

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?
There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next after the special orders heretofore made I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, on June 29 on roll calls 98 and 99 I am shown as not having voted. I was unavoidably detained in my office. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on roll call 98 and "yea" on roll call 99.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. JENCKES of Indiana, for 1 week, on account of official business.

To Mr. GRISWOLD (at the request of Mr. GREENWOOD), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. MERRITT, for 2 days, on account of important business.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will continue the call of the committees.

Mr. RAYBURN (when the Committee on Education was called). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further business in order for today, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that this calendar has been called more in the last 6 months than in any 4 years of my experience in the House. I have stated to each and every committee chairman that I would seek to protect the various committees and not have them called at 4:30 in the afternoon when by points of no quorum or otherwise they might lose their day.

The Committee on Labor is the next committee to be called. The chairman of that committee is present and has a bill for the consideration of the House. I am just afraid that committee may lose its day by being called at this late hour and that is why I am making this unanimous-consent request.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand the Committee on Labor has some bills.

Mrs. NORTON. The committee has one bill to call up.

Mr. RANKIN. How long will its consideration take?

Mrs. NORTON. That depends entirely upon the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Probably how long?

Mrs. NORTON. It should not take more than 5 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, there probably will be little or no opposition to the measure, and I see no reason why the Committee on Labor should not take it up.

Mr. RAYBURN. The trouble is that some of the minority members of the Committee on Labor, who had no idea we would reach the Committee on Labor today, are not here.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mrs. NORTON. I may say to the gentleman I have sent a messenger for the gentleman from California [Mr. Welch], who is the ranking member of the Committee on Labor, in order that he may be on the floor, but I have not been able to reach him.

Mr. RANKIN. The difference between the Committee on Labor and the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation is that the Committee on Labor is always able to get a rule from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. RAYBURN. Oh, no.

Mr. RANKIN. The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation is not even able to get a hearing on its bill before the Committee on Rules, and it has been trying to do so

for 60 days. So far we have been unable to get any hearing at all. We are not deceived about this matter. We realize this is the only way for us to get this bill passed on by the House of Representatives. I hope the chairman of the Committee on Labor will call up her bill, for I am sure there will be no opposition to it, and let us proceed.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Mississippi knows something of my situation. Under the circumstances, and in view of the statement made by the majority leader, I do feel the gentleman ought to show me the consideration of not insisting upon his objection to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. COX. Yes; and I am in favor of granting the gentleman a rule for the consideration of his bill. I am for his bill, and I will do everything within my power to influence the committee to give the gentleman a hearing. I hope the hearing will be granted and that a rule will be reported for the consideration of the gentleman's measure.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman force a vote of the Committee on Rules on my resolution?

Mr. COX. I cannot force the Committee on Rules to do anything, but I will do my best for the gentleman to get a rule.

Mr. RANKIN. This bill involves the gold-star mothers whose insurance payments are expiring, the mothers who sent their sons to the war and never saw them again. They must be taken care of, and this bill is their only hope. This is the only chance we have to take care of them. As I have stated, I have had the bill on the calendar for 60 days, and have had a resolution before the Committee on Rules for 40 days or more, trying to get the bill to the floor of the House. I should like to accommodate the gentleman from Georgia and should like to hear him speak, and will stay here as long as necessary in order to hear the gentleman speak.

Mr. GREEN. I am one who has signed the gentleman's petition, and I am willing to stay here until midnight to help the gentleman pass his bill.

Mr. RANKIN. I am willing to stay here until midnight.

Mr. RAYBURN. Does the gentleman have any idea the bill will come up today? Certainly not.

Mr. GREEN. I thought the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation had the next call.

Mr. RANKIN. It will come up if the chairman of the Labor Committee will get her bill out of the way.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

APPRENTICES IN INDUSTRY

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Labor I call up the bill (H. R. 7274) to enable the Department of Labor to formulate and promote the furtherance of labor standards necessary to safeguard the welfare of apprentices and to cooperate with the States in the promotion of such standards, and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

Mr. RANKIN. We will pass this bill tonight unless the House adjourns on a roll call, if we have to stay here until midnight.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order for the moment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I renew the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order a quorum is not present.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I think the minority members of the Committee on Labor are not aware this bill is coming up. I think they should be here and have a chance to be heard if we are going on with it.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes; I withhold my point of order for the moment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COX. May I appeal to the gentleman from Mississippi that he kindly not object to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will let the call of committees proceed, when it gets down to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation I am willing to let him dispense with further proceedings under the call of committees, but I am not going to withdraw my objection until the World War Veterans' Committee is called.

Mr. COX. The gentleman has that right, of course.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts withhold his point of order?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I must insist on my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to withhold his point of order. A constitutional question has been raised that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order for a moment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts withdraws his point of order.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Labor I call up the bill (H. R. 7274) to enable the Department of Labor to formulate and promote the furtherance of labor standards necessary to safeguard the welfare of apprentices and to cooperate with the States in the promotion of such standards, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, before we give this permission I think we should know something about the bill. We are somewhat handicapped because we did not expect it to come up at this time.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the author of the bill, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FITZGERALD], is here and will be pleased to explain the measure.

I may say further that the bill was reported out unanimously by the Committee on Labor before I became chairman of that committee. I have looked up the record and I have found that the vote of the committee was unanimous.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think the rest of the House should know something about the bill, and under my reservation of objection, in order that we may know what the bill is about, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, this bill sets up in the Department of Labor an apprentice training system for the youth of this country. We have debated here today for hours about taking 300,000 boys and putting them into the forests of America. This bill will provide a cloak of protection to put around boys and girls and encourage them to go back into the skilled trades, and in some localities today we have a crying need for trained and skilled workers.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Just what does the bill do?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The bill sets up standards by Federal cooperation with the States and through the formation of voluntary committees in the States, throwing a cloak of protection around the boys and girls and setting up standards and protecting them and guaranteeing that when their time of service in a trade has expired, they will come out full-fledged mechanics. It also incorporates vocational education in the plants.

Mr. HOFFMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question when he concludes his statement?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. The bill was heard by a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and representatives

of labor and capital appeared. I may say this is, perhaps, the only bill before the House today that both labor and capital are in favor of. The National Manufacturers Association wrote the committee and went on record in favor of the bill and Mr. John Frey represented the American Federation of Labor before the committee, testifying in favor of the bill.

If you really want to do something for the youth of the country, this is one of the best bills you can pass, because it will encourage them to learn a skilled trade as a means of livelihood.

In the past 25 years over one million and a quarter mechanics have come here from the European countries, and I am going to tell the Members of the House now that if a bill of this nature is not passed and a system of this kind not established, within 10 years you will lower your immigration bars in order to get mechanics from across the water. We have a need for mechanics in special lines today. Industry is crying for them and still we are passing laws here to put the youth of our country into the forests, instead of encouraging them to go back into the trades and become skilled mechanics.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In the New York Times of yesterday and in the same paper the day before there was a long article each day by a special writer who had been investigating conditions in Michigan, and in the article the statement was made that the W. P. A. and the C. I. O. were interested and that the C. I. O. had contributed some \$6,000 in Michigan for the purpose of educating the youth there along certain lines. If the Department of Labor establishes this school, what connection, if any, will the C. I. O. workers have with the undertaking?

Mr. FITZGERALD. This bill does not propose to establish schools, but it proposes to protect the boys and girls in industry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It proposes to educate them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. While they are getting practical knowledge, so that a boy, after serving an apprenticeship of 4 years, will not be exploited, but when he has served his apprenticeship he will be a first-class mechanic.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The question I want to ask the gentleman is this: What part has the C. I. O. in the training of these young men and women?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It has nothing to do with it, to my knowledge.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The W. P. A. has something to do with it, according to this article.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know about that, but I do know that the bill is endorsed by both labor and capital.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will not the C. I. O. furnish the teachers if the training is under the present Secretary of Labor?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The training is going to be done by the employers in the various industries.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But under the supervision of the Department of Labor?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The standards will be set up by the Department of Labor in cooperation with the States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. With the cooperation of Mme. Perkins?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Department of Labor.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell us whether the committee went into the cost of the administration of this bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Approximately \$56,000 has been the amount provided previously. This activity has been functioning under the National Youth Administration.

