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The Special Victory Convention of the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor opened in the ballroom of the Hotel Commander, Cambridge, at 10:20 a.m., Harry W. Joel, past President, Cambridge Central Labor Union, presiding.

Delegate Joel: Delegates to this convention, as you know, this is a victory convention.

I have attended many, many conventions of the American Federation of Labor, also international conventions, and when I sat among the delegates to take part in the conventions of the Massachusetts State branch of the American Federation of Labor, I never thought that the great honor would be bestowed upon me to call the delegates to order, or, in other words, to open up a convention of the American Federation of Labor, and I believe that that honor will always be remembered by me until I am of no more use in the labor movement.

It now gives me great pleasure to introduce to you the President of the Cambridge Central Labor Union, Howard H. Litchfield.

Thank you.

Delegate Litchfield: We will now have the raising of the colors by members of the Cambridge Fire Department, Fire Fighters Union, Local No. 30.

(The delegates stood at attention while the colors were raised by members of the Cambridge Fire Department, Fire Fighters Union, Local No. 30.)

Delegate Litchfield: We will now have the singing of the Star Spangled Banner, led by John McCabe of the Cambridge Fire Department.

(The delegates stood at attention while the singing of the Star Spangled Banner took place.)

Delegate Litchfield: We will now have the invocation by the Rt. Reverend Monsignor Augustine F. Hickey, Pastor of St. Paul’s Church, Cambridge.

Let the light of Thy Divine Wisdom shine forth in all the proceedings and plans formed for our rule and government, that they may tend to the return of universal peace, the increase of industry and prosperity, the promotion of civic virtue and happiness.

We recommend to Thy unbounded providence, the lives and efforts of those who meet in thoughtful and serious conference here today. Give these neighbors and friends of ours, we pray, understanding, courage, fidelity in unstinted measure that their high purposes for the spread of justice and for the welfare of those who toll may ever move forward under greater and abundant blessings which come from Thee.

All this we ask in holy confidence and in the name of Thy Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, who with Thee liveth and reigneth in the unity of the Holy Ghost, world without end. Amen.

Delegate Litchfield: It is a pleasure and an honor for me, as the President of the Cambridge Central Labor Union, to welcome the delegates to Cambridge to the special victory convention.

It is altogether fitting and proper that we in the labor movement should meet in Cambridge, in this special victory convention. It is only a short way from here where George Washington assumed command of the Continental forces, and who later became the Father of our country. We of Labor realize the efforts we made and the extent we went to, to bring victory to this country. So therefore, I say again, it is altogether fitting and proper that this special victory convention should be held in Cambridge. We of Cambridge are most happy to have you here. We will make every effort to have your stay a pleasant one. May your deliberations be to the benefit of those that you come here to represent.

It is now my pleasure to turn this convention over to President William J. Doyle, Massachusetts State Federation of Labor.

WILLIAM J. DOYLE

-President)

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, Amen.

Almighty and Eternal God, Father and Protector of this country and its people, we humbly acknowledge our abiding faith in Thee. We praise Thy bounty and Thy generosity in our behalf. We ask Thy gracious help to show ourselves more worthy of Thee by ever-increasing loyalty and devotion to Thy Holy Will.

We pray Thee, O God of might and power, to assist with Thy Holy Spirit of counsel and fortitude the President of the United States, that his administration may be conducted in righteousness and be eminently useful to Thy people over whom he presides.
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President Litchfield, Monsignor Hickey, and delegates to this special victory convention:

This morning, I talked with Delegate Joel, whom you met this morning, and I don’t think there was a happier man in this gathering than he. He told me, “At 79 years of age to have a convention of the State Federation of Labor meet in Cambridge,” was something that pleased him very much and something he never did expect to live to see.

I want to thank the Rt. Reverend Monsignor Hickey, who, in addition to being a great priest, is also a great and important citizen of Cambridge, who has devoted much of his time to improvement of the lot of people in Cambridge.
I also want to thank the firemen who gave over their morning to placing the colors here in our convention.

We are called together, I think most appropriately, to first celebrate the victory of our armed forces and the victory of American workmen. American management, American knowledge, and our own-our enemies also must here plot the course ahead, examine the problems that we are being faced with and will be faced with. The officers of the Federation is a difficult task, a finding task, and we have here to plot the course ahead, examine the problems that we are being faced with and will be faced with. The officers of the Federation are a difficult task, a finding task, and we have here to plot the course ahead, examine the problems that we are being faced with and will be faced with.

We discussed the possibility of holding the convention in this hotel, and the management of this hotel very great. They provided the facilities of this room for use of the convention.

Now for a few of the problems that face the State Federation of Labor and labor in general.

Naturally, the first problem that concerns us is jobs. and you might add to that, jobs that at what—jobs at what will provide for the purpose of this convention. Many schemes are being presented to the American public for discussion, for examination. I think our Congress has not set a very great example. and I think we can be most critical of Congress for their conduct up to now. Next, I believe, in importance, is the maintenance. We have the proper level of buying power without the greatest possible number of workers being employed at the greatest possible wage. We must have a high level of production. We must have a high level of production.

The next step, I think, is taxation. Prior to the war, and during the war, we were told—and the authority was authority that could be—that the high tax to income was placed there most deliberately by government to slough off some of the excess, extra earnings of workers, so that their movement would be in competition for scarce civilian goods. If that be so, why the delay of Congress in reducing that tax and reversing the process and putting into the hands of the people some of what is already there. If that be so, why the delay of Congress in reducing that tax and reversing the process and putting into the hands of the people some of what is already there.

The next step, I think, that needs to be examined is. if reversion is delayed by either management or labor, I believe, will suffer the most by any such delay. Already certain industries are suffering by delay, and it is reflecting in the employment, and if these delays continue, we could very well, very shortly, have as many as ten million unemployed, and that is a sad state of affairs, with all the needs of all the people in the United States.

Many, many efforts are being made to bring about peaceful settlement of labor disputes. President Green has urged peaceful settlement of disputes, and the use of strike only as a last resort.

I think, however, to Massachusetts, we are an example to the rest of the United States in the handling of problems, both during the war and since the cessation of hostilities. We have gone well and we have

Another problem I believe the convention should examine is the returning veteran problem. Many unions have changed their set-up to recognize the returning veteran. We believe that our first responsibility is to the returning veteran of our own organization, and in most instances, that amounts to no less than 13 percent of the membership of the organization. We won't be able to provide for the returning veteran to the extent that we would like to, if there are holdups, delays, by either management or labor.

We have said we will do everything under the sun for these returning men, and I think the most critical instance we cannot do it if there is going to be delay. Many unions have reduced their initiation fees to bring into their fold veterans that are qualified for their particular organization. Some of the unions are accepting an honorable discharge and crediting the time spent in the military services to part of the apprenticeship. In particular, in other words, many, many organizations are making everything possible in their organization to carry out the pledge they have made that they will do what can be done for the returning veteran.

For many years during the depression, the skilled crafts did not develop mechanisms through the apprenticeship system. They cannot be criticized for it. They couldn't provide for these young men during the life of their apprenticeship, and had they accepted them into membership, they would only be spreading the miseries and needed good, strong apprenticeship systems, and again, to have them work and work well, we must have a continuity of employment for them.

In this respect, I think we will need the additional funds from government to provide the necessary educational and training on the job training received by the apprentice.

Another step that I think should be examined—and you hear it everywhere—everybody is fearful, it is making the proposal that the inflation will come. I think there should be a continuance of control of prices, and only raises in prices be permitted where it is necessary, and that the wages of the workers is. I touched on taxation, but I think we ought to examine what has been done, what provisions have been made on excess profits due to the war, and what Congress is now discussing.

I am told by economists that it is possible for business to show a loss in 1946, and strange as it may seem, come out with a profit, because of the reduction in taxes by government which were collected during the war. The worker gets no refund, and I don't think Congress is making the proper reduction suggesting the proper reduction for workers. I think it should be 50 percent, and that seems to be the general feeling of labor union officials.

Government today is considering the 65-cent wage minimum, which is a raise from the 45-cent minimum. I think that Congress could very well approve that legislation.

Another matter we should consider, a matter of discussion for the convention, is if the level of employment is not such as to provide employment for mostly all of our people, we should discuss a shorter work-week. I am not even going to suggest the number of hours. It may be that we would have to go down and go up various times in various years. The Congress has been giving very little attention to legislation of this particular sort. It has been sponsored by Labor, and I think we can charge Labor with the responsibility in this regard. We don't bring to the attention of our Congresses what they desire.

Yet only last night I was told of a Boston Congressman who has been in Washington approximately three years, that he has never been approached by a representative in behalf of legislation. That is so, that is a sad state of affairs. No Congressman, no legislator in our state, can hope to examine each piece of legislation to its minutest detail. He must rely on the information that is passed to him by his constituents, in many cases, as to what a bill will do, and what a bill will
not do. We all can take that to heart, and improve that situation.

Recently, the officers of the Federation have joined with public-spirited groups in furthering programs for Massachusetts. We joined with groups in the Port Authority Bill and the reeves commission for a Department of Transportation, and sponsored a Department of Commerce bill, believing that it will aid in bringing new industry, sorely needed as it is, to Massachusetts. During the convention, we will be on the lookout:

We are stuck up here in the corner of the country, as we always say, with the next place beyond us the Atlantic Ocean, and every effort should be made for a position, and with the proper support, this can be done.

In the Full Employment Bill, provisions are made for public works, which the House has been designing a program of public works. We read where Massachusetts has somewhere around 150 million dollars for road work. And only yesterday, the Department of Commerce advertised something less than two million dollars worth of work. Before the figures could be in, before work could get under way, the winter is upon us, and the work will have to be cut out of the soft, materials are short, and non-existent, maybe, in certain cases, but the materials are available for road work. The materials are there; stone, sand and cement, yet it took months to advertise less than two million dollars worth of work. I think there is something lacking somewhere in that Department. We feel that public works should be handled in a manner that will aid employment when needed, and all these projects should be of such a nature that it would be an improvement in the community, and all the projects should be done under the contract system, and naturally, by organized labor at the prevailing rates of wages.

We all know there is a shortage of housing. And I think that that shortage is going to continue for some time. Neither lumber nor brick is available. And those in the building trades certainly hope that soon both will be coming in from the Southwest. The Arizona Bill, but there is little doubt they will go forward very rapidly, at the cost of these materials at the present time. Again, the imposition of price control, and that may have to be continued for some time, for the benefit of all.

We have on the statute books in Massachusetts, a so-called housing bill, which will make possible the entrance into the housing field by insurance companies, public corporations, etc. They have the right to take land by eminent domain and build for them, and for some insurance companies to engage in large-scale homebuilding in Massachusetts. They may not try to compete with low-cost Federal Housing. I rather think they will try to meet the needs of the workers such as themselves.

Your State Federation of Labor is in a very sound position, both numerically and financially. It has more member unions today than at any time in its history, but it is still far from where it should be. All too many unions remain outside the Federation and its benefits. In future Federation, the benefits that those associated with the Federation of Labor bring about. We hope that that condition will be improved upon.

I think for the Commonwealth Federation of Labor is greater than at any time in the history of the Federation.

In addition to sponsoring, carrying through and seeing adopted important legislation beneficial to the workers, we are faced with the task of fighting legislation that will tear down and prove injurious to the workers. We have been very successful recently in the legislation presented by the State Federation of Labor. We were successful in defeating the so-called Massachusetts Public Aid of Unemployed Bill. That has not prevented—neither did the Attorney General decide that was the end—the Attorney General intends to carry his bills to the people in a referendum at a special election in in the fall of next year. 1946. In these referendums, a number of steps must be taken by the State Federation of Labor, all of them rather expensive, but nonetheless must be done in an effort to prevent the appearance of these bills on the ballot in 1946. There are about nine steps that can be taken. Eight of them, before the ballots are ready to be printed, the ninth one is to fight its appearing on the ballot.

And as Acting Secretary Wilkinson, only the other day, in a talk said, most every in the, the only thing we can do is to further the wealth of Massachusetts that required a "yes", vote succeeded, and this is one where, if you vote "yes", Mr. Barnes will have these bills as he wants them, which, in our opinion, will be only the start of the ballot measures. And these ones which will follow. You will be called upon to take part in this battle. And you will have to carry back to the membership of your own union and enlist their aid in defeating these bills.

I think I have gone far enough.

I will now declare the convention open and ready to consider any matters legally presented.

The Chair will now recognize Acting Secretary Wilkinson.

Acting Secretary Wilkinson then read the Convention Call as follows:

CONVENTION CALL

Because regulations of the War Committee on Conventions made it impossible to meet in annual convention this year, and as the national program of the American Federation of Labor made it mandatory for State Federations to abide by the decisions of that Committee, the Executive Council advised all affiliated unions and local bodies through the President of the War Committee on Conventions, we would forego holding our annual convention this year.

Now that the regulations governing such conventions have been relaxed, it is possible for organizations such as the Federation to convene. As the regular date for our annual convention, as established by our Constitution, has passed, the Executive Council has called a Special Victory Convention for the purpose of celebrating our victory over the forces of barbarism and totalitarianism, and to formulate the policy that will guide the Federation through the difficult days of reconversion to peace-time living that lie ahead.

Therefore, on Friday, October 26, 1945, a Special Victory Convention will convene at 10 a.m., in the Ballroom of the Hotel Commander, 16 Garden Street, Cambridge, and remain in session until adjourned sine die on Sunday, October 28, 1945.

REPRESENTATION

Each Union of 200 members or less attached to a National or International Union, when one is in existence, shall be entitled to one delegate and an additional delegate for each
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rules of the convention at the afternoon session, after the Committee on Rules has made its report to the convention for the acceptance of such resolutions.

President Doyle: The Chair now requests that Chairman Russell take the resolutions, if Chairman Russell is in the hall. His committee will be named very shortly.

Acting Secretary Wilkinson: We have a telegram from William Green, President of the American Federation of Labor, addressed to the convention:

Cincinnati, Ohio.

Executive Council just adjourned. Am planning to attend next Sunday session of convention of Massachusetts State Federation of Labor at Cambridge. Hope to advise you at a later time of my arrival.

WM. GREEN, President.

We have a communication, a copy of a communication addressed to the Secretary of Labor, Lewis Schwellenbach, from the Cambridge Central Labor Union, which we have been requested to read to the convention and enter into the records:

CAMBRIDGE CENTRAL LABOR UNION
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

Dear Sir:

At the regular meeting of the Cambridge Central Labor Union held on Monday, October 22, 1945, I was instructed to protest to you the existing condition of the Boston Office of the National Labor Relations Board. The protest of the Cambridge Central Labor Union is as follows:

1. Lack of sufficient examiners;
2. The delay of processing unfair labor charges, and the delay in issuing certificate either by election or otherwise, and the time spent by the staff for strike votes under the Smith-Connelly Act.

