members of both parties voted to override. That was their answer to the pressure campaign in which labor organizations by their own admission spent millions of dollars. The House has this day by their action restored the faith of many in representative government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an Associated Press article from Durham, N. C., on the banning of two filthy screen films being shown by moving picture shows in that city.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by one of his constituents.

SHIPMENTS TO RUSSIA

Mr. BENDER. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, we have just learned from the gentleman from Wisconsin regarding the shipment of oil to Russia. Some time this afternoon we will again discuss the so-called Voice of America. They will tell us that the Voice of America will be used to fight communism.

Mr. Speaker, is is inconceivable that we should be shipping oil, locomotives, manufactured articles, and other equipment from this country to Russia, then spend $31,000,000 to tell the people of the world that we are out to fight communism. Mr. Speaker, I just cannot quite comprehend this.

ACTION OF THE HOUSE IN OVERRIDING PRESIDENT'S VETO

Mr. HOLIFIELD. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, with corporation profits the highest in the history of America, with inflationary prices and the cost of living the highest we have known in many, many years, with the housing and building program falling off due to unrestrained material prices, 16,000,000 organized workers in America and their families will look with fear today upon the action of this body. They can only await with prayers in their heart and hope that the action of the other body will be more favorable to their needs.

THE VOICE OF AMERICA

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I understand there is some delaying action going on at this time on the floor of the House against the Voice of America, to hamper the bringing up of this bill. Therefore I am going to get my 2 cents' worth in at this time by reading a letter I have just received from a manufacturer in my district who has returned recently from Germany:

> I find the Communist Party active and distributing their literature and posters without regard for expense. The people of Germany and Europe in general are pitifully unacquainted with the other side of the story. Although I am heartily in favor of economy, I deplore the possible cancellation of funds for the Voice of America, and any other similar agencies that are tending to neutralize Communist propaganda.

I believe, in view of this, it is a mistake to filibuster any longer on this bill.

Let us get on with the business of the day.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

AUTOMOBILES FOR AMPUTEES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an article by General Rusk appearing in the New York Times.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, General Rusk, who was a very famous flight surgeon during the war, a rehabilitation man, now the medical editor of the New York Times, wrote an article away back last December stating that in the last session the Congress passed a bill which gave automobiles to certain of the leg amputees. He now endorses very strongly the taking in of the amputees who were left out of that bill and certain paraplegic cases that were not included. He said it was discriminatory. I talked to General Rusk at the time the bill was introduced. He was not so enthusiastic about it then as a rehabilitation measure, but he told me last autumn it was a very fine piece of legislation for rehabilitation. It gives these men who are too disabled to get to and from work or to get to and from college and from on-the-job-training a chance to get there, a chance to learn and to become productive in business. It gives them a chance in the sun, and it will bring back money to the Government in taxes also. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that we should not economize when it comes to the disabled veterans. That is the last thing the people of the United States want. They insist that the disabled be cared for—and helped first of all—they demand action for disabled veterans.

The gentleman from New Jersey, Judge MATHEWS, made a masterly plea for his bill which includes veterans who were left out of the measure last year which was discriminatory. Last year's bill left out certain disabled veterans whose disabilities always have been classed together for rating purposes and for other benefits.

The article in the New York Times is as follows:

REHABILITATION ANOMALIES ARE NOTED IN THE LAW ON CARS FOR AMPUTEES—EARLY ADJUSTMENT IS HELD LIKELY AS THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS CONVENES

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

In ward 3D at the veterans' hospital in the Bronx, New York City, two severely disabled men occupy adjoining beds. Both are victims of spinal-cord injuries which have left them partially paralyzed. Both are classified as being totally disabled. Both draw maximum Government pensions. They differ, however, in degree of paralysis. The first is a paraplegic suffering from paralysis of both legs; the second is a quadruplegic with paralysis not only of the legs but of both arms and the trunk. Two weeks ago the paraplegic received a new specially equipped 1946 automobile from the Government. Ironically, the quadruplegic, even though his

disabilities are much more severe, is not entitled to receive a car.

The widely publicized "cars for amputees" bill which was passed by Congress last session denies a car to this second man because of his inability to pass an examination for a State driver's license. The act, Public Law 663, provides that veterans who have lost one or both legs, or the use of their legs, as a result of military service are entitled to a car at Government expense, but only if they hold a State driver's permit. This automatically excludes veterans paralyzed in the upper extremities.

ONE HUNDRED IN DIRE NEED FOR CARS

The number of men in military and veterans' hospitals who suffer paralysis of both upper and lower extremities is less than 100. Their need for cars, however, is even greater than the paraplegics and leg amputees who, with prosthesis and rehabilitation, can, in most cases, learn to walk. The man paralyzed in all extremities is unable to walk or use public conveyances. His chances for rehabilitation and recreation are contingent upon his traveling.

Amputees and paraplegics have many avenues open to them for employment, while men with paralyzed arms are unable to augment their Government pensions by earning money, except in rare cases. Thus, from a financial standpoint, they are in greater need. Without a car, they are completely home-bound. The fact that they themselves cannot drive should not mean they are to be imprisoned within the four walls of their homes. Members of their families and friends can drive for them. The important thing is that they are not permanently home-bound.

When the bill providing cars for amputees was pending in Congress last July, this column warned that the bill, as framed, would create inequalities, for its provisions were restrictive and did not establish need as the basis for its benefits.

BRADLEY CONCURS IN VIEW

This same vein was taken by General Bradley, Veterans' Administrator, and the major veterans' organizations. Those inequalities are shown by the paradoxical situation in which the most seriously disabled veterans are denied cars at Government expense while they are given to those with lesser disabilities.

Many veterans who suffered double arm amputations are bitter about the law, as they feel that they, too, have been discriminated against as their disabilities are more serious and incapacitating than the loss of one or both legs. These men are able to drive with the aid of special controls, and many hold State driver's permits. The law, however, restricts benefits to leg amputees and those who have lost the use of their legs.

Another anomaly of the law is evidenced by a letter received this past week from a paralyzed first lieutenant in the Army-Navy General Hospital, Hot Springs, Ark. This officer is not eligible for a car because he is still in the Army and the law applies only to veterans. Although he lost the use of his limbs in service, he will be hospitalized for such a long period before being discharged from the Army, he may not become a veteran before the law expires in June of next year. The obvious intent of Congress was to furnish this man with a car, but the technicalities of the law prevent it.

Although General Bradley vigorously opposed the law last summer in its present form, the VA took immediate steps to carry out its provisions. Within 30 days the first car, a hydramatic Oldsmobile sedan, was delivered to Richard A Tennelly of Washington, an ex-marine combat correspondent who lost his left leg at Iwo Jima.

ONLY 75 CARS DELIVERED

Up until October 1, out of 8,000 applications, only 75 cars had actually been delivered. The VA attributes this to the unavailability of cars from manufacturers. The Disabled American Veterans in the lead editorial of the last issue of their official organ point out that the maximum amount which can be paid for a car under the law is $1,600 which includes all accessories, special driving controls, and taxes. The veteran is not permitted to purchase a more expensive car and personally pay the difference. The price of cars has risen since the law was passed. This, plus delivery costs to those living at great distances from the factory, often bring the price of the car above the established ceiling. The DAV suggests the technicalities of the law can be circumvented by eligible veterans purchasing cars without any accessories except the necessary driving controls and then purchasing additional accessories later from their own resources. If this does not bring the car within the limit of $1,600, the other alternative is to go to the factory and drive the car home, thus eliminating delivery costs. The latter course, however, is often most impractical.

Sales taxes in many States help bring the car's cost above the price limit. The DAV calls attention to the fact that in Ohio cars purchased under the act are exempt from sales taxes and suggest this practice should be adopted in all States.

LAW WAS PASSED AS RIDER

Public Law 663 was passed by Congress in the closing days of last summer's session, and then only as a rider on the servicemen's terminal leave law which was "must" legislation. The critics of the bill at that time, including this writer, did not question the fairness of the principle of automobiles for certain disabled veterans at Government expense or the need of many disabled veterans for automobiles. They did, however, question the feasibility of the law as drawn, believing it sacrificed thoroughness and equality for the sake of expediency.

With the reorganization of the House of Representatives in the coming session, due to the Republican majority, it is assumed that Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, ranking Republican member of the House Veterans Committee, will replace Representative JOHN RANKIN as head of that committee. Mrs. ROGERS was one of the original sponsors of the "cars for amputees" bill and has long been a champion in the cause of the disabled veteran. Mrs. ROGERS will, if appointed to the post, probably work for immediate revision of the present law to remove the present unjust and illogical restrictions. It should be one of the first items of business on the crowded agenda of her committee.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

FILIBUSTER

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] charged—at least he intimated—that a filibuster was going on here. Well, be that as it may, I want to congratulate the gentleman on contributing his 1 minute to the filibuster.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 29, noes 84.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 86]

Andrews, N. Y.	Gallagher	McMillan, S. C.
Banta	Gifford	Mansfield, Tex.
Bell	Granger	O'Toole
Bennett, Mich.	Gross	Patman
Bland	Hall,	Plumley
Bonner	Leonard W.	Poulson
Boykin	Hart	Powell
Brophy	Hartley	Ramey
Burke	Heffernan	Rayfiel
Byrne, N. Y.	Jenkins, Pa.	Rich
Celler	Jennings	Sabath
Clark	Johnson, Okla.	Seely-Brown
Combs	Jones, Wash.	Shafer
Coudert	Kefauver	Sheppard
Davis, Tenn.	Kelley	Smith, Ohio
Dawson, Ill.	Kennedy	Taylor
Delaney	Keogh	Thomas, N. J.
Dingell	Kerr	Van Zandt
Dolliver	Larcade	West
Fellows	Lea	Winstead
Fogarty	Lusk	Youngblood
Fuller	Lynch	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 365 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INFORMATIONAL SERVICE, STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma) there were—ayes 102, noes 11.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present and make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-eight Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 303, nays 63, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

YEAS—303

Abernethy	Andersen,	Bakewell
Albert	H. Carl	Barden
Allen, Calif.	Anderson, Calif.	Barrett
Allen, Ill.	Andrews, Ala.	Bates, Ky.
Allen, La.	Arends	Battle
Almond	Arnold	Beall

Beckworth
Bell
Blackney
Blatnik
Bloom
Boggs, Del.
Boggs, La.
Bolton
Bradley
Bramblett
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buchanan
Buck
Buckley
Burleson
Busbey
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Canfield
Cannon
Carroll
Carson
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Chadwick
Chapman
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Clark
Clason
Clements
Coffin
Cole, Kans.
Colmer
Cooley
Cooper
Corbett
Cotton
Courtney
Cox
Cravens
Crawford
Crosser
Crow
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Dingell
Dirksen
Domengeaux
Donohue
Dorn
Doughton
Douglas
Drewry
Durham
Eaton
Eberharter
Elliott
Ellsworth
Elsaesser
Elston
Engel, Mich.
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fenton
Fernandez
Fisher
Flannagan
Fletcher
Fogarty
Folger
Foote
Forand
Fulton
Gamble
Gary
Gathings
Goff
Gordon
Gore
Gorski
Gossett
Grant, Ala.
Grant, Ind.
Gregory
Gwinn, N. Y.
Gwynne, Iowa
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Hardy
Harless, Ariz.
Harris
Harrison
Hart
Hartley
Havenner
Hays
Hedrick
Heffernan
Hendricks
Herter
Heselton
Hill
Hinshaw
Hobbs
Hoeven
Holmes
Hope
Howell
Huber
Jackson, Calif.
Jackson, Wash.
Jarman
Javits
Jenkins, Ohio
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Tex
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N. C.
Jones, Ohio
Jonkman
Judd
Karsten, Mo.
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Keefe
Kersten, Wis.
Kilburn
Kilday
King
Klein
Kunkel
Lane
Lanham
Larcade
Latham
Lea
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lewis
Lodge
Love
Lucas
Lyle
McConnell
McDonough
McDowell
McMahon
McMillen, Ill.
MacKinnon
Macy
Madden
Mahon
Manasco
Mansfield, Mont.
Marcantonio
Martin, Iowa
Meade, Ky.
Meade, Md.
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Mitchell
Monroney
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Mundt
Murdock
Murray, Tenn.
Nixon
Nodar
Norblad
Norrell
Norton
O'Brien
O'Konski
Pace
Passman
Patterson
Peden
Peterson
Pfeifer
Philbin
Phillips, Calif.
Pickett
Plumley
Poage
Potts
Poulson
Preston
Price, Fla.
Price, Ill.
Priest
Rabin
Rains
Ramey
Rayburn
Redden
Reed, Ill.
Rees
Reeves
Richards
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers
Robertson
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Rooney
Ross
Russell
Sabath
Sadlak
Sadowski
Sarbacher
Sasscer
Scoblick
Scott, Hardie
Scrivner
Shafer
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Maine
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Snyder
Somers
Spence
Stanley
Stefan
Stevenson
Stockman
Stratton
Sundstrom
Talle
Teague
Thomas, N. J.
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Tollefson
Towe
Trimble
Twyman
Vail
Wadsworth
Walter
Weichel
Welch
Wheeler
Whitten
Whittington
Wigglesworth
Williams
Wilson, Tex.
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood
Worley
Zimmerman

NAYS—63

Banta
Bender
Bennett, Mo.
Bishop
Brehm
Brophy
Brown, Ohio
Buffett
Butler
Church
Clevenger
Clippinger
Cole, Mo.
D'Ewart
Dondero
Ellis
Gallagher
Gavin
Gearhart
Gillette
Gillie
Graham
Griffiths
Gross
Harness, Ind.
Hess
Hoffman
Hull
Jenison
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Ill.
Johnson, Ind.
Landis
Lemke
McCowen
McGregor
Maloney
Mason
Mathews
Miller, Md.
Muhlenberg
Murray, Wis.
O'Hara
Owens
Phillips, Tenn.
Ploeser
Rankin
Reed, N. Y.
Rizley
Robsion
St. George
Sanborn
Schwabe, Mo.
Schwabe, Okla.
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Smith, Kans.
Springer
Taber
Tibbott
Vursell
Wilson, Ind.
Woodruff

NOT VOTING—63

Andresen, August H.
Andrews, N. Y.
Angell
Auchincloss
Bates, Mass.
Bennett, Mich.
Bland
Bonner
Boykin
Bulwinkle
Burke
Byrne, N. Y.
Celler
Cole, N. Y.
Combs
Coudert
Davis, Tenn.
Delaney
Devitt
Dolliver
Fellows
Fuller
Gifford
Goodwin
Granger
Hébert
Holifield
Horan
Jenkins, Pa.
Jones, Wash.
Kefauver
Kelley
Kennedy
Keogh
Kerr
Kirwan
Knutson
Lesinski
Lusk
Lynch
McCormack
McGarvey
McMillan, S. C.
Mansfield, Tex.
O'Toole
Patman
Powell
Rayfiel
Rich
Rockwell
Seely-Brown
Sheppard
Sikes
Smathers
Smith, Ohio
Stigler
Taylor
Van Zandt
Vinson
Vorys
West
Winstead
Youngblood

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. August H. Andresen with Mr. Keogh.
Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Delaney.
Mr. McGarvey with Mr. McMillan of South Carolina.
Mr. Seely-Brown with Mr. Lynch.
Mr. Rich with Mrs. Lusk.
Mr. Horan with Mr. Holifield.
Mr. Bennett of Michigan with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Auchincloss with Mr. Rayfiel.
Mr. Angell with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Combs.
Mr. Gifford with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Rockwell with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Devitt with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Vorys with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Weichel with Mr. O'Toole.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Granger.
Mr. Knutson with Mr. Byrne of New York.
Mr. Jones of Washington with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. Youngblood with Mr. Kelley.
Mr. Burke with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Bates of Massachusetts with Mr. Kerr.
Mr. Goodwin with Mr. Boykin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3342, with Mr. JENKINS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: Page 13, line 3, after the word "States", insert a period and strike out the words "and in other countries."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, on the floor and in the lobby there has been not a little comment during the three preceding days that this bill has been under discussion all to the effect that some folks were filibustering, delaying proceedings.

Permit me most respectfully to call attention to the fact that on practically every vote that has been taken, rising vote or teller vote, that only once during all that voting has more than one-third of the Republicans of this House voted in favor of keeping this bill alive, or in opposition to the amendments which have been offered. That one occasion was when 53 Republicans voted to keep the bill alive and 78 voted to strike the enacting clause. The 53 won because they were joined by a solid Democratic vote. So, if there is delay, that delay is not caused by those who are opposing this legislation. It is due to the fact that a minority group of the majority party has insisted for 4 days in having its way. This bill has been kept alive and this bill is today before the House and before the Committee because the minority of the Republicans supported by the minority party as a unit want it to be here and want it passed, so there is no question of a lack of party regularity on the part of those of us who oppose this legislation.

Now, this amendment has this effect. On page 12 there is a provision in subsection (1) authorizing the Secretary of State "to make grants of money, services, or materials to State and local governmental institutions in the United States, to governmental institutions in other countries, and to individuals and public or private nonprofit organizations both in the United States." And then these words which I ask be stricken "and in other countries."

All this amendment seeks to do is to strike from that subparagraph the authority of the Secretary of State to make grants of money, services or materials to individuals and to public or private nonprofit organization in other countries. We had UNRRA and we had this and that organization legalized by Congress peddling our money all over the world. In general, the funds were wasted and misapplied. Whether it was legalized or not, we now know that some one, Treasury, State, or War Department, authorized the Russians and the Italians to print invasion money, which apparently we now must redeem, to the amount of some $400,000,000.