If the gentleman will recall, 2 months ago, when the Committee on Appropriations had that part of the bill under consideration, they would not pass it, because that committee claimed it was not removed legally from the National Youth Administration into the Department of Labor. Both the minority and the majority parties on the committee are in favor of making that small appropriation of \$56,900.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And this is transferring it to the Department of Labor?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And then setting up a standard for the apprenticeship, for the different States?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is all voluntary?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is not compulsory?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No. In fact, 45 States have set up State committees already, and 112 voluntary committees are working, and these States already have passed these plans during the last year. There was no opposition before the committee.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman from Connecticut please tell us what the power of the National Advisory Committee will be? Under section 2 the Secretary of Labor is authorized to appoint a National Advisory Committee, to serve without compensation. Will the gentleman tell us what the duties and powers of that committee will be?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They will set up a voluntary plan. It is national because some association wrote and asked that the name be changed to the National Association or the National Committee, to make it function with the States.

Mr. DITTER. Then to that extent the Secretary of Labor will be able to carry out and formulate a policy with respect to the several States.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not unless the States agree to it.

Mr. DITTER. But the Secretary of Labor is authorized to appoint the members of the committee. There is no reservation, no limitation with respect to the authority of the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The States adopt their own plan.

Mr. DITTER. I am speaking now of the National Advisory Committee. The gentleman said the National Advisory Committee's duties and powers would be to formulate policies. I say to that extent the influence of the Secretary of Labor will be expressed through the appointees of this committee.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The committees will be appointed through the State agencies.

Mr. DITTER. I am afraid that the gentleman and I are in disagreement. Under section 2 the Secretary of Labor has authority to appoint the committee. It does not say anything except to appoint this national committee. It delegates that authority directly to the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is, the national committee sets up with the State organization a voluntary plan. Everything in this is voluntary.

Mr. DITTER. And to that extent, then, the Secretary of Labor's influence will be felt in the administration of the proposed act.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would not say so.

Mr. DITTER. How is it to be obviated?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Because it will be voluntary on the part of a State whether it accepts the act or not.

Mr. DITTER. What is the power of the committee?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Just making recommendations; that is all.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied with the explanation of the gentleman from Connecticut and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object in order to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan reserves the right to object.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Here is the article to which I referred, and it says about \$7,000 is set aside by the union each month for this educational program from its income of \$350,000 a month, and it ties in with the W. P. A. If this committee is established by the Department of Labor to teach these young men and women and qualify them to follow a trade, how does that hook up with this?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not see any connection at all with it, because all this bill does is this: After a boy is in a plant, working, he is indentured to learn a trade in the plant, working for the company. After he is indentured, these standards will be set up for his protection. He will get his practical experience right there. His vocational education he will get through the trade school.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But these schools are to be set up in these plants, and the C. I. O. is furnishing \$7,000 a month to assist in that. Does not that tie up directly with this?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Labor is hereby authorized and directed to formulate and promote the furtherance of labor standards necessary to safeguard the welfare of apprentices, to extend the application of such standards by encouraging the inclusion thereof in contracts of apprenticeship, to bring together employers and labor for the formulation of programs of apprenticeship, to cooperate with State agencies engaged in the formulation and promotion of standards of apprenticeship, and to cooperate with the National Youth Administration and with the Office of Education of the Department of the Interior in accordance with section 6 of the act of February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 932), as amended by Executive Order No. 6166, June 10, 1933, issued pursuant to an act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 414), as amended.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of Labor may publish information relating to existing and proposed labor standards of apprenticeship, and may appoint national advisory committees to serve without compensation. Such committees shall include representatives of employers, representatives of labor, educators, and officers of other executive departments, with the consent of the head of any such department.

Sec. 3. On and after the effective date of this act the National Youth Administration shall be relieved of direct responsibility for the promotion of labor standards of apprenticeship as heretofore conducted through the Division of Apprentice Training and shall transfer all records and papers relating to such activities to the custody of the Department of Labor. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to appoint such employees as he may from time to time find necessary for the administration of this act, with regard to existing laws applicable to the appointment and compensation of employees of the United States: *Provided, however,* That he may appoint persons now employed in Division of Apprentice Training of the National Youth Administration upon certification by the Civil Service Commission of their qualifications after nonassembled examinations.

Sec. 4. This act shall take effect on July 1, 1937, or as soon thereafter as it shall be approved.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, several days ago the House very kindly granted me 1 hour's time for an address after the completion of the legislative program for today.

My address, Mr. Speaker, will be more or less factual and largely intended to be used as a basis for discussion later on.

Mr. Speaker, the industrial contest which is today driving the United States of America toward what may be a state of civil war is a titanic struggle between forces favoring industrial relations between labor and capital on the basis of an organized labor democracy, as represented in the American Federation of Labor, and forces favoring industrial relations between labor and capital on the basis of a labor despotism, as typified by the Committee for Industrial Organization. Beginning as an apparently internal disagreement in the American Federation of Labor, John Lewis and his cohorts have expanded the Committee for Industrial Organization movement into what now cannot be described by any other term than as a reign of industrial terror.

Both the philosophies and the modus operandi of the American Federation of Labor and the Committee for Industrial Organization are as far apart as the poles.

The American Federation of Labor system of an organized labor democracy is based upon a lawful and orderly procedure of collective bargaining to adjust capital-labor relations. The Committee for Industrial Organization believes in a lawless and disorderly procedure to force its own desired adjustments of capital-labor relations.

The American Federation of Labor, a conservative but aggressive aggregation of trade-unions, has, over the years, demonstrated its disciplinary control over its unions and its high regard for the inviolability of its contracts with employers.

The Committee for Industrial Organization, a radical if not communistic, reckless, and marauding aggregation of hastily formed unions, has demonstrated no disciplinary control over its unions, but has demonstrated its utter disregard for the inviolability of any contract it has made or may make with employers.

The American Federation of Labor officials have been duly elected by a fair vote of their membership on the basis of a pure labor democracy.

The officials of the Committee for Industrial Organization are a group of self-constituted leaders intent upon wielding a despotic power over the laboring men and women of America. They have never been elected to their offices by any group.

The American Federation of Labor operates under a duly adopted constitution and bylaws approved by its membership.

So far as I have been able to ascertain, the Committee for Industrial Organization operates under no constitution and no bylaws, except the will and desires of John L. Lewis and his cohorts.

The American Federation of Labor grants autonomy to its member unions.

The Committee for Industrial Organization demands and secures absolute submission of its member unions to the mandates of John L. Lewis.

The American Federation of Labor revenues and expenditures are audited and accounted for to the general membership of the organization.

So far as I have been able to ascertain, the Committee for Industrial Organization makes no accounting to its union membership for dues or special assessments collected and expended.

The American Federation of Labor operates on a basis of voluntary membership of working men and women in its craft unions.

The Committee for Industrial Organization operates on a basis of an involuntary and impressed membership of working men and women in its unions.

The American Federation of Labor is a strictly nonpolitical labor democracy.

The Committee for Industrial Organization is a labor-political-communistic organization, insofar as its leaders are concerned.

The American Federation of Labor never makes any political contributions to any party.

The Committee for Industrial Organization made the largest single contribution in history to a political party in the last campaign.

The American Federation of Labor has always sternly rejected from its membership those who advocated a communistic government for the United States.

The Committee for Industrial Organization staff of officials, strike directors, and organizers are shot through and through with avowed Communists.

The American Federation of Labor has never made the closed shop and the check-off system a strike issue.

The avowed intention of John L. Lewis and the other Committee for Industrial Organization leaders is to make every industry, big and small, in the United States a closed shop—a Committee for Industrial Organization closed shop—with the check-off system.

The American Federation of Labor has at all times advocated legal methods of strike and picketing.