We of the Central Labor Union feel that the processing of unfair labor charges and certifications should still be the paramount function of the National Labor Relations Board and not be sidetracked by the Smith-Connelly Act.

We also feel that since Congress has passed the Smith-Connelly Act, they should appropriate the money and set up sufficient boards to handle this without interfering with ordinary procedure.

Hoping that you may in some manner find
WAYS AND MEANS OF CLEARING UP THIS SITUATION.

I Am,

Yours Truly,

William Smith,
Secretary-Treasurer.

President Doyle has appointed the following convention committees:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON OFFICERS' REPORT AND RESOLUTIONS

Harry A. Russell, Engineers No. 849, Boston (Chairman)

John J. Regan, Electrical Workers No. B-224, New Bedford

J. Anthony Moriarty, Typographical Union No. 13, Boston

John J. Murphy, Bricklayers No. 6, Worcester

Anthony J. DeAndrade, Paper Handlers, Plate Boys and Press Clerks No. 21, Boston

John C. Carey, Street Carmen No. 589, Boston

E. E. Longley, Railroad and Steamship Clerks, At Large

James T. Moriarty, Sheet Metal Workers No. 17, Boston

William V. Ward, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees No. 648, Boston

Joseph L. Regan, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees No. 656, Boston

Daniel J. Goggin, Boot and Shoe Workers No. 138, Boston

John F. Queaney, Electrical Workers No. 108, Boston

Alfred Ellis, Sheet Metal Workers No. 17, Boston

John C. Harrington, Teamsters No. 829, Boston

Francis E. Lavigne, Teamsters No. 653, Brockton

Franklin J. Murphy, Central Labor Union, Lawrence

Daniel F. Downey, United Textile Workers No. 1113, Lawrence

William A. Nealey, Teamsters No. 42, Lynn

Harry P. Hogan, Central Labor Union, Springfield

Arthur J. Payette, Moving Picture Operators No. 186, Springfield

Leonard A. Ryan, Teamsters No. 170, Worcester

Nicholas P. Morrissey, Teamsters No. 25, Boston

Committee on Rules

Benjamin E. Naylor, Teamsters No. 404, Springfield

Michael J. Riordan, Firemen and Oilers No. 47, Brockton

Bart P. Saunders, Electrical Workers No. 104, Boston

William R. Smith, Central Labor Union, Cambridge

Manuel Souza, Teamsters No. 59, New Bedford

Mark A. Sullivan, Street Carmen No. 174, Fall River

Joseph A. Picone, Fireworks and Munitiions Workers No. 22694, Rockland

Joseph A. Sullivan, Meat Cutters No. 294, Quincy

William J. Kennedy, Textile Workers No. 1113, Lawrence

Committee on Credentials

Timothy F. Grady, Electrical Workers No. 707, Holyoke (Chairman)

William A. Roche, Street Carmen, No. 589, Boston

John J. Mulcahy, Carpenters No. 1092, Lawrence

James P. Reilly, Cambridge City Employees No. 692

Neil MacKenzie, Bricklayers No. 20, Pittsfield

Sergeant-At-Arms

Harry W. Joel, Federal Labor Union No. 22365, Cambridge

Assistant Sergeant-At-Arms

John A. McCabe, Teamsters No. 496, Boston

Committee on Guests

P. Harry Jennings, Teamsters No. 168, Boston (Chairman)

Edward C. Carroll, Electrical Workers No. 103, Boston

Charles A. Burns, Teamsters No. 379, Boston

James R. J. MacDonald, Engineers No. 4, Boston

Thomas F. Burns, Bakery Workers No. 348, Cambridge

Acting Secretary Wilkinson: I draw the attention of the delegates to the Executive Council's Report.

You will notice in the Executive Council Report that the Executive Council has proposed to you an agenda, so to speak, to bring before you certain matters which, to them, appear to be of prime necessity for your consideration.

They are contained in the nine paragraphs, beginning with Paragraph 1 on page 6, and continuing on through paragraphs 7, 8 and 9 of the Officers' Report, and we urge that each delegate examine and digest the recommendations of the Council, because they are sufficiently broad to encompass any of the problems that I think we are all plagued with.

Delegate Grady, for the Committee on Credentials, submitted the following report:

Roll Call of Delegates

ANDOVER

Woolen and Worsted Workers No. 38; John Croley, George F. Driscoll, Harold L. Williams

Arlington

Carpenters No. 831; Brenton C. Cameron

Beverly

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees No. 798; James P. Fullerton

Bricklayers No. 40; Thomas P. J. McMullen

Boston

Central Labor Union, Harry P. Grages, Herman Koster
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 164, James P. Griffin

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 203, William H. Fuller

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 239, Josephine B. Roche

Hope Smith

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 296, Walter E. Shaughnessy

John J. Butler

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 370, Joseph L. McLean

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 419, John C. Kerivan

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 435, Thomas J. Gately

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 445, Jeremiah C. Fitzgerald

Walter C. Mackie

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 465, Patrick J. Gately

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 477, Angelo Vozzella

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 648, William V. Ward

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 656, Joseph L. Regan

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 709, Arthur L. Stanek

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 731, A. H. Kalish

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 804, John F. Kenney

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 823, Thomas G. Kirwin

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 869, Lawrence J. Collins

AMERICAN GUILD OF VARIETY ARTISTS, Allen F. Nickerson

ASSOCIATION OF ENGINEERS, ARCHITECTS AND DRAFTSMEN- No. 105, Maurice J. Scott

BAKERY WORKERS No. 20, Patrick J. Leonard

BAKERY WORKERS No. 45, Julius Brisgalsky

BARBERS No. 182, Charles Cali

BOILERMAKERS No. 29, John D. Scott

BOOKBINDERS No. 16, Jeremiah J. Connolly

BOOT AND SHOE WORKERS No. 138, Daniel J. Goggins

THomas A. Lyons

John F. Mealey

BRICKLAYERS No. 3, Thomas E. Ryan

John F. Tracy

BUILDING SERVICE EMPLOYEES No. 148, Arthur Constant

BUILDING SERVICE EMPLOYEES No. 254, Homer W. Allen

Raymond Brodus

William K. Paris

CAFETERIA AND LUNCHROOM WORKERS No. 480, Saul Swartzman

Carpenters No. 40, Peter A. Reilly

William L. Ross

Carpenters No. 2169, Patrick J. Sullivan

CEMENT FINISHERS No. 534, John Carroll

COOKS AND PASTRY COOKS ASSOCIATION No. 186, Mary Pahay

Joseph Stefani

COOPERS No. 89, James F. Morrissey

ELECTRICAL WORKERS No. 103, Edward C. Carroll

William J. Doyle

William C. Horneman

John F. Queaney

Joseph A. Slattery

ELECTRICAL WORKERS No. 104, Bart F. Saunders

ELECTRICAL WORKERS No. 396, Arthur Myhail

ELECTRICAL WORKERS No. 717, John S. Murray

ELECTRICAL WORKERS No. B-1120 (Telephone Operators), Catherine F. Murphy

ELECTRICAL WORKERS No. B-1228 (Radio Broadcast Technicians), John D. Buttrick

ELECTROTYPERS No. 11, Martin J. Casey

ELEVATOR CONSTRUCTORS No. 4, Edward I. Kelley

ENGINEERS No. 4 (Hoisting and Portable), John F. Cummings

James R. J. MacDonald

ENGINEERS No. 849 (Operating), Harry A. Russell

Roderick McKinnon

FEDERAL LABOR UNION No. 21432 (Newspaper Writers), Edward F. Sullivan

FEDERAL LABOR UNION No. 22632 (Plastic Products), Albert L. Greene

Joseph Sweeney
FIRE FIGHTERS No. 718,  
Alexander Campbell  
James H. Curran  
Henry J. McCue  
Thomas G. Sullivan

FIREMEN AND OILERS No. 3,  
Francis Cahill  
Joseph F. McNamara

FIREMEN AND OILERS No. 79,  
John G. Markley

IRON WORKERS No. 7,  
James A. McDonald  
Frank J. Moriarity  
William J. Reynolds

INTERNATIONAL LADIES GARMENT WORKERS No. 24,  
Nathan H. Barker

INTERNATIONAL LADIES GARMENT WORKERS No. 229,  
Mary Levin

INTERNATIONAL LADIES GARMENT WORKERS No. 359,  
Jack Halpern

LATHERS No. 72,  
Joseph L. Coullahan

LAUNDRY WORKERS No. 66,  
Joseph F. Donovan  
Joseph Neil

MACHINISTS No. 264,  
John Clayton

MACHINISTS No. 1373,  
John L. Dwyer

MAILERS No. 16,  
Cable N. Salter

MARBLE AND TILE SETTERS AND HELPERS No. 18,  
James F. Meagher

MEAT CUTTERS No. 592,  
John J. Conroy  
William J. Kelly  
John J. Lally  
David C. Murphy  
James B. Nickerson

MUSICIANS No. 9,  
Gus Fischer  
George Gibbs  
J. Edward Kurth

NEWSPAPER PRESSMEN No. 3,  
Stephen W. Fardy  
William J. Harris

OFFICE EMPLOYEES No. 6,  
Esther F. Cahill

PAINTERS No. 11,  
Raymond A. Christensen  
Oscar Omdahl  
W. H. Osgood

PAINTERS No. 391 (Sign Writers),  
John MacG. Hogh

PAPER HANDLERS, PLATE BOYS AND PRESS CLERKS No. 21,  
Anthony J. DeAndrade

PLASTERERS No. 10,  
Louis Klehm  
Francis O'Toole

PLUMBERS No. 12,  
Timothy A. Callahan

PRINTING PRESSMEN No. 67,  
Bertram W. Kohl

PRINTING PRESS ASSISTANTS No. 18,  
Walter F. McLoughlin

RAILWAY AND STEAMSHIP CLERKS No. 218,  
William Bellis

RETAIL CLERKS No. 189 (Newsstand Salespersons),  
Margaret C. Hartnett

RETAIL CLERKS No. 1445,  
Fred A. Ammond, Jr.  
Bernard S. Kenney  
William J. Walsh

RETAIL CLERKS No. 593 (Pharmacists' Guild),  
Philip P. Kagan

SEAFOOD WORKERS No. 1572-2,  
John Donegan  
Milton H. Elvey

SHEET METAL WORKERS No. 17,  
James E. Brooks  
Alfred Ellis, Jr.  
James T. Moriarty

SPRINKLER FITTERS No. 669,  
Payton R. Williamson

STAGE EMPLOYEES No. 11,  
Jeremiah F. Galvin

STONE CUTTERS,  
Nelson Mattola

STONE MASON'S No. 9,  
John McLaren

STREET CARMEN No. 589,  
Thomas W. Bowe  
Charles F. Cahill  
John C. Carey  
Thomas P. Dillon  
Frederick O. FitzGerald  
Michael J. Flanagan  
Lawrence J. Flynn  
William J. Flynn  
John H. McNulty  
Peter Nolan  
Cyril A. O'Brien  
Charles L. Riley  
William A. Roche  
Patrick J. White

TEACHERS No. 66,  
Mary C. Cadigan

TEACHERS No. 441,  
Grace K. Lorch

TEAMSTERS No. 25,  
Nicholas P. Morrissey  
Michael J. Norton  
John M. Sullivan

TEAMSTERS No. 68 (Coal and Fuel),  
John Duffy  
Michael J. Sullivan

TEAMSTERS No. 82 (Furniture and Piano Movers),  
Charles A. Armstrong  
Charles F. Hanson

TEAMSTERS No. 168 (Laundry and Liquor Drivers),  
P. Harry Jennings  
Nate Hurwitz

TEAMSTERS No. 259 (Newspaper Chauffeurs),  
Samuel Feldberg  
Isador Fox  
Thomas C. Healey

TEAMSTERS No. 379 (Building Material),  
Charles A. Burns  
John J. DelMonte  
Frank J. McMorrow  
Charles J. Murphy

TEAMSTERS No. 380 (Milk Wagon Drivers),  
Matthew A. Dunn  
Joseph P. Lane  
William McManus  
Mathew J. Maloney  
Joseph L. Murray

TEAMSTERS No. 404 (Bakery Drivers),  
Edward J. Trainor

TEAMSTERS No. 496 (Taxi Cab Drivers),  
John V. Jenkins  
John A. McCabe  
Theodore F. Miller
TEAMSTERS No. 829 (Warehousemen),
   Frank Dooley
Maurice Enright
John J. Greeley
John C. Harrington
James J. McCarthy
Jerome F. McCarthy
John Sexton
Michael Toland
Estelle Willis

TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION No. 13,
   Allen H. Goodman
Wallace S. Groves
J. Arthur Moriarty

UNITED GARMENT WORKERS No. 1,
   Nathan Sidd

WAITRESSES No. 112,
   Margaret J. Donahue
Delia Hurley
Katherine McNabb

BRAINTREE

CARPENTERS No. 1550,
   John W. Knox

BRIDGEWATER

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE,
   COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 503,
   James L. O'Shea

BROCKTON

CENTRAL LABOR UNION,
   Joseph E. Connolly
   Thomas E. Wilkinson

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE,
   COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 512,
   Elmore Kelley

BUILDING LABORERS No. 721,
   Victor Parziale

BARBERS No. 235,
   Raffaele Valentino

CARPENTERS No. 624,
   Everett L. Pratt

ELECTRICAL WORKERS No. 223,
   Herbert S. Ferris

FIRE FIGHTERS No. 144,
   Wallace W. Campbell

FIREMEN AND OILERS No. 47,
   Michael J. Riordan

INTERNATIONAL LADIES GARMENT
   WORKERS No. 242,
   Henry J. Brides

PAINTERS No. 296,
   Onesime Lajoie

STREET CARMEN No. 235,
   John J. Costello
   Francis L. Sheehan

TEAMSTERS No. 653,
   James F. Clark
   Francis E. Lavigne
   George P. Petrulis

CAMBRIDGE

CENTRAL LABOR UNION,
   Howard H. Litchfield
   William R. Smith

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE,
   COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 602,
   James P. Reilly

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE,
   COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 776,
   John J. Moran

BAKERY WORKERS No. 348,
   Edward Deshler
   Daniel J. McCarthy

BOOKBINDERS No. 204,
   John J. Barry

CASKET AND FURNITURE WORKERS
   No. 560,
   Michael McLaughlin

CHEMICAL WORKERS No. 86 (Dewey & Almy)
   Charles Cann
   Bernard F. Honekamp

CHEMICAL WORKERS No. 116 (Lever Brothers),
   Daniel F. Daly
   Joseph A. DeVincenitis
   Joseph T. Healey
   John P. Kennedy

FEDERAL LABOR UNION No. 22305
   (Fertilizer Workers),
   Harry W. Joel

FIRE FIGHTERS No. 30,
   Francis J. Harrington

JEWELRY WORKERS No. 124,
   Catherine M. Barrett

PAINTERS No. 577,
   Dominic Seretto

PRINTING PRESSMEN No. 482 (Ink and Carbon Workers),
   Joseph Babineau

CHARLESTOWN

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE,
   COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 451,
   Harold E. Miller