The argument now made is this, that it is about time that the United States of America quit authorizing anyone, Secretary of State or anyone else, to give away the money which we raise through taxation. It is time now that we end that. A former President of the United States suggested the other day, as he has at various times in the past, and as Members of this House for the last 3 or 4 years repeatedly asked, that we take an inventory and learn what, if anything, we have left; how much we can afford to give away. The Members in the other body, the great international statesmen just recently fell in with that idea and said that it might be a good thing before we gave away or pledged ourselves further to ascertain whether we had anything to give away. It is self-evident that we do not have the money; that every dollar that is going to be appropriated under this legislation will have to be

borrowed, and so why should we now authorize the Secretary of State to give away as much as $34,000,000 that this bill will ultimately call for to individuals and public or private nonprofit organizations in other countries. Let him do it? I cannot understand it, and I hope that someone will enlighten me and relieve my ignorance, and that the committee will adopt this amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in the first part of his remarks the gentleman from Michigan indicated that he was speaking for the majority of the members of the Republican Party and that most of the members of the Republican Party had voted as he had on the various measures and amendments up to now. I do not know whether the Republican Members of the House are following the foreign policy proposals of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], whether they are following the recommendations of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, or whether they are following the impulses of their own convictions. Each of you has to decide that for yourself on the measures which come before us.

I think, however, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has drawn the issue pretty clearly. I think he has dramatized the division which exists among Republicans and Democrats alike on matters of this kind. I want it understood, at least for myself, that I do not propose to follow any foreign policy pattern which isolates America from the peace.

I think there are some things about so-called isolationism which might be justified at times, when you attempt to isolate a country from war, but when you attempt to isolate a country from peace, when you attempt to break down the peace machinery of America, when you tell the State Department, "We will deny you the tools that you tell us you need to build the temple of peace," I want no mistake in the record about where I stand. I do not stand for that kind of isolationism, and I do not believe the Republican Party does either.

May I point out about the particular amendment in question that it is just one little isolationistic clause which would say that you cannot aid American institutions such as the great American university at Beirut in Syria, which our former Minister to Syria, Mr. George Wadsworth, tells us has done more to help maintain friendly relations with the Arab people and maintain American prestige in the Middle East than any other one thing. It would say you cannot aid Roberts College at Istanbul, Turkey, a country in which we are spending $250,000,000 of the American taxpayers' dollars. This amendment would say you cannot go in there and help the people of Turkey understand America by aiding Turkish students to learn the truth about us in this great American college.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an unwise amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does that bar debate on other amendments which are on the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. On this section only.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 13, at the end of line 4, insert the following: "*Provided, however,* That no grant of money, services, or materials shall be made under this subsection to any governmental institution or to individuals or public or private organizations in any country which has a socialistic or communistic form of government or which is under the domination of any government having a communistic government or which advocates or teaches communism."

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

SEC. 702. In carrying on activities which further the purposes of this act, subject to the approval of such activities by the Secretary, the Department and the other Government agencies are authorized—

(1) to place orders and make purchases and rentals of materials and equipment;

(2) to make contracts, including contracts with governmental agencies, foreign or domestic, including subdivisions thereof, and intergovernmental organizations of which the United States is a member, and, with respect to contracts entered into in foreign countries, without regard to section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 22);

(3) under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, to pay the transportation expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, of citizens or subjects of other countries, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Subsistence Act of 1926, as amended;

(4) under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Subsistence Act of 1926, as amended, to provide for planned travel itineraries within the United States by groups of citizens or subjects of other countries, to pay the expenses of such travel, and to detail, as escorts of such groups, officers and employees of the Government, whose expenses may be paid out of funds advanced or transferred by the Secretary for the general expenses of the itineraries;

(5) to make grants for, and to pay expenses incident to, training and study;

(6) to provide for, and pay the expenses of, attendance at meetings or conventions of societies and associations concerned with furthering the purposes of this act when provided for by the appropriation act; and

(7) to provide for, and pay the expenses of, the purchase of health and accident insurance for persons not employed by the United States Government while away from home under the authority of this act, or for Philippine trainees who receive training from a Government agency in the United States under authority of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended (Public Laws 370 and 597, 79th Cong.), and to defray the expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of such persons who may die.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 16, line 2, after the semicolon insert the word "and."

On page 16, line 6, strike out all after the word "appropriation", and all of lines 7 to 18, inclusive, and insert the word "act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a few days ago when this bill was under consideration I was shocked and humiliated and aggrieved to hear the genial gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS], whom we affectionately call Toby, unbosom himself of these words:

Why, you ask most any school child in America where the largest trees are and he will say, as I heard it alleged on the floor of the House, that they are out in California. But the biggest trees in the world are not in California. We think so. Why? Because it is so easy for us all to become big headed, to think that everything we have is the biggest and best in the world.

When I recovered from the impact of those words I went scurrying to the Encyclopedia Britannica and found in volume 20, page 339, these comforting words:

The redwood tree, the Sequoia sempervirens, is the tallest of trees. Many specimens attain a height of over 300 feet, and one now standing near Dyerville, Humboldt County, is by careful measurement 364 feet. Maximum diameter of the redwood is about 18 feet, considerably less than the big tree, although exceeded by very few others. Mature trees vary in age from about 400 years to about 2,000. * * *

The big tree, the Sequoia gigantea, is the largest of all trees in bulk and commonly reputed to be the oldest living thing. Largest specimen is "General Sherman" in Sequoia National Park measuring 101½ feet in circumference at base, mean base diameter 32 feet, diameter 8 feet above ground 27 feet, diameter 100 feet above ground 18½ feet. Height above mean base 272 feet, diameter of largest branch (130 feet above ground) 6½ feet, total weight estimated at 2,150 tons of which the foliage alone constitutes 155 tons (Frye and White, 1938). A few specimens stand over 300 feet high but are less in total bulk than "General Sherman." Age, based on ring counts, is known to exceed 3,000 years in some instances.

So, Mr. Chairman, whether the school children of America are big-headed or not, according to how the genial gentleman from Oklahoma meant it, they are quite right in believing that the tallest of trees and the largest in bulk are still growing in California.

So we must in this instance credit to California the honor of offering the hospitality of its soil to the oldest, the tallest and the largest living things on the face of the earth, its Sequoia gigantea and Sequoia semperviren, monarchs of the forests, giants of antiquity that they are.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. The largest trees in the world, according to authentic information that I have, are in the Belgian Congo. I just wonder if this article

might not have been written by Paul Bunyan.

Mr. GEARHART. So far as I know Paul Bunyan is not a contributor to the Encyclopedia Britannica. The gentleman will recall that it was on the 6th day of June that his objected-to remarks were uttered, so the gentleman from California has had ample opportunity to make a very, very careful check of the authorities, not only of the Encyclopedia Britannica, but with the Forestry Service and the Architect of the Capitol, and they agree and report to him that without question the tallest and biggest trees, the oldest living things on the face of the earth, still grow in California. I merely rise to make announcement of the immutable facts of the forest. With the modesty of a true Californian, I submit them to my good friend, the gentleman of the great State of Oklahoma. The proofs are before you.

Mr. MORRIS. I think I can prove to the contrary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] has expired.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, some time ago when I read this letter before the House, we were in such a furor that I doubt very much that many Members got the contents of it, and I am going to read it again. I think after I read it you may wake up to the fact that we do need this bill.

This is a letter written to me, incidentally, by the president of a small manufacturing company in my district who had recently visited the continent of Europe and had gone particularly into Germany.

He writes:

> I find the Communist Party active and distributing their literature and posters without regard for expense. The people of Germany and Europe in general are pitifully unacquainted with the other side of the story. Although I am heartily in favor of economy, I deplore the possible cancellation of funds for the Voice of America, and any other similar agencies that are tending to neutralize Communist propaganda. The funds required for this purpose are moderate compared with what is being spent in larger quantities for less essential purposes.

That was signed by a reputable manufacturer in my district, who knows what he is talking about, and certainly cannot be inferred to be a Communist.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am sorry; my time is limited.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What does the gentleman manufacture? Radios?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Well, now, since you are on that subject of radios, I am going to take a minute and say that apparently some of the opposition to this measure may be coming from a lack of conviction on the part of some of the membership of this House as to the effectiveness of the radio in telling the truth. I am not talking about propaganda. I am not talking about advertising. I am talking about the ability of the radio to disseminate the truth. I think it is high time that the people of Europe are given the truth. The Voice of America has been accused of being subversive; that is, the activities of the "Voice of America" have been called subversive, and some of the individuals connected with the program are accused of being subversive.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot yield. My time is limited.

The truth is that what this House should do at this time in considering this bill is to write into this legislation enough assurance against the activities of any subversive people so as to guarantee the Voice of America to be the voice of America; and I see no reason why we cannot do it. That is one reason I am for this bill.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. Why do not we appropriate money to secure radios to distribute over in those countries so they can listen to the program when it does go through?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. This is a step in the right direction. You can bring radios in too.

Mr. GAVIN. They have not got any radios.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is something we can consider a little later. I do feel, however, that it is timely to give consideration to this because we cannot afford according to the letter of this gentleman to go very much further allowing these lies, innuendoes, and adverse propaganda to be going into the various countries of Europe where we have attempted to do everything we could for them.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. CORBETT. I wonder if the gentleman thinks it possible that some of the Members do not believe radio is here to stay?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman thinks as I do, that probably there is a feeling on the part of some of the Members that radio is not effective; but let me give you an example. Many Members of the House have had to counteract adverse and vicious propaganda back home while they were down here on the job, while they were attending to their official duties and pursuing the job which the people elected them to fulfill. Many Members have been actually defeated back home because they were unable to get back home to defend themselves against these vicious lies and innuendoes that subversive individuals back home have spread about them.

The point is that the radio in many cases has enabled them to carry the truth of their convictions back home and to tell the people correctly of their position. I say the same thing can be done with the United States.

Let us tell the other countries the truth by developing the Voice of America, so that it is loud enough and strong enough to be heard all over the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot arrive at a limitation of debate. I see seven Members on their feet.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, while the House has been discussing that example of sheer madness, the Voice of America, our State Department has been engaged in a wholesale propaganda campaign here at home to sell this piece of sheer madness to the American people. Commentators, newspapers, all kinds of opinion-forming groups in American life have been peddled this idea of wasting $30,000,000 on hot air.

At the same time that this piece of sheer madness has been peddled around the country we find that the State Department has delivered itself of approximately a dozen major foreign-policy speeches which conservatively estimated that we will spend anywhere from six to eight billion dollars a year for the next 4 or 5 years to reconstruct the economy of Europe.

Numerous uggestions have been made that Mr. Truman will call the Congress back into session in September and lay before us a six or eight billion dollar program to execute the Truman and Marshall doctrines in Europe.

Perhaps the House should begin to examine the way in which the State Department spends money on publicity and propaganda within the United States. In my opinion the State Department is engaged in a wholesale propaganda campaign right here in America using the taxpayers' money to pressure the Congress into voting not thirty million but $30,000,000,000 for the reconstruction of Europe.

Somehow or other the State Department does not seem to think that the American taxpayer wants to spend this money else why would the State Department be engaged in this propaganda campaign here at home?

The whole publicity and propaganda set-up of the State Department should be investigated. The Voice of America should, of course, be eliminated, and best of all, of course, would be the removal from office of the present administration in 1948. This insane policy of pouring out billions of dollars on objectives which are unlimited and the principal consideration of which is to rearm the world for another world war, this policy will only be defeated by the removal from office of the group of State Department bureaucrats to whom nothing is sacred except their own prestige and personal bureaucratic power.

Sheer madness is the only way that John Q. Citizen can describe the proposals which have been put before us. Sheer madness is the basis of our present

foreign policy. To launch this Nation upon a world-wide system of entangling military alliances and unilateral economic grants will end only in the bankruptcy of our Nation. This House should say a firm and decisive "No" to the proposal for a phony Voice of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which has been at the desk for a long time and I have been sitting here to get a few minutes to discuss it. Now I finally wind up with 4 minutes on this important amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: Page 15, strike out all of subparagraphs 3 and 4 and on page 16, strike out subparagraph 6.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Would the gentleman be willing to divide his amendment into two parts, one having to do with subparagraph 3 and the other having to do with 4 and 6. The committee is willing to accept 4 and 6, but 3 has been in the law and regulations since the beginning of the program, and we feel we must oppose that. Is the gentleman willing to divide his amendment?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to divide the amendment in view of the statement just made by the distinguished gentleman, a member of the committee. Do I understand that the committee is willing to accept the amendment as divided so as to strike out paragraphs 4 and 6 and allow another amendment to be submitted separately to strike out paragraph 3? If so, I will be glad to do that, and I ask unanimous consent to so modify the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman's amendment will be modified accordingly.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentiary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. Will that require then the submission of a new amendment in order to accomplish the purpose of striking out subparagraph 3?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; that will require a new amendment.

Mr. KEEFE. I shall try to do so as soon as I can get time to write it out.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I would like to inquire if the committee will not accept the amendment as amended. I understand they will accept it, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE as modified: On page 15, strike out all of subparagraph 4; and on page 16, strike out all of subparagraph 6.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, we will accept the amendment in that form.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEEFE. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would now like to offer an amendment to strike out the provisions of subparagraph 3.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 15, strike out all of subparagraph 3.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I had an amendment on the desk to strike that paragraph.

Mr. KEEFE. I will withdraw the amendment then, Mr. Chairman, and ask unanimous consent so to do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; if it is the same one, the gentleman can offer it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike subparagraph 3, that is all right with me.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. May I inquire of the Chair just what the status is at the present time? I did offer an amendment to strike subparagraph 3.

The CHAIRMAN. That amendment is now pending.

Mr. KEEFE. Am I recognized then for that purpose?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized within the 4 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment. I do not have any time. I only have about 30 seconds under that situation. I will not have any time to discuss it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: Page 15, strike out all of subsection 3.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hoped the gentleman from Wisconsin would offer this amendment because I thought the committee might accept it in order to avoid opposition. Though I suspect that in the end we will find the original provisions back in the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will make a correction right now myself. I want to state that the gentleman from South Dakota inadvertently—get that word—misstated my position a while ago when he stated that I was speaking for the Republican Party. I never, never in my life tried to speak for anyone except the Representative from the Fourth Michigan District. Now get that thoroughly in mind. The only thing I was calling attention to when I said this was not a Republican measure was when the motion was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], to strike the enacting clause, 78 Republicans went down the aisle past the tellers to do that very thing, and 53, and only 53, were in favor of keeping this bill alive. That was the point I was trying to make. Seventy-eight voted to kill the bill. It is alive and here on the floor because a minority of the Republicans aided by an almost solid Democratic bloc keeps life in it.

As to this amendment, the amendment is that we strike out subparagraph 3. My amendment was that we change the $10 to $5. I just thought that $5 a day was enough. I can see no reason why we should pay these men more than we pay the returned veterans who are in this country or elsewhere. I cannot understand it. Rear Admiral Zacharias, who testified before a House committee yesterday and today, was asked about this Voice of America program. He said, as many of us believe, that if you keep the machinery and get rid of those who are operating and feeding it, there would be some good accomplished.

Every Member of this House who is advised of the situation knows that in the State Department there have been over the years not one but many Communists, and we have every reason to believe that some of them are there yet. Now, why should we let the State Department peddle this Voice of America through people who believe as these people do believe? People who do not believe in America. If the committee wants to keep the machinery alive, all well and good, but then get some competent engineers, some competent people to write and speak the output, so that really and truly it will be the Voice of America which today it is not. They should not only quit sending across those pictures of the fat woman, a disgrace to all of us, but they should quit sending out the false information and the doctrine in which no American believes.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JUDD. Are these amendments to be voted on as they are offered or at the end of the allotted time?

The CHAIRMAN. As they are offered.

Mr. JUDD. Then I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman claim the time of the committee?

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment because I think the gentleman who offered it believes the authorization in subparagraph 3 is something new or makes more liberal grants than heretofore. As a matter of fact, it has been in the appropriation acts and the regulations issued under them for several years. You can find on page A2982 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the portion of the 1947 State Department Appropriation Act, which specifically authorizes for this year such a grant for travel expenses in lieu of subsistence. I have here the Federal Register for August 23, 1944, con-

taining the travel regulations which Cordell Hull established then and under which the program still operates.

It divides those who come here or go abroad into two groups. One is the leaders, who are defined as "professors and instructors, persons of influence, and persons of outstanding accomplishment or possessing special qualifications in a professional, technical, cultural, or specialized field." The other group is the students, internes, trainees.

Under "Grants to foreign leaders" the regulations state:

Per diem of $10 in lieu of subsistence and all incidental expenses including gratituitous fees, taxi fares, head tax, visa fees, telegraph and telephone charges, etc., while traveling to and from the United States except for the period spent on seagoing vessels.

When it is reduced to $5 as a later paragraph stipulates:

Provided, That when a traveler is furnished meals and/or lodging without charge by a United States department or agency, one-fifth of the authorized per diem shall be deducted for each meal or night's lodging.

Under "Grants to foreign students," it is provided that students traveling by land or by air get $7 a day in lieu of subsistence and when by sea $3.50 a day.

Later in the regulations is a section headed, "Maxima not controlling" under which it is made clear that the $10 figure is the maximum that can be paid. Smaller per diem where indicated can be specified in the contract or the grant to a student or a professor at the time his appointment is made.