The very essence of the Committee for Industrial Organization technique is lawless methods of striking and armed picketing.

The American Federation of Labor invariably takes a vote of its membership in any industry before a strike is adopted—even as a last resort—to effectuate collective bargaining.

The Committee for Industrial Organization, with its group of sit-down technicians, and its strong-arm squads always strikes first without the consent, and usually without the knowledge, of the workers in any industry, and, after suspending operations, impresses those workers into membership in the Committee for Industrial Organization.

The American Federation of Labor has always maintained its operations within the realm of the economic field, where they properly belong, in striving to achieve better adjustment of wages, hours, and working conditions.

The Committee for Industrial Organization has shifted the problem of industrial relations between employers and employees from the economic field into a political movement; and that political movement has been shifted by the leaders of Committee for Industrial Organization into a communistic political movement.

The American Federation of Labor has always maintained the theory of the vested right of the worker in his job at proper wages, hours, and under proper working conditions.

The Committee for Industrial Organization holds to the theory that the worker not only has a vested right in his job but that he also has a vested ownership in the plant in which he may for the moment be working, and is therefore entitled to sit down and suspend operations whenever he so desires.

The American Federation of Labor has never countenanced and has never permitted an outlaw strike by any of its unions in defiance of a contract with employers. It has always appropriately disciplined such unions on the rare occasions of such action.

Committee for Industrial Organization unions, according to Dorothy Thompson, in the Washington Evening Star of Monday, June 21, have had 180 strikes in some part of the motors industry in 180 days since a solemn written agreement was signed between General Motors and Committee for Industrial Organization.

In short, the difference in the concept of industrial labor relations between the American Federation of Labor and the Committee for Industrial Organization is the difference between American constitutional government and the communistic concept of government of Soviet Russia.

The American Federation of Labor has fought for 50 years for the one objective of bettering the condition of the American working men and women.

The Committee for Industrial Organization is fighting for the declared objective of making John L. Lewis the labor czar of America, with a group of self-avowed Communists as his chief lieutenants and advisers.

In the Committee for Industrial Organization movement America today faces an organized terroristic movement which is utterly ruthless, utterly irresponsible, utterly unprincipled, and utterly foreign to any logical concept of the principles of either of the two great political parties of this country; utterly foreign to every concept expressed in the Constitution, completely at variance with everything we have known in this Nation since its birth in the way of organized movements for the improvement of our economic, industrial, or social conditions.

While the American Federation of Labor has always based its movement and its operation on a logical ground of economic necessity and advantage for the whole people, the Committee for Industrial Organization has proceeded, from the day it was conceived in the mind of John L. Lewis, on the basis of an appeal to the basest emotions and the grossest motives that can actuate those persuaded and propagandized into bitter class hatreds and warfare.

It is time that the emotionalism, the deception, and the cowardly acquiescence to a surge of organized lawlessness be stripped from this situation, and the true picture held up before the American people in all of its sinister and ugly possibilities.

How does the Committee for Industrial Organization operate?

A group of sit-down technicians, in no case employed in the industry they are going to strike, decide upon a demonstration of power by either the sit-down method or by the

armed picket method. Outside of a very few key places in the industry which is to be struck, no information is given to the rank and file of the workers in that industry. Suddenly the wheels stop. A small group of these sit-down strikers take wholly illegal possession of the plant. They immediately debar the law-abiding workers from entrance into the plant. To do this, if necessary, they quickly resort to armed intimidation, slugging, assassination, sabotage—any method which at the moment may be regarded as the most effective to frighten the workers and to force the employers to come to such terms as the Committee for Industrial Organization may desire, and by throwing large bodies of massed pickets around the plants, many of these pickets being imported from other States.

Owners of property are barred from their own premises. The United States mails are stopped. The duly constituted courts are defied. The law-enforcement agencies are ignored or resisted.

No appeal is made to the National Labor Relations Board for a free and fair referendum to ascertain whether or not the majority of the workers in the industry want to be represented in collective bargaining by the Committee for Industrial Organization.

Instead of that, these lawless strikers seize the properties; plant records are destroyed, furniture is befouled and defaced.

Not the slightest consideration is given to the economic loss forced upon the workers who, satisfied with the wages, hours, and conditions, are for days and weeks denied their constitutional right to engage peacefully in the vocations upon which they depend for a living for themselves and their families.

Not the slightest consideration is given to the economic loss imposed upon employers and innocent stockholders.

No consideration is accorded the inarticulate mass of ultimate consumers who must finally pay the penalty in increased prices for all the depredations, loss of wages, loss of profits, and suspension of production of real wealth.

Time and again—and it is happening now—the duly elected officials of cities and towns are defied and threatened with armed raids upon their communities, by legions of deluded and power-drunk Committee for Industrial Organization followers, led into these communities from the outside by communistic directors.

When met by determined citizens, properly armed and deputized by their officials, to protect the homes and the towns and the industries of this country, and when some of the Committee for Industrial Organization followers get bruised heads and blackened eyes, and in some cases when they are shot down while on their lawless raids, what happens? John Lewis and his communistic cohorts howl to high heaven of "butcheries", "massacres", "bloody outrages." When the Committee for Industrial Organization pickets beat up honest workingmen who want to go to their peaceful employment in the plants, John Lewis and his lieutenants approve it as being necessary incidents in a good cause.

Very rarely, indeed, is any communistic leader of these deluded Committee for Industrial Organization followers ever found in the forefront of the battle. They are always far back behind the lines inciting their excited dupes to these assaults upon peaceful citizens, and these defiance of the courts and the constituted law enforcement agencies. It is characteristic of this communistic breed, which is so active in carrying on the Committee for Industrial Organization depredations, that they are willing to fight to the last drop of the other fellow's blood. But they always make sure that their own heads are well out of the way of police clubs.

By a cowardly and supine surrender to these lawless forces in their initial depredations in the Michigan sit-down strikes we invited exactly the condition that we have in this country today. This is proved beyond question by the fact that those States whose governors had the moral and political courage to declare that the lawless methods of the Committee for Industrial Organization would not be tolerated have

been free of such scenes of carnage and disorder as have characterized the seven States now terrorized by this incipient revolution.

It would seem too grotesque for credence, if it had not happened, that conditions such as obtain in Michigan and Ohio and Pennsylvania could come to pass in the United States of America in A. D. 1937. What a sinister and alarming spectacle we have witnessed in Michigan when the troops were called out to protect and maintain sit-down strikers in their illegal possession of industrial plants, while orders of the courts were defied by the Committee for Industrial Organization.

What a sinister and utterly dangerous event, pregnant with the possibilities for red revolution, we have witnessed in the great State of Pennsylvania. There 14,000 peaceful men quietly engaged, under their constitutional rights, at their vocations in a steel plant were driven from their work by the bayonets and the pistol muzzles of Pennsylvania guardsmen and State police because a group of self-appointed Committee for Industrial Organization leaders had decreed they should not work until they submitted to forced membership in that organization.

What an alarming and utterly dangerous situation has arisen that thousands of men desirous of pursuing their peaceful employment in the steel plants of the Middle West should be driven from their labors at the point of bayonets because a group of self-appointed Committee for Industrial Organization strike leaders decreed they should not work.

What sardonic and unbelievable effrontery these Committee for Industrial Organization leaders have displayed in successfully petitioning the President to close the steel plants because of the "awful carnage", "dreadful scenes", "horrible bloodshed" that would be precipitated by the Committee for Industrial Organization strikers if peaceful American citizens were permitted to continue their work in the struck plants.

I wonder if the full implication of this audacious thing has reached the mind of America yet. Here a group of Committee for Industrial Organization strike technicians struck these plants for no other reason than that they wanted a written contract with the independent steel industry, designating the Committee for Industrial Organization as the sole bargaining agency of all the workers in that industry.