BOILERMAKERS No. 304 (Government Employees),
   John J. Doyle

MACHINISTS No. 634,
   William H. Browne
   John F. Domey

CHELSEA

CARPENTERS No. 3191,
   William R. Ford

PAINTERS No. 623,
   Edward I. Tarlow

CHICOPEE

BARTENDERS No. 116,
   John F. Lynch

CARPENTERS No. 685,
   William Austin

FEDERAL LABOR UNION No. 18518,
   John C. Brown
   Norman Cote

FEDERAL LABOR UNION No. 19469,
   Roland W. Aubertine
   Roland J. Goodwin

FEDERAL LABOR UNION No. 20322,
   John W. Valego

CLINTON

PRINTING PRESSMEN No. 265,
   Isaac L. Ellis

CONCORD

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE,
   COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 420,
   Robert J. Carson

EAST WEYMOUTH

WOOLEN AND WORSTED WORKERS
   No. 1715,
   Abraham Nesson
EVERETT
CHEMICAL WORKERS No. 57, Robert M. Walsh
PAPER BOX WORKERS No. 511, Edward F. Keefe

FALL RIVER
INTERNATIONAL LADIES GARMENT WORKERS No. 178, Lucy Levesque Frederick Siems
STREET CARMEN No. 174 Mark A. Sullivan
TEAMSTERS No. 526, Joseph S. Callahan Walter J. Sokoll

FISHERVILLE
FEDERAL LABOR UNION No. 21071, Charles Scowcroft Bertha Campbell

FITCHBURG
CENTRAL LABOR UNION, Robert P. Gagne
BARTENDERS No. 97, Henry P. Casey
CARPENTERS No. 775, Ellis E. Blomquist
ELECTRICAL WORKERS No. 256, Clarence J. Durkin
PAPER MAKERS No. 12, Ralph W. LeMay

GLOUCESTER
CENTRAL LABOR UNION, Joseph F. Grace
SEAFOOD WORKERS No. 1572-1, Robert W. Cusick John J. Curley James M. Donnellon Manuel R. Goulart Henry A. Lima Joseph A. White

GREENFIELD
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 268, Raymond L. Bickford
ELECTRICAL WORKERS No. 761, Walter J. Kenefick

HAVERHILL
TEAMSTERS No. 437, Charles Tomes

HOLYOKE
CENTRAL LABOR UNION, Charles F. Moran
BARTENDERS No. 81, Arthur J. Perreault
BOOKBINDERS No. 45, Walter Folsentraeger Raymond A. Lacroix
CARPENTERS No. 656, Frank Conway
ELECTRICAL WORKERS No. 707, Timothy F. Grady
ELECTRICAL WORKERS No. B-1101, Charles H. Murray

FEDERAL LABOR UNION No. 23633, J. Roger Fontaine
FIREMEN AND OILERS No. 4 Francis M. Curran
PULP, SULPHITE AND PAPER MILL WORKERS No. 203, William Lemelin
STREET CARMEN No. 537, Edward J. Borlen

LAWRENCE
CENTRAL LABOR UNION, John J. Havey Franklin J. Murphy
BARTENDERS No. 90, Thomas P. Finnegan
BUILDING LABORERS No. 175, John A. Fusco
CARPENTERS No. 111, Richard A. McNeice
CARPENTERS No. 1092, John J. Mulcahy
ELECTRICAL WORKERS No. B-1006, Joseph C. Jardis
HOTEL AND RESTAURANT EMPLOYEES No. 319, John M. Slumbo
PAINTERS No. 44, James P. Meehan
STREET CARMEN No. 261, Martin L. Earley
TEAMSTERS No. 477, Raymond V. Hill
TEAMSTERS No. 686 (Bakery Drivers), Emmett E. Cudahy
TYPOGRAPHICAL No. 51, John F. Wade

WOOLEN AND WORSTED WORKERS No. 2674, James Anderson Philip Salem

LEE
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 735, Joseph Wood

LOWELL
CENTRAL LABOR UNION, Daniel J. Coakley Sidney E. LeBow
BARTENDERS No. 85, Armando Alberghini
CARPENTERS No. 49, James H. Golden
MOVING PICTURE OPERATORS No. 546, Robert C. Gray
STREET CARMEN No. 280, Joseph M. Shea
TEAMSTERS No. 49, Robert Margeson
WOOLEN AND WORSTED WORKERS No. 17, Armand F. Denault
WOOLEN AND WORSTED WORKERS No. 734, John J. Mullen

LYNN
BARBERS No. 347, Frank Ardidiacomo
ELECTRICAL WORKERS No. 377, Harold B. Oliver
FIRE FIGHTERS No. 739, William E. Sexton
MEAT CUTTERS No. 71, Peter Albacento
STREET CARMEN No. 238, John H. Carter
TEAMSTERS No. 42, John Cronin
Joseph F. McManus
William A. Nealey

MELROSE
STREET CARMEN No. 240, Jessie A. Levin

MIDDLEBORO
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 601, Warren Delano

MILFORD
MOVING PICTURE OPERATORS No. 723, George F. Mills

NATICK
PAINTERS No. 916, Stephen J. Angleton
PAPER BOX WORKERS No. 502, Kenneth G. Barry

NEW BEDFORD
CENTRAL LABOR UNION, Julia E. Daley
Dorothy B. DeLoid
BUILDING LABORERS No. 385, Antonio F. Gomes
Lionel Marchand
CARPENTERS No. 1416, Henry Bowles
Roland C. Dubois
Philip J. Lajoie
ELECTRICAL WORKERS No. B-224, James F. Loftus
John J. Rezan
TEAMSTERS No. 59, S. P. Jason
Antone Lewis
John P. O'Neill
Manuel Souza

UNITED TEXTILE WORKERS No. 36, Emily Daigneault
John Vertente, Jr.

NEWTON
CARPENTERS No. 275, Angus MacLean
UNITED TEXTILE WORKERS No. 2574, William F. Bowen

NORFOLK
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 464, George S. Murray

NORWOOD
BOOKBINDERS No. 176, John J. Connolly

PITTSFIELD
BRICKLAYERS No. 20, Nell MacKenzie

QUINCY
CENTRAL LABOR UNION, Robert W. Canavan
John A. Wishart
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 802, James V. Gardner
GRANITE CUTTERS,
Constanzo Pagnano
MEAT CUTTERS No. 294, Kenneth J. Kelley
Joseph A. Sullivan
STREET CARMEN No. 233, Ernest R. Withrow

ROCKLAND
BOOT AND SHOE WORKERS No. 48, Fred W. Gardner
FEDERAL LABOR UNION No. 22694, George H. Browne
Joseph Ingles
Charles R. McAloney
Jessie Macdonald
Alphonse E. McGrath
George F. McGuire
Joseph A. Picone
Stephen Porrino
Charles Shebeck
Cari P. Stone
Janet Whiting
Hazel Wickett

SALEM
LAUNDRY WORKERS No. 246, Albert Bouchard

SOMERVILLE
CENTRAL LABOR UNION, Robert F. Maguire
Frank Mangan
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES No. 274, John J. Griffin
BAKERY WORKERS No. 458, Francis E. Shea
Matthew A. Ziminsky
PULP, SULFITE AND PAPER MILL WORKERS No. 230, Earle T. Gould
SPRINGFIELD
CENTRAL LABOR UNION,
Harry P. Hogan
Shirley J. Vines
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERN-
MENT EMPLOYEES No. 178,
Stephen G. Fopiano
BAKERY WORKERS No. 32,
Eugene Pasini
BARTENDERS No. 67,
John D. Dahner
BRICKLAYERS No. 1,
James Leonard
BUILDING LABORERS No. 999,
Carlo Tronghere
CARPENTERS No. 177,
Leon H. Manser
CORRUGATED BOX WORKERS No. 488,
Ettore Della Mattera
ENGINEERS No. 98 (Operating),
James J. Bird
FEDERAL LABOR UNION No. 18885,
Myles Burke
Arthur J. Duncan
Oliver Hill
Allen G. Moore
Joseph E. Paquin
John J. Sullivan
C. Fred Tassernari
FEDERAL LABOR UNION No. 20681,
Robert E. Morrison
Ralph Wellingius
FEDERAL LABOR UNION No. 21467,
Francis J. Maloney
FEDERAL LABOR UNION No. 22804,
Percy Fletcher
Emilien Lapierre
FIRE FIGHTERS No. 648,
Arvid G. Anderstrom
MOLDERS No. 167,
Nick Carter
Francis L. O'Brien
MOVING PICTURE OPERATORS No. 186,
Arthur J. Payette
PAINTERS No. 287,
Roy Surpremante
PATTERN MAKERS ASSOCIATION,
Finton J. Kelly
PLUMBERS No. 89,
Thomas F. Egan
POST OFFICE CLERKS No. 497,
James E. Walsh
SHEET METAL WORKERS No. 63,
Richard J. Leary
STREET CARMEN No. 448,
J. P. Coughlin
Edward A. Raleigh
TEAMSTERS No. 404,
Leon J. Kennedy
Benjamin E. Naylor
Stanley M. Rochford
Harry W. Stears

TAUNTON
CENTRAL LABOR UNION,
Arthur Anctil
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE,
COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES
No. 492,
George B. Seekell

WALTHAM
BRICKLAYERS No. 15,
Thomas Crane
BUILDING LABORERS No. 560,
Salvatore Pavone
LATHERS No. 142,
Frank C. Burke
STREET CARMEN No. 600,
Lawrence J. Duffy

WATERTOWN
FEDERAL LABOR UNION No. 21914,
Oscar R. Carlson
Frank J. Cusick
Samuel DeLuca
Dominic J. Perolito
William Hay
Joseph Hughes
Joseph D. Kelley
Howard Morrison
Harry O'Connor
S. A. Percoco
John J. Ring
Ann Shapazian
Edward Sherlock
Joseph P. Talarico
Oscar E. Tisdale

WESTFIELD
CENTRAL LABOR UNION,
Benjamin G. Hull
FEDERAL LABOR UNION No. 20291,
Frank Maciasak
Edward J. Wall
FEDERAL LABOR UNION No. 22998,
J. Thomas Conway
LAUNDRY WORKERS No. 77,
Stella A. Hobday

WEYMOUTH
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE,
COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES
No. 772,
Harold S. Gardner

WORCESTER
CENTRAL LABOR UNION,
Philip F. Coyle
BAKERY WORKERS No. 133,
David Widoff
BAKERY WORKERS No. 251,
Thomas F. Burns
Leo J. Dell'Olio
BARTENDERS No. 95,
Jaames H. Loughlin
BRICKLAYERS No. 6,
Henry J. Brennan
John J. Murphy
ELECTRICAL WORKERS No. 96,
Samuel J. Donnelly
ENGINEERS No. 75 (Operating),
Robert A. Burns
STREET CARMEN No. 22,
William H. Murphy
John M. Shea
TEAMSTERS No. 170,
Thomas J. Enwright
Chester G. Fitzpatrick
Oscar Johnson
Leonard A. Ryan
TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION No. 165,
Freeman M. Saltus
BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY AND
STEAMSHIP CLERKS, FREIGHT HAN-
DELERS, EXPRESS AND STATION EM-
PLOYEES, AT LARGE
Alfred Arruda
Robert A. Babcock
Raymond R. Bachand
Proceedings of the Special Victory Convention

Roy P. Blinn  
James D. Blue  
Joseph F. Buckley  
James J. Chambers  
Edward F. Halshauer  
George W. Hurley  
John F. Hurley  
Arthur H. Jackson  
James D. Lee  
E. E. Longley  
Joseph F. Lynch  
J. J. Mahoney  
Fred L. Maxwell  
John F. McAuliffe  
Joseph L. McCarthy  
John J. McGrail  
Thomas F. Neal  
Alexander Ryan  
Russell Swan  
Harold H. Ulrich  
Harvey F. Wolf

Delegate Grady moved the report of the committee be adopted and that the delegates be seated with voice and vote.

President Doyle: The Committee on Credentials has made its report and they recommend that the delegates whose names were read be seated with voice and vote. Action comes on the adoption of the recommendations of the committee. Those in favor will manifest by saying "aye." Those opposed "no." The "ayes" have it. It's a vote and so ordered.

President Doyle: It was the intention of the Governor of the Commonwealth to be here this morning. No doubt you all realize the reason for his not being here, but he now hopes to be with us this afternoon. Because of the weather last evening, it was necessary for the workers, and even the Governor, to forego the opportunity of being with us this afternoon. But now he is here and will be with us this afternoon.

Will Chairman Naylor of the Rules Committee meet with his committee immediately after adjournment, so that he will be prepared to report early in the afternoon session?

We have with us this morning, the President of the Massachusetts Federation of Labor. He has very greatly journeyed to Boston to attend our convention. He came here at my request, and I know him to be a swell fellow. I have to say that, he is a brother electrical worker. So I present to you, the President of the New Jersey State Federation of Labor, Lou Marcilante.

LOUIS P. MARCIANTE  
(President, New Jersey State Federation of Labor)

President Doyle, Officers, Delegates to the Massachusetts Federation of Labor: I am most happy to be with you today to observe, in a small way, I will grant, the 30-day observance of the Labor Law. Far from it. Many times they follow that usual campaign of making Labor look as bad as they can possibly make them look, but, on the whole, I would say that in great many other times they attempt to be fair in some respects.

When I arrived in Boston last night, I bought four Boston newspapers and took them up to my room and read them, and I was rather amazed by the similarity of propaganda. I don't think you can call it anything but that. Practically every newspaper had an editorial attacking Labor, which, to me, was rather amazing.

I did run into one new thing, which hasn't as yet been suggested further down East, and that was a suggestion by one of the papers that the provisions of the Railway Labor Act be extended to all of Labor. Well, of course you know what that would mean. It would mean that long delay that is necessary for the operation of the Act before a final determination, or before action could be taken. The so-called "cooling off" period. And if you look at the record to note that the "cooling off" period, rather than cooling people off, has aggravated them to an extent that in only three cases out of several hundred did the workers vote for no strike after a 30-day cooling-off period. So that the Act accomplished just the opposite of what it was intended to do.

Now I can imagine a great many labor situations in which a "cooling off" period would be most harmful to Labor's cause. You and I know, who are practical men, that in most cases, before a "cooling off" period could run its course, Labor would have lost its equity in the case. Imagine the building construction going on for some time. And there are a great many others. There isn't any doubt in my mind, but what there is a concerted effort, a concerted campaign, to bring about most repressive, restrictive, and most injurious legislation. And that causes me to wonder what we gave our sons to the Army and Navy and Marine Corps for, whether we went out to kill Fascism in Europe or here in the United States. And I submit to you that government control of the activities of the great mass of people to a restrictive point is nothing less than Fascism.