It seems to me the committee would not consider it proper to bring here a distinguished scientist or a professor or the president of a university, some great scholar or inventor or cultural or religious leader, from this or that country, and pay for his ticket, but not make suitable provision for him to get a place to sleep or food to eat en route. The per diem applies only when he is traveling. The average total cost for a foreign student living in this country is $1,800 a year. The average total amount furnished by the State Department is less than $700 a year per student, less than half the average amount paid to a GI student per year.

We have always provided this travel per diem heretofore. It has not been abused. I do not believe we ought to strike it out now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, the further this debate goes the more confused I become. My good friend from California talked on trees, California's great trees. I think it would be more profitable for me if I took the short time allotted to me to discuss Pennsylvania grade crude oil, one of the finest lubricating oils in the world. An oil that is known the world over and ever since oil was discovered in my State—the great State of Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania grade crude oil is recognized as the outstanding lubricant of the Nation.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. Do I understand from the gentleman's remarks that he would like to have this bill in the grease?

Mr. GAVIN. Not exactly that, but I might say to the gentleman from California who gave such a splendid talk on California trees that in the future he use Pennsylvania grade crude oil in his car when traveling through the California forests.

Mr. GEARHART. That I will.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the voice of Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. GAVIN. My time is limited; however, I cannot help but yield to my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, one of the outstanding Members of the Pennsylvania delegation, a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, a man who commands the respect and admiration of the Congress for his fine work, and I might add, a man who has won for himself the hearty commendations of the membership on both sides of the aisle. I am glad to yield to my good friend and colleague.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the gentleman. I wish the gentleman would make that speech in my district some time. Will the gentleman please call attention to the fact that the only standing tract of virgin timber left in the United States east of the Mississippi River is in our own State of Pennsylvania in Cook Forest?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes, and it is a gorgeous tract of timber, 8,700 acres of virgin pine that we have preserved to show future generations of Americans the beauties of the Pennsylvania woods.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to get back to this bill. I might say I have a great respect and admiration for all the members of the committee.

The bill as it now stands is a hodgepodge of confusing, conflicting pronouncements so muddied up by amendments that no one can tell exactly what it contains.

It is evident that the committee has been quite willing to accept any and all amendments offered, in the hope, I presume, of getting votes, merely to pass a bill, any kind of a bill.

This proposed legislation has been poorly presented; the evidence submitted is but little more than vague promises of what will or will not be done. The committee has not presented a case based on facts that we, as representatives of 140,000,000 people, can intelligently cast our vote for to create a vehicle to sell America to the world at a terrific cost to the American taxpayer, when in reality we have oversold ourselves already.

I have no confidence in this branch of the State Department which has been handling this matter. I have no faith in the integrity or ability of these individuals to do the kind of a job that should be done.

They say that Secretary of State Marshall will clean house. Well, he should have cleaned house before he came to Congress for a blank check to permit this blundering outfit to continue. We have heard repeatedly about cleaning house; but once the legislation is on the books the old gang takes over and carries on in any way they see fit.

How is Secretary Marshall going to look after this outfit? He will have plenty to do looking after Uncle Sam's affairs for the next 2 or 3 years without looking after the Voice.

I am tired of listening to a lot of glittering generalities. I want sound facts.

Let me ask you this; if you were the president of a corporation accountable to your stockholders and you listened as we have for 3 days to testimony and you were asked to approve the spending of ten, twenty, or thirty million dollars of your company's money for such a program as has been proposed, what would you do? Why, you would not give them a thin dime.

Well, you are directors in a great corporation, elected to look after the taxpayers' dollars and if you can reconcile yourself to approving this program to carry on with an element who have been tossing the American taxpayers' money down a rat hole, I cannot. This bill should be recommitted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I hope the members of the committee will not be confused about who will come to the United States to study, should this bill be passed. There have been a great many amendments adopted. In fact, the amendment that I was going to offer was offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and the committee accepted it. I think it helps the bill, but even with these amendments there are many things in this bill that are not satisfactory.

I would call your attention to the fact that the State Department reported to me the first of the week that there were 16,956 students from many foreign countries now studying in the United States. Of this number, 60 are from Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria, which is now behind the iron curtain. The number of students, mostly GI's, from the United States studying in foreign countries is 3,163. They are studying in a great many universities.

I also call your attention to the fact that without this bill these students are here. Without this bill they are going to continue to be here. Every university in the country has exchange scholarships with universities in other countries, which will continue to go on.

It must be quite evident to the members of the committee that the State Department, in bringing this bill through the committee, is trying to build up a large bureau or agency in the State Department, and making it a permanent bureau. The bill goes far beyond the original intent of the will of Congress and does not reflect the publicity which goes out on this legislation.

When Secretary Marshall was before the Senate committee he said we must have some means of broadcasting to other countries. With that I agree. I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] when he said we should sell America to the rest of the world. I want to do that, but I

contend, and I feel sure you will agree, that this bill goes far beyond that purpose.

I hope at the proper time, unless it is offered by someone on the minority side, to offer a motion to recommit, to make this bill just a broadcasting bill.

The other body has reported out a bill that is just a broadcasting bill and I think we ought to conform to that language and the original intent of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MATHEWS: Add a new subsection to section 702, as follows: "Due to the crowded conditions in the institutions of learning of this country, which are interfering with the opportunities of veterans and others to obtain their educations, and to presently prevent the diversion of further Federal funds from use for the education of our own veterans, as now provided by law, subsections (3) and (5) of this section shall not become effective until 1 year after the effective date of the remaining provisions of this act."

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is perfectly clear. It is to defer the effectiveness of subsections (3) and (5) of this particular section for 1 year, for the reasons stated in the amendment itself.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] having failed, the per diem allowance still remains at $10 per day, or $300 a month, which is five times the rate paid to our own veterans in the institutions of learning, which are now overcrowded. This bill, of course, will overcrowd them more by bringing in foreign students and foreign teachers.

During the colloquy with the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, the other day, as brought out here today, there is already authorization apparently for the State Department to conduct this Latin-American program. It will not affect that at all. In fact, I would like to see them concentrate on Latin America for the next year, under previous authority granted. Not only that, but the colleges themselves can exchange students and can exchange professors without the necessity of this act. There will be nothing whatsoever to interfere with the purposes of this act, except that during this period when we are told that we cannot grant even certain necessary funds for disabled veterans during this year because of economy, we should spend $10 a day or $300 a month to bring foreign students here, to crowd our own students out of the universities.

I spoke on this matter the other day. I think this is a very reasonable amendment and ought to be accepted, because I do not think this Government should be spending that money at a time when we are only spending a little bit for our own veterans to get their education, when the other objectives can be accomplished. At the end of the year we will know better where we stand and what world conditions are.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHEWS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. And the program for the exchange of teachers and students will go on whether this bill is passed or not?

Mr. MATHEWS. That is exactly right.

Mr. DONDERO. Through our own colleges and universities?

Mr. MATHEWS. Yes, sir. And our program with Latin America will still go on under Government expense.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHEWS. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Nobody comes in under this program except graduate students, who go to graduate schools, usually on a fellowship, or doing special work with a particular professor or research man.

They do not interfere with the GI's, most of whom, of course, are undergraduates. Even if you consider all of the foreign students under this program as undergraduates, they would constitute only one-twentieth of 1 percent of the total number in our colleges. If this program were to displace any GI's I would go along with the gentleman in opposition; but knowing what kind of students are coming under this legislation I do not see how they would interfere with or prevent the education of GI's.

Mr. MATHEWS. How can the gentleman know what students are coming? He does not have charge of the students.

Mr. JUDD. Because the committee has gone over the lists from the countries that come under the program. Most of the foreign students in this country do not come under the State Department. Only a handful come under this program.

Mr. MATHEWS. Does the committee hand-pick and check the students?

Mr. JUDD. No. They are selected by committees of scholars and Americans abroad and are placed and supervised in this country by the Institute of International Education—a private association of educators. I will have something to say about that later.

Mr. MATHEWS. I do not understand the gentleman's statements. How does he reconcile them?

Mr. JUDD. If I said the committee went over the individual students on the lists, I misspoke myself. What I meant to say was that we have gone over the list showing the number and kind of students—that is, scientific, agricultural, medical, and so forth—from each of the countries from which they are received; and I said further that most of the students are coming primarily for special graduate training, students who have passed competitive examinations and been selected for their special ability. Most of the foreign students in this country came on their own, have scholarships, or are able to support themselves from their own resources, but some of the ablest are not. This program is designed especially for that class.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-two Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 88]

Andresen, August H.	Fogarty	Pace
Auchincloss	Fuller	Patman
Bennett, Mich.	Gallagher	Phillips, Calif.
Bland	Gifford	Powell
Boggs, La.	Goff	Rayfiel
Bonner	Gossett	Rich
Brophy	Granger	Robsion
Buckley	Hagen	St. George
Buffett	Hartley	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Bulwinkle	Hébert	Seely-Brown
Burleson	Hedrick	Sheppard
Carroll	Heffernan	Simpson, Ill.
Celler	Hill	Smith, Ohio
Chapman	Hope	Stratton
Clark	Jenkins, Pa.	Thomas, N. J.
Cole, N. Y.	Jones, Wash.	Thomas, Tex.
Combs	Kefauver	Thomason
Coudert	Kelley	Van Zandt
Davis, Tenn.	Keogh	Vinson
Deane	Kerr	Vorys
Delaney	Kirwan	West
Dingell	Klein	Wilson, Tex.
Dolliver	Knutson	Winstead
Domengeaux	Lesinski	Wood
Drewry	Lusk	Worley
Elliott	Lynch	Youngblood
Feighan	McGarvey	Zimmerman
Fellows	McMillan, S. C.	
	Mansfield, Tex.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having under consideration the bill H. R. 3342, and finding itself without a quorum, he directed the roll to be called, when 343 Members responded to their names, disclosing that a quorum was present; and he handed in the names of the absentees for printing in the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS].

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

There being no objection, the Clerk again read the amendment offered by Mr. MATHEWS.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MATHEWS) there were—ayes 40, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, the remarks I am about to make were intended to apply to subparagraph 4, but since that paragraph has been eliminated, I conclude they are quite germane to subparagraph 3.

The real purpose of my comments is to support the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] in setting forth the merits of the State of California, as one of the chief stops in this series of travels which I understand is being contemplated for the various scientists of foreign lands.

I would invite your attention to this full page of beautiful pictures. Just see those magnificent beaches at Long Beach, Calif.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JENNINGS. The Committee, in the shadow of the great trees of California, is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will be in order.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, these beaches are as broad as the purposes of this bill. As you look along them you can no more see their end than you can see the end of the ramifications of this legislation. And now look at this lower picture. You see a crowded beach. With our usual Californian modesty, we note that we expect only a million people there on the next Fourth of July; but, Mr. Chairman, we can squeeze that million up a little and work in a few thousand of the best of these professors and students, especially so if the Government pays their expenses.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy that on this occasion I have been able to get ahead of Florida, and I hope that the chambers of commerce of the Golden State will take due notice of this most worthy accomplishment.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from the great State of California yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. Gladly to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. My heart palpitated with happiness and gratitude when I heard the gentleman speak so eloquently of our beaches, the glory of our great State. Tomorrow I shall introduce a resolution to move those beaches up to my trees in Kings Canyon National Park, so that it may become possible for the thousands upon thousands of our visitors to sit in the shade as they gaze out over the mighty Pacific, contemplating its wonders, marveling at its greatness.

Mr. BRADLEY. May I remind the gentleman from California that my beaches are older than his trees. They are larger than his trees. I think if either were to be moved, his trees should be brought to our southern California beaches. There, they would prove to be a great added attraction—not that any such is really needed, but, nevertheless, additional attractions are always welcome.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman's comment is well made. I bow my head in recognition of the great age and the incomparable wonders of the great beaches of southern California. On second thought I think I will leave my trees where they are. What do you say, you keep your beaches and I will keep my trees.

Mr. BRADLEY. It is a deal. I thank the gentleman from the Ninth District of California for his valued contribution to this exposition of the merits of our beloved State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

All time on this section has expired.

The Clerk will read the committee amendment.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MASON moves that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MASON) there were—ayes 44, noes 115.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment on page 16.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: page 16, line 19:

"MAXIMUM USE OF EXISTING GOVERNMENT PROPERTY AND FACILITIES

"SEC. 703. In carrying on activities under this act which requires the utilization of Government property and facilities, maximum use shall be made of existing Government property and facilities."

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as time is being utilized today in the creation of a State admiration society, and having heard the excellent remarks of the gentlemen from California and Pennsylvania, I, coming from the great State of Illinois, might as well join the parade by reminding you that Illinois has in it the city of Chicago, the flower of the universe.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the point of order and I want to be heard on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Can we not be heard in support of or in opposition to the point of order? The gentleman wants to talk about Chicago?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, my statement is in order, because I am rising in defense of Illinois. When this matter first came to the floor 2 weeks ago I was not on the floor. I came on the floor the following Tuesday afternoon. I had in the meantime read the report, the bill and the hearings, and after listening to the debate I made a statement with reference to this bill. The following Sunday there appeared certain statements in the newspaper directly charging me and other Members from Illinois with being isolationists. That same afternoon I heard my name again mentioned. It was stated that I and the other isolationist Members of Illinois were holding up consideration of the bill. The following morning I saw an article in the paper, the Washington Post, again stating that the Members from Illinois were holding up this bill, engaged in a concerted plot to resist it, at least, that that was the theory of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. That was stated right in the article. I want the members of that committee to answer what I have asked them many times before: Is the word "isolationist" the antonym of the word interventionist? They would have to answer that it is. That being so, if I am going to be charged with either being an interventionist or isolationist, I shall choose the latter every day of the week. They can intervene all they want in the affairs of other nations. That is what is being done by this bill. But they should not attempt to cast odium upon those who honestly oppose it.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said before, if we are going to spend the money of America in other places, let us watch carefully as to what we are doing with it in this Nation. We have bills pending providing aid to education and for other needed support in our own country and the very people who are asking for that aid are those who would be willing to send our money over to other nations, money that should stay here. The portion of the bill just read says: "In carrying on activities under this act which require the utilization of Government property and facilities, maximum use shall be made of existing Government property and facilities."

I say to the committee that it had better check into what is being done with the property and facilities of this Nation in foreign countries right now. There are certain men who are assistants to the assistant to the assistant of the Secretary of State who by one stroke of the pen are depriving people of the things that they should have over there and by the same stroke of the pen they are spending hundreds of millions of dollars of our money without our having one thing to say about it. I can give you absolute proof of that fact. Instead of charging the Members from Illinois, who are trying to do their best here, with isolationism, they ought to look into these other things. When I first came here in the consideration of this bill I had not spoken with one Member of the Illinois delegation nor any other Member concerning this matter. I addressed the committee from my own knowledge of the bill and what is contained in it and what I heard in the debate. When the committee charges us with being isolationists, and charge us with being opposed to this, and in view of the fact that the newspapers state that the basis for the remarks came from the committee, I think the members of that committee should respond.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GAVIN. I know the gentleman comes from Chicago, one of the great metropolises of all the world, one of the leading cities of the world. I know that if the people of Chicago heard him today they would be proud of the stand he is taking.

Mr. OWENS. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I voted to strike out the enacting clause. I voted for all the amendments on this bill with some realization that if we take seriously that we are in an atomic age, and that the next war will be fought with atomic power, most of what we have been doing to prepare ourselves for defense is probably wasted. Most of the ten to eleven billion dollars that we have appropriated for the usual armaments along traditional lines we feel in our hearts even now probably to be useless.

It is likely that we have not accepted seriously the atomic age and the atomic power. If we do accept it, then our only defense is the defense of ideas, and that is all. We have got to send, somehow or other, ideas to the people who may attack us; ideas that are better than warfare. Those ideas have to do with how to raise food in the countries where the people are striving. We cannot go on appropriating funds to feed them only to find that when we stop feeding them, their anger rises against us. They must take care of themselves.

We have, therefore, it seems to me, come to the place where the dissemination of ideas is about our only resort. If that is true, then the spending of $10,000,000 or $20,000,000 or $35,000,000 is not a crippling undertaking compared to the reliance that we have on billions of dollars, probably, for useless defense. I made up my mind as a result of this debate that we must face it. We have a board now of our own citizens, a bipartisan board, to set forth the ideas that freedom does work at home; that it is the source of food, of houses, and of health, and also must be the source abroad, if they will only take it. If they do accept they will be content at home; they will not drop bombs on us for our food and houses. They will destroy their own dictators and be at peace. If they keep the ideas they now have and the dictators they have, they will ride the bombs that we discovered and drop them upon us. That is the issue.

We had better go to work on ideas of freedom to show that the freedom that works here will work abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to participate in the debate on this bill. I sat through the four sessions during which we considered the bill and its various amendments, but in view of the turn that the debate has taken I do want to take these few minutes to place in the RECORD my conclusions as to this bill. I am going to vote for the bill when it comes to final passage.

Whenever a responsible Member of this House states that every official charged with our national defense and our national security and the future peace of this Nation tells us that they want certain legislation passed, I will waive any doubt I might have in my mind as to certain provisions of the bill and vote for the bill.