They stationed armed pickets, in defiance of the law and the law-enforcement agencies, to prevent ingress and egress of the workers. They stopped the United States mails. They shot into airplanes. And then they appealed to the President to see that peaceful employees were ejected from the plants by military force, because otherwise these lawless Committee for Industrial Organization groups would not be able to restrain themselves, and carnage and bloodshed would result. It is unfortunate and regrettable that the President acquiesced.

The Committee for Industrial Organization in these cases has made no appeal to the National Labor Relations Board for a free and voluntary referendum of the steel workers as to who shall represent them in their collective bargaining.

There is no issue of wages, or hours, or working conditions involved. The employers have agreed to every wage- and hour- and working-condition demand. The sole issue upon which all this lawlessness and disorder and bloodshed is based is an arrogant demand by the Committee for Industrial Organization leaders that the employers sign a written contract with them recognizing them as the sole representatives of all labor in the industry.

I hold no brief for Tom Girdler and his kind. I think they have been very unwise in their attitude toward labor over the years in the steel industry. That does not alter the fact that two wrongs never made a right; that two lawless and immoral attitudes never create a lawful and moral attitude; that two wrongful acts will not result in a right one.

Let us see what lies behind a written contract between the employers and the Committee for Industrial Organization:

The simple statement sounds logical that if a man is willing to make an agreement he should be willing to put his name to it. Here is a picture of what a signed contract between

employers and the Committee for Industrial Organization means, and has been demonstrated to mean:

It means that the employer is fully responsible for the performance of his part of the contract. It means that there is not one iota of responsibility on the part of the Committee for Industrial Organization to perform its part of the contract. Committee for Industrial Organization leaders have violated their contracts with employers scores of times.

A written contract with the Committee for Industrial Organization means new demands by irresponsible leaders, forced by extravagant promises to their deluded followers, for higher wages and shorter hours, without any regard to the economic laws governing production costs and consuming markets that set limits upon such demands.

A written contract with the Committee for Industrial Organization inevitably means—and it is so avowed by John L. Lewis and his lieutenants—a subsequent demand for a closed shop and the check-off system, precisely as John Lewis brought about the closed shop and the check-off system in the United Mine Workers of America.

What do the closed shop and the check-off system, under the Lewis concept of industrial relations, mean?

They mean that the American Federation of Labor craft unions would necessarily disappear from the economic picture in America. Every man and woman employed in any industry, big or small, dominated by the Committee for Industrial Organization, would have to submit to involuntary membership in the Committee for Industrial Organization as a condition to securing employment and making a living. They could not escape this condition. It would mean that no worker in America, be he skilled or unskilled, would dare, in his place of employment or the precincts of his own private home, to breathe one word of discontent or disrespect that might be heard by any member of the Committee for Industrial Organization OGPU on pain of being black-listed by the Committee for Industrial Organization and denied any chance to make a living for himself and his family at his trade anywhere in America.

A signed contract with the Committee for Industrial Organization will mean eventually the check-off system. What does the check-off system mean? It means that every worker in every industry dominated by the Committee for Industrial Organization, as a condition of his involuntary and forced membership in the industrial union, would have to agree that any dues or special assessments levied against him as a tribute for his right to work would be withheld from his pay envelope by his employer upon orders of John L. Lewis, and, without the employee's consent or knowledge of the reason for such tribute, be transmitted by the employer to the treasury of John L. Lewis.

For any political or other purposes which he might choose, such a system would give John L. Lewis and his communistic cohorts a fund of untold millions a year with which to corrupt politics, buy elections, bribe officials, or use for any other purpose this labor czar of America might desire.

Such a system is plain unadulterated labor despotism.

There is no shadow of question that John L. Lewis and his leaders mean to move to that ultimate goal of the closed shop and the check-off system just as quickly as they can bludgeon American industry into submission to their power.

There is another and even more sinister picture to be drawn.

John Lewis and his lieutenants are now engaged in the unionization under the Committee for Industrial Organization banner, and according to the Committee for Industrial Organization concepts, of 3,000,000 Government workers, Federal and State. Newspaper reports have quoted some of the Committee for Industrial Organization leaders as saying that "as yet" the Army and Navy forces are not to be so organized. "As yet" the employees of the United States Postal Service are not to be so organized. Those two words, "as yet", contain implications of the gravest danger to this Nation, to our constitutional democracy, and to the personal liberties of our people.

Does anybody believe that when John Lewis and his communistic assistants have thoroughly organized the Federal and State and city employees that these labor commissars will hesitate to demand and to secure the most confidential documents in the files of the Government?

Does anybody question my assertion that the motivating force behind the Committee for Industrial Organization is communistic? Read the article entitled "John L. Lewis, His Labor Record" in the American Mercury Magazine for June.

Let me read you a paragraph from an editorial in the Daily Worker of June 22 last, this being the central organ of the Communist Party, United States of America, a section of the Communist International. This Communist newspaper is printed in New York. In an editorial entitled "Neither Spies Nor Weir's Hatchet Gang", the Daily Worker says:

Now is the time to enroll the steel workers into the Communist Party, in every steel State and community. They are filled with new hopes in their great awakening. They are eager to listen to the party's message.

What can be a greater contribution to the advance of socialism in America than thousands of steel workers proudly enrolled under the banner of the Communist Party?

I have in my possession an authentic transcript of the plan of campaign for a general steel strike worked out by America's leading Communist, William Z. Foster, in Pittsburgh in 1936, the details of procedure of the present steel strike were laid down in their entirety in that plan.

I have in my possession an authentic list of the names of the organizers for Committee for Industrial Organization, which shows that 75 of them are members of the Communist Party. In addition to these 75 there are working as volunteer organizers 46 others who are known or suspected Communists. I have the names of these organizers and the cities in which they are working. Thus, out of an organizing staff of 249 people, 121 of them are self-avowed Communists or are known to be Communists.

It is not unknown to John Lewis that most of his chief aides and many of his organizers are Communists. He has publicly condoned that fact in more than one statement. The names of many of John Lewis' closest advisers and co-officials in the Committee for Industrial Organization have been placed in the RECORD of this House by other Members with the proof that they are Communists.

It is known to the commanding officers of both the military and the naval services that Communists are recruiting members to their party among the civil and the enlisted personnel. It is known that these Communist workers are carrying on their activities here in the Washington Navy Yard, at Brooklyn, and in the navy yard at San Francisco. Wherever these military and naval forces are stationed these communistic workers, men and women, are busy proselyting. The proofs behind these charges are available whenever any investigating committee of this Congress desires them to be produced.

The avowed purpose of John Lewis and his Committee for Industrial Organization is to create a political party with a large enough treasury—an obvious necessity—which, with the tremendous voting power of his labor forces, will give to him control of the Presidency and the Congress.

In addition to the aid the Committee for Industrial Organization has received from public officials, who are either too cowardly or blind to the ominous trends to perform their sworn duty in the face of John Lewis' threats, we have learned in the last few days that the strikers, as well as the men and women rendered idle through no desire or fault of their own, are to go on relief. If there is anything that has not been done by the Federal and several State Governments to aid and abet John Lewis in establishing a labor despotism in the United States of America, it would be difficult to imagine what it could be.

As I said awhile ago, we have invited this dangerous and costly condition because the Federal and State officials did not meet this threat as it should have been met, by a firm declaration that law and order would be maintained, that the

rights of private property would be upheld, that the rights of men and women to pursue their vocations without interference would be preserved, and that the edicts of the duly constituted court would be enforced by whatever armed force of the Federal and State Governments might be required.

To temporize with this movement is like temporizing with a deadly plague creeping over the country. To continue to temporize with this movement will be to invite utter disaster for this Nation.

If we are for a moment to admit that millions of working men and women who are satisfied with their wages and their hours and their working conditions are to be summarily denied their right to earn their living without being impressed into membership in the Committee for Industrial Organization, or in any other organization, we must be prepared to admit that this Government is no longer capable of maintaining the constitutional rights and privileges of its citizens.