I suppose that the Massachusetts Federation of Labor is confronted with what most every other Federation is forced to meet, and that is, the difficulty of securing legislation that benefits the greatest mass of men. I am most happy to be able to report to you that contrary to the trend throughout the United States—and you know that the State of Arkansas, Florida, California, and many, many states, legislation was passed to restrict Labor and legislation had to be fought and defeated in a great many other states that were definitely in Labor's cause—I am happy to say to you that in New Jersey, strangely enough, we had just the opposite trend. We secured more legislation this year in the special session of the State Federation of Labor, than in any other convention in the history of the State Federation of Labor.

We were successful in the passing of six bills sponsored by the State Federation. Our unemployment compensation act was boosted to $22 a week for 26 weeks, with a one-third formula, which was the most important feature. Our Workmen's Compensation Act waspapers of tremendous influence and whose opinions are widely read and whose thoughts are usually, in the final analysis, incorporated into action. Now, of course they are not pro-Labor. Far from it. Many times they follow that usual campaign of making Labor look as bad as they can possibly make them look, but, on the whole, I would say that. Many times they follow that usual campaign of making Labor look as bad as they can possibly make them look, but, on the whole, I would say that.
revived from top to bottom, so that today we think it is one of the best in the United States. We had a Migrant Labor bill passed this year; it is the most comprehensive law ever passed into New Jersey by the thousands during the harvesting season. And I am sure this will be interesting to the teamsters. This was the last bill of its kind passed in the United States.

We had a bill enacted that makes it unlawful to deliver milk before 7 o'clock in the morning. We got the bill, which was sponsored by the Teamsters' Union. The bill passed and got the signature of the governor and is now a law in the state. I believe that the considerations which were not of such vital importance, we feel that we have had the most successful year in our history. Of course, there were some reasons for it. I think that the events of the recent year or years and a half have convinced the legislators of New Jersey that the State Federation of Labor is worth playing ball with, that the State Federation of Labor represents real thought, an attempt to create a political party, not an attempt to take over the government—we are not Anarchists—that we are rather decent citizens, that maybe they should play a part. This is the type of individual. That seems to be the thought in the minds of most legislators.

I want to say to you that it was a pleasure, for the first time, to see the legislators of the State House at Trenton.

We expect this year to secure legislation that will, we believe, refine some of the laws that have been on the books and need revision. For the sake of brevity, I won't go into that.

Next November 12th, next month, we intend to hold our annual convention, our 67th annual convention. At that time, we expect to lay out our program.

I note, in reading your Executive Council Report that our programs will be very similar. I want to commend your Executive Council on the program they have submitted to you. I think in a broad measure it meets with the American Federation of Labor feels is needed for the welfare of the labor national life. I am certain that so far as the State Federation of Labor is concerned, our recommendations will be very similar.

I want to say here this morning and talk to you at great length. In fact, I was a little bit apprehensive about coming up here to Massachusetts and attempting to speak to you at great length. I don't think you have any information to any great center of culture. You know I am just a little bit impressed that you meet almost across the street from the great Harvard University, although I found out after I got up here that they don't call it Harvard. It is pronounced differently. Down in New Jersey, we have a different pronunciation, sometimes they don't speak too well of Harvard.

In your Executive Council Report, recommendation No. 6: "We condemn and denounce the idea of the Federal administration that it is a good thing for the Federal administration to see to develop a breach between Labor and the veteran . . ."—I must say to you that that is most important. It is unnecessary for me to tell you that in my opinion, or in your opinion, there has been a most definite campaign to put a breach between the veteran and Labor. I might say that I believe it is a very serious crime on the part of those who would attempt to engineer that campaign, because if I am any judge of human nature. Labor doesn't own the job, the employer owns the jobs, and unless the employer can find a way to keep employment, out to these boys who come back, they won't be so hostile so much to Labor, as they will to those who own the jobs, and I think they had better concentrate their effort on seeing that these men secure employment rather than a lot of political pap such as is the case with our government and in every daily newspaper, day after day.

We hear so much, or read so much of strikes that are occurring at the present time. Well, I wonder that they don't think it is rather natural about that. I wonder if they feel that with pay levels reduced as a result of the war's ending, the ending of overtime, and etc., the layoffs of men and prices remaining as they are, that there would be any labor unrest. I wonder how they could doubt it. I don't think anybody will be very happy if they don't remain rather stationary, if they haven't gone up. And yet the take-home pay has been considerably reduced. I wonder what they expect.

Labor wants to reconvert too. They want to reconvert to a basis on which they can live. Or do the employers or those who condemn strikes tell that Labor ought to live on its savings of the past? I say in my opinion, not too great. I believe that within a reasonable period of time this commotion will die down, strikes will settle down, they will go away. But I think that will occur when prices begin to come down or wages go up to meet the requirements of our living standard.

In New Jersey, we are rather fortunate. I might say to you that when the war ended, and industry began to close down, we expected the most dire consequences of unemployment. We were a little bit apprehensive about our unemployment compensation fund, notwithstanding the fact that we feel it is one of the strongest set-ups in America. We have a state law, and while the drain has been rather heavy, I think the position taken by the State Federation of Labor years ago has done much to maintain the integrity of the unemployment compensation fund, the solvency. We are one of the four states in the Union where employees contribute.

Notwithstanding the fact that the American Federation of Labor policy is opposed to that, we have always felt that the more money there is in the pot, the more money there is to take out; plus the fact that when we contribute, we get a vote in the determination and administration of that fund, with the result that since the formulation of the Unemployment Compensation Commission, we have had two labor men who are members of the Commission—one of them is now Chairman of the Unemployment Compensation Commission.

So that we feel our position has worked out—with the reserve fund of $450,000,000, in addition to which we have a most authoritative voice in the administration of the law, we feel that we have been justly justified. We are to let go and allow them to pass a bill that would wipe out employee contributions. The result is to within a short time, Gov. Murphy is not the only one representing the workers in administering the fund, with very grave consequences to the workers of New Jersey.

Wm. W. Murphy, who is the Mayor of Newark and Secretary of the State Federation of Labor, has been a member of the Commission since the law was passed. In fact, I think you could say that the vote of Murphy on a very important minority report that was adopted by the Legislature and has become the law of New Jersey. He has done probably more to mold that law, and the interpretation something that what have become precedents, than, I think, the rest of the Commission combined.

Next year, we intend to, if we can, raise
that $22 maximum to $25. I don't think it will be too difficult. I only hope that here in Massachusetts you have as much success with the law as we have had in New Jersey. For I feel, as one, that it is probably the finest piece of legislation ever enacted in the interests of labor. With that type of legislation, never again can we see what we saw in 1930, '31, '32, '33 and '34. There will be no need for WPA's and all the other alphabetical relief outfits that were foisted upon us.

I hope that your State Federation, in its legislative endeavors, are able to convince the legislators of your state of the soundness of your position, and you as they have done with us in New Jersey. For I feel that unless there is some collaboration soon, before many years roll by, between labor and industry, and the legislatures, that the demagogues you speak of in your report will make tremendous headway. Nobody can stir up or arouse contented people. Nobody can sell a bill of goods of radicalism to a full unthinking generation. Too many of us think with our stomachs instead of our heads. I hope that in every state of this Union, that rather than attempt to sell the wrong idea, that you have the news and to read in your newspapers this morning and last night, that we set down to a common sense basis and quit kicking one another around.

The American Federation of Labor is devoted to a free enterprise. We want to live. I agree with your Council when they say reduce taxes and let industry live. No industry can survive without a profit. You cannot send out into the world and make a profit. Unless a reasonable profit is assured, what incentive is there for a man to go out and struggle and maintain his business.

I think that is one of the soundest policies the American Federation of Labor has pursued, and pursued since the formation of the Federation. We believe in "free" enterprise. I think you can sum it all up in one word, when you say it is an awful poor bird that doesn't want to own something for himself. I think that applies to the workers as well. It is a poor bird that doesn't want to own something for himself and so forth, and with the contention American worker. America need have no fear.

We care so much about winning the peace. Winning the peace has become a major industry. Everybody and anybody can win the peace. I don't think that be-cause a man is labelled a Republican that he is, by any means, bad, nor does the fact that he is a Democrat indicate that he is, by any means, endowed with any particular virtue.

I think that history will prove, eventually, that the choice of which way we have always followed of supporting our friends and defeating our enemies is a far better policy than attempting to form our own political party and lead us into discord. You have a trade union organization, not a political organization. You can't herd men's minds down one line. Go into your own meeting room and you will find that there is never any agreement or opinion. And I would regret to see the day when Labor goes whole hog for political action. I have concluded what I have to say to you. Now I am going to read the pleasure of sitting out in your audience instead of trying to get my friends Tommy Wilkinson and Bill Doyle earn their tremendous salaries. You know labor leaders are overpaid. You read the reports. In fact, I was elected to the income tax office one day, and the fellow said, "Your expenses." I said, "Well, what about them?" He said, "What do you do?" I said, "Well", I said, "I get around New Jersey pretty well; I have no program; my main job—in plain language, I am a labor lobbyist, but when the Legislature is not in session, I may be up in the northern counties of the state or down south tomorrow, and central Jersey the next day—I have no program, no routine." "Well", he said, "now this item, hotel bills and telephone bills etc., is something wrong with it?" He said, "Well, no, it's not so bad, but do you mean to say that is your salary?" I said, "Well, I said, "What does the other fellow say?" He said, "Well, I read the amount, then he shook his head and said, "That is different than the common conception of labor leaders' salaries." So I said, "My friend, I am afraid you don't read the right newspapers. They tell you who publishes yours?" "Now," I said, "if you want any more information, find it out for yourself", and I walked out. When I walked out, he cleared '32 and '33. So, I have no fear of being indicted on either count those years. I know that Tom and Bill won't be indicted for their salaries either.

But I am going to have the pleasure of sitting out there and watching them work, and let me tell you that a three-day convention is work for the secretary and the president. Un-fortunately, we had the President's birthday, November 29, too, for three days. At that time, I hope that I will be able to see both their smiling faces in the audience in New Jersey as our guests, and that New Jersey will enjoy the invigorating air of Atlantic City.

Down there, they always tell you there is no snow on the boardwalk. That is because the salt air runs it off quickly. They say come down to Atlantic City. You've read the ads. The bait is beautiful girls that are splashed out on the advertising sheets. You might think everything was free, but don't tackle the night clubs or some of the other attractions in Atlantic City. It is a great resort, and it is a great town.

You know, every convention we have a fight as to where the next convention will be, and they jump up in the hall and they say, "I nominate the City of Newark", and they make a long speech, and another fellow nominates another city. They will turn to national action. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly content with Democrats and Republicans. I know them. There isn't too much between them. The thing that I have really found is that one is in, and one is out. Otherwise they are about the same type of fellow. You can reason with them and deal with them. I don't think that be-cause a man is labelled a Republican that he is, by any means, bad, nor does the fact that
wishing this convention a most successful session. I hope that when you have left here, you have done much to accomplish or to erect at least the foundation on which your program will be based for the coming year, and I conclude by wishing all of you the best of luck.

Thank you.

President Doyle: I believe I express the gratitude of the convention when I say thanks to President Marcianite. We all know now, if we didn’t know before, why the New Jersey State Federation of Labor is so successful. President Marcianite has been President of that organization now for 13 years, and he has done a remarkable job, and I say, on behalf of the delegates present, while we are in this convention, we all appreciate your presence.

Will Delegate Naylor, Chairman of the Committee on Rules, come forward and call together his committee to meet at once so that they will be able to report immediately after the afternoon session gets under way?

The Chair recognizes Acting Secretary Wilkinson.

Acting Secretary Wilkinson: In the absence of Chairman Naylor, Chairman of the Committee on Rules, will Delegate William R. Smith, Central Labor Union, Cambridge, get the committee together in Room C, to the right of the stage?

President Doyle: There being no immediate matters to come before the convention, the convention will now adjourn to reconvene at 2 p.m.

The convention then adjourned until 2 p.m.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The convention was called to order at 2 o’clock by President Doyle.

President Doyle: The convention will please come to order.

Is the Committee on Rules ready to report, Chairman Smith?

Delegate Smith: Mr. Chairman, delegates to the Special Victory Convention. The report of the Committee on Rules is as follows:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES

1. At the opening of the convention, the President shall take the chair, call the convention to order and the Secretary shall read the call.

2. A roll call shall be taken upon any question before the convention upon demand of 25 delegates.

3. Seventy-five delegates shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

4. No resolutions shall be received after 5 p.m., on Friday, October 26, 1945 without unanimous consent of the convention, nor shall resolutions be accepted which do not confine themselves to the purpose for which the Special Victory Convention was called, namely, problems arising out of post-war reconversion.

5. The sessions of the convention shall be held between the hours of 10 a.m. and 12:30 p.m., and from 2 p.m. to 5 p.m.

6. Any member rising to speak shall, after being recognized by the chair, give his name, the number of the house of which he represents and the location of the same.

7. The limitation of debate on all questions shall be five minutes, subject to the discretion of the chair. No delegate shall be permitted to speak more than twice on any one question without two-thirds vote of the convention.

8. After a motion is stated by the presiding officer, or read, it may be withdrawn by the mover, at any time previous to an amendment, or final and number by consent of the convention.

9. When a question is under debate, no motion shall be received but to adjourn; to lay on the table; for the previous question; to postpone to a certain day; to commit; or to amend—which several motions shall have precedence in the order in which they stand arranged. The first three shall not be amended and shall be decided without debate; a two-thirds vote being necessary to carry a motion for the previous question.

10. Any amendment or resolution properly introduced but not voted on shall be considered and discussed on the table until the introducer of such amendment or resolution has had an opportunity to speak.

11. When a motion or question has been put and carried it shall be in order for any member who voted in the majority to move for a reconsideration thereof; but a motion to reconsider, having been put and lost, shall not be renewed.

12. A motion to suspend the rules must receive the concurrence of two-thirds of the members present, and shall be decided without debate.

13. The rules of one convention shall remain in force until the Committee on Rules shall report at the next convention and the report be accepted.

14. Roberts’ Manual shall be the recognized authority on all questions not provided for in these laws.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Roll call of Delegates.
2. Reading of Minutes.
5. Unfinished Business.
7. Good of the Federation.
8. Adjournment.

Delegate Sullivan: Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Rules moves adoption of the committee’s report.

President Doyle: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the committee’s report be adopted. Is there anything to be said on the question? If not, as many as are in favor of adoption of the committee’s report will signify in the usual manner by saying “aye.” Those opposed “no.” The “ayes” have it. It is a vote and so ordered.

The committee’s report is adopted.

The Chair will now recognize Delegate Sullivan.