This I do know, that the more the people of the world understand our Government and our people, and the more we understand the other peoples of the world, the better are the chances for peace. As I understand it, that is the purpose of this bill. I have confidence enough in Secretary Marshall to believe that the bill will be administered in such a way that that program will be carried out. Many Members of the House are not pleased with the way the program has been carried out in the past and neither am I, but I believe that, as the majority leader said at the time we considered the labor bill, this is but the first step in the legislative process. By the time the bill is ready to go to the President for his signature, it will be an improved bill. If it contributes one iota to increasing our chance for world peace, then I want to be recorded as favoring the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VIII—FUNDS PROVIDED BY OTHER SOURCES

REIMBURSEMENT

SEC. 801. The Secretary is authorized, when he finds it in the public interest, to request and accept reimbursement from any cooperating governmental or private source in a foreign country, or from State or local governmental institutions or private sources in the United States, for all or part of the expenses of any portion of the program undertaken hereunder. The amounts so received shall be credited to the then current and applicable appropriation available to the Secretary for carrying out the purposes of this act and shall be available for the purposes of such appropriation.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 17, line 4, strike out "is authorized" and insert "shall."

Line 5, strike out "to."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 17, in line 10, after "be", strike out the balance of the line and all of lines 11, 12, and 13, and insert the following: "covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, the only purpose of this amendment is to prevent the possibility of another revolving fund. The amendment would simply require that any reimbursements received as a result of this program shall be covered as miscellaneous receipts into the Treasury of the United States, thus preventing the re-use of these funds out of a revolving fund, and will require appropriations to be made by the Congress before such funds can be re-used.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's point fully. It was brought up during the hearings. When we raised the question, we were assured that this language would take care of it. I respect the gentleman's judgment, however. He is rapidly developing a merited reputation as one of the most effective watchdogs of the Treasury. We want this legislation to do what he says his amendment provides and we are happy to accept his amendment in this connection. It is an additional safeguard which is meritorious and it makes doubly certain that the intent of the committee and of Congress will be completely and carefully carried out. I ask that the amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I fear that we learn very little from the lessons of history. We seem to have lost sight of that great lesson following the First World War when we, having successfully completed our military mission, merely sat down and let the cumulative forces that lead to war pile up until we finally were thrust into another conflict of armed might—the greatest war of history. That, it seems to me, should have taught us that we must work constructively toward peace, just as in time of war we must exert our every fiber to the task of attaining ultimate victory.

Peace in this world cannot come to us by chance. As we look about us we can readily see that the earth is encompassed by clouds of fear and doubt, of uncertainty, of misunderstandings between nations. These unsavory conditions are seeds of war and must eventually lead to armed conflict unless something is done to destroy them. These fears, doubts, and misunderstandings do not automatically dissolve themselves, but must of necessity be obliterated by a definite and deliberate action. No one of us can possibly know just what road will lead to universal and permanent peace, for that road has never been traveled, but I am willing and anxious to travel the road which I believe will offer the greatest possibilities in that direction.

The program outlined in this bill offers tremendous possibilities for the dispelling of doubts and misunderstandings in foreign countries about the United States and vice versa. An iron curtain about the United States would be far more disastrous than such a curtain about the Soviet Union, for I am convinced that we have in our democratic system the ultimate hope for the world. We must sell it to the world, by letting the world know how it operates.

I received a letter from the superintendent of the Greenville, S. C., city schools. This letter is a glowing tribute to the international teacher exchange

plan in practical operation. The letter follows:

GREENVILLE CITY SCHOOLS,
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT,
Greenville, S. C., June 11, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRYSON: The purpose of this letter is to give you a little more information concerning the international teacher exchange plan in which the Greenville city schools have participated during the past year.

As I told you in the day letter forwarded yesterday, the British exchange teacher we have had this year was highly satisfactory. Because I am eager for you to know just how fortunate we considered ourselves in having her here, I am sending you a copy of a letter of recommendation prepared for her on May 29, a duplicate of which was sent to the director of the exchange.

The detailed information which I have received from the exchange committee leads me to believe that the teacher we are expecting during the coming year will be equally satisfactory. You perhaps know that teachers who are accepted for the exchange must be outstanding instructors with good recommendations. A great deal of information comes to the school systems involved before the teacher ever arrives. I am sure that no school system would be required to accept any person who appeared undesirable.

There seems to be some fear on the part of a few Congressmen that some of the teachers who come to the United States may act as foreign agitators. This is, of course, a possibility. There also is the possibility that some of our teachers may do a little agitating for some of our institutions and our way of life which, in the opinion of some people, would be a good thing. I hope any teachers we send believe in this country enough to speak well of it. Since we always send as many teachers abroad as we accept, I have an idea that the influence of the foreigners here will be pretty well counteracted by our teachers abroad.

Frankly, I have very little patience with Congressmen who oppose the plan. In a world such as ours is today, we need to do everything we can to see that there is more association with the peoples of other countries, not less. If the teachers who come into our schools attempt to spread undesirable propaganda or to behave in any improper manner, I am sure that we could appeal to exchange officials and secure their removal. There certainly is no point in sabotaging a splendid plan because we may get or send abroad one or two undesirable teachers.

Thank you for all your services in the past.

Yours respectfully,
W. F. LOGGINS,
Superintendent.

JUNE 11, 1947.

To Whom It May Concern:

It affords me real pleasure to have the opportunity to write a letter of recommendation for Miss Ethel Davis, British exchange teacher who has been in the Greenville city schools this year.

Miss Davis has been highly praised by her principal and fellow teachers for her ability as a teacher, for the fine relationship she has had with her pupils and coworkers, and for the ease with which she apparently has adjusted to all the differences which exist between the schools of Great Britain and the United States. Her principal naturally followed her work closely because he wanted to be helpful in every possible way, but he found that she required very little assistance. She is able, self-reliant, and has a good sense of humor.

Not only is Miss Davis an excellent teacher of elementary school children; her general information is outstanding. She is highly intelligent and well-informed. During the year I have found myself constantly amazed at the amount of information she has concerning many matters and have sometimes wondered if our American teachers know as much as she does about our Nation and world affairs.

No letter would be complete without some mention of the contribution Miss Davis has made to Greenville and surrounding communities. She is a charming public speaker and has given generously of her time to speak before professional, cultural, civic, and church groups. All who have heard her are delighted with her personally and are impressed with the things she has to say.

A Greenville newspaper columnist devoted part of a recent day's writing to her, stating, in part:

"If a survey were made, it probably would show that Miss Davis has made more speeches during the last 9 months than any other person in Greenville. He fine sense of taste, her frankness and tolerance have made her a favorite in our city and young and old alike regret to see her return to her native England in the early future. Whatever person in England made such a wise choice as the selection of Miss Davis as an exchange teacher is due a vote of thanks from every one of the 107,000 persons of greater Greenville."

I think he has voiced the sentiments of all of us. Miss Davis has sold the teacher exchange plan to the people here.

I am delighted to recommend her unreservedly for any position she feels she is equipped to fill.

Yours truly,
W. F. LOGGINS,
Superintendent.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during all the years of my service in Congress I have consistently refrained from indulging in the slightest criticism of my associates. It is not my intention to be critical now. Far be it from me to question the motives of any Member of this body or to voice objection to his free expression of his informed views on any subject. I do, however, question such views when and if they are apparently based upon misinformation or inspired by prejudice.

Until now I have listened in silence to the long and frequently bitter debate upon the pending measure. In many respects it has been a remarkable and disappointing exhibition. As an informative discussion it has had but little appeal. On the other hand it has forced upon me the conclusion that much of the opposition to the bill under consideration stems from a lack of understanding of the intent and purpose of the measure and lack of appreciation of the vital necessity of the action it authorizes.

In addition to this, throughout the debate there has frequently been evidenced a partisan political predjudice against our State Department and all its works. Day after day we have heard what might well be termed unreasoning criticism directed at the Department—criticism so undeserved as to indicate that, to the minds of the critics, anything commended by our State Department should at once be subject to condemnation.

I hold no brief for any department of our Government. In my opinion the men who head our departments are amply able to take care of themselves, and there is not one of them who, if given the privilege of the floor of this House, could not come here and answer his critics face to face with credit and honor to himself. Unfortunately he has not this privilege. An attack made upon him here can be answered only by silence, while his critic preens himself upon the courage of his performance.

Our Secretary of State and his assistants are today engaged in the performance of a task of unprecedented difficulty and importance. The difficulty of this task cannot be magnified—the results of a failure in performance cannot be measured. All of us know or should know that upon the success of these efforts depend the security of a distressed world. That success or failure may spell the difference between a continuation of democratic processes in government and the end, throughout the world, of all liberty and freedom. Success may mean peace—failure may mean war. Faced with this critical situation, who will say that the men of our Department of State should not be given the confidence and trust of the Nation they serve? Who will say that they should not be supplied with every instrumentality necessary to the success of their undertaking.

One of the questions raised by the bill now under consideration is whether or not there is need for continuation of the broadcasting program provided for in the measure. During the debate we have been told over and over again, and truthfully, that the Soviet Union has for many months been broadcasting a program designed to injure the United States of America and bring upon our country the hatred and contempt of the peoples of other nations. We are told that day after day and month after month the official broadcasting stations of the Russian Government have been, and are now, beaming to all countries in Europe and to other nations of the world, in the language of the peoples sought to be influenced, a mass of untruths, distorted information, garbled news, and false propaganda against our people and our Government. Day after day and night after night this insidious propaganda is being hammered into listeners in scores of countries over the globe.

Until the Voice of America came on the air not a word of denial or correction of the Russians' statements was heard. Not a single truth about America was uttered. Not a single voice was raised in our defense. Who is it who cannot foresee the results if we now become and remain silent? Our need for the Voice of America is great. It must not be silenced.

Now is the time when our great democratic Nation must be presented to the world in its true light, and not in the distorted image created by the Russian Communists. We know that the Russian objective is to undermine the Government of the United States and destroy all confidence of the world in our democratic form of government. They know that a lie, however incredible, if constantly repeated and unchallenged, will ultimately be accepted as the truth. This was the Hitler philosophy once; it

is the Russian policy now, and to carry it on the Soviet Government is spending on its broadcasting program more money than all other governments combined are spending for the same purpose. If the opponents of the pending bill have their way and defeat this measure, the field will be open for Russia to work her will with the peoples of the world.

The United States of America saved Russia from destruction. During World War II our ships, loaded with desperately needed materials of war, crowded the sea lanes leading to her shores. We drew upon our resources to arm, clothe, shelter, and feed her armies. We fed and clothed her noncombatant population. We gave without stint in order that she might have the strength to drive from her soil the invading armies of Hitler. Russia was made strong through the will and generosity of a free and democratic nation. Today, awakened to her power and strength, her Government is spending something like $100,000,000 a year to tell the world that the United States of America is imperialistic, grasping, and domineering; that it threatens the security and freedom of all peoples and is endangering the peace of the world.

We cannot afford to let a campaign like that go on unrebuked and unchallenged. We cannot afford to keep silent. Our voices must be heard. The people of all countries must be told the truth. The prestige of our Nation is at stake and the interests of the American people demand the passage of the pending measure.

The bill under consideration provides a further answer to the problem we are facing. This is found in its provision for the exchange of students, skills, and information. It calls on the nations of the world for open doors, for a friendly exchange of the knowledge necessary to human progress. It will permit the youth of our country to visit other lands, to see their cities and towns, to enter their schools, to visit their homes, to mingle with their people, to learn to understand and to speak their language, to observe their habits and customs, to meet them face to face and to know them for what they are.

This bill, if passed, will bring the youth of other nations to America for the same purpose and grant to them the same privileges. Those who come here will visit our educational institutions, our museums, our libraries, our galleries of art. They will study in our colleges and universities. They will, as do those we send abroad, visit with us in our American homes and note our way of life. They will see democracy in action and learn at first hand the true meaning of freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.

And, then, those who come here and those we send there will return to their respective homes carrying with them a new concept and understanding of each country and people they have visited. This new concept will be put into words—into friendly words—to enlighten those at home; and in every community from which a visitor was sent, there will grow and flourish a new respect of one people for another—a friendly respect born of knowledge and understanding.

Now, more than at any time in its history, is it necessary for the United States to cultivate and win the friendship and cooperation of other nations. Russia's propaganda campaign against us has already been effective in many countries. If her broadcasted untruths became fixed in the minds for which they are intended, they will never be uprooted. They will grow, flourish, and expand into a deep distrust and hatred. Our world leadership will pass to another nation headed by an individual whose will is law and whose power is fear. If that time should come, we will again face the alternative of a loss of liberty and freedom or a war to preserve our most precious heritage—and this time we will face that crisis alone.

It is my earnest hope that this House will pass the measure now under consideration. Its passage will mean that the Voice of America will not be silenced and that a student-exchange program will be established. Both programs are needed instrumentalities for world-wide and a lasting peace.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, much has been said during the last hour or two about our veterans. Certainly, I yield to no man in this Chamber or in the country in my appreciation of the conduct of the veterans during the last war as well as during World War I. That being the case, and since that appreciation is unanimous on our part, it occurs to me that now is probably an appropriate time to ascertain who is for and who is against this bill.

First, the subcommittee which is in charge of it here held very extensive hearings and indulged in a unanimously favorable report to the full committee. Then, the full committee after mature consideration after the subcommittee had amended the bill very generously, and after a number of other amendments were made, unanimously reported the bill to the House.

On what did the members of the committee base their unanimous report? Who appeared for the bill? Among others, Secretary of State Marshall, Chief of Staff during the war; General Eisenhower, commander of the Allied Armies during the war, and present Chief of Staff; General Walter Bedell Smith, General Eisenhower's chief of staff during the war, and presently Ambassador to Russia who spoke not only with his war experience as a background but as an American diplomat now in one of the large foreign countries and who has heard this program, seen its activity, and observed the reaction.

Who else? The leadership of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Veterans of World War II.

That, my colleagues, I submit, includes practically all the veterans of the last war as well as of World War I. They unanimously, through their leaders, came to our committee and many of them spoke with experience, such as Marshall and Eisenhower. They not only unanimously approved this legislation but urged its enactment.

Who appeared against the bill? Despite the invitation which I personally heard extended by the chairman of the subcommittee, which was a very cordial invitation through the press, which was well represented, for anybody to appear in opposition, not one single person, my colleagues, appeared in opposition to the bill.

Now, who are you going to follow in casting your vote when the roll is called?

Are you going to follow the leadership of our veterans, General Marshall, General Eisenhower, and General Smith, and the leaders of all veterans' organizations, or are you going to cast your vote against what these illustrious patriots are all very positively convinced is for the best interests of the country we love because of the fact that you heard some rumor that your uncle's grandpa's niece's cousin's stepdaughter said that this bill was not good? On what are you going to base your vote? In reaching your conclusion, remember that while these soldiers brought this war to a glorious and successful conclusion, remember that the psychological warfare is still on, and remember, too, that the money proposed to be contributed toward the success of this warfare is some $30,000,000, as against some $300,000,000,000 spent during the war and many more billions that would be necessary to win another war, to say nothing of the hundreds of thousands of precious lives. Certainly, my colleagues, does not statesmanship, does not love of country, does not respect for these gentlemen who know whereof they speak demand that you stop, look, and listen?

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. The gentleman stated that the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars were sponsoring this bill. At what national convention did they state by any resolution that they were sponsoring it?

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman belongs to both organizations and he knows that between conventions their respective committees act for these bodies, and it was the executive committees which approved the resolution approving this bill, both the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I just wanted to say that as far as I am personally concerned, I am going to vote on this legislation as a result of my own study of it and I think every other Member has intelligence enough to study this bill and to come to a conclusion upon the bill, regardless of what anybody else may have told him.

Mr. JARMAN. I certainly commend the gentleman for voting on that basis and I hope that all others will do the same. If so, if they will really thoroughly familiarize themselves with the real bill, its purposes and its possibilities for accomplishment for our country, there will be no doubt whatever of its overwhelming passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request for time at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. All pro forma amendments are withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADVANCES OF FUNDS AND PROPERTY

SEC. 802. If any governmental, intergovernmental, or private source shall express the desire to provide funds, property, or services to be used by this Government, in whole or in part, for the expenses of any part of the program undertaken pursuant to this act, the Secretary is authorized, when he finds it in the public interest, to accept such funds, property, or services. Funds so received may be established as a trust fund or special deposit account in the Treasury of the United States, to be available for reimbursement of appropriations or direct expenditure for the purposes and under the provisions of this Act. Any unexpended balance of the trust fund or special deposit account and other property received under this section and no longer required for the purposes for which provided shall be returned to the source providing the funds or property.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 17, line 14, strike out all of line 14 and all of section 802.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I may say that this amendment is prompted by some research into the problems that are presented in this bill in section 802. When I read the bill and studied it, I came to the conclusion that if this grant of authority were permitted to remain in this bill, it would be possible for a State Department, so inclined, to completely circumvent the will of the Congress of the United States, and to bypass the Appropriations Committee entirely and to accept voluntary grants and contributions from private agencies of one kind or another, to pay the expenses of carrying out a purely governmental function. That has been contrary to public policy ever since this Nation was established as a nation.

There has never been a time when an expenditure of money for such a purpose could be properly justified, or the acceptance of money for expenditure by the Government for a purely governmental purpose could be justified unless and until the Congress of the United States expressly gave its approval.

I have here as a result of research a great long list of acts passed by the Congress of the United States dealing with the acceptance of donations, and I do not find a single one that related to a situation such as is envisioned in this section 802.