If we are going to pursue a policy of encouraging defiance of the courts, of approving lawlessness and disorder, of condoning illegal seizures of entire industrial plants, and if we are going, as we already have gone, a dangerous step further, and use the armed forces of the States, and finally of the Federal Government itself, to compel satisfied wage earners to submit to conscription into the Committee for Industrial Organizations, then we must be prepared to admit not only that this Government is no longer capable of maintaining the constitutional rights and privileges of its citizens, but that it has gone into partnership with the forces of lawlessness and disorder; it has joined hands with a labor despot; it has embraced communism in industrial relations.

In my own Southland we have conditions unlike industrial conditions in the North, in the West, and in the East.

It is the declared intention of John Lewis, Sydney Hillman, and other Committee for Industrial Organization officials to invade the South and to organize both the white and the Negro labor of the Southern States—under the banner of the Committee for Industrial Organization—into a political party as well as a labor union. The proofs are at hand that Committee for Industrial Organization organizers have been convening meetings of Negroes in different parts of the South, at which they have preached social and political equality. They have promised those Negroes shorter hours and higher wages, and they have gone even further and promised them that through the Committee for Industrial Organization the Negroes would be able to dominate the white man's industry of the South.

There is not a Member of this Congress who comes from the Southland who does not know what awful and bloody possibilities lie alarmingly near the surface in any such situation as that.

I find myself amazed that the southern Members of this Congress do not rise en masse to strangle this movement in the South which will inevitably result not only in utter chaos in industrial conditions, but which will lead many a man, white and colored, ordinarily orderly and law abiding, into a conflict that can only end in havoc, bloodshed, and loss of lives.

I warn John L. Lewis and his communistic cohorts here and now that no second "carpetbag expedition" in the Southland, under the red banner of Soviet Russia, and concealed under the slogans of the Committee for Industrial Organization will be tolerated. If minions of the Committee for Industrial Organization attempt to carry through the South their lawless plan of organization, if they attempt to demoralize our industry, to corrupt our colored citizens, to incite race hatreds and race warfare, I warn them here and now that they will be met by the flower of southern manhood, and they will reap the bitter fruits of their own folly.

It is a lamentable and perilous situation that the apparent tendency of the National Labor Relations Board has been to aid and abet the Committee for Industrial Organization movement at the expense and to the disadvantage of the American Federation of Labor ever since the Supreme Court decided that the Wagner Act was constitutional.

We were promised that the purpose of the National Labor Relations Act was to bring about industrial peace and sanity. We were assured that it would offer through the National Labor Relations Board a much-needed agency by which collective bargaining between industry and labor could be achieved without strikes and bloodshed. We were assured that its functions would be similar to those of the Railway Labor Board, and that the effect of the law would be to produce an era of cooperation between capital and labor which has, on the railroads of this country, prevented strikes for many years.

The National Labor Relations Board has not performed that function. The attitude of the National Labor Relations Board has clearly been that of a partisan adherent of the Committee for Industrial Organization. It has time after time submitted in a so-called free and voluntary referendum ballots which in effect said, "Do you want the Committee on Industrial Organization to act as your collective bargaining agency?" Thus the Labor Board has left no alternative for workers in industry but to choose Committee on Industrial Organization as their bargaining agency or remain without any organized representation.

The American Federation of Labor has protested and is now protesting to the National Labor Relations Board this unfair and prejudiced action. If the National Labor Relations Board does not display a better spirit of fairness it will be necessary for this Congress to amend the act so that the Board will be compelled to be unprejudiced in its operations and decisions.

My chief concern is for the laboring men and women of this country. I do not want to see them conscripted into membership in the Committee on Industrial Organization against their will, or into any other labor organization. I am for labor organization, but I am for voluntary, democratic, American labor organization.

I do not want to see the wage earners of this country compelled to pay tribute to any labor despot or to any group of labor commissars for the privilege of exercising their constitutional right to work and to earn a living.

I have but to look at labor under Mussolini in Italy; I have but to look at labor under Hitler in Germany; I have but to look at labor under Stalin in Russia; I have but to look at labor in Turkey under Kemal Pasha, to learn what will be the plight of labor in America under the despotism of John L. Lewis or any other man who attains to the stature of a labor czar.

My next concern is for the consumers of this country. These consumers must in the end pay the full price for whatever power John Lewis and his communistic cohorts obtain and for the tribute which they will take from the pay envelopes of the wage earners of America. Every dollar of damage, every economic loss caused by these lawless outbreaks, these disorders, these epidemics of illegal strikes, will inevitably have to be paid for out of the pocketbooks of the ultimate consumers of this country.

I favor the highest wages, the best hours, and the most pleasant working conditions it is possible to give the wage earners of America which would be compatible with the purchasing power of the people of this country to afford a market for the products of the workers. But I do not favor any headlong, reckless, irresponsible, lawless terroristic attempt to adjust industrial relations that will precipitate a buyers' strike through inordinately high prices, which would in turn surely close the factories and put the deluded followers of the Committee for Industrial Organization leaders in the bread line along with other helpless wage earners.

John Lewis knows, his communistic cohorts know, we all know, that Mr. Roosevelt himself has been depending for the salvation of this great Nation upon the upturn in business, a return of prosperity to industry. With unerring accuracy, John Lewis and his advisers picked the moment when a recuperating industry was again beginning to hit its stride; they picked the moment when prosperity was returning to bring about this disruption in industrial labor relations. The wheels of industry are slowing down and

growing silent. Millions of dollars in lost wages and lost profits are mounting day after day. Investors are growing fearful of entrusting their money to industrial uses knowing not what they face from the Committee for Industrial Organization.

If this movement is not sternly curbed, it will lead this country directly into a new deflation. If this lawlessness is not strangled, if this disorder is not stamped out like a plague, this country will see civil war.

The wage earners of America must remember that when the right of private property is denied to the industrialists the right of private property is denied to those of the workers who own their own homes.

It is a sinister picture indeed that we face when we recall that the National Labor Relations Board has ruled in the case of a small Virginia industry that it could not be moved from one section of the State to another unless the owners moved their employees and their families to the new location at the expense of the company. It is but one step further—and a very short step indeed—to a decision by the Labor Board that the owner of a factory cannot close his plant without the permission of the Board. Regardless of what the Labor Board may call that sort of thing, it is governmental absolutism.

In the State of Michigan today there is pending before the legislature an act providing that if an employer cannot peacefully operate his business in event of a strike that the State shall take over and operate the plant. It is but one step further—and a very short step, indeed—to the confiscation and socialization of all industry in the United States.

The condition in Pennsylvania, the condition in Michigan, the condition in Ohio and in other States point unerringly to this final result:

If the Governor of Pennsylvania, the Governor of Ohio, and the Governor of Michigan are willing to use the armed forces of the Federal or State Government to close industries because the Committee for Industrial Organization pickets threaten bloodshed if those industries are not closed, then we have arrived at the point where in any community, at any time, the leaders of the Committee for Industrial Organization can, without consulting the workers employed in that industry, picket the plant and be assured of the use of State or Federal troops or police to help them make their picketing effective until they secure whatever demands they may make.

Mr. Speaker, there is no middle ground in this situation. It is law or it is lawlessness. It is order or it is disorder. It is right or it is wrong. It is justice or it is injustice. No compromise with lawlessness, disorder, wrong or injustice is possible if this Nation is to survive as a constitutional democracy.

There is no middle ground, I say. There is only one course for the President, for the Governors of the States, for the courts and law-enforcement agencies to follow, and that is a firm and unflinching adherence to the principles of justice and law and order, let the cost be what it may from the standpoint of political expediency.

Let me paint you one last picture:

Not long ago the great Saginaw Valley in the State of Michigan suddenly found itself paralyzed. The wheels of industry stopped. Hospitals went dark with patients on the operating tables under the knife. Elevators stopped between floors. Fire alarms were stilled. Public transportation ceased and people found themselves trapped in high buildings or many weary miles from their homes. Refrigerators in private homes, hotels, restaurants, and markets ceased to function, and thousands of dollars worth of food spoiled. A vast economic loss was imposed upon this great industrialized valley of Saginaw, while 192 towns and villages and four great industrial cities remained helpless. And for 24 hours that condition prevailed. Why?