Delegate Sullivan (Teamsters No. 25, Boston): Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a motion. No doubt you will all agree that it is very unusual when a labor representative from another part of the country will travel to our city and give an elegant speech, as the speaker did this afternoon. I refer to the President of the New Jersey State Federation of Labor. I personally think his remarks were educational and beneficial to the delegates attending this convention.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that Delegate Marcianite, as we may call him, or the President of the New Jersey Federation of Labor, be given a rising vote of thanks for his remarks to this convention this morning.

President Doyle: It has been regularly moved and seconded that we give a rising vote of thanks to President Marcianite. Is there anything to be said on the question? If not, as many as are in favor of adoption of the motion will signify in the usual manner by
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saying "aye". Those opposed "no". The "ayes" have it.
(The delegates gave a rising vote of thanks to the President-Marshal.)

(The Chair recognized Acting Secretary Wilkinson, who then read to the convention Resolutions Nos. 6 and 7.)

Acting Secretary Wilkinson: I move you, Mr. Chairman, that these resolutions be submitted to the Resolutions Committee.

President Doyle: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the foregoing resolutions be submitted to the Resolutions Committee. Is there anything to be said on the question that not, as many as are in favor of adoption of the motion will signify in the usual manner by saying "aye". Those opposed "no". The "ayes" have it. It is a vote and so ordered.

The resolutions are ordered to be submitted to the Resolutions Committee.

We have with us this afternoon a man who is the Secretary of the Chicago Federation of Labor, who, for many months has been employed by the government in the high post of Vice-Chairman of the War Production Board. He has appeared at our convention before, and we are pleased to welcome to our convention again, Joseph D. Keenan.

He has always had a most interesting message for us. He has taken this morning to tell us of the conditions he found on his recent trip to Germany, and what effect the observations and the decisions being made in Germany are having on us in this country.

I present to the convention, Joseph D. Keenan, Vice-Chairman of the War Production Board, and Secretary of the Chicago Federation of Labor, and a member of my own international organization—the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

Brother Keenan.

JOSEPH D. KEENAN
(Vice-Chairman, Labor Production, War Production Board)

It is a great pleasure for me to be here today and to take part in your first postwar convention. I am glad that the war has been won, it is imperative that we learn from what we have on hand, and try to figure out what foreseeable problems will hit us in the near future.

"Reconversion" is the byword of the day. When this is interpreted to mean redirecting every phase of the national life—from war to peacetime pursuits—"reconversion" becomes an awe-inspiring assignment. It presents on a gigantic scale the acid test to the American way of working and living. It is as fierce and as challenging as the business of winning the war.

At present, the Nation's industrial facilities are being put into shape for the production of peacetime goods. Some firms have finished the readjustment of their facilities, while others are still in the process. But as far as actually producing peacetime goods, we are on dead center. On the heels of an unequalled war production, we have been under going an in-between period of readjustment and preparation in which there is a relatively small volume of goods turned out. It's like the little boys on the way to school that forces regroup and make ready for a new onslaught.

The natural let-down which followed the V-J day, resulting in some restrictions, while helpful onto some others, has introduced a certain amount of looseness into the whole picture. This "looseness" has startled a lot of people into believing that the whole nation is heading for the rocks.

The people who can see nothing but black are the people who did not know a great deal about the strain and tension generated by our mature and highly stabilized war economy. It must not be forgotten that it took a year or more to readjust from most of us to war production, and it will take that long or longer before we can fully focus our efforts in the other direction.

There are few people who will admit that their postwar objective is not to assure "full production and full employment." But what do they mean by "full production and full employment?" The I didn't want to mislead our gentlemen into thinking that I have suddenly acquired the wisdom of a government "economist," but there are a few things which can't be overlooked on such with this "full production" generalization.

Don't let anybody kid you that we pick up where we left off in 1938. The 1939 levels of production and employment won't be adequate. The capacity of our industry has been vastly altered. Methods of production have been improved with pretty substantial increases in productivity of labor has been significantly expanded. High-level employment will require a volume of production greater than any previous peacetime year.

Up to this point, government action has been concerned mainly with getting rid of unnecessary controls, based on the belief that the principal part of reconversion should be left to private enterprise, and that price, wage, and material bottlenecks. Those controls which have been retained are scheduled to disappear altogether when the danger of inflation has passed away, and we have overcome the war-created shortages, like that in lumber.

This policy, I believe, will invoke the confidence of industry and the public generally. It is founded on the age-old American tradition of permitting the maximum freedom to the individual consistent with the common good. The wisdom of such an approach is apparent from our wartime record. Although certain phases of our economy were supervised, the government relied on private initiative to do the production job. This was the foundation of our production overhang and standardization. There are significant differences between our production accomplishment and that of the enemy countries.

In many ways, we are better off today than we were in the beginning of the war.

The value of preparations in advance of the actual termination of hostilities was recognized early in this war, as a result of the 1919 experience. However, the sudden capitulation of Germany and Japan found us not fully prepared to meet the responsibilities of reconversion.

On the one hand, business was not permitted to do much civilian production, even where war needs had tapered off, for fear that this might detract from the war effort. Also, we were largely lacking in the necessary legislation to help business and workers make the change.

Even today, the government has many reconversion responsibilities, which have not been fulfilled; although certain phases of it point out that the problem of fitting the large number of displaced workers into productive and profitable employment is a tremendous one. To realize that many workers in peacetime production even in the space of a couple of years would be an outstanding feat. It is the responsibility of the government to help these people. It is the responsibility of the displaced war workers must be made. We must be practical—we cannot talk about markets for consumer goods and purchasing power—
and remain silent as to what is to happen to millions of war workers who have lost their jobs. A large number of unemployed, only part of whom have a subsistence wage to tide them over, will only prolong the period of reversion.

The President took note of this and other gloomy portents of the trend of labor and management to Congress covering the whole field of social readjustment. He established firm objectives and chartered the necessary legislation to make the government a focal point. It is clearly up to Congress now to carry the ball, to make certain that we do not return to the mass unemployment and bread lines of the past.

But while government has important responsibilities to fulfill, labor and management have equally challenging roads ahead. It will take a couple of years before the full effects of wartime changes can be worked out. Increased production per manhour, greater use of machines, increased living costs, and many other war babies will carry for many changes in labor-management relations. These and other problems which grew out of reconversion and new peace time products must be approached intelligently. Never before have management and labor been more inter-dependent or more statesmanlike. Never before have their deliberations been of greater moment to the American people and the American way of life.

Teamwork on the part of labor and management holds the brightest prospects for the welfare of both, and greater benefits to the public generally in the form of higher living standards.

As I have said before, when you dig deep into our economic system, you find that labor and management have more interests in common than is generally suspected. For example, labor has a direct interest in preventing a decrease in worker's purchasing power. Management has an equal, if indirect, interest because that same money will be used in turn to buy products and provide markets for more goods.

The reconversion responsibilities of labor and management are similar on that respect to their responsibilities during the war. Then as now the existence of labor and management is groups of free men was at stake. They had to make compromises. They had to live within a certain amount of governmental restriction on wages, prices, and so forth. But when the blue chips went down, and the American people produced for victory, we did not falter. Instead, they got together and devised ways of increasing their output through teamwork. The results of that teamwork amazed the world.

The successful solution of our reconversion difficulties lies in this same type of teamwork. I have no patience with those pessimists who say that a postwar depression is inevitable. The opportunity is greater than that which is before us today, to make certain that each and every American has a decent home, plenty to eat, and the means of educating his children. And to those people who are urging additional controls over labor and management, I have this to say: not only industry, but the whole country needs to settle in mind and begin thinking and planning and working intelligently toward a postwar better life. If our people only knew what it means to lose; if they could but see the children today that had to live within our unscarred country and prostrate Europe; if they could see those hopeless, half-starved people who were on the losing side of this war, I wouldn't have any chance of our reconversion job bogging down.

Yet there are only too few in this country who realize how close America came to losing.

How many remember that in 1941 we didn't have an Army, didn't have any equipment to speak of, not much of a Navy left after Pearl Harbor? How many stop to think that there were no major battles up to 1942? That we were shadow boxing, not fighting a war; that we had to recoil at each new enemy thrust and jockey for ground?

These things are easily forgotten and few people will remember anything but our crushing victories later in the game, when destiny and the enemy's mistakes had given us time to catch up.

But I would like to ask each American to remember. There will never be another chance for us to come from behind. If there is a next war, they are going to be sure and polish off the United States first, and then take the others in stride.

President Doye: I think there is no man taken from the labor movement in the United States during the war that has contributed more to the production achieved in the United States than Joe Keenan.

I feel sure that the message you brought to us today, and I know by the action of those in attendance was well received. Brother Keenan has certainly saved a rest after over five years of hard work. He has been a leader that has already committed himself to go back to Europe and aid in straightening out some of the problems of Europe, and Joe, we all wish you success in your efforts in Europe.

Thank you again for coming.

A matter which concerns us all, and is receiving state-wide, yes, nation-wide attention, is housing. It is the main concern of laborers, in meeting halls, meetings of all types, in our legislative halls in the state and nation. We are fortunate, indeed, in having with us this afternoon our Regional Director of the National Housing Agency. I present to the convention John Dobbs, who is an authority on housing and housing problems.

John Dobbs:

JOHN DOBBS

(Regional Director, National Housing
Agency)

I appreciate very much, ladies and gentlemen, the opportunity of you today. In the first place, I have the comfortable feeling that I am among friends, and, in the second place, I know how deeply interested Labor is in the subject. Housing today stands at the crossroads. And every single one of us must assume some share of responsibility for the direction it takes. There aren't too many alternatives. We are either going to move along a new road to a new and exciting future for housing in this country, or we are going to be satisfied to stay on the same old road, either going to attempt to make a reality of our hopes about the American standard of living, or we are going to make a mockery of it. We shall either plan to lead the march in housing our citizens decently, or else we are going to allow most modern nations in the world to outdistance us in that respect.

We are either going to remain complacent about one-third of our people living in clearly sub-standard quarters, or we are going to find out why the wealthiest nation in the world is satisfied with anything less than a decent home for every citizen living within its borders.

Today many eyes are on housing and housing's eyes are on the future, and that is why, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to talk to you today about that future, and I would like to talk to you about your share in it, not only
how you may share in it if it is brought about, but how you may serve and help serve bring it about. I don't want to discuss the war housing situation any longer. We know that it proved a difficult lesson to teach, that war housing was an integral part of war production. A great many people had a hard time believing it, but for that reason, to today's headlines, housing and a good deal of war housing was a vital necessity for the development, the completion, and the production of victory.

Our war housing here in New England was both praised and condemned. We were criticized for building temporary housing in one community, and we were criticized in another for building permanent housing. We were criticized, on one hand, for spending too much government money. We were criticized the next day for not spending enough of it. We were criticized because people felt we were trying to run at the same time with the hares of private housing and the hounds of public housing.

One city in Massachusetts practically hung us in effigy for insisting that they needed a housing project for war workers. Three weeks ago, I was in that city, and I was assured by the local officials, by the leaders in the community that the housing project we put in there had not only proved itself indispensable during the war, but that they hoped it would leave it there for a few years longer.

Well, I think that a great many of those distractions were inevitable, and despite them I think we managed pretty well to keep our eyes on the main jobs.

Today we like to think, and Washington talks as though we have a little breathing spell, a little time to review the history of the war years, see what we can secure out of them that will assist us in the future, and ponder the whole post-war period. It is a nice idea, but it is a delusion, because the future is here, and the housing problem is very much alive and about a housing program for the United States will have to start today.

We can look upon housing from many different viewpoints, and the general notion is that housing as a being between private housing and public housing, a very narrow viewpoint. We can look upon it as being composed of civic and economic elements. We can look upon it merely as an opportunity for the investment of money. Or, we can look upon it from a technical, architectural point of view. All of them are very good and very limited levels. It would take too much time to discuss them effectively.

What I would like to do today is to cut through all these different viewpoints, and to discuss housing from two angles: One, the national angle, and the other angle, the local angle, in both of which organized labor has a very important part to play, which will probably do everything to play, particularly at this time.

To begin with, I think we have to accept the premise that a residential construction program larger than any we have ever had before in this country is an absolute necessity for the success of a full employment program. Full employment will demand the full activation of the national economy, and housing is one of those major segments.

There is a remarkable unanimity of agreement in Washington among many different types and classes of people. That housing can be one of the main highways to full employment in the years ahead. And I think I can call upon witnesses without quoting them, such as President Truman, Secretary of Commerce Wallace, Senator Wagner of New York, Senator Taft of Ohio, and my own boss, the Administrator of the National Housing Agency.

We also believe, I think it is commonly agreed, that without additional housing tools the National Housing Act could not lift us toward the goals that we want to set for ourselves. The tools which we already possess, such as the Federal Housing Administration, with its insurance and mortgage loans, its insurance of repair and modernization loans, the Federal Home Loan System with its reservoir of credit for mortgage lending institutions, the Federal Public Housing Authority, its system of loans and grants to cities for low rent housing, for slum clearance housing, are all good tools. They have all been proven over a period of about 10 years, and in fact, their very success has sort of set the guideline for the type of planning that should be taking place now in the legislative field for a future housing development.

Probable the most important step that would have to be taken would be an intensification and an expansion of those tools we now have.

An analysis made recently by the National Housing Agency indicated that there was a definite need in this country for twelve and a half million new dwelling units in the next 10 years. This is a higher rate of home construction than we have ever had in the country, and if we could achieve it, it would mean about a billion dollars annually going to our gross production, and would provide jobs for about four million workers, both on and off the site.

Now, it is obvious, in the first place, that a goal such as that calls for; one, a great expansion in our private construction industry, and in the whole area of related private enterprise, serving residential construction. Consequently, it is our belief, and we have so indicated in Washington, that a basic necessity would be a broadening of the existing federal credit and insurance aids to facilitate increased production of private housing at lower sales prices, and rentals than would otherwise be possible. We also believe in the continuation of the program of federal assistance to cities for low rental units, for clearance, for housing at lower sales prices, and rentals than would otherwise be possible.

We also believe in the continuation of the program of federal assistance to cities for low rental units, for clearance, for housing at lower sales prices, and rentals than would otherwise be possible. We also believe in the continuation of the program of federal assistance to cities for low rental units, for clearance, for housing at lower sales prices, and rentals than would otherwise be possible. We also believe in the continuation of the program of federal assistance to cities for low rental units, for clearance, for housing at lower sales prices, and rentals than would otherwise be possible. We also believe in the continuation of the program of federal assistance to cities for low rental units, for clearance, for housing at lower sales prices, and rentals than would otherwise be possible.
resentatives are in agreement with the general philosophy that housing is a community responsibility, a community enterprise, and a community duty. I think that they are going to expect to hear from the community and the people in the community, and from those organizations which represent citizens as well as from organized labor, to see that the right road is taken. We have found that the few cities that have already begun to pioneer have started the job by taking a good look into their housing, by a sort of picture of themselves, looking in the mirror, finding out just exactly what their housing situation looks like, their supply of housing, what they want out of the handful. You own broad interests in this field should lead you to become familiar with what is being proposed in the way of federal housing legislation, as well as state and local housing legislation, to discuss it among yourselves, and, as representatives of organized labor, to give those who have the responsibility of acting in these matters the benefit of your considered opinion.