I think it would be a dangerous thing to allow any private organization to go to the State Department and say: "Mr. Secretary, the Congress of the United States has refused to give you the amount of money that you want to carry on this program. We will give it to you and provide the money"; and he would have the right to accept it and to thumb his nose at the Congress and its control over appropriations.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the Members of the House that the gentleman from Wisconsin was thoughtful enough to come before our subcommittee to discuss this problem to which he has devoted a great amount of research in tracing down the genesis of these provisions to which he has referred.

This section is not basic to the legislation at all, and rather than take an unnecessary chance we have told him we will be happy to accept the amendment.

I wanted him, however, to give the explanation to the House. I thank him for it. It is a constructive amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS

LOYALTY CHECK ON PERSONNEL

SEC. 901. No individual may be employed or assigned to duties under this act unless the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, after such investigation as he deems necessary, certifies that, in his opinion, such individual is loyal to the United States and such employment or assignment is consistent with the security of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 18, line 8, after the figure "901", strike out the balance of the section and insert in lieu thereof the following: "No citizen or resident of the United States, whether or not now in the employ of the Government, may be employed or assigned to duties under this act unless the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, after such investigation as he deems necessary, certifies that in his opinion such individual is loyal to the United States and that such employment or assignment to duties is consistent with the security of the United States: *Provided, however*, That any present employee of the Government, unless an unfavorable report as to such employee is rendered sooner by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, may, without such certification, be employed or assigned to duties under this act for the period of 6 months from the date of its enactment. This section shall not apply in the case of any officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. RICHARDS to the committee amendment: "No citizen or resident of the United States, whether or not now in the employ of the Government, may be employed or assigned to duties under this act until such individual has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a report thereon has been made to the Secretary of State: *Provided, however*, That any present employee of the Government, pending the report as to such employee by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, may be employed or assigned to duties under this act for the period of 6 months from the date of its enactment. This section shall not apply in the case of any officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this substitute amendment for the consideration of the House because I think it my duty to do so.

Both section 901 and the committee amendment provide that no one may be employed under this act until he has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation from a loyalty and security standpoint.

In my humble opinion, so far, so good. I believe these people should be investigated, those coming in and those already there. If there are Communists or Communist sympathizers in this outfit, or in any other department of the Government, they should be and must be ruthlessly weeded out. There is no room in any department or agency of our Government for those who do not owe their allegiance solely and wholeheartedly to the United States.

As a matter of fact, there have been so many wild rumors about Communists boring into the State Department that I believe such an investigation would be welcomed by 99 percent of the employees there.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has the machinery, the experience, and the know-how to do this job. You already know that the President has requested scrutiny and screening of all Federal employees from the loyalty standpoint. Secretary of State Marshall, shortly after his return from Moscow, filed a specific request with the FBI that top priority be given investigation of employees in the State Department. Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of Administration John E. Peurifoy realizing that a man in his position must be, like Caesar's wife, above suspicion, immediately upon his appointment some weeks ago requested that he himself be investigated by the FBI. There is no doubt what this investigation will reveal as to Mr. Peurifoy. I have known him for many years and his family all my life, and I can testify that he is able, trustworthy, and efficient, and that there is no man in Government service today more loyal to the United States Government and our way of life.

But the committee amendment goes too far. In addition to requiring an investigation by the FBI, it further provides that, before the Secretary of State can employ anyone, the Director of the FBI must certify "that, in his opinion, such individual is loyal to the United States and that such employment or assignment is consistent with the security of the United States."

So far as I know, no such requirement as to the employees of this or any other department of the Government has ever before been enacted into law.

My substitute amendment provides that the FBI is to investigate and report its findings to the Secretary of State, but strikes out the requirement as to certification.

I have not communicated with either Secretary Marshall or Mr. Hoover about this certification requirement. I am not authorized to speak for either of them. But I am certain that Mr. Hoover does not approve this requirement because it was never intended that the FBI have this super-power over the Secretary of State himself. The FBI is an investiga-

tive agency; it is a fact-finding body; it has peculiar facilities for making investigations. Its services are needed here. Its proper function is to investigate and present the facts to our courts and the departments of the Government. It may be assumed that the Secretary of State, to whom the results of FBI investigations are made known, will act for the best interest of this country. To assume otherwise would be to impugn the loyalty of the Secretary of State and his Assistant in Charge of Administration. To assume otherwise would be to admit a fatal weakness in our system of government.

I am strong for this bill. The true story of the United States must be carried to the world, if we are to be understood. Our democratic way of life must be championed in the forum of the world. Right now Russia is spending millions propagandizing the world on the virtues of the communistic state. We must combat this stuff or reap the whirlwind later on. We must combat it by doing everything possible to see that foreigners are told the truth. But we should do it through democratic processes.

This bill sets up the machinery for getting our story told. We want the world to know that this is a Government of free men; that the United States is not a police state and, with the help of God, will never be.

That being true, it is inconsistent and destructive of our purposes to allow to remain in this bill a provision which makes the Federal Bureau of Investigation a superpolice body with final say-so over the personnel and activities of the State Department. The provision of the committee amendment, if enacted into law, would in itself create in this country the germ of the police state, the very thing that this bill proposes to combat abroad. We would thereby help to create a Frankenstein which could finally destroy our democratic system and our way of life.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS to the substitute: In the substitute offered by Mr. RICHARDS, after the word "safe", line 5, insert "who shall certify that in his opinion such individual is loyal to the United States and that such employment or assignment to duty is consistent with the security of the United States."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee, because I would like to explain what is wrong with the approach that these two gentlemen are making to this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman choking off debate on this important bill when many Members have not had a chance to speak on the bill at all?

Mr. MUNDT. I scarcely think it has been choked off, but I will modify my request and make it 15 minutes if the gentleman cares to have some time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. My amendment to the substitute is designed to strengthen it and to meet some objections which I think might occur on the Republican side of the aisle. My amendment vests the obligation to certify in the Secretary of State, because I believe that the Members on the Republican side of the aisle want to be sure that in this particular program it should be somebody whom they have confidence in who will vouch for the loyalty and the security of the personnel involved. Under my amendment the Secretary of State is required to certify to the loyalty and security of each individual employee in the program.

I beg leave to inform the Committee why this entire proposal is important, although it is not in the main stream of the bill. The head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is not a Cabinet officer. He is an officer appointed by the Attorney General. The Secretary of State is a Cabinet officer, and of high rank. Yet, by what we are doing in the bill, we are saying that an officer of lower rank, in a bureau which is charged essentially with criminal investigation, has the power to bind the Secretary of State on a certification of the loyalty of important personnel in the Department of State; hardly an expression of confidence in the Secretary of State of the United States. Also as my colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee from South Carolina so eloquently said, it opens the possibility of a political police bureau of our own. In the bill for relief assistance to Greece and Turkey we included a similar provision, but that provision called for no such certification by the FBI. It said only that a person "shall have been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

Now, I yield to no one in my solicitude for the passage of this bill, and I would like to say a word while I am on my feet on two of the arguments that have been made here today about the bill.

We have been asked what is an antonym for isolationism. An antonym for isolationism is security, and I would like to give the gentleman three synonyms for isolationism—one is insecurity, the other is impracticability, and the third is unrealism. I cannot believe that anybody who went through the last war could still stand up here and claim to be an isolationist and find any virtue in that position.

One other point—a good deal has been made about the fact that a majority of the Republicans went through the middle aisle on a teller vote to shelve this bill, and that a minority of the Republicans supported the move to continue on with this bill, argue it out and come to a vote. But, I would like to point out that when the Greek-Turkish assistance bill was before this Committee, on the question of whether we were going to be isolationists or whether we were going to be realists, a majority of the Republicans who voted, 58 percent, voted to be realistic, voted aye, in recognition of the fact that national security was a part of world security and that the preservation of freedom here required it to be fought for in places far removed from here.

I prefer to believe that what Republican Members want is a clarification of this bill; they want some amendments; they want a complete discussion. I refuse to believe that a majority will be so unrealistic as to want to kill this bill, finally. The Republicans were in the minority in the Congress for a long time, and it is because new men have come in that the Republicans are in the majority. Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that the great majority of the new men who received the mandate of the people in November 1946, realize the inseparability of foreign policy and the means for explaining it to the people of the world, and will vote "aye" when the roll is called on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that there is anything that I can add to the discussion of this bill. It occurs to me that at this time everyone should be given an opportunity to express himself. This is very important legislation. This is legislation dealing with the future of this country and the world. If I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, although I have not had a chance to study it—I just heard it read—it seems to me that the amendment ought to be adopted. I have no understanding of the amendment that was just offered by the gentleman from New York. It may be a good suggestion.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JAVITS. All that it does is that it takes exactly the thought of the gentleman from South Carolina and gives the power of certification to the Secretary of State. The amendment as presented by the gentleman from South Carolina just states that the Secretary of State shall have a report of the investigation. My amendment requires in addition that the Secretary of State, after having that report from the FBI, shall certify.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. I very much appreciate the gentleman's remarks about this amendment. If I understood correctly what he said, he has a clear conception of what my amendment does.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I confess that I have not had any chance to study it, but it seems to me that it is a good amendment.

Mr. RICHARDS. My substitute provides for an investigation by the FBI. It provides for a report from the FBI to the Secretary of State, but it cuts out the requirement for certification by the FBI to the Secretary of State before an employee can be added to the rolls of the State Department.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I see nothing wrong with that.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. The thing that strikes me with peculiar force is, Who is going to tell the Secretary of State or give him the facts with reference to these people that he may select? He has no personal knowledge of them. Will he get his information and his certification from some of those who are in that agency, that the President recently said he wanted $50,000,000 to investigate and get rid of?

Mr. LECOMPTE. He will get his information from the FBI. That is one of the big departments in this Government and is one of the departments that stands high in the estimation of the American people.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman who now has the floor and also the gentleman from New York that the State Department is an important branch of the Government, tied into the Cabinet, and that the FBI is not, but I am not unmindful of the fact that the FBI is the investigating arm of the United States Government.

Mr. LECOMPTE. If we cannot depend on the FBI, on whom can we depend?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not propose to turn that arm of the Government over to the State Department. Further, the State Department is entrusted more than any other department of the Government with the welfare of the country. The employees of that Department should be investigated by the FBI before they are permitted to deal with the destinies of the United States.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I am confident that General Marshall does not want anybody in whom he does not have complete confidence.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. This is the way this situation appears to me. Nobody may be employed until after he has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Without the certification, Secretary Marshall then would take that report, and I cannot think that anyone in this House, having the faith and confidence in him that we do, would believe that Secretary Marshall would appoint to any position anybody upon whom the FBI had made an unfavorable report.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is the position I am trying to take, but I thought that was the purpose and the object of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is exactly it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. As near as I could understand it, that is what I thought should be written into the bill.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The committee is up against this hard situation, however. We know of instances where a Secretary of State has employed or continued in employment individuals on whom the FBI made distinctly unfavorable reports. Still they were retained in the State Department.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Was the Secretary of State conscious of that fact?

Mr. JUDD. Well, the FBI turned in an unfavorable report in one case and, I understand, the Secretary did not look at the report. If he had looked at the report of course he could not have employed the man; but for various reasons it apparently was thought that to discharge the man for his pro-Communist activities might get us into trouble with Russia so the man was continued in employment although there was reason to believe he was not working primarily in the interest of the United States.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. I have plenty of faith in Edgar Hoover, but I certainly do not have any more faith in Edgar Hoover than I have in George Marshall.

Mr. JUDD. Neither do I; but George Marshall is not in charge of investigating the activities of a given person, and Edgar Hoover is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize what the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from South Carolina have said. Really, when you require the FBI to report to the Secretary of State on an investigation of a proposed employee, as the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina would require, it is the same thing as requiring the FBI to report on his loyalty, because I, too, cannot conceive of Secretary of State Marshall employing anyone about whom he has received a report from the FBI that he is disloyal to this country.

Mr. Hoover does not want this. Just as in the case of the United Nations, if we continue, as has been attempted in the House, to load the United Nations with many things which it is not equipped to do, that is the easiest way to kill it. Similarly, if we continue to load duties on our FBI, it cannot continue to function on the high plane and with the efficiency that it has always operated heretofore. I repeat, Mr. Hoover does not wish to have this duty. No other law has ever been passed by Congress in which such a provision has been placed.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I, too, have every respect for Edgar Hoover, but I, too, do not wish to run any risk whatever, just as the gentleman from South Carolina does not wish to run the risk, of the possibility of an accusation from any foreign country or from any "pinkos" in our own country that we are tending toward an NKVD in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, we are carrying forward in this proposed amendment a program on which we are now embarked. We wrote it into the relief legislation and we wrote it into the Turkish-Greek Loan Act. In fact I was the author of the FBI protective amendments in both of those bills. We provided that employees dealing with certain aspects of our international affairs should be screened by the FBI. I think that is a sound and prudent policy.

We have put it in this bill in this fashion deliberately because we feel this is one of the great struggles in which our country is engaged in order to defeat the activities and efforts of Communists abroad. We want the people carrying out this new program to be free from suspicion. We want to put an end to the suspicions and rumors of which we have heard so much during this debate. We want these new employees to be audited and to be screened and to be examined and to be checked by the FBI and we want them affirmatively certified. We believe that Secretary of State Marshall will be happy to have that responsibility taken off his shoulders.

I have never had too much confidence, Mr. Chairman, in an audit of a bank which is made by the wife of a cashier in the bank. I think the FBI, being outside of the State Department, should have the responsibility of investigating. The State Department is not set up as an investigating agency. This is in line with legislation which I hope the House and Senate will enact before we adjourn which will establish throughout all Federal agencies that the FBI shall clear all Federal employees as to loyalty and also clear them in the matter of security for this country.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a negative vote on the proposals of both the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] for the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JARMAN) there were—ayes 65, noes 87.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 902. If any provision of this act or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the question was raised as to the endorsement of this legislation by the American

Legion. I have in my hand a letter from John Thomas Taylor, director of the national legislative committee, in which he says:

The American Legion, at the meeting of the national executive committee held May 5-7, 1947, at Indianapolis, Ind., considered the situation relative to the dissemination of American information to countries overseas. Appreciating the seriousness of the situation and efforts of the State Department to remedy this, they adopted the attached resolution which I am enclosing for your information, with the request that it be included in your record of the hearings as the established position of the American Legion on this vital subject.

The hearings referred to in the letter relate to the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, which was considering this subject.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. In other words, the national executive committee of the American Legion acted on this matter after the issue came before the Congress?

Mr. GARY. And adopted this resolution. Yes.

RESOLUTION 97, NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., MAY 5-7, 1947

CONTINUED WORLD-WIDE DISSEMINATION OF THE OPERATION AND PROGRESS OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

Whereas it is vitally necessary that the peoples of the world be fully and constantly informed of the operation and progress of American democracy and of the unselfish aims and purposes of the United States of America in opposing the encroachment of tyrannical and totalitarian ideologies by some nations beyond their own boundaries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the continuation of world-wide dissemination by our Government, through international radio, motion pictures, and otherwise, of the fundamental facts of the American form of government and way of life and of the basic character and objectives of our foreign policy.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. ELLIS. The resolution did not endorse this bill.

Mr. GARY. It endorsed the program which this bill provides for.

Mr. ELLIS. But it did not endorse H. R. 3342.

Mr. GARY. It endorsed the program which this bill provides for.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. MASON. And no one could endorse this bill now because no one knows what is in it.

Mr. GARY. I have read the resolution and the resolution speaks for itself.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. This committee, through its chairman, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], did receive a letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars specifically approving this particular measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, for many days the opposition to H. R. 3342 has succeeded in successfully bottling up a final vote on what is to some of us a most important measure if the United States is to combat successfully the advance of other ideologies considered by us to be inimical to the self-interest and the safety of the United States.

H. R. 3342, regardless of what its critics may say, was drawn up in honesty and sincerity. After several days of the bitterest debate, the members of the committee, who reported the bill with a surprising degree of unanimity of thought, are in no manner dismayed by the attack and are determined to bring the matter to a vote. As Henley said in his immortal Invictus:

In the fell clutch of circumstance,
I have not winced nor cried aloud;
Under the bludgeonings of chance,
My head is bloody but unbowed.

So it is with the collective head of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We offer no apologies for our convictions, nor are we prepared to sacrifice this bill to the demands of those who would use their prejudice against certain portions of it as a lever to collective bargaining. The committee, in the interest of some degree of harmony, has accepted amendments which have not had the effect of emasculating the measure. We are prepared to accept others, so long as the weapons of ideas which we unanimously urge are not dulled beyond the possibility of use.

Time does not permit the listing of those who support this measure throughout the country. Captains of industry, the press, the radio, educators, churchmen, veterans, and laymen have joined together in support of the principles herein set forth.

I should like particularly the attention of the Republican side of the House.

Joined to this national voice last week was that of the platform committee of the Young Republican Clubs, meeting in national convention in Milwaukee. I quote from the statement of principles adopted by the convention. Under the heading, "The United States and the world," the future Republican leaders of America stated:

We advocate effective opposition to the spread of communism and other totalitarian ideologies. We must have a positive, vibrant approach to the rest of the world which is designed to show our faith in the objectives and operation of our free institutions. This approach should be implemented by educational programs for the purpose of informing others of the virtues of our way of life, and by a program of economic help for other nations to the end that they may be self-supporting.

That is the voice of the Young Republicans, now; it is not the Young Democrats; it is not the American Youth for Democracy; and it is not the Young Communists.