Because a disgruntled group of power company employees, led, it is said, by a boy 22 years of age, pulled the switches in the power-house that furnished the electric energy for the

power and light and heat in that great valley. There was no notice. There was no parley. Suddenly the blow fell that paralyzed the valley. Why did these men do that thing?

Why? Because they grew impatient over a few hours' delay in the negotiations at the moment being conducted in Washington by John L. Lewis and other representatives of the Committee for Industrial Organization for the power company employees of the Saginaw Valley.

At the very instant those reckless men pulled the power switches the utilities company had signed a contract satisfactory to John L. Lewis and the Committee for Industrial Organization representatives of the employees of the power company. We then witnessed the spectacle of Committee for Industrial Organization leaders chartering a plane and flying to the Saginaw Valley in order to persuade those irresponsible industrial vandals to put the switches back in contact and release that valley from paralysis.

What explanation did John L. Lewis and his cohorts give for that lawless and despotic act? Their explanation was an attempt to waive that ominous incident aside with the statement that "It was an unfortunate outburst of impatience", and that "It was all a misunderstanding." Was there one word of regret for the economic loss imposed upon the workers and the employers, the householders, and the businessmen of the Saginaw Valley? Not a word.

Was there any assurance that these hotheaded, irresponsible, impatient men would be punished under the law or disciplined by the Committee for Industrial Organization? Not one word. Have they been punished for that lawless act? Not to this good hour. Have they been warned that it is an outrage not to be tolerated to cut off power and put out lights in hospitals, with patients on the operating tables, to cause elevators to stop between floors, to trap people in high buildings, to cause the spoilage of food in thousands of homes and markets? They have not. Does this ominous occurrence tell America anything?

The city of New York could find itself in that critical condition; it might also occur in the city of Chicago or the city of Washington, or in any large city in this country. A small group of reckless and power-drunk men, blinded and deluded by Committee for Industrial Organization propaganda and the dreams of dominating industry, could disrupt the water systems, the sewer systems, power systems, public transportation, communication, the hospitals, industry, and business in general of any city or community upon which they might choose to vent their wrath or display their lawless, despotic power.

Unless I very greatly misjudge my country and my countrymen, this menacing condition will not much longer be tolerated. If the Federal and State and county officials do not prove faithful to their oaths and duty, if this sinister movement is not brought within the bounds of law and order, this country will witness an uprising of its outraged citizens in protection of their industries, their businesses, their employment, and their homes.

And that, Mr. Speaker, will be civil war!

ORIGINAL LIST OF COMMITTEE FOR INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATION AND STEEL WORKERS' ORGANIZING COMMITTEE ORGANIZERS

(Prepared June 19, 1937)

ORGANIZERS

(Salary, \$160 per month and expenses)

Numerals denote the organization from which the organizers were drawn, and 8 shows volunteer worker.

LEGEND

1. United Mine Workers of America.
2. Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers.
3. Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers of North America.
4. International Longshoremen's Association.
5. Electrical Workers.
6. Garment Workers.
7. Communist Party.
8. Volunteer worker.
9. Glass Workers.
10. Clothing Workers.

Numerals	Names	Location
3.	Wm. Anderson.	Chicago.
3.	Albert Atallah.	Albion, Pa.
3.	Geo. D. Atha.	Pollo.
7-8.	Helen Anderson.	Indiana Harbor.
1.	Bunny Askey.	Johnstown.
1.	Meyer Adelman.	Waukegan.
7-8.	D. Antiano.	Pittsburgh.
1.	Monroe Adcock.	Do.
7-8.	Arthur Anderson.	Gary.
8-3.	T. B. Anderson.	South Chicago.
7-8.	Alfred Avela.	Youngstown.
3.	Robert Burk.	Youngstown, Ohio.
8-3.	Maurice Brown.	Steubenville, Ohio.
1.	Louis Buhaley.	Youngstown, Ohio.
1.	Alfred Bittner.	Ambridge.
3.	B. Baird.	South Chicago.
2.	Noel R. Beddow.	Indiana Harbor.
7-8.	J. Burns.	Birmingham.
7-8.	Jos. Baron.	Gary.
1.	Bill Blizard.	McKeesport.
1.	Cal Believer.	Chicago.
3.	Hy Braun.	Canton.
1.	Virginius Browning.	Chicago.
1.	Ike Bullard.	Birmingham.
1.	Sam Bakely.	Do.
7.	Louis Bedenz.	Cleveland.
7-8.	Jas. Barton.	Pittsburgh.
7-8.	Robt. Brown.	Birmingham.
7-8.	Frank Butler.	Chicago.
7-8.	— Burk.	Pittsburgh.
3.	Joe Bowen.	Youngstown.
8-3.	Louis Baker.	Wellsburg.
8.	James Burns.	Martins Ferry.
1.	Thomas Butler.	Gary.
1.	J. P. Bussarella.	Johnstown.
8-3.	Alex Balint.	Pittsburgh.
9.	Ferdinand Bundel.	Cleveland.
1.	John Cingue.	Tarentum.
3.	M. A. Carr.	Steubenville, Ohio.
8-3.	Richard Carr.	Chicago, Ill.
8-3.	Bill Coleman.	Steubenville, Ohio.
8-3.	Carl Cotton.	Do.
8-7.	Margaret Cowa.	Pittsburgh.
7-8.	John Chesovich.	Clairton.
8-7.	Ben Carrouthers (col.).	Do.
1.	John Cocodrilli.	Bethlehem.
3.	Thomas Cometa.	Do.
1.	Smile Chatak.	Wildwood.
7-3.	Elmer F. Cope.	Youngstown.
7-8.	— Cox.	Duquesne.
7-8.	Jas. Carey.	New Kensington.
7-3.	Harry Cope.	Pittsburgh.
7-8.	Harry Conner.	Youngstown.
7-8.	Robt. Cling.	Gary.
7-8.	Paul Cline.	Chicago.
7-8.	Tony Candreva.	Sparrows Point.
7-8.	Robt. Cruden.	Gary.
2.	— Cole.	Chicago.
8-3.	— Casey (Otis).	Cleveland.
7-8.	— Carpenter.	Beaver Valley.
3.	Peter Carpa.	Ambridge, Pa.
1.	— Chambalas.	Chicago Heights.
1.	John Divens.	Steubenville, Ohio.
3.	Jack Davis.	Do.
8-7.	John P. Davis (col.).	Washington, D. C.
8-3.	Melon Dobricie.	Clairton.
1.	John Dolphin.	Homestead, Pa.
7-8.	John Derkich.	Pittsburgh.
7-8.	David Doran.	Do.
3.	Jas. Draperchic.	Do.
7-8.	Joe Dallet.	Youngstown.
7-8.	Will Dunne.	Chicago.
8-3.	J. J. Davey.	South Chicago.
3.	Charles Davis.	McKeesport.
3.	— Donoran (Otis).	Cleveland.
8-5.	— Davis (Otis).	Do.
3.	Dick Evans.	Portsmouth, Ohio.
3.	Wm. Evans.	Waukegan.
7-8.	James Egan.	Homestead.
7-8.	Herman Enkuist.	Gary.
1.	Nick Fontecchio.	Chicago, Ill.
1.	Wm. Feeney.	Monessen, Pa.
1.	Patrick Fagan.	Pittsburgh.
3.	Paul Fuller.	New Kensington.
3.	Chas. J. Fieger.	South Chicago.
1.	Frank E. Flynn.	McKeesport.
1.	Dave Fowler.	Birmingham.
3.	Jake Fink.	Chicago.
1.	Anthony Federoff.	Sharpsburg.
8-3.	— Favorita (Otis).	Cleveland.
7-8.	Salvatore Falvo.	Pittsburgh.
3.	George Ferguson.	Farrell.
1.	John Grecula.	Monongahela Valley.
1.	Adolph Germer.	Detroit, Mich.
7-1.	Ted Gaul.	New Kensington, Pa.
8-3.	Joe Gilbert.	South Chicago.
1.	John B. Gallagher.	Bethlehem.
7-8.	Bill Gebert.	Pittsburgh.
1.	Leonard J. Green.	Birmingham.
3.	C. T. Greenwood.	Steubenville.
7-8.	Ben Green.	Chicago.
7.	Jos. Gollomb.	Pittsburgh.
8-3.	Mike Habina.	Braddock, Pa.
1.	Lee Hall.	Steubenville, Ohio.
3.	Charles Henry (col.).	South Chicago.