That is on the national level. On the local level, I think your interests and responsibilities are no less important. In fact, judging from my own observation of New England, New England may seem to me that because of the rather unfortunate apathy with which most cities are approaching their housing problem, most of which are quickly growing with housing crises, this probably is the most important place to begin, the local government.

It was Sir Raymond Unwin, I think, the great English planner, who once said, "If you want a better city, begin with your town; if you want a better town, begin with your neighborhood; if you want a better neighborhood, begin with your street." This is true of all the levels of government and in your contact with your levels of government, state, local and federal.

Offhand, I know of one example of my own knowledge of this. John Carroll, Chairman of the Boston Housing Authority, who has done a yeoman's job during the many many years on all those levels. His local level of doing is the prediction of a housing boom lead to a really vital question, is that, whether or not a great home building activity is actually going to help our cities make the planning for place to live, whether it will actually continue a series of blighted areas and finally further rot into our towns and cities. And I don't like to be discouraging, but very, very, I might predict here and now that if a housing program of the size which we anticipate is just allowed to grow like topsy, it will do more damage to our cities and reduce them to a series of highly successful bombing attacks.

What happens from now on, I cannot be the sort of thing that happened in the 20's. A building a right road, or it can take a wrong road. If it is to be a right road, it can mean a supply of new homes only for families in the upper income groups. It can mean more of the unplanned suburban growth that we had before, with a further partition of our cities, and a consequent loss in revenues and a bunch of idle, empty buildings standing around. It can mean housing that is structurally uncode, that it contains a lack of slum conditions which will continue to breed vice and crime and disease.

If it takes the right road, a building boom can mean, for example, the planning of new homes to meet the needs of all families in all income groups. It can mean the growth of sound, stable neighborhoods that will not become middle-aged before the people who have lived there have moved, and a rebuilding of slums and blighted areas with all of their tolls and their waste and their tragedy in lives and human happiness.

It is up to the communities themselves to see that the right road is taken. We have found that the few cities that have already begun to pioneer this have started the job by taking a good look into their housing, by a sort of picture of themselves, looking in the mirror, finding out just exactly what their housing situation looks like, their supply of housing, what they want out of the handful. You own broad interests in this field should lead you to become familiar with what is being proposed in the way of federal housing legislation, as well as state and local housing legislation, to discuss it among yourselves, and, as representatives of organized labor, to give those who have the responsibility of acting in these matters the benefit of your considered opinion.

That is on the national level. On the local level, I think your interests and responsibilities are no less important. In fact, judging from my own observation of New England, New England may seem to me that because of the rather unfortunate apathy with which most cities are approaching their housing problem, most of which are quickly growing with housing crises, this probably is the most important place to begin, the local government.

It was Sir Raymond Unwin, I think, the great English planner, who once said, "If you want a better city, begin with your town; if you want a better town, begin with your neighborhood; if you want a better neighborhood, begin with your street." This is true of all the levels of government and in your contact with your levels of government, state, local and federal.

Offhand, I know of one example of my own knowledge of this. John Carroll, Chairman of the Boston Housing Authority, who has done a yeoman's job during the many many years on all those levels. His local level of doing is the prediction of a housing boom lead to a really vital question, is that, whether or not a great home building activity is actually going to help our cities make the planning for place to live, whether it will actually continue a series of blighted areas and finally further rot into our towns and cities. And I don't like to be discouraging, but very, very, I might predict here and now that if a housing program of the size which we anticipate is just allowed to grow like topsy, it will do more damage to our cities and reduce them to a series of highly successful bombing attacks.

What happens from now on, I cannot be the sort of thing that happened in the 20's. A building a right road, or it can take a wrong road. If it is to be a right road, it can mean a supply of new homes only for families in the upper income groups. It can mean more of the unplanned suburban growth that we had before, with a further partition of our cities, and a consequent loss in revenues and a bunch of idle, empty buildings standing around. It can mean housing that is structurally uncode, that it contains a lack of slum conditions which will continue to breed vice and crime and disease.

If it takes the right road, a building boom can mean, for example, the planning of new homes to meet the needs of all families in all income groups. It can mean the growth of sound, stable neighborhoods that will not become middle-aged before the people who have lived there have moved, and a rebuilding of slums and blighted areas with all of their tolls and their waste and their tragedy in lives and human happiness.
of guidance from this state, and it was then that I developed the strong personal relationship and friendship with the men that have come out to this meeting as Mr. Watt, Frank Fenton, and others with whom it is now my great privilege to work. It is really a great thing to look back on this kind of progress, for it is a national thing to be able to participate in your proceedings to this extent.

Now, I am going to tell you a little story about something happened on one phase of our social security, and that is the unemployment compensation, and I am not going to go into great detail on it. I am just going to try to hit the highlights. I think if I find it is a pretty interesting story, in a way although it is not exactly a happy story.

I am going to tell you, just hitting a few of the high spots, what has happened in the very important phase of unemployment compensation, because I think it shows us the kind of thing we are going to be up against in health insurance, old-age and survivors’ insurance, and other fields of social security in which we have a big job cut out for us, if we are going to make the headway and meet the objectives of the American Federation of Labor.

Now, this story starts back just a little bit over a year ago, when there was introduced in Congress the Kilgore bill of 1944, and that was to remember you, to meet the inequities of the unemployment compensation bills as of that time, but this action was introduced then, despite the fact that Congress had taken a very distressing step in reverting with conversion taxes, with all kinds of benefits and protections to big business and to agriculture.

When this was put in, the representatives of the states came in and said two things. They said: first, we have got six billion dollars worth of money in the state funds, and therefore, we are solvent on every point, secondly, we have got a year, at least a year, before the end of the war to patch up our state laws and do what needs to be done in order to meet the obligations. We know that there were one weak-nesses, they said. They had that meeting, and the bill was killed in 1944.

Now, the American Federation of Labor convinced the Senate and the Representatives of the United States to say two things: First, we would like to have the overall social insurance program, as represented in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell Bill, but pending the time that we can make that public sweep and have a unified program, we believe that we should cooperate with the states in clearing up their program, and in all unem-ployment compensation, they set four standards. They wanted to remove the limitation on coverage, because only half of the workers are covered. They wanted to lift the ceilings on weekly benefits to $25. They wanted to lift the ceiling to 26 weeks, and they wanted to remove the disqualification provi-sions and those reducing or cancelling benefit rights.

Now, President Green, soon after the meeting of the convention, asked me to analyze every state law with respect to the declaration of the American Federation of Labor Convention in New Orleans, which I did, and he sent an analysis of every state law to every state secretary-treasurer, and every state president, and asked that there be amendments introduced into the laws to meet these standards of the American Federation of Labor. Now, in practically every state, as far as I know—we didn’t get detailed reports from every state—but we actually introduced in every state those prepared resolutions and prepared bills to introduce into the state legislatures of the 45 states whose legislatures met this year, and they introduced the measures proposed by the American Federation of Labor.

Now, I could go into great detail and present an analysis of what has been done, as a matter of fact, we can summarize it, as nobody would remember all the details anyway. After all, I have to have it written out here, and I have been working with it almost constantly. I have to have it written out in order to remember it myself, what would I expect you people to remember if I took and read a lot of notes of the detailed operations of the bill?

The important thing to remember is the overall result, and that is what you want to have in mind, and that is what I have well enough in my mind to make the point, but the overall result is that only one state met the double standards of $25 a week and a maximum of 26 weeks. There were five states that met the seven states out of the 45 that met the 26 weeks, but in only one instance did they coincide. Then the disqualifications were changed in about 13 states, but out of the 15 states the seven of those 15 states, the disqualification provisions were made even more rigid than they are now, so that it becomes in those seven states out of the 45, the 13 that had it, and in the other seven, it is even more difficult for a worker to go in and establish his claim and to maintain his claim for unemployment compensation that he is entitled to.

So, the story goes, that as President Green said when he testified on August 28th before the Senate Finance Committee, and I am quoting him, ‘It is indeed a matter of great achievement, in view of the promises so blithely given a year ago to Congress that the state laws would be improved.’

Now, the number of states, the laws were improved. In the State of Massachusetts, there were definite liberalizations, but in the great number of states there were no significant liberalizations. In ten states, you still have today a maximum amount of unemployment compensation benefits of $15 a week, and the record summarized for the whole United States has definitely gone down.

I will give one statistic that covers a whole lot of other figures, but summarized into one thing, in 1940, the weekly benefits, the average weekly benefits paid in unemployment compensation was 49 per cent of the weekly wage. In other words, if the average weekly wage had been $50, there would be 43 per cent of $50, a little less than half, about $23, that would be any weekly benefit. Of course, it wasn’t that high. But 43 per cent of the average weekly earnings represented the weekly benefits paid over the United States, but with all the promises to improve the situation in 1945, the weekly benefit checks that are actually paid out in unemployment compensation are down to 85 per cent of the average weekly earnings.

Now, of course, some say that the weekly earnings have gone up, and that is true, that is, in terms of take-home pay, with overtime and all that. They have gone up, but so have living costs, as you well know, and I need not dwell on that, and it is a shame and a disgrace to ask people to accept as unemployment insurance a lower proportion of their wages than they accepted in 1940 as unemployment insurance, and that is the overall record of the states.

Now, I say, there are some strong states, like New York, New Jersey, Illinois, California, Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island, but there are also some frightfully weak states, and they are not all in the south. North Carolina is one of the worst, with a maximum weekly benefit of $7.89 a week, asking a man to support a family on $7.89 a week. It might as well be nothing at all.
Now, it is up to the strong states to bear the burden of the weak. As a result, there was introduced again this year another Kilgore bill, an amendment to the Federation act, and we went before the Senate Finance Committee and pleaded for an improvement of the social insurance unemployment compensation program that would deal with this problem. It is important, because there was widespread misunderstanding about the provisions of that bill. Everybody talked about $25 a week for 26 weeks, and you couldn't expect worthwhile thing to do, nobody ever proposed that $25 a week be paid to everybody and for 26 weeks. All the proposal was to do was to put the ceiling from the ceiling of $16, or a week in the great number of states to $25 a week where that ceiling operated against the percentage payment.

Let me just make it simple. Many of you know that the benefits are based on percentage, 40 per cent, say, of past earnings, and a man had been making $60 a week. He would be entitled to the percentage, $24 a week, wouldn't he? But in state after state, there is a double ceiling. It says, "a per cent of his past earnings, or (and then the amount is put in) whichever of the two may be less." You have situations where no matter how much a man has been making, $100, or $125 a week, the maximum he can draw is $15. Now the Kilgore Bill said that despite those restrictive measures, keep the state percentage program, but lift the arbitrary ceiling from whatever it is up to $25, and the federal government would pay half of that. The state would also present a very reasonable program. We called upon many of the key states to support us, and I want to say to you, not because I am here to sell a bill, but let's be frank to say differently if it wasn't, your state officers came through magnificently, and they got support from the Governor of your state, one of the few governors that came through and recommended the Kilgore Bill Amendment, and I think it was because of the very splendid work of the officers of your State Federation of Labor, the Kilgore Bill Amendment.

Other states worked on their governors, some with success, some without success. They sent in their message and their testimony, and the State Federations came down and did a wonderful job and presented the results. I think we were about to win, when, of a sudden, up pops a fellow from the State of Texas, by the name of Williams, and he said, "I disagree with you, I want it the way the Local Bill Amendment is worded, and I want it the way it is written." He introduced a bill, and it was illegal in about half the states. Now, as a matter of fact, when some others and I first sat down in the drafting of this first question, I asked whether this was legal, and we got a legal opinion from the official counsel of the federal government that it was legal to make the payment in every state of the Union, but up pops Mr. Williams, and he says it isn't. All of a sudden, the Senate Finance Committee said: "Well, that puts a different light on it, that is a horse from a different gate, and I would be very (n), and he also introduced a bill, and then they also got messages out to all their state unemployment compensation directors, and said that this telegram is going out from Chairman George, in the form of the telegrams and given the right kind of language. They also said that the 21 states that it was legal to do it, and 20 states said it was illegal, although all of them were interpreting almost identically the same language that came out of the National Unemployment Compensation Act.

In any event, Mr. Williams' testimony gave the boys the kind of thing they were looking for. It was a bad thing, and I think it would be better if we had the word, and if it was like this: That for the whole thing, ladies and gentlemen, which you can well see, is not just a little political measure to get some patronage jobs alone, although that is in it, there is a vital state here, and the state is to see that unemployment insurance is used throughout all the states wherever it is possible, to use it, to do this, to do this, to do this, to do this, and to make sure that they will do this, and to break down the standards which have been carefully built up. It is a desire to flood the labor market so that the wage standards will be broken, and this whole nefarious affair is a story of a direct attack on the wage struc-
tute, and I say that anything that is an attack upon the wage structure of America is an attack on the American way of life, and is, in effect, a threat to the things that we hold precious and dear.

It is not just a little political thing that we are talking about. It is a thing in which the working man has a stake, and we must return the Employment Services to the states immediately as a part of it, because they pass on the eligibility clauses. They say when they have some money, they have said that any job is a suitable job, the wage of which is equal to or above the weekly benefit. In other words, a man has been working on a construction job at a skilled trade, and he has been making $65 or $68 a week. In one of those ten states where they pay $15 a week unemployment compensation benefit, the rules of the state board are that anything that pays $15 a week or more is a suitable job, and if he turns down that suitable job, he is ineligible for further unemployment compensation. They can take the bricklayer, or they can take any of the skilled trades, or they can take any of the medium skilled, the intermediate trades, or the people who are working on wages that are somewhere near approaching a living wage, and they can force them to accept the lowest paid jobs or deny them of all unemployment compensation.

We have been busy eating away at the underpinnings of the whole structure of unemployment compensation, so that the timber is now so rotten that when the whole load of unemployment compensation rests down on it, we don't know whether the structure is going to be able to bear the load or not. But the important thing is this: That this whole story has shown very clearly that there is a direct link between many of these state offices, and there is a political machine there, and there is a lobby of one of the worst kinds that you have ever seen in operation. It is a lobby of one of the worst kinds because, actually, the money on which they travel to Washington to lobby against the improvement of unemployment compensation and other agencies, that is from 7 per cent or 8 per cent. These monies go into the federal treasury, and then they are sent out by the social security boards to the regions and state offices, and they force to make a deposit, they are deposited in the state funds, and then they draw on them.

One unemployment compensation officer, the counsel of the state agency in Wisconsin, Stanley Rector by name, and I don't mind calling him by name, because at the national convention where I got myself bootlegged in just this week to address them, I gave them this story face to face. Stanley Rector, who decries so much influence from Washington on a state agency on a state payroll paid to administer state laws, in the last two years has been $38 dollars and 8 cents per week. He is administering a state law out of Madison, Wisconsin, and his expense account, paid out of the federal treasury, is $3,685.10. Now, what kind of inequality is this? One of the principle states in the federal treasury to pay a man to come in and fight federal laws for the improvement of things.