In short, the Young Republicans of the United States call for positive action, and for a vision which extends over and beyond their neighbor's cornfields.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I am sorry; I cannot.

Mr. HUBER. I do not like the reference to the National Youth outfit and the Young Communists.

Mr. JACKSON of California. The implementation of our foreign policy has changed materially since our forefathers stood before Concord Bridge and fired the shot heard "round the world," although some of the statements made in opposition to the measure under consideration would indicate that some minds are still muzzle loaded, and that some concepts of our present day relationships to the rest of the earth could well have been voiced on the quarterdeck of the Santa Maria, or on the poop deck of the Mayflower.

Mr. Chairman, this is 1947, in the era of the atom. Upon one thing all men of good conscience are agreed. The world, its great distances shortened from terms of days and months to terms better expressed in minutes, cannot survive against the unleashed atom. The bundles of currency saved by defeat of this measure will burn as furiously as any others in the hot fires of the next war.

The gentlemen in opposition claim realism as their guide, and economy as their shield. Today there is no realism in silence and no protection behind a shield of dollar signs. To paraphrase a famous line from the marriage ceremony, we must speak now or forever lose our peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In view of the doubt as to the type of personnel to be selected for these posts under this act, I think it is especially important that the veterans be given preference in the selection of such personnel. Millions of veterans served overseas in foreign countries and know conditions in those countries. I understand an amendment to this end will be introduced by a Member, the very able and distinguished chairman of the Civil Service Committee [Mr. REES], who is very thoroughly qualified to sponsor such an amendment.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 903. The Secretary may delegate, to such officers of the Government as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, any of the powers conferred upon him by this act to

extent that he finds such delegation to be in the interest of the purposes expressed in this act and the efficient administration of the programs undertaken pursuant to this act.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 19, strike out all of section 903.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, however the other Members of the House may feel, personally I am deeply grateful to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON], who just spoke so eloquently and so enlighteningly a few moments ago. He remarked that some of us in our thinking apparently were loaded at the muzzle. Perhaps that is right. I would like to plead guilty to that, if he meant what I think he meant, but I will say to the gentleman from California that I am not so heavily loaded with foreign propaganda that I blow out at the breech all the time.

I regret that the gentleman from South Dakota, for whom I have great respect and admiration, raised the issue of isolationism or nationalism a little while ago; and as is so often the case with gentlemen who think as he apparently does, they make very little distinction between isolationism and a lack of patriotism. The internationalists seem to be thinking of ways we can hamper ourselves while aiding others—of the interests of other nations rather than of the welfare of the United States of America. We will let that stand as it is. The gentleman said that we should line up and do everything we can for all other nations. I most respectfully call his attention to a recent statement of a former President of the United States, Mr. Hoover, who certainly cannot be characterized as an isolationist. You will remember that President Hoover warned us not once in the last few months, but several times, that there is such a thing as expanding and extending our giving and lending program until after a while we will not only be unable to give or to aid other people but we will not have a shirt left to cover our own national back. Muzzle loading? Yes. Some of us from the Midwest are. And, after all, our freedom was won, and for many years maintained, by muzzle-loading ancestors who shot true and often with muzzle-loading guns; and if the present generation of breech-loading gentlemen who shoot foreign ideology all the time will do as well, our welfare will be assured.

We are wondering whether those who advocate day in and day out that we must give this, that, and the other to everyone all over the world, while taking from our own people, are finally going to get us into a condition where we will not be able to help anyone and will not be able to carry on for ourselves. I go to the statement made earlier in the day: When are we going to take an inventory and find out what we have? We have not a nickel in the bank, we have not a thing in the cupboard any more; we have been giving away until finally we will find ourselves stripped.

Let us take a glance at this section on page 12 which reads: "In carrying out the purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized, in addition to and not in limitation of the authority otherwise vested in him (1) in carrying out title II of this act, within the limitation of such appropriations as the Congress may provide, to make grants of money, services, or materials" to everybody.

Now, let us go over to the section I want to strike, section 903:

The Secretary may delegate, to such officers of the Government as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, any of the powers, conferred upon him by this act.

First, what do we do? Instead of controlling the money and the way it is to be spent, we delegate that power to the Secretary of State. Then we tell the Secretary of State that he can delegate any or all of those powers or any or all of the powers which we give him to spend every dollar which the Congress may appropriate to anyone that he may select. That is a second-degree delegation of authority. I have called your attention to the printing of money in Italy and Russia, which has to do, I presume, with the duties of Secretary of the Treasury. Here we are dealing with the Secretary of State and we authorize him to delegate all of the authority given by this bill. Do you think that is right?

I ask that that section, that second delegation of authority, that double delegation of authority, first to the Secretary of State and then by him to someone else, be cut out of the bill and that we at least have the good judgment to delegate authority only to the Secretary of State himself, not permit him to redelegate the authority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I think I should say simply in connection with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], that if we were to adopt that, we would certainly cripple the State Department in its administration of the act and make it impossible for the Secretary of State to do an efficient job, because obviously the Secretary of State must delegate to other people not only in the State Department but outside of the State Department some of these functions. For example some of them will deal with the census bureaus of other countries.

Obviously you could not expect the Secretary of State to work with the census experts of another country. Some questions will deal with the problem of agriculture. A great many of them will deal with the problems of agriculture, I may say, since hunger is today a serious world problem, and surely the Secretary of State should be permitted to delegate to the people in the Department of Agriculture those portions of the program in which we work with specialists of other lands from the standpoint of agricultural problems and the battle against starvation.

In addition to that, the educational exchange features will require the advice and cooperation of people in the Bureau of Education, so they are going to work in certain aspects of this matter. If we limit it to the Secretary of State and tie him down to his Department, without any delegation of authority inside or outside of his Department, obviously you phrase this legislation in such a way that it is unworkable, and it is unthinkable that this Congress is going to pass legislation with unworkable or crippling amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

SEC. 904. Nothing in this act shall authorize the disclosure of any information or knowledge in any case in which such disclosure is prohibited by any other law of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 19, line 23, after "United States", insert a comma, and "or (2) is inconsistent with the security of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPEAL OF ACT OF MAY 25, 1938, AS AMENDED

SEC. 905. (a) The act of May 25, 1938, entitled "An act authorizing the temporary detail of United States employees, possessing special qualifications, to governments of American Republics and the Philippines, and for other purposes," as amended (52 Stat. 442; 53 Stat. 652), is hereby repealed.

(b) Existing Executive orders and regulations pertaining to the administration of such act of May 25, 1938, as amended, shall remain in effect until superseded by regulations prescribed under the provisions of this act.

(c) Any reference in the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999), or in any other law, to provisions of such act of May 25, 1938, as amended, shall be construed to be applicable to the appropriate provisions of titles III and VIII of this act.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the extreme internationalists seem to think that any man who is opposed to feeding every lazy lout from Tokyo to Timbuctu out of the pockets of the American taxpayers is an isolationist. They seem to think that anyone who is in favor of looking out for the American people first is an isolationist, and subject to condemnation.

Now, let me tell you this, if you do not know it now, you will find it out—and I am speaking to Members on both sides—at least 75 percent of the American people are nationalists. They believe in the fundamental principles laid down by George Washington and Thomas Jefferson when they said that our foreign policy should be one of "peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations; entangling alliances with none."

That policy, if followed today, would make America the strongest and most powerful nation under the shining sun, but when you go off under the guise of carrying the Voice of America abroad and bring in legislation here that tears down our immigration laws, imports Communist professors, if you please, from behind the iron curtain, and violates every principle of the foreign policy Washington and Jefferson and the great leaders who founded this Republic believed in, you are not doing the country any good, and you are not carrying out the will of the American people.

I shall vote to recommit this bill in its present form to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in my opinion, if you pass it in its present form, it will be as dead as a dodo.

I do not believe it will ever again see the light of day. I am sure it would not if the Americans could have their way.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 9 minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, like every other Member that is serious-minded I want to do the right thing about this piece of legislation, but I am tremendously confused. I do not know what is in it and nobody else who votes on this bill will know what is in it.

I noted in this morning's paper that certain agents of the Department of Agriculture went down to the National 4-H Club meeting yesterday and very earnestly and seriously told those 4-H boys and girls that any of them who possibly can should go to China to learn how to farm.

There was a time when foreigners came here to learn to study our methods, our manners, our ways, our religion, and so on, but since the New Deal has come into effect we have gone haywire and have been sending people out all over the world to learn foreign methods and to bring foreign methods here. Today when a foreigner comes to our shores we welcome him with open arms and he usually goes home with a loan that turns out to be a gift. It is said one of the recent visitors who addressed this House took along home $4,800 for each word in his speech. I speak for much less. So to satisfy my conscience, with which I have to live, I am going to vote against this whole business. If they want to bring a bill in here that will take our information and our way of life to these countries to help them, all right, but if we are going to invite the world in here with their isms and their cockeyed ways of doing things, I am against it, so I am going to vote "no," and I believe a majority of you will, and I believe all of you should.

The House did a good job with the President's veto in overriding it. The message was inflammatory, weak, misleading, and very erroneous, and inconsistent as well as contradictory throughout. What the Senate will do remains to be seen. I am told that the 15 Democratic Senators who voted against it were summoned to the White House for lunch with the President today. That really is turning on the heat.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to call to the attention of the House that we are $260,000,000,000 in the hole. A million dollars is a thousand thousand dollars, and a billion dollars is a thousand million. We owe two hundred and sixty thousand million dollars that the American taxpayer eventually must pay. Now the State Department is developing programs for bigger and better spending; as my good friend and colleague would say, "Where are we going to get the money?"

I hold here an article by Walter Trohan which reads as follows:

UNITED STATES CONDUCTING PROPAGANDA FOR GLOBAL SPENDING

The State Department is conducting an undercover campaign to win support for its dollar-spending foreign policy.

The diplomats are holding a series of off-the-record seminars on foreign affairs for "influential" citizens only. The meetings are being held in Washington and around the country. The persons of influence, as they are characterized by State Department protocol, are being brought to Washington at Government expense.

The "influential" citizens attending the conferences are told by the State Department they have been selected because they are regarded as molders of opinion and leaders in their communities for support of the Department's foreign policy.

The Truman doctrine is being explained to representatives of women's clubs, church groups, fraternal organizations, and independent voters' leagues as well as individuals of standing in various communities. These include ministers, doctors, and lawyers.

The press is barred from the propaganda meetings.

I repeat, the press is barred from the propaganda meetings.

It is said that the secrecy is calculated to impress those invited and win them over to support of the Department on the theory that they are being initiated into inside secrets, when all they are getting is a rehashing of global-spending diplomacy.

At a 3-day meeting early this month——

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

Mr. GAVIN. Not at this point.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I plead with the gentleman to yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I decline to yield to my very dear and able friend from Pittsburgh.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Yes, Pennsylvania, and the gentleman comes from the great city of Pittsburgh of which we Pennsylvanians are proud.

At a 3-day meeting early this month the State Department had 250 persons representing groups of a total membership of 75,000,000 persons.

During the sessions, it was learned, the delegates were told the United States must give financial and political assistance around the world to stop Russia; that the State Department information program, now aground on congressional rocks, is necessary to save the world; that they must educate the general public to support the State Department; that President Truman is a great statesman; that General Marshall is a great diplomat, and that the State Department could use more money.

The wide range of organizations at the large meeting included representatives of the Southern Council of International Relations, the League of Women Voters, Community Discussion Council of Muncie, Ind., the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the Southern Baptist public affairs committee, Junior Leagues of America, Daughters of the American Revolution, Girl Scouts, and the B'nai B'rith, which supports and maintains the antideflation league.

And yet in face of this information we are shipping thousands of barrels of oil and gasoline—right now from California to Russia—so I cannot see how we can ever stop Russia in this manner.

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

Mr. GAVIN. Not at this point.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Please.

Mr. GAVIN. Please. I have a high regard for my very dear friend, and I ask that he please permit me to continue.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I have a letter from the Secretary of State at the Clerk's desk which I would like to have read at this time since I believe it effectively replies to the statements made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and to some of the other arguments that we have heard this afternoon. It tells the House clearly in his own language, over his own personal signature, exactly and definitely what Secretary of State Marshall needs and desires in his efforts for peace. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the Clerk may read the letter so that no Member may be led into denying the Secretary of State the weapons for peace, which he needs, through any misunderstanding about what Mr. Marshall says these requirements actually are. A Member of Congress assumes a frightening burden indeed when he votes to disarm our emissaries of peace.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, June 19, 1947.

The Honorable KARL MUNDT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MUNDT: I learn from the Department's legislative counsel that the House is about to take final action on H. R. 3342, authorizing an international-information program and educational exchanges.

Since I appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee in support of this bill on May 17, Members of Congress have attributed to me a great variety of opinions concerning the bill. I want to make my position plain.

I consider American security to rest not only on our economic and political and military strength, but also on the strength of American ideas—on how well they are

presented abroad—and on how clearly we are understood abroad.

There is no question that some other nations are using ideas as weapons and distorting facts to fit their ideas. We do not propose to follow suit. But I am convinced that we must present ourselves clearly, candidly, and affirmatively if we are to achieve the kind of peace we believe in. I know from personal experience that we are grossly misunderstood or misrepresented in many parts of the world.

I gave your committee my view that the facts about the United States must be spread in various ways. In some countries we must rely largely on radio. In others, we use also the press or motion pictures or exchanges of students and books or the assignment of government advisers. All are important and must be used if we are to be successful. To remove any one of these activities from the bill would be a form of demobilization. Peace cannot be served by any rationing of American facts or by limiting the methods for making them known.

I have informed committees of both Houses of Congress that authority for this type of program is necessary if the State Department is to fulfill its responsibilities to the President and the Nation. Without legislative authorization it has become almost impossible to recruit additional highly trained personnel to work on this program, either at home or abroad.

I am asking for the tools which are necessary to meet present circumstances in world affairs.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 20, line 17, insert:

"UTILIZATION OF PRIVATE AGENCIES

"SEC. 906. In carrying out the provisions of this act it shall be the duty of the Secretary to utilize, insofar as is practicable, the services and facilities of private agencies, through contractual arrangements or otherwise.

"OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

"SEC. 907. Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the establishment of any new Government agency; except that for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act the Secretary is hereby authorized to establish in the Department of State an office to be known as the Office of Information and Educational Exchange.

"TERMINATION PURSUANT TO CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF CONGRESS

"SEC. 908. The authority granted under this act, or under any provision thereof, shall terminate whenever such termination is directed by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress.

"REPORTS TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 909. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress semiannual reports of expenditures made and activities carried on under authority of this act."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: On page 20, line 21, after the period, add a new sentence, as follows:

"It is the intent of Congress that the Secretary shall encourage participation in carrying out the purposes of this act by the maximum number of different private agencies in each field, consistent with the present or potential market for their services in each country."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN]. As a result of the consideration given the matter of his subcommittee on appropriations when dealing with it, he and other members of that committee worked out this amendment. They discussed it with our committee, and we are perfectly agreeable to it. In essence it is this: It makes clear that it is the intent of Congress that the Department of State will always use private agencies, for example, the United Press and the Associated Press, whenever the market for their services in various countries is such as to permit those private agencies to carry on their informational activities.

The committee has no objection, and I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] may extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I have studied the bill which my colleague KARL MUNDT's subcommitee has devised for a foreign information program.

Surely most of the Members here present realize that many of their objections and questions are the kind which can be answered only on the basis of administration. The weeks of debate and criticism—both in the press and in the Congress—must by now have served to notify the President, the Secretary of State, and their subordinates of the kind of administration the people want in this program.

Certainly such a program must have checks on its administration—chief among which must be approval by the Appropriations Committee of each individual activity to be undertaken, and the fact that under terms of the bill the Congress itself can terminate the program upon 30 days' notice, should it so determine. These provisions are and should be much more stringent than those placed upon almost any other phase of governmental activity.

I sit on the subcommittee which handles appropriations for the State Department. We have to study these matters and make our recommendations to Congress. Because of this our attention has been directed to the fact that enormous numbers of Americans have foreign relations of their own through individuals, corporations, institutions, and other firms.

I should like at this time to direct the attention of the Members to this program as an attempt to utilize this latent talent and to organize it in an orderly way.

As the Members of this House may recall, I spoke at some length during the discussion of the House bill for State Department appropriations concerning the necessity of recognizing the strong part that private enterprise—the keystone of our American social-economic system—had to play in our international affairs. I would like to see the role of competitive private enterprise strengthened in this bill. For that reason, I have asked for these few minutes to discuss an amendment which I shall propose and which I already have submitted to the committee and which they have agreed to accept.

The present bill does make a provision for the use of privately owned facilities through contractual or other arrangements in carrying out the State Department program. I feel, however, that without amendment the bill does not provide for the fostering of competitive private agents. In fact, the present terms, if improperly administered, could tend to perpetuate a system whereby the present OIC has let contracts with such firms as the Radio Corp. of America and National Broadcasting Co. to produce programs at a profit without worrying about selling them to a customer. I can see why the heads of these great corporations, which only a few years back were forced to sell the Blue network under charges of monopoly, would see nothing wrong with that setup.

However, I consider it most necessary to strengthen the position of pioneer independent broadcasters like World-Wide—WRUL—in competition with any Government "chosen instrument."

The possibility here sounds to me altogether too much like the bills recently discussed in Senate committees to set up a "chosen instrument" world air line. There, again, the president of the air line company which has most to gain through establishment of a Government-sponsored monopoly thought the idea was fine. I am given to understand there are a dozen or more other air-line operators who believe in and welcome competition and who do not agree with that point of view.