Numerals	Names	Location
7-8.	Roy Hallas.	McKeesport, Pa.
7-8.	John Hallas.	Do.
3.	Powers Hapwood.	Pittsburgh.
3.	James Hart (col.).	Gary.
8-3.	Tod Hunter.	South Chicago.
1.	Ira Hart.	Do.
1.	Blackie Harris.	Birmingham.
1.	Dannie Haley.	Do.
7-8.	Robt. Hall.	Do.
7-8.	Frank Herron.	Gary.
8-3.	Wm. Hill.	South Chicago.
4.	Homer Henderson.	Indiana Harbor.
9.	Jack Hassen.	Sharpsburg.
7-8.	C. A. Harris.	McKeesport.
7-8.	Jas. Hull.	Martins Ferry.
7-8.	Carl Haessler.	Chicago.
7-8.	Will Hubert.	Pittsburgh.
7-8.	Clarence Irwin.	New Castle, Pa.
4.	Henry (Ben) Johnson.	South Chicago.
8-3.	Paul Juhasz.	Donora.
8.	Jack Johnstone.	Chicago.
8-3.	— Jenkins.	South Chicago.
8-7.	George Jaroway.	Ambridge.
8-7.	Joe Jurcich.	Midland.
8-7.	Hy Jackson (ex-district organizer, Birmingham and San Francisco).	J. and L., Pittsburgh.
7-8.	Vladimer Janawicz.	Chicago.
7-8.	John Julio.	Youngstown.
3.	Jas. Kirkland.	Chicago.
3-8.	— Keim.	South Chicago.
3-8.	— Kowalski.	Do.
1.	Robt. B. Kimble.	Baltimore.
3.	Anthony Kovalski.	Weirton, W. Va.
3.	C. R. Kramer.	Bethlehem.
7-8.	Steve Kiki.	McKeesport.
7-8.	Thomas Keenan.	Pittsburgh.
8-3.	Leo Kennedy.	Gary.
1.	Sam D. Kepler.	Farrell.
1.	Garfield Lewis.	Bethlehem.
1.	George Lorey.	Pittsburgh.
1.	Chubby Lark.	Do.
8-3.	— Lohman.	Cleveland.
1.	Miss Saraianne Lowe.	Chicago.
1.	Geo. Lambert.	Weirton.
3.	— McDonald (col.).	Indiana Harbor.
3.	Bert Milligan.	South Chicago.
8-3.	T. Mellinger.	Arnold.
3.	Grad Matthews.	Steubenville, Ohio.
3.	John J. Mullen.	Clairton, Pa.
1.	Geo. Medwick.	Charleroi, Pa.
7-8.	Thomas Moore.	McDonald, Ohio.
1.	A. B. Martin.	Johnstown, Pa.
8-3.	John Mayo.	Charleroi, Pa.
7-8.	— McNellis.	South Chicago.
1.	E. R. McKinney (col.).	Youngstown.
3.	— McCrone.	Bethlehem.
3.	John S. Mayer.	Sharon.
7-3.	A. W. McPherson.	McKeesport.
1.	John J. McCarry.	Pittsburgh, Pa.
8-3.	Morris Mallinger.	Monaca, Pa.
1.	Ward Macabee.	Steubenville.
1.	Wm. Mitch.	Birmingham.
1.	Frank Miley.	Chicago.
1.	John F. Moody.	Pittsburgh.
1.	Matt Markowitz.	Do.
3.	Harold McMullen.	Chicago.
1.	James McCullough.	Do.
8-3.	— McKnight.	South Chicago.
7-8.	Wm. Murphy.	Farrell.
7-8.	Tom Minich.	Pittsburgh.
7-8.	A. J. Marsh.	Aliquippa.
7-8.	John Marsh.	Chicago.
7-8.	Miles Morton, alias Zaliski.	Do.
1.	— McKay.	Bellaire.
8-3.	John Monarch.	Martins Ferry.
8-7.	Dave Mates.	Gary.
3.	— Moss.	Chicago.
8-8.	— Murphy (Otis).	Cleveland.
7-3.	T. L. Majors.	Ellwood City.
9.	Glenn McCabe.	New Kensington.
8-3.	Jim Malone.	Homestead.
7-8-1.	McNeil.	Worcester.
3.	— Nakardo.	South Chicago.
7-8-1.	— Nordstrom.	Waukegan.
3.	Jos. North.	Pittsburgh.
3.	Joe O'Hara.	Clairton, Pa.
7-8.	Andrew R. Olmstead.	Chicago.
7-8.	P. Frank O'Brien.	Do.
7-8.	Blane Owens.	Pittsburgh.
7-3.	Mike Ostroski.	Gary.
8-3.	Joe Petrich.	South Chicago.
7-8.	Mildred Price.	Pittsburgh.
3.	George Powers.	Clairton, Pa.
8-3.	Walter J. Payne.	Yorkville, Ohio.
3.	H. R. Patterson.	South Chicago.
3.	G. A. Patterson.	Do.
3.	Anthony Pann.	Bethlehem.
3.	Harry Phillips.	Sharon.
3.	Geo. Parsons.	Gary.
3.	Jake Rusak.	Steubenville, Ohio.
8-3.	Richard Reisner.	Donora, Pa.
7.	Mike Repka.	Benwood, W. Va.
7.	Paul Russen.	McKeesport.
7.	Arthur Back (attorney).	Aliquippa.
7.	Harold Ruttenberg.	Chicago.
7-8.	J. V. Rife.	Waukegan.
7-8.	Dan Ryan.	Pittsburgh.
7-8.	Ann Rochester.	Pittsburgh.

Numerals	Names	Location
3.	Harold Rasmussen	Gary.
1.	Frank Rumbaugh	South Chicago.
8-3.	Wm. J. Sneed	Chicago, Ill.
7.	Lawrence Skuski	South Chicago, Ill.
6-7.	Charles Sharbo	Homestead, Pa.
3.	Tom Shaue	Do.
8-7.	Shearon	Do.
8-7.	Fred Siders	Do.
8-3.	George Sickerchak	Braddock, Pa.
8-3.	Andy Stewart	Waukegan, Ill.
8-3.	Philip Scharer	South Chicago.
1.	Dan Serried	Gary.
8-7.	Frank Shifka	Youngstown.
8-3.	Ralph Shaw	Calumet.
3.	Stewart	South Chicago.
1.	Nick Steponovick	Midland.
7-8.	John Sabal	Bethlehem.
7-8.	Carl Smith	McKeesport.
7-8.	Saunders	New Kensington.
3.	James Strong	Cleveland.
3.	Tim Sullivan	Chicago.
3.	Jas. Shalleros	Do.
1.	T. J. Sparks	Anniston, Ala.
3.	Leon Strong	St. Louis.
3.	D. P. Sullivan	Oakland, Calif.
8-3.	Carl Schmidt	Homestead.
7-8.	Nat Sparks	Pittsburgh.
7-8.	Tony Salopak	Duquesne.
1.	John Tafalski	Johnstown, Pa.
8-3.	Roman Taylor	South Chicago, Ill.
1.	Louis Tomiko	Donora, Pa.
1.	Harry Tetlow	Youngstown.
1.	Joseph Tinko	Midland.
8-3.	Rade Travica	Do.
1.	Thomas	Johnstown.
1.	Paul Tobanko	Pittsburgh.
1.	Tom Tippet	Canton.
3.	Jas. Thimmes	Chicago.
7-8.	Sador Vores	Youngstown, Ohio.
8-3.	August Virkich	Donora.
8-3.	Joe Vince	Yorkville.
1.	Leo Wisniewski	South Chicago, Ill.
3.	Frank Willys	Steubenville.
3.	Manuel Wood	South Side, Pittsburgh.
7-8.	Rose Wortis	Pittsburgh.
7-8.	Robt. Washington	Birmingham.
7-8.	Joe Weber	Gary.
4.	Ernest Woods	Indiana.
3-8.	John Williams	Coraopolis.
1.	Wiburton	Chicago.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a list of Committee for Industrial Organization and Steel Workers' Organizing Committee organizers, showing the organization with which they are connected and the places where they are now located.