Then, he is one of the advisors of the state agency, Roy Leach, the state agency of that same office in Washington, D.C. They areehing in Washington, a man who boasts—I don't know whether he translates his boasts to his income tax returns or not—but he boasts that he has made $15,000 or $16,000 in the last two years. How? By advising employers how they can keep people off the unemployment compensation rolls and thus reduce their contribution rate. And he has a member of the State Advisory Committee in that same state, and often these two men are seen riding back and forth on the train together. Now, if that isn't a racket, I don't recognize one when I see it.

But that is the kind of machine, that is the kind of lobby, that is the kind of federally-supported attack on the things that we have all come to stand for. Now, we have to meet that combination, that lobby, brothers and sisters, every time we come up against an improvement of the social security laws. I am about through, but I think you see already what my conclusion will be. The necessity is for us to work right in these states, even in the states like this where you have one of the better unemployment compensation laws, but in all of them, to work and to see that our state commissions are not used to eat away the standards that protect and insure against wage loss due to unemployment of the working people of America.

We have got to go into the government, and we have got to go before those commissions, and we have got to know at least one of them and say, at least, "You don't travel on these expense accounts to go down there and fight the things that we are fighting for. If you want to go out and make another organization and do your best for the interests of the unemployed, you can do it. You are paying for that, and you should use your privilege, because that is what we are doing." You people are keeping me down there to try to fight this, but that is all right, because you are paying for your own life, and every time enough of you want to stop it, you can do it, but it isn't as if I were sitting down there on the federal payroll fighting these laws, and I am just as much doing what you are doing. We need to call their bluff, and we need to do it right back in the states, and it is a job for the state federation of labor to do.

When we got together last week and we were talking about it recently, I suggested this: "President Green, I think from what we have seen here in the last few months that I am wasting a lot of time working in Washington. We bring up these situations, and the legislative boys go over on the hill and fight it, and it is impossible to fight it, and I want to get out and talk to the state federations and tell them this story." And I said, "When they know what is happening, they will be anxious to get to work, and they have done a good job before, and they will do it in the future, and if there has been chosen in the states to do it, all right. I think when we do it that that is their biggest mistake, because the strength of the whole movement is in the city central bodies and in the state federations, and if they want to meet in Boston and in Albany, if they want to meet in Sacramento, and in the old state capitals, we can get them with the strength of the state federations, and not only meet them but lick them on their own ground, and when the time comes again that we try to improve these conditions and establish health insurance improvements, and do all of these other things that we need to do for the protection of the American worker, they will find that these federations have swung into action and they get them and lick them on their own ground." That is my story, and that is why I am here appealing for your help. I have had it in the past through the state federations, and now we will continue to get it, and we are going to meet this thing, and we are going to win. Thank you.

President Doyle: Brother Crulkshank, I hasten to assure you that we in Massachusetts will continue to fight for better social security legislation. We made improvements during the last session of the Legislature, but we feel that
they are still far from adequate. I also want to tell Brother Cruikshank, and the convention, that only last week we called to the attention of the Governor a situation that has been hanging fire in Fall River for about a year and a half. A strike ofloom fixers took place in Fall River. They were members of an independent union and the District Council has condemned members of both the American Federation of Labor and the CIO to lose their employment during that strike. The members of the AFL and the CIO fell back for unemployment compensation, which was denied.

The Central Labor Union of Fall River carried the matter to the District Court, and presented to the District Court that the case is still in the hands of the District Court, despite the lapse of a year and a half. We presented that to the Governor only last week, and, in our presence, the Governor got in touch with the judge who heads up the judicial council and presented the problem to him. It appears that the judicial council can insist on a decision on a case that has been hanging that long. So, we now are hopeful that there will be a decision rendered very shortly on the matter in Fall River.

I cite this to the delegation and to Brother Cruikshank to show another flaw in the entire set-up.

For the convention, I thank you, Brother Cruikshank, for your visit to Boston and presentation to us of an enlightening address on social security and social legislation problems.

The Chair recognizes Delegate Reilly.

Delegate Reilly (Carpenters No. 40, Boston): I would like to move at this time that this convention go on record in favor of a protest, as outlined by the speaker who has just left the platform.

President Doyle: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the convention concur in the recommendations made by Brother Cruikshank. Is there anything to be said on the question? If not, as many as are in favor of adoption of this motion will signify in the usual manner by saying "aye". Those opposed say "no". The "ayes" have it. It is a vote and so ordered.

The motion is adopted.

I would like to announce to the convention that Ambassador Kennedy is on his way to the Court of St. James and will probably be visiting throughout this state with the Recession Commission in the interests of the Department of Commerce. And, at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, I make this announcement now because I believe his message will be very important to us. We have been watching with interest his journeys throughout the state, and what he has been saying in the various sections of the state. I make the announcement in order that all may be present when he speaks.

The Chair recognizes Acting Secretary Wilkinson, who will read into the record additional resolutions.

Acting Secretary Wilkinson then reads resolutions Nos. 8, 9 and 10.

President Doyle: If there is no objection, the resolutions will be presented to the Resolutions Committee. There being no objection, they will be submitted.

Delegates, we have with us this afternoon, the Governor of the Commonwealth. He has just come from a round-trip flight to England. I wouldn’t be a bit surprised if he spoke to us with a bit of a brogue, because he stopped off in Ireland.

He has, for the time being, left his official address, and that was to incorporate many subjects of importance to the State Federation of Labor. Many times that has happened, that governors have incorporated in their inaugural addresses some message that was of importance to Labor. But this time, what was contained in his message, his inaugural, bore upon the great work and placed the Governor, in my judgment, in the best position to seek out in to see carried out.

After Nelson Cruikshank talked to us here a few moments ago, I talked with him about the Governor, and the Governor came back with the message that he and the paymen’s directory, the CIO, to the President Washington on the Kilgore Bill. It was impossible for the Governor to go himself. We made the request of him to go, but it was quite impossible. However, the Governor has done everything in his power to see carried out.

Without anything further from me, I am sure it is a great privilege and an honor for me to present to this gathering, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Maurice J. Tobin.

MAURICE J. TOBIN

(Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts)

President Bill Doyle, Acting Secretary Tom Wilkinson, my other escort into the room, Charles Reilly, and I, had the honor and distinction of the State Branch of the American Federation of Labor: I am delighted to have this opportunity of speaking to you.

When I left Boston on Tuesday night for the flight across the Atlantic, I think many people believed I would not be back, but I was confident I would be. I knew that the inventive genius of American engineers and the marvelous product put out by our mechanical and engineering mechanism was capable of duplicating the trip that had been taken so many thousands of times by the men in the armed forces. I had an opportunity to visit the land of the birth of my father and my mother, and, in fact, I had an opportunity, in a period of 10 hours, to tour four counties, arriving in Tipperary, which was the birthplace of my father, and there had an opportunity to see relatives of mine that I had not seen for a period of seven years.

So, I arrived in New York last night and came back to the Atlantic City for the purpose of talking to this convention.

Before I wrote my inaugural message, which I delivered in January, I was in close conference with the President of the Executive Clique, person, who is also your Legislative Agent, and every proposal that they had to make was so reasonable, so basically American, and so, to my way of thinking, capable of contributing to a sounder economy in the country, that every single proposal which they made to me was embodied in my inaugural address, and practically every one of them has been enacted into law.

I remember as a youngster, the days when men who worked in dangerous industry did not have the advantage of workmen’s compensation, because the old law was so old that it had no value when it was enacted into law under the administration of Eugene Noble Foss. Tremendous changes have been made since that time, and in no single year was there ever a period of progress that was made in the year of 1945, and the recommendations of your organization were accepted practically in toto.

But I am told that I can describe, to say that for the very first time, workmen’s compensation recognized the sacredness of the family unit, recognized that the man who has a family to support had a much greater responsibility when he is stricken down in industry by accident than the single man. Now nothing was taken from the single
man. His compensation was increased. The compensation was likewise increased for the man with dependents. In place of the old $20 maximum, it was raised to $22, but there was $2.50 additional allowed for each dependent child. That will, in some cases, give a man equally as much as he earned for a full week's pay.

In addition to that, the maximum was increased from $4500 to $7500, and a man who is permanently and totally disabled will receive his compensation for a lifetime. I think that was the most progressive piece of legislation that was ever enacted for the benefit—from a material point of view, either due to unemployment or due to accident, due to injury—that was ever enacted in the State of Massachusetts.

There are many other laws that I could discuss with you, but I would like particularly to touch on the Kilgore Bill. I believe that the Kilgore Bill was the answer to the reconversion period in the United States. It embodied two principles in which we in New England and Massachusetts particularly, should be deeply interested, because it elevated the standards of the southern states to the standards of the northern states. In other words, we are always going to be in doubt as to the security of our business position as long as the South is going to be a haven for those who want to take advantage of niggardly wages and niggardly unemployment compensation—but this law would have changed that to a great extent in the transition period up to 1947. I can tell Bill Doyle that I was the only governor in the United States who wholeheartedly supported it and issued a public statement in favor of it.

I think eventually, the Kilgore Bill—not in its present form, but with practically all of the principles recommended in the Kilgore Bill—will be enacted within a reasonable period of time.

There are many other things I could discuss with you, but I don't think I need to. There is no need of my going over your legislative report. You all have that. You can read that and see what has been accomplished during the course of the last year.

I am delighted to come before this convention and to be able to say a deep and sincere "thank you" for the opportunity you gave me to contribute toward the great changes that have occurred in the last year. I realize that I would not hold the position that is mine today if it were not for the almost wholehearted support I received from men and women who work for a living throughout the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

I can assure you it has been a pleasure to work in cooperation with your reasonable representatives on Beacon Hill, and they have always been that, and I am confident that in 1946, even greater progress will have been made, and I can come back to the convention in the fall of 1946, reporting additional progress.

Thank you very much.

President Doyle: Thank you, Governor Tobin. I assure you you are always a welcome guest at the conventions of the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor.

Governor Tobin: Thank you.

President Doyle: The business of the convention having been concluded for the day, we will adjourn to meet promptly at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Whereupon, at 4:33 p.m., the convention was adjourned.
SATURDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1945

MORNING SESSION

The convention was called to order at 10:00 o'clock Saturday morning by President Doyle.

President Doyle: Will the convention please come to order? This morning, the invocation will be pronounced by Reverend Samuel H. Miller, Pastor of the Old Cambridge Baptist Church.

REV. SAMUEL H. MILLER

Let us pray. Almighty and Everlasting Father, Whose wisdom hath made both night and day, Whose Grace hath given us both labor and rest; let Thy spirit abundantly bless us with understanding, that in the anxieties and agonies of this world we shall move toward those solutions of industry and labor in such spirit that both ourselves and all men everywhere shall enjoy more abundantly of life. These things we pray, in the name of Our Father. Amen.

President Doyle: Thank you, Reverend Miller.

This morning, we have with us the Mayor of the City of Cambridge. The City has proved to be a most gracious host. Tonight, the Cambridge Central Labor Union is providing a banquet which, in turn, was provided by the City of Cambridge.

I present to the convention the Mayor of the City of Cambridge, John H. Corcoran.

HON. JOHN H. CORCORAN
(Mayor, City of Cambridge)

Mr. Chairman, Reverend Miller, ladies and gentlemen of the American Federation of Labor: I know you are going to hear a lot of talking and I am going to be very brief. I welcome you. We are proud to have you here, and I hope you will come again.

There is only one thing I want to say, and that is: we are all more than children now; and there is one thing in life we all should have, and that is sincerity. In whatever you do—whether you are capital or labor, whether you are this or that or the other thing—may I ask you to do one thing: Do it in all sincerity.

Thank you.

President Doyle: Thank you, Mayor Corcoran.

The Chair now recognizes Acting Secretary Wilkinson who will read a resolution which will not need to be referred to the Resolutions Committee.

RESOLUTION No. 11

IN MEMORY OF FREDERICK J. GRAHAM

Whereas, God in His infinite power and wisdom, has removed from our midst, our late and beloved Brother Frederick J. Graham, associate and member of Carpenters Union No. 111, of Lawrence, and

Whereas, His association with the labor movement has been honorable and of high esteem within our ranks, and within the civic life of the Commonwealth and of the Nation, and

Whereas, He exemplified and practiced within his own life, and within the groups of his associates that honor from which no shame can rise, and which no stain can wound, as he journeyed upon the road of life and into the valley of the departed, with the golden key of character that opens the door to the palace of eternity, wherein the mortal puts on immortality to dwell forever in the presence of his God; therefore, be it

Resolved, We stand in silent and sacred tribute to the beloved memory of our departed brother, and this resolution be put upon the records of this convention as a token memorial to his remembrance.

[Submitted by Delegates John J. Mulcahy, Carpenters No. 1092, Lawrence; Peter A. Reilly, Carpenters No. 40, Boston: Richard A. McNelis, Carpenters No. 111, Lawrence; Timothy F. the Association of those railroad men on Holyoke, and Harry P. Hogan, Central Labor Union, Springfield.]

(The delegates then stood in silence for one minute.)

President Doyle: I now present to the convention one known to all of you, the New England Regional Director of the American Federation of Labor, John J. Murphy.

JOHN J. MURPHY
(New England Director, American Federation of Labor)

Mr. President, invited guests, and delegates to this victory convention: I am more than pleased to have the opportunity to come before this group once again.

Our fair City of Cambridge, where this convention is being held, I am proud to say, is one of our best organized cities under the banner of the American Federation of Labor in the United States.

Now, we have much legislation confronting us. You have heard many speakers cover that legislation. You have heard speakers of Congress have been not consulted nor have many of you even taken the time to contact those representatives of yours in Washington, for the purpose of discussing this legislation or giving your viewpoints on these very serious matters.

We have the Ball-Burton-Hatch Act which, of course, is going to do nothing more than to hamstring Labor. You were told it was going to be patterned after the Railway Labor Act. I attended a conference of railroad men only a short time ago and let me tell you from speakers of Labor who have attended the present bill under which they are bound to work, I am damn sure we want no part of the Ball-Burton-Hatch Act or any plan drawn up along the same lines under which that Act is drawn. We want the right to meet with our employers and to negotiate our contracts without interference from governmental agencies or any other outside group. We want to maintain the right to strike, if it becomes necessary to do so, and to use that weapon only as a last resort when the employers refuse to arbitrate.

We should be man and woman enough to be willing, if we can not come to an agreement with the employer with whom we are negotiating, to submit that matter to a third party and to accept that decision as final and binding. You know, of course, that if the Ball-Burton-Hatch Act went into effect it means...
you lose that only weapon you have of economic strength against those who are opposing you.