Competition is the backbone of the free-enterprise system. Any program of Government support in foreign commerce, whether it be in the information services, transportation, or any other phase, must and should be based upon the encouragement of more than one entry in each field.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the Members of this House, and much less the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, will not want to find themselves in the position of approving Government-sponsored monopolies in the field of foreign commerce—while at the same time conducting a "trust-busting" campaign at home. The aim of the amendment I am proposing is that, through Government encouragement, competitive American enterprise will, as quickly as possible, be put in a position to "carry the ball."

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include four items—an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor for May 20 regarding the field for nongovernmental foreign broadcasting; an article from the same paper for May 21, outlining a definite program which is today successfully operating a privately owned international radio activity; a portion of

an announcement by the McGraw-Hill Co., published in the Washington Post for May 21, telling of that firm's recent expansion of its activities in foreign publishing; and an Associated Press dispatch from London, quoting a statement of W. Randolph Burgess, vice president of the National City Bank of New York, regarding the role of private investments in our foreign rehabilitation work.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 21, line 7, after the word "terminate", insert the following: "two years after it becomes law, or."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the committee will not accept this amendment. This amendment simply puts after the word "terminate", on line 7, "two years" when terminated by concurrent resolution. I submit to the membership of the House that all legislative procedures must come back to this House after 2 years for reexamination. What is wrong with that? I ask the chairman if he will not accept this amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. If I understand the gentleman's amendment, the committee cannot accept it. I believe he places a 2-year limitation on the bill. We placed "a concurrent resolution" in there so that the two Houses of Congress would be able to keep complete control of the legislation. Certainly we do not want to engage in a battle of ideas around the world and then announce to the world that we are doing it only on a 2-year basis. If as we proceed with this program we find portions of it not working effectively we can repeal them or the legislation as a whole by a concurrent resolution which can be presented at any time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not think you can cite any legislation that has ever been ended by a concurrent resolution of this Congress. It just is not done. Every agency, whether the RFC, the CCC, or the OPA, or any other agency has had to come back to the Congress and justify its existence every 2 years, and sometimes every year. I would like to see some legislation that is not going to be permanent, because in my own mind the State Department has one thought in mind and that is to build up a tremendous large agency that will go on and on and on and will never be terminated by concurrent resolution of this House.

So I submit to the membership that you should give this your honest and sincere consideration. I am sincere in offering this. I think it is only right and proper that an agency that has had so much controversy from both sides should come back and ask the Congress to justify its existence in 2 years. I saw an amendment offered a short time ago by a gentleman on the other side [Mr. RICHARDS], and it was a very close vote. Still there was complete disagreement as to the type of amendment. We have placed many amendments on this bill. I submit it is only right and proper that this agency should come back to Congress and justify its existence in 2 years, and not leave it to a concurrent resolution of both Houses.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken; and on division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska) there were—ayes 80, noes 112.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to inquire about the status of the legislation.

As I understand, the Clerk has read clear through to the conclusion of section 909 at the end of the bill, all of which following section 905 is part of the committee amendment, and that any portion of this committee amendment is now open to amendment. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. In view of that, Mr. Chairman, and the lateness of the hour, I think it would serve the convenience of a great many Members if we would defer the final vote on this legislation until Monday or Tuesday. This would still give opportunity for consideration of this amendment before the final vote next week. Reports have reached the committee that an objection would be raised to voting late today without having an engrossed copy of the bill before us and without Members having an opportunity to see the legislation in its present form. So no purpose is to be served by holding Members here longer this evening.

If this suggestion prevails, I am going to ask unanimous consent therefore, Mr. Chairman, in the interest of clarity and good legislation and in response to request that the entire bill as now amended be printed in the RECORD at this point so Members will have an opportunity to study it carefully between now and Monday and to inform themselves fully as to the exact contents of the legislation now that a number of important restrictive and regulatory new amendments have been agreed upon. By this method every Member will have full opportunity to study the many careful safeguards and controls included in this legislation which has now been divested of the features and phases to which Members have raised substantial objections.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The bill as amended reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I—SHORT TITLE, OBJECTIVES, AND DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1947."

OBJECTIVES

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this act are to enable the Government of the United States to promote mutual understanding between the people of the United States and of other countries, which is one of the essential foundations of peace, and to correct misunderstandings about the United States in other countries. The means to be used in achieving these objectives are—

(1) the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills;

(2) the rendering of technical and other services to other countries on the basis of mutual cooperation; and

(3) the dissemination abroad of public information about the United States, its people and the principles and objectives of its Government;

(4) the dissemination abroad of public information about the United Nations, its organization and functions, and the participation of the United States as a member thereof.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. When used in this act, the term—

(1) "Secretary" means the Secretary of State.

(2) "Department" means the Department of State.

(3) "Government agency" means any executive department, board, bureau, commission, or other agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or independent establishment, or any corporation wholly owned (either directly or through one or more corporations) by the United States.

TITLE II—INTERCHANGE OF PERSONS, KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

PERSONS

SEC. 201. The Secretary is authorized to provide for interchanges, on a reciprocal basis, between the United States and other countries of students, trainees, tachers, guest instructors, professors, and leaders in fields of specialized knowledge or skill. The Secretary may provide for orientation courses and other appropriate services for such persons from other countries upon their arrival in the United States, and for such persons going to other countries from the United States. When any country fails or refuses to cooperate in such program on a basis of reciprocity, the Secretary shall terminate or limit such program, with respect to such country, to the extent he deems to be advisable in the interests of the United States. If the Secretary finds that any person from another country, while in the United States pursuant to this section, is engaged in activities of a political nature, or in activities not consistent with the security of the United States, the Secretary shall promptly report such finding to the Attorney General, and such person shall, upon the warrant of the Attorney General, be taken into custody and promptly deported.

BOOKS AND MATERIALS

SEC. 202. The Secretary is authorized to provide for interchanges between the United States and other countries of books and periodicals, including government publications, for the translation of such writings, and for the preparation, distribution, and interchange of other educational materials.

INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 203. The Secretary is authorized to provide for assistance to schools, libraries, and community centers abroad, founded or sponsored by citizens of the United States, or serving as demonstration centers for methods and practices employed in the United States. In assisting any such schools, however, the Secretary shall exercise no control over their educational policies and shall in no case furnish assistance of any character which is not in keeping with the free democratic principles and the established foreign policy of the United States.

TITLE III—ASSIGNMENT OF SPECIALISTS

PERSONS TO BE ASSIGNED

SEC. 301. The Secretary is authorized, when the government of another country is desirous of obtaining the services of a person having special scientific or other technical or professional qualifications, from time to time to assign or authorize the assignment for service, to or in cooperation with such gov-

ernment, any person in the employ or service of the Government of the United States who has such qualifications, with the approval of the Government agency in which such person is employed or serving. Nothing in this act, however, shall authorize the assignment of such personnel for service relating to the organization, training, operation, development, or combat equipment of the armed forces of a foreign government.

STATUS AND ALLOWANCES

SEC. 302. Any person, while assigned for service to or in cooperation with another government under the authority of this act, shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his rights, allowances, and privileges as such, an officer or employee of the Government of the United States and of the Government agency from which assigned and he shall continue to receive compensation from that agency. He may also receive, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, representation allowances similar to those allowed under section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999). The authorization of such allowances and other benefits and the payment thereof out of any appropriations available therefor shall be considered as meeting all the requirements of section 1765 of the Revised Statutes.

ACCEPTANCE OF OFFICE UNDER ANOTHER GOVERNMENT

SEC. 303. Any person while assigned for service to or in cooperation with another government under authority of this act may, at the discretion of his Government agency, with the concurrence of the Secretary, and without additional compensation therefor, accept an office under the government to which he is assigned, if the acceptance of such an office in the opinion of such agency is necessary to permit the effective performance of duties for which he is assigned, including the making or approving on behalf of such foreign government the disbursement of funds provided by such government or of receiving from such foreign government funds for deposit and disbursement on behalf of such government, in carrying out programs undertaken pursuant to this act: *Provided, however*, That such acceptance of office shall in no case involve the taking of an oath of allegiance to another government.

TITLE IV—PARTICIPATION BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

GENERAL AUTHORITY

SEC. 401. The Secretary is authorized, in carrying on any activity under the authority of this act, to utilize, with their approval, the services, facilities, and personnel of the other Government agencies. Whenever the Secretary shall use the services, facilities, or personnel of any Government agency for activities under authority of this act, the Secretary shall pay for such performance out of funds available to the Secretary under this act, either in advance, by reimbursement, or direct transfer. In utilizing the Government agencies, it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the best available and qualified Government services, facilities, and personnel shall be sought, in order to ensure professional competence and avoid duplication; and (2) that the Secretary shall consult the appropriate technical agencies of the Government concerning any activity authorized by titles II, III, and IV of this act which comes within the competence of such agencies.

TECHNICAL AND OTHER SERVICES

SEC. 402. A Government agency, at the request of the Secretary, may perform such technical or other services as such agency may be competent to render for the government of another country desirous of obtaining such services, upon terms and conditions which are satisfactory to the Secretary and to the head of the Government agency, when it is determined by the Secretary that such services will contribute to the purposes of this act. However, nothing in this act shall authorize the performance of services relating to the organization, training, operation, development, or combat equipment of the armed forces of a foreign government.

POLICY GOVERNING SERVICES

SEC. 403. In authorizing the performance of technical and other services under this title, it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the Secretary shall encourage through the Government agency with appropriate legislative authority the performance of such services to foreign governments by qualified private American individuals and agencies; (2) that if such services are rendered by a Government agency, they shall demonstrate the technical accomplishments of the United States, such services being of an advisory, investigative, or instructional nature, or a demonstration of a technical process; (3) that such services shall not include the construction of public works or the supervision of the construction of public works, and that, under authority of this act, a Government agency shall render engineering services related to public works only when the Secretary shall determine that the national interest demands the rendering of such services by a Government agency, but this policy shall not be interpreted to preclude the assignment of individual specialists as advisers to other governments as provided under title III of this act, together with such incidental assistance as may be necessary for the accomplishment of their individual assignments: (4) that such services shall not be undertaken for a foreign government if, in the opinion of the head of the Government agency, such services will impair the fulfillment of domestic responsibilities of that agency; and (5) that the Department shall invite outstanding leaders in the United States, both within and outside the Federal Government, in the various fields of activity covered by this title, to review and extend advice on the Secretary's policies in rendering technical and other services to another government pursuant to this title.

TRAINING

SEC. 404. Any Government agency, at the request of the Secretary, is authorized to provide to citizens of other countries, and to citizens of the United States going to other countries in connection with the carrying out of this act, technical and other training within the fields in which such agency has competence, or to provide for such training through State and local governmental agencies or private institutions and organizations.

INTERCHANGE OF SPECIALIZED KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

SEC. 405. A Government agency, at the request of the Secretary, is authorized to promote the interchange with other countries of scientific and specialized knowledge and skills, within the fields in which such agency has competence, through publications and other scientific and educational materials.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COORDINATION

SEC. 406. In order that the activities of Government agencies authorized by titles II, III, and IV of this act may be effectively coordinated and interdepartmental relationships as authorized by this act may be clearly defined, the Secretary may establish upon direction of the President an interdepartmental committee to advise the Secretary on the development and administration of these activities.

TITLE V—DISSEMINATING INFORMATION ABOUT THE UNITED STATES ABROAD

GENERAL AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 501. The Secretary is authorized, when he finds it appropriate, to provide for the preparation, and dissemination abroad, of information about the United States, its people, and its policies, through press, publications, radio, motion pictures, and other information media, and through information centers and instructors abroad. All such press releases and radio scripts shall in the English language be made available to press associations, newspapermen, radio systems, and stations in the United States and to Members of the Congress of the United States upon request, within 15 days after release as information abroad.

POLICIES GOVERNING INFORMATION ACTIVITIES

SEC. 502. In authorizing international information activities under this act, it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the Secretary shall encourage and facilitate by appropriate means the dissemination abroad of information about the United States by private American individuals and agencies, shall supplement such private information dissemination where necessary, and shall reduce such Government information activities whenever corresponding private information dissemination is found to be adequate; (2) that nothing in this act shall be construed to give the Department a monopoly in the production or sponsorship on the air of short-wave broadcasting programs, or a monopoly in any other medium of information; (3) that the Department shall invite outstanding private leaders of the United States in cultural and informational fields to review and extend advice on the Government's international information activities; and (4) that all printed matter, films, broadcasts, and other materials in the fields of mass media shall, when disseminated by the Government, be identified as to Government or private source.

TITLE VI—ADVISORY COMMISSION TO FORMULATE POLICIES

FORMULATION OF POLICIES

SEC. 601. There is hereby created a United States Information and Educational Exchange Advisory Commission (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Commission") to be constituted as provided in section 602. The Commission shall formulate and present to the Secretary of State the policies to be followed and adhered to in connection with the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills, the assignment of specialists, the preparation and dissemination of information about the United States, its people and its policies, and the carrying out of the other provisions of this act.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 602. (a) The Commission shall consist of 11 members, not more than 6 of whom shall be from any one political party, as follows: (1) Ten members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; and (2) the Secretary of State or such officer in the State Department as may be designated by such Secretary.

(b) The members of the Commission shall represent the public interest, but of the persons appointed under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section, one shall be selected from among educators, one from among individuals formerly in active service in the armed forces of the United States, one from representatives of labor, one farmer, one from the newspaper business, one from the motion-picture industry, one from the radio industry, and three from persons having general business experience. All persons so appointed shall be persons of national reputations in their respective fields. No person holding any compensated Federal or State office shall be eligible for appointment under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section.

(c) The term of each member appointed under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall be 3 years except that the terms of office of such members first taking office on the Commission shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, three at the end of 1 year, three at

the end of 2 years, and three at the end of 3 years from the date of the enactment of this act. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor is appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Upon the expiration of his term of office any member may continue to serve until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

(d) The President shall designate a chairman and a vice chairman from among members of the Commission.

(e) The members of the Commission shall receive no compensation for their services as such members but shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel and subsistence in connection with attendance of meetings of the Commission away from their places of residence.

(f) The Commission is authorized to adopt such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary to carry out the authority conferred upon it by this title.

(g) The Commission is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such clerical assistants as may be necessary in carrying out the provisions of this title.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

SEC. 603. The Commission shall meet not less frequently than once each month and shall, from time to time, prepare and transmit to the secretary and to the Congress its recommendations for carrying out the various activities authorized by this act, and shall submit to the Congress a quarterly report of all programs and activities recommended by it under this act and the action taken to carry out such recommendations.

TITLE VII—APPROPRIATIONS

GENERAL AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 701. Appropriations to carry out the purposes of this act are hereby authorized.

TRANSFERS OF FUNDS

SEC. 702. The Secretary may authorize the transfer to other Government agencies for expenditure in the United States and in other countries, in order to carry out the purposes of this act, any part of any appropriations available to the Department for carrying out the purposes of this act, for direct expenditure or as a working fund, and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority contained in this act or under the authority governing the activities of the Government agency to which a part of any such appropriation is transferred, provided the activities come within the scope of this act.

TITLE VIII—ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

THE SECRETARY

SEC. 801. In carrying out the purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized, in addition to and not in limitation of the authority otherwise vested in him—

(1) In carrying out title II of this act, within the limitation of such appropriations as the Congress may provide, to make grants of money, services, or materials to State and local governmental institutions in the United States, to governmental institutions in other countries, and to individuals and public or private nonprofit organizations both in the United States and in other countries;

(2) to furnish, sell, or rent, by contract or otherwise, educational and information materials and equipment for dissemination to, or use by, peoples of foreign countries;

(3) whenever necessary in carrying out title V of this act, to purchase, rent, construct, improve, maintain, and operate facilities for radio transmission and reception, including the leasing of real property both within and without the continental limits of the United States for periods not to exceed 10 years, or for longer periods if provided for by the appropriation act;

(4) to provide for printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States, without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111);

(5) to employ without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, when such employment is provided for by the appropriation act, (i) persons on a temporary basis, and (ii) aliens within the United States, but such employment of aliens shall be limited to services related to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages when suitably qualified United States citizens are not available; and

(6) to create such advisory committees as the Secretary may decide to be of assistance in formulating his policies for carrying out the purposes of this act. No committee member shall be allowed any salary or other compensation for services; but he may be paid his actual transportation expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, while away from his home in attendance upon meetings within the United States or in consultation with the Department under instructions.

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

SEC. 802. In carrying on activities which further the purposes of this act, subject to approval of such activities by the Secretary, the Department and the other Government agencies are authorized—

(1) to place orders and make purchases and rentals of materials and equipment;

(2) to make contracts, including contracts with governmental agencies, foreign or domestic, including subdivisions thereof, and intergovernmental organizations of which the United States is a member, and, with respect to contracts entered into in foreign countries, without regard to section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 22);

(3) under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, to pay the transportation expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, of citizens or subjects of other countries, without regard to the standardized Government travel regulations and the Subsistence Act of 1926, as amended;

(4) to make grants for, and to pay expenses incident to, training and study; and

MAXIMUM USE OF EXISTING GOVERNMENT PROPERTY AND FACILITIES

SEC. 803. In carrying on activities under this act which require the utilization of Government property and facilities, maximum use shall be made of existing Government property and facilities.