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

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just want to ask the gentleman whether or not this list of organizers to which he refers is a complete list?

Mr. COX. It is a complete list as of date when first prepared. At least 50 percent of them are avowed Communists or known to be Communists.

Mr. BOILEAU. When was that list prepared, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. COX. I am not prepared to give the gentleman the exact date when it was prepared.

Mr. BOILEAU. I should like to have definite assurance before I permit this request to be granted.

Mr. COX. The gentleman will be within the exercise of his right and privilege in objecting. I make the request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I have reserved the right to object. My only purpose is to identify the list, to know whether or not it is a complete list or whether the gentleman claims it to be a complete list. That is all.

Mr. COX. I do claim it to be a complete list and an accurate list.

Mr. BOILEAU. As of the present time or some time recently?

Mr. COX. June 19, as I recall.

Mr. BOILEAU. Of this year?

Mr. COX. Of this year.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, about 3 or 4 weeks ago there came about what amounts to a rule in this House that no one could make a speech until after the legislative business had been completed. I do not say that rule is wrong. I do not want to impede legislation, but I just want to bring up the question of the fairness of the rule and how it applies.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] made an attack on the Secretary of Labor the other day, and I have been seeking recognition for several days, but will not get it until Friday. It seems to me we ought to eventually build up some sort of a custom where a few short speeches can be made in the early part of the day. I had reservation of time and could not speak until 7 o'clock. I did not want to insist on that time so late in the day. So I think something should be done so that Members can make at least short statements.

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

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. All we have to do is go back to the time-honored practice of the House of Representatives, that when a man gets permission to address the House he should be given that time to address the House at that hour and let the committees come on afterward. This way of shoving these special orders off until after legislation is disposed of simply amounts to "Cannonizing" the House of Representatives, if you want to know how I feel about it. This practice deprives the Members of the only opportunity they have to come down in the Well of the House and deliver their speeches. I think we ought to go back to the original rule and let the Members speak when they have secured time.

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

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. I want to say that the only way on earth, in my opinion, we can put into effect a program in the House is to do it the way we are doing it. For 2 months after the Congress met, before committees had reported a great many bills, I even announced that on Wednesday or Thursday of next week or Friday of next week there would be no program, and gentlemen could speak. At this late time in the session I am exercising the same right the gentleman from Mississippi has been exercising this afternoon, in objecting to unanimous-consent requests.

I think it is proper, in order to protect the legislative program, to protect these Mondays, these Tuesdays, and these Wednesdays, and the regular business of the House. I started this and I shall continue it until the close of the session.

Mr. MAVERICK. But let me point out, for instance, that the other day the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] got unanimous consent to address the House before the legislative program. It is a fact the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] was out of the room, and I think it was all right for the gentleman from Georgia to do what he did—I would have done the same thing. I am not criticizing the gentleman from Georgia. The result, however, is that when a Member wants to talk, the practice amounts to an effective gag. One of the things that is really wrong about it is that when you get a right to talk on a bill under consideration you get off the subject, just as we are doing now. The practice tends to disturb the relevancy of ordinary debate, and to otherwise gag the Members.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to permit me to make a brief observation?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield.

Mr. COX. While this new rule has operated against me today, to my very bitter disappointment, still I think it is a very sensible practice.

Mr. MAVERICK. Of course the gentleman and I disagree on lots of things, and this is one of them.

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

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOILEAU. Formerly we used to have a week now and then when there was nothing very important brought

up. Formerly when appropriation bills were brought up we used to have 3, 4, 5, or 6 days of general debate. Now when a week comes along with nothing particular to do we jam through an appropriation bill in a few hours and no one has any opportunity to talk. In former years, too, of course, we used to work on Saturdays. I think this is a situation that needs to be corrected.

Mr. MAVERICK. I just want to present that thought to the House as something that ought possibly to be changed. The expression of opinion pro and con on any subject is one of the most important functions of the House, whether it concerns actual legislation or not. The present situation should be corrected.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

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.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 642. An act for the relief of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 676. An act for the relief of Heinrich Schmidt, G. m. b. H., of Flensburg, Germany; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 714. An act relating to the eligibility of certain persons for admission to the civil service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

S. 821. An act for the relief of Lawson N. Dick; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1216. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the State of Montana to be used for the purposes of a public park and recreational site; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1379. An act authorizing any nation, tribe, or band of Indians, in suits heretofore filed under their original Jurisdictional Acts, to present claims to the United States Court of Claims, by amended petitions at any time before final submission of said suits, to conform to the evidence; and authorizing the said court to adjudicate such claims upon their merits as though filed within the time limitation fixed in said original Jurisdictional Acts; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1435. An act to create a Board of Shorthand Reporting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1517. An act authorizing the payment of attorneys' fees contracted to be paid by certain Indians allotted on the Quinalt Reservation, State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1626. An act for the relief of Maurice D. Pryor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1759. An act to amend an act, entitled "An act to eliminate the requirements of cultivation in connection with certain homestead entries", approved August 19, 1935; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1865. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cliff Snider; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1882. An act for the relief of the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1918. An act to authorize the award of a decoration for distinguished service to Acors Rathbun Thompson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1986. An act to amend section 42 of title 7 of the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1998. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts by the Department of Agriculture", approved June 24, 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2010. An act to authorize the appointment of an additional judge for the southern district of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2026. An act to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Fort Donelson National Military Park in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2086. An act to authorize the construction of a Federal reclamation project to furnish a water supply for the lands of the Arch Hurley Conservancy District in New Mexico; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

S. 2093. An act for the relief of George H. Stahl and Henry A. Behrens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2146. An act to amend the act entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the city of Perth Amboy, N. J., approved July 23, 1935; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2221. An act to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating upon lands within the exterior boundaries of the Cache National Forest in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2241. An act for the relief of W. G. Adams; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2276. An act to provide for an additional midshipman at the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2279. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to give wartime rank to retired officers and former officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and/or Coast Guard of the United States", approved June 21, 1930, so as to prohibit persons who have been subsequently separated from the service under other than honorable conditions from bearing the official title and upon occasions of ceremony wearing the uniform of the highest grade held by them during their war services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2301. An act for the relief of Lois H. Anthony; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2349. An act to authorize the administration of oaths by the Chief Clerk and the Assistant Chief Clerk of the Office of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

S. 2416. An act relating to the citizenship of certain classes of persons born in the Canal Zone or the Republic of Panama; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 2418. An act for the relief of John Prosser; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2629. An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2647. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain enlisted men and former enlisted men of the Navy for the value of personal effects lost while engaged in emergency relief expeditions during the Ohio Valley flood in January and February 1937; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2649. An act to authorize appropriations for construction and rehabilitation at military posts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a delegate to the Fifth World Congress of the Deaf; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 563. An act for the relief of E. W. Garrison;

H. R. 607. An act for the relief of Dorothy McCourt;

H. R. 1235. An act for the relief of John Brennan;

H. R. 1310. An act for the relief of Clifford R. George and Mabel D. George;

H. R. 1406. An act for the relief of Frank S. Walker;

H. R. 1689. An act for the relief of Dominga Pardo;

H. R. 1731. An act for the relief of Angelo and Auro Cattaneo;

H. R. 1761. An act for the relief of Paul J. Francis;