TITLE IX—FUNDS PROVIDED BY OTHER SOURCES

REIMBURSEMENT

SEC. 901. The Secretary shall, when he finds it in the public interest, request and accept reimbursement from any cooperating governmental or private source in a foreign country, or from State or local governmental institutions or private sources in the United States, for all or part of the expenses of any portion of the program undertaken hereunder. The amount so received shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

TITLE X—MISCELLANEOUS

LOYALTY CHECK ON PERSONNEL

SEC. 1001. No citizen or resident of the United States, whether or not now in the employ of the Government, may be employed or assigned to duties under this act unless the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, after such investigation as he deems necessary, certifies that in his opinion such individual is loyal to the United States and that such employment or assignment to duties is consistent with the security of the United States: *Provided, however,* That any present employee of the Government, unless an unfavorable report as to such employee is rendered sooner by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, may, without such certification, be employed or assigned to duties under this act for the period of 6 months from the date of its enactment. This section shall not apply in the case of any officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 1002. If any provision of this act or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 1003. The Secretary may delegate, to such officers of the Government as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, any of the powers conferred upon him by this act to the extent that he finds such delegation to be in the interest of the purposes expressed in this act and the efficient administration of the programs undertaken pursuant to this act.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

SEC. 1004. Nothing in this act shall authorize the disclosure of any information or knowledge in any case in which such disclosure (1) is prohibited by any other law of the United States, or (2) is inconsistent with the security of the United States.

REPEAL OF ACT OF MAY 25, 1938, AS AMENDED

SEC. 1005. (a) The act of May 25, 1938, entitled "An act authorizing the temporary detail of United States employees, possessing special qualifications, to governments of American Republics and the Philippines, and for other purposes," as amended (52 Stat. 442; 53 Stat. 652), is hereby repealed.

(b) Existing executive orders and regulations pertaining to the administration of such act of May 25, 1938, as amended, shall remain in effect until superseded by regulations prescribed under the provisions of this act.

(c) Any reference in the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999), or in any other law, to provisions of such act of May 25, 1938, as amended, shall be construed to be applicable to the appropriate provisions of titles III and VIII of this act.

UTILIZATION OF PRIVATE AGENCIES

SEC. 1006. In carrying out the provisions of this act it shall be the duty of the Secretary to utilize, insofar as is practicable, the services and facilities of private agencies, through contractual arrangements or otherwise.

It is the intent of Congress that the Secretary shall encourage participation in carrying out the purposes of this act by the maximum number of different private agencies in each field consistent with the present or potential market for their services in each country.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

SEC. 1007. Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the establishment of any new Government agency; except that for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act the Secretary is hereby authorized to establish in the Department of State an office to be known as the Office of Information and Educational Exchange.

TERMINATION PURSUANT TO CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF CONGRESS

SEC. 1008. The authority granted under this Act, or under any provision thereof, shall terminate whenever such termination is directed by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 1009. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress semiannual reports of expenditures made and activities carried on under authority of this act.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include in each extraneous matter, one extension being on the St. Lawrence waterway.

Mr. CARROLL (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from yesterday's Washington Evening Star entitled "A Proper Veto."

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I recently obtained permission to extend my remarks and include certain extraneous matter. This has been returned to me by the Government Printer because it exceeded the limit. I am advised that the amount will be $266.25. Notwithstanding that it exceeds the limit I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the RFC Extension Act.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the President's veto of the labor bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the State Department.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

TO CLARIFY THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this delivery is something in the nature of a post mortem. It is an attempt to shed some light on an issue which was summarily dismissed on this floor 2 days ago, an attempt to clarify the facts that bear upon this issue in order that the temperate Members of the other body may see the issue in its true light.

I am referring to the President's Reorganization Plan No. 3 and to House Concurrent Resolution No. 51, expressing disfavor with that plan, which was passed on the floor of this House 2 days ago without a great deal of notice and without the consideration which it so richly deserved.

Let us look briefly at the situation with which Reorganization Plan No. 3 attempted to deal.

Executive Order No. 9070, issued by the President on February 24, 1942, under the authority of the First War Powers Act, consolidated the Government's housing functions in a single administrative unit, the National Housing Agency. This action was made necessary by the war emergency, a state of affairs in which we could no longer afford the luxury of dispersion and lack of cohesiveness in the Nation's housing program.

The National Housing Agency proved its value in lending directivity and coordinated effectiveness to the field of housing. No one would deny that errors were made, but they were errors born of war confusion and of the novelty of large-scale administration in this field. In no way do these errors constitute a valid criticism of a policy of coordination among the Government's housing activities.

At the present time, although the war is over, we are faced with a housing shortage of unprecedented magnitude. In order to deal with this shortage, the President has sought to maintain the consolidation of Federal housing activities in a single unit, a unit similar in most ways to the wartime National Housing Agency. In seeking to achieve this consolidation on a peacetime basis the President is only discharging the responsibility placed upon him by the Reorganization Act of 1945. Let me quote to you the six statements of congressional intent given in section 2 (a) of that act:

> The President shall examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:
>
> (1) to facilitate orderly transition from war to peace;
>
> (2) to reduce expenditures and promote economy to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;
>
> (3) to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable within the revenues;
>
> (4) to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;
>
> (5) to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and
>
> (6) to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

When we look at the details of Reorganization Plan No. 3, we see that the plan can be supported in terms of all of these objectives.

In evaluating the effect of the plan, we must consider what would happen in its absence. If this plan is rejected in both Houses, the housing functions, now grouped in the National Housing Agency, would upon expiration of the First War Powers Act, revert to a total of five executive departments and agencies. Try to imagine the chaos, confusion, inefficiency, and expense that would result.

The Federal Housing Administration would revert to the Federal Loan Agency, an agency which exists only as a structural shell at the present time and which would have to be completely reconstituted as an administrative unit. The United States Housing Authority would revert to the Federal Works Agency, an agency unequipped at the present time to deal with the problems of slum clearance and low-cost housing control. The Defense Homes Corporation would revert to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The defense housing constructed under the authority of the Lanham Act would be turned over to the Federal Works Administrator. The defense housing, exclusive of military reservations, constructed by the Army and Navy before and during the war, would revert to the War and Navy Departments. The nonfarm housing constructed by the Farm Security Administration, including the 3 "green" towns and some 30 rural proj-

ects, would revert to the Department of Agriculture. The Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation would all revert to the Federal Loan Agency.

The fantastic process of reversion described above, if allowed to materialize, would be twofold in its confoundedness.

In the first place it would be tremendously costly. There would be an initial expense of many millions of dollars necessary in reconstituting the various, separate administrative units required. There would be a continuing uneconomic expense necessary in maintaining these isolated, duplicating, and overlapping facilities in five departments and agencies scattered about the executive branch.

In the second place this process of reversion would rob the Government's housing programs of any semblance of coordination. No one man would be able to study the whole picture of the Nation's housing problem and meet that problem intelligently and effectively with a combination of the private-loan management and low-cost development facilities available to him. The segregated housing activities would be competing with each other for the support of Congress and the public.

Now let us see what Reorganization Plan No. 3 actually does. First of all it does not continue any function beyond the time set by law for its expiration. It does not, as has been alleged, make permanent any housing function which Congress did not establish as a permanent function.

The plan establishes a Housing and Home Finance Agency, with an administrator, to replace the present, tenuous National Housing Agency as the coordinating unit for Federal housing activities. Under this unit the plan establishes three constituents, each with a high degree of autonomy, as follows:

First. The Home Loan Bank Board, consisting of three members, to supervise the operation of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. The function of all of these activities is one of insuring investments in local savings and loan associations.

Second. The Federal Housing Administration, with a Commissioner, to exercise the functions of the present Federal Housing Administration. These functions are primarily concerned with the insurance of mortgage loans and loans without collateral security for the construction, remodeling, and repair of residential units and real property.

Third. The Public Housing Administration, with a commissioner, to control the United States Housing Authority, the Defense Homes Corporation, the defense housing constructed under the authority of the Lanham Act, and the general housing—referred to earlier—constructed by the Departments of War, Navy, and Agriculture. The functions of the Public Housing Administration are those of disposing of war housing and of encouraging, where necessary, the clearance of slum areas and the construction of low-rent housing by means of capital loans and annual subsidies to aid local public housing agencies.

Finally, the plan establishes a National Housing Council to coordinate the work of the Housing and Home Finance Agency with that of other Executive departments and agencies concerned with the availability of housing. These other agencies include the Department of Agriculture, the Veterans' Administration, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

This, then, is what Reorganization Plan No. 3 proposes to do. To an unprejudiced student of the housing problem this seems like an eminently sane solution. Let us look at some of the objections of the plan.

A. Many critics of the Plan say that it does not lead to any economies. Consideration of the foregoing material shows clearly, however, that while the plan offers no great change from the present temporary structure, it avoids the tremendous expense of the reversion process that would be necessary in its absence.

B. There are those who feel that it would be dangerous—the word "socialistic" has even been used—to place the Government's home loan and mortgage insurance functions under the control of an administrator who was also concerned with slum clearance and the construction of low cost housing. These people hold the irrational fear that this man might be public housing conscious and that the home finance functions would be deliberately throttled.

This is an ingenious argument. Its invalidity becomes apparent upon examination, however.

In the first place, the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator are, and always will be, established by the Congress. The reliance which he places upon the various housing facets with which he works will be predetermined by law.

In the second place, and of even greater importance, the centralization of housing functions provided for in this plan effectuates the congressional principle already referred to in the Reorganization Act of 1945: "to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purpose." Certainly the major purpose here is the provision of adequate housing for the Nation. Those who advocate putting the Federal home-finance functions in a separate agency apparently consider the housing shortage as a fertile field for speculation in real-estate loans, rather than considering the home-finance functions as a really effective weapon with which to attack the housing shortage. This is tantamount to placing the cart before the horse.

C. Finally, it is contended in some quarters that the National Housing Agency was a wartime consolidation which has had no justification in the peacetime picture of government.

To refute this argument it is only necessary to study the recent history of housing in this country. Our present housing shortage is the result of stagnation in housing construction during the 1930's, stagnation that could have been overcome by sensible, long-range planning and the provision of financial incentives to private construction concerns.

We cannot afford to slip back into the chaos of a disintegrated housing program. It is necessary that a single administrative unit be able to control the entire picture, providing every possible inducement to private industry and carefully controlling the expenditure of public funds in those areas where private companies decline to operate—funds such as those envisaged in the Taft-Wagner-Ellender bill. Only in this way can costly competition between the so-called private and public housing activities be kept under control, to the advantage of the country as a whole.

The real-estate lobbies—in particular, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the National Home and Property Owners' Foundation, and the National Association of Home Builders—object to Reorganization Plan No. 3, just as they objected to the continuation of effective rent control and the passage of the Taft-Wagner-Ellender bill. These real-estate interests have a peculiar way of making their objections felt. Their batting average has been tragically high in this Congress.

They base their objection to this plan on the fact that it approaches the present housing shortage from the point of view of increasing the supply of housing in critical categories rather than from the point of view of speculating in the current demand.

These real-estate lobbies have been successful in defeating Reorganization Plan No. 3 in the House. The foregoing evaluation of the issue is offered here in the hope that the facts may be made clear and that this success will not be repeated in the other body.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. VINSON, for an indefinite period, on account of important business.

To Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM), for 2 days, on account of attending funeral.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for the erection, in Grant Park, Chicago, Ill., of a Marine Corps memorial; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the

following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3203. An act relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 814. An act to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

S. 1230. An act to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 19, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3792. An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 23, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

817. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list of various institutions and organizations which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

818. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to promote the national defense by increasing the membership of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Armed Services.

819. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of its newly issued Electric Utility Depreciation Practices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

820. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 20, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Great Lakes connecting channels, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 11, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 335); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with 15 illustrations.

821. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

822. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for administrative expenses of United States agencies incident to the liquidation of United States participation in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (H. Doc. No. 336); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

823. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision relating to an existing appropriation of the War Department (H. Doc. No. 337); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

824. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $3,370,000 for the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency (H. Doc. No. 338); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DEVITT: Committee on the Judiciary. Part II, minority views on H. R. 1639. A bill to amend the Employers' Liability Act so as to limit venue in actions brought in United States district courts or in State courts under such act; without amendment (Rept. No. 613). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TWYMAN: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 1821. A bill to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census; with amendments (Rept. No. 618). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3051. A bill to amend the act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 780; 34 U. S. C. 495a), and to amend section 2 and to repeal the profit-limitation and certain other limiting provisions of the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503; 34 U. S. C. 495), as amended, relating to the construction of vessels and aircraft known as the Vinson-Trammell Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 619). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 3888. A bill to provide increased subsistence allowance to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 620). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VURSELL: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. House Joint Resolution 221. Joint resolution to provide for permanent rates of postage on mail matter of the first class, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 621). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3494. A bill 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 amendments (Rept. No. 622). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3471. A bill to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 623). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3861. A bill to allow to a successor railroad corporation the benefits of certain carry-overs of a predecessor corporation for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; with amendments (Rept. No. 624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANDIS: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 3682. A bill to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments; with an amendment (Rept. No. 625). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 3916. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and to extend the succession and certain lending powers and functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 626). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 751. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia through June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 627). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2173. A bill to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3131. A bill to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 629). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BEALL: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3433. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to classify the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 630). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3744. A bill to authorize the construction of a railroad siding in the vicinity of Franklin Street NE., District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 631). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3864. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act with respect to contribution rates after termination of military service; without amendment (Rept. No. 632). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 3916. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and to extend the succession and certain

lending powers and functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3917. A bill to amend section 5 (a) of the Farm Credit Act of August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 703); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COX:

H. R. 3918. A bill to amend section 201 of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELLIS:

H. R. 3919. A bill to amend sections 812 and 861 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to allow the deduction of the amounts of bequests, legacies, devises, or transfers to or for the use of veterans' organizations in determining the net estates of decedents subject to Federal estate taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3920. A bill to exclude certain vendors of newspapers from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3921. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 3108 of the Internal Revenue Code (53 Stat. 359; 26 U. S. C. 3108 (c)) and the second paragraph of subsection (a) of section 3114 of the Internal Revenue Code (53 Stat. 360; 26 U. S. C. 3114 (a)); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3922. A bill to provide for the admission of certain former members of the armed forces to practice law in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 3923. A bill to authorize retroactive payment of compensation or pension barred because of capture, internment, or isolation by the enemy during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 3924. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act in regard to certain matters of personnel and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3925. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to postgraduate schools of public health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MICHENER (by request):

H. R. 3926. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to designate the location of the offices of United States marshals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3927. A bill to amend the act of September 7, 1916, to authorize certain expenditures from the employees' compensation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3928. A bill to prescribe the measure of damages on account of trespass upon, unlawful use of, and unlawful enclosure of lands or resources owned or controlled by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3929. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional protection for owners of patents of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910, as amended, so as to protect the United States in certain patent suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REEVES:

H. R. 3930. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, in relation to extensions made pursuant to wage earners' plans under chapter XIII of such act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to provide for permanent rates of postage on mail matter of the first class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. Res. 251. Resolution to provide that Members of the House of Representatives and officers shall, for their convenience, be furnished with identification cards; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 3931. A bill for the relief of James W. Keith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3932. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Bohm and Edith Bohm Staub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROHRBOUGH:

H. R. 3933. A bill for the relief of Rev. John C. Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

656. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Mary Seeley and 23 other signers, all members of Battle Mountain Auxiliary, No. 1, United Spanish War Veterans, Hot Springs, S. Dak., requesting favorable consideration of H. R. 969 and H. R. 3516, which propose an increase in pensions of Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Rules.

657. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of Paralyzed Veterans Association of Bronx County, Bronx, N. Y., opposing any cut in the appropriation requested by General Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

658. Also, petition of the Human Relations Commission of the Protestant Church of the City of New York, urging (1) passage of the antilynching bill; (2) H. R. 2768, to create an Evacuation Claims Commission to adjudge claims made by Japanese-Americans for losses incurred in the evacuation; and (3) H. R. 2933, to stay the deportation of persons excluded from naturalization because of race; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

659. By the SPEAKER: Petition of T. S. Kinney, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

660. Also, petition of Mrs. B. F. Crane, Zephyrhills, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

661. Also, petition of Mrs. Albina Bibeau, St. Petersburg, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

662. Also, petition of Mrs. Martha Moffitt, Sanford, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

663. Also, petition of Mrs. Carrie L. McManus, Sarasota, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 23, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

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

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

We thank Thee, O Lord, that this land is still governed by the people's representatives. Let democratic processes be seen at their best in this time of testing. As these chosen men discharge their duties, guide them, O God, in the decisions they must make today. Give them the grace of humility, and shed now Thy guiding light into every mind. Break down every will that is stubborn against Thine or that has ignored Thee.

May what is done be so clearly right that it needs no incendiary justification. Soothe our still-smoldering hearts and minds with the spirit of forgiveness. Let us be swayed not by emotion or ambition but by calm conviction.

This we ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 20, and Saturday, June 21, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On June 20, 1947:

S. 321. An act to amend section 17 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 so as to increase the pay of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies, and for other purposes.

On June 21, 1947:

S. 26. An act to make criminally liable persons who negligently allow prisoners in their custody to escape;

S. 50. An act for the relief of Joseph Ochrimowski;

S. 125. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of such act to the Official Reporters of Debates in the Senate and persons employed by them in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters; and

S. 620. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ida Elma Franklin.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—VETO MESSAGE

The Senate resumed the reconsideration of the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the