This is not the record of Great Britain. They have had compulsory arbitration and they have had their no-strikes laws. But you in this country gave your word on the strike situation. With a population of 139,000,000, we find that man days idle were 8,721,079, whereas in England, with a population of 44,038,699, the man days idle were 3,710,000. With our population five times greater than England, in England, we find we had twice as many man days idle in this country. There is the comparison between being placed under laws and against the voluntary arbitration, and we did not do along just because somebody may recommend we adopt them.

In the field of organization, I want to say that I must thank the officers and members of our central labor unions for the cooperation which they have extended to us in this field. The war is now over. Many of you have been long and patiently waiting for a chance to organize the unions. Many of your organizing committees of your various central labor unions have been so busy they haven’t had time to put the effort which should have been made to organize your original program. But now you are going to have to set up militant, active organizing committees—and let me warn you here and now—you are going to have to do it for your own self-preservation, because that rival known as the CIO is rearing each and every organization represented within this hall today. I don’t care whether it is from the federal labor unions to the powerful teams—or from the little, independent unions.

I ask you to be militant enough and go back home and set up organizing committees to combat this situation and show these people that they cannot get away doing it.

Oh, I have been in many parts of the country where I have had said to me, “They are not bothering us so why should we worry about them.” I will tell you they will be serious enough. Make a study of each and every one of your cities. There are only five real central labor unions in the State of Massachusetts who have been in close touch with organization work. Every one of these five unions has made a real good job. There are many more of you who just sit back. You want the honor of being named to the organizing committees. You want them to call on you, until the next convention or the next election of officers in your central body, you lay idly by. But at the next meeting for the election of officers, you would like to see your name in the newspapers as a member of the organizing committee.

Let’s not accept the position and the responsibility or remember what the Mayor said here this morning—sincerity. I think that was one of the most important things which have been said at this convention, and if we are all sincere and honest in our efforts, if we do our job as we should, we could make a better labor organization than the one we have today.

I am sure with your cooperation and your assistance in each and every city and town within the State of Massachusetts, that we can be successful, that we can become big enough, to make the CIO so big that there won’t be a hall in the City of Boston large enough to hold our conventions.

There is one other thing I would like to bring to your attention and that is the fact of affiliating with your central labor unions and State American Federation of Labor. I would like each and every one of you to bring that message back. I would like the committees from the central bodies to call upon these unions and request that they become affiliated with them, and with the State Federation of Labor. “In unity there is strength.”

Mr. Chairman, I know you have quite a schedule ahead of you. I want to take this opportunity of thanking you and the Executive Board of the State Federation of Labor for the cooperation they have extended me during this past year, and if, in any small way, I can be of any help to you, I want you to feel free to call upon me. I also want to thank the delegates in attendance.

President Doyle: Thank you, John. I assure you you are always a welcome guest at the conventions of the State Branch of the American Federation of Labor.

I was told the Resolution Committee would be ready with a report. While we are waiting for them, Delegate Reilly, Carpenters No. 40, Boston, wishes to read into the record an original poem of his own on a subject I think we will all like.

Will you come up here, please?

Delegate Reilly: Mr. Chairman, delegates to the convention, and friends: I am not reading this because I happen to be here, because I am not. Rather, I am anxious to place it into the records of this state convention because of the honor of being permitted, within my sovereignty, as an individual, to have within me the sentiments which I have expressed here and which the delegates I hope will likewise feel. This is entitled, “Farewell, Our Commander-in-Chief,” a dedicated memorial to our late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

FAREWELL, OUR COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF!

Hail and Farewell! Our Commander-in-Chief!

Good bye, and Good Luck to you now—

As your soul wings its way in the reaches of space.

In reverence and sorrow we bow!

Though you physically lost the great strength of your youth,

You built your soul as you trod—

With a spirit and a courage inspiring to us,

You reached on to the summits with God!

To the glorious heights you moved upward and on,

Bringing forward the world in your stride—

Freeing slaves from the bondage of tyrants and fief.

With a courage and faith you supplied!

From the depths of depression you raised us again:

For our sorrowing hearts you did plead—

Till you lifted our souls into sunlight and hope

And you eased us from hunger and need!
Now your journey is out in the Spaces of Time, 
In a spirit released, and earth free—
To sail on to the Port of Valhalla's reward,
In the Harbor of God's peaceful Sea!
Where the valiant's live on, and the brave
Of their dying die:
Where the souls of the heroes unite—
From the stolls and beachheads and foxholes of death,
To awake in the rays of God's Light!
So Farewell to our loving Commander-In-Chief!
May your Ship safely sail o'er the Foam—
With angels as shipmates to guide you along
And bring you safe into His home.

President Doyle: The poem just read will become part of the records of the convention.
I consider it a great honor to introduce to this
collection our next speaker. He is a Boston boy—East Boston to be exact—and he
certainly made good in a big way. And despite
making good in a big way, he is one of the
most down-to-earth men you could ever hope
to meet. He held the all-important post of
Ambassador to Great Britain. Today, he is
devoting practically every moment of his
time to the betterment of Massachusetts.
He is Chairman of a Recess Commission ap-pointed by the Governor to study the advisa-
bility of creating a Department of Commerce.
He has gone all parts of the Commonwealth,
and his schedule, many days, was enough to
kill a much younger man. He has been running
up and down the highways speaking to all
groups—management, public, labor. He has
been another Paul Revere for Massachusetts.
I present to you, Joseph P. Kennedy, former
Ambassador to the Court of St. James.

JOSEPH P. KENNEDY
(Chairman, Commission to Establish
Department of Commerce)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: It is
a privilege to be with you today and to
tell you a little something about what we are
working on, because, after all, what we are
working on today will be the basis of success
for Massachusetts. People have asked me to
give you a name for my talk, and I have said
I couldn't sum it up except to use one word—
"jobs"!

As I have gone through the state, I have
found some fault with the conditions which
have been with us for the last 25 years and
about which I think I can speak more or less
as an expert.

I left the state about 20 years ago—I am
not sure whether it was with five or six of my
children at that time—and I moved to another
city, because I felt there was a better oppor-
tunity in other places than there was in Boston
and Massachusetts. Now, it isn't the easiest
thing in the world to move out of a state and
move your family and move away from your
friends. But one of the principal reasons for
doing that was because I thought that Boston
and Massachusetts were not forward-looking
enough for young men.

The real difficulty which is still
apparent in this state in spite of the fact that
a great many of the older groups—the genera-
tions before us—did wonderful things through-
out the United States. Still, it's been so long
ago, as a lot of you may well remember, that
the Atchison-Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad
had its main office in the City of Boston. As
a result of the developments by the people
of this state, and after all this money was
made by people working in overalls, they
turned around and put it into tails and top
hats, and the result of it has been that too
much industry in this state is run from the
state.

Now, I have great sympathy with the man
who says, "I can't afford to invest my money."
Let me explain to you just why a lot of them
can't so that you won't get the idea that
everything is wrong with people who have
money.

Let's take the man who gets $50,000, $100,-
000, or $200,000 a year income after all deduc-
tions have been made. They are the people
we ordinarily would believe would be the ones
who should be spending the money to replace
old industry, buildings, and equipment, and
buy themselves a position in some of the
other places in the country. Let me tell you
what happens to those gentlemen.

If they live in Massachusetts and receive
their income from dividends and interests, the
man who gets $50,000 a year will have $18,000
left. And the man who gets $200,000
a year, will have $28,000 left. Now if
this is true, I'm told that the
industry in Massachusetts and we can invest in
a business that pays 10 percent," let me tell
you what happens to the gentlemen with
those incomes.

If each one of them puts in $10,000, and
the dividend is 10 percent, the man who made
500,000 will make $5,000; the man who makes
$10,000 will make $1,000, the man who makes
six tenths of one percent, and the man who
makes $200,000 will pay the Government $8
and receives no income.

I am willing to say that there is
too much money tied up in "conservative"
investments and not enough money in "venture"
capital. And if we don't have "venture" cap-
ital, we are standing still; we are not fighting
against what is liable to happen to us; we are
not making any step forward. And, it seems
to me that it is just as much the interest of
Labor to make possible that a Department of
Commerce such as we suggest will be the
clearing point for discussions in Washington
and to make it possible for some investments
to go into what I call "venture capital."

As I have gone through the state, I have had
a good deal of contact with a gentleman, with a
good deal of pride, said to me, as he pointed out a building, "That building
is 100 years old. It's a bit obsolete." I said,
"My God, they used to be." They don't seem to realize that when indus-
try moves out of this state to some other part
of the country, they immediately start off with
new buildings, new lighting, new equipment,
and, naturally, they can do better than we can.
Unless you can get people interested, un-
less you, as a group, will interest yourselves—I am not holding any brief for people getting
more than they deserve—I have said repeatedly
that there is no salvation for this country unless
it can bring its natural income up to at least
100 billion dollars and you can't bring it up to
that amount by keeping wages down.

I don't know how else you can get it. The
most we ever had in this country was 85 bil-
lion dollars. Somebody has got to find some
way of getting the money in the hands of the
people in order that we can pay our bills.
One of the ways to get it and the only way I
know is to have purchasing power in the hands of the people and to somehow
and say, "You can't have this wage, you can't have that wage." We've got to find some
way of finding how we can do it.

I don't believe the national government is
in a position to solve the most important problem of the entire country, and that is,
the question of full employment. I think what
has to be done is that community by community
must take a greater interest in what they are doing in order to make that possible.

Take the Kilgore Bill, for instance. There wasn’t anybody who didn’t know the war would end, and there certainly wasn’t anybody who didn’t know there would be a lot of unemployment in various parts of the country during the period of reconversion. Nevertheless, the Kilgore Bill was brought in and put before one of the most able committees in Washington, headed by one of the most able men in Washington—Walter George—and yet it took them a great deal of time for discussion, and then decided that it can counter to a lot of state regulations.

There are too many different localities with different points of view and different interests to make it possible for the national government to wave a wand and say, ‘That solves everything.’ Each and every community can do the job better than anybody else. They understand it. People say to me, ‘You are too tough in talking about what’s going to happen in the state.’ After all, we have now appropriated 15 million dollars for the Port of Boston."

I said: ‘That’s fine. You should have done it 20 years ago. Everybody says, “Well, we are in the soft part of the airport.” We are spending 15 million dollars.”

But the first time we sent a transatlantic plane, we had to send it out of Bedford. It is true we are working up to these things but it is taking us a long while to wake up to them. It is taking us a very long time to consider the problems that have attacked Massachusetts in the last 15 years.

And I tell you that if we didn’t have in the Labor Department in this state a man like Jim Moriarty we wouldn’t be holding the record we have.

I had a good deal of experience in Washington with two Commissions—the Securities Commission and the Maritime Commission—and it taught me one thing: No matter how much power rests in the hands of a group sooner or later, if that power isn’t wisely used they will be caught up with.

We witnessed it in the banking investigation a small many years ago, if not to the power of this country controlled and dominated everything. We saw it with the Stock Exchange and the panic of 1929 and people were ruined, but only as a question of who lost money in the stock market. It was the repercussions and the failure of those securities which affected every man in this country.

The same thing is happening to us all today. There is only one way in which this country can be prosperous and that is to get out production. There is no panacea in the words to say an up line up and wave this magic wand that I am talking about and say, ‘Well, we’ll do this.” It can’t be done.

We have a number of cities in Massachusetts where if one major industry closed and moved out it would affect the entire population of Massachusetts. There is no point in saying that we have been successful in these troubles in various parts of the state.

I know you wouldn’t believe me when I tell you that during hearings lasting five months we have never been able to get one bit of information to tell us why so many hundreds of industries left the state. There was a great deal of criticism about the question of labor unions, but there was no question or mention during the hearings particularly the question of women having to stop work at 10 o’clock at night. There was a great deal of discussion about the tax laws sending them out of the state, and we have yet to put a finger on anything affecting our tax laws.

What has happened has been indifferent to what could happen in this state. There is no question about it—we believe we are good, but we don’t want anybody to tell us whether we are or not. We have a business in this state of approximately $90 million dollars in recreation. Have you any idea how much we spent last year in the state to find out where they were going to get the money, but they weren’t too busy to vote 500 thousand dollars for the advertising of their state, industrially and commercially—and our amount was less than 20 per cent of the room who knew it! As I have gone through the state, I have asked at every meeting how many people knew that labor and industry here won the second number of votes this past campaign and nobody knew it. I asked Associated Industries the other day how many people in the room knew their own legislator and there was less than 20 per cent in the room who knew it. And when I asked 1800 people how many of them had ever written to a newspaper on any matter of community interest, there were about six people in the room who had done so. Now if you don’t take any more interest in the state, how do you think it is going to succeed—and if it doesn’t succeed, it affects every man in the state who has a job.

I lived in East Boston and I lived on the waterfront—and a lot of your men here today I knew intimately, and they knew my father—and I have seen this thing go on for a long time, and I tell you that if my judgment is worth anything and if you hired me to go out and make a report, I would say to you that you can win every strike you want to, that you can win everything you want because you are organized and because the public believes that you haven’t had a square deal—but—you also owe a lot to the people who have no voice, no one else, to realize that this state needs a lot of “ringer” put into it. You need to remember that unless everybody in this state will get behind—the house as well as Industry—this state will be in trouble.

Now I have met a great many people who tell me what is going to happen after the boom is over. There are more specialists and more experts today on every question than I ever believed possible in the history of the world. They will come up to me and they will get into a discussion or argument and they don’t have what in heaven’s name they are talking about.

How many people could decide here in this room this morning whether we should or should not go away the way people will say, ‘Well, I would like to follow the scientists.’ Others will say, ‘I wouldn’t give Russia anything. But we don’t know: how can we succeed?’

The London Conference breaks up and some people say, ‘There you are—you can’t get along already.’

It’s the same way with finance and economics. There isn’t any question but that we can take any figures today to show that you can or you can’t do certain things.

Now one thing I hope and pray we all go right back to the fact that you people, as contractors to the nation’s prosperity, have definitely got a problem right in your own
We'd better start being very nice if that is the only thing that will hold an industry in this state. You know, when I went in the last year to the Commission, I had been lambasted all over the place when I went in because I had been a speculator myself—and I remember that Roy Howard, the Editor of the World and the Governor of the Securities Exchange, as Chairman of the Securities Commission." And the President said to him: "Don't you think it is a good idea to put someone in a commission who wants something about the business? If I were going to appoint a Newspaper Committee, wouldn't you like to have one newspaper man on it?"

When I finished, they thought I had given a very good administration, and the papers were very complimentary. But I can remember Frank Kent, who ran a column in the Baltimore Sun, writing an editorial something like this: "Everybody says, 'Kennedy is a great fellow; he has done a great job.' I don't see why the hell he's going to get anything up about his. His competition wasn't very good."

And that is exactly the situation now. Everybody says we have the best industry, we have the largest, we have the best of the best people to do the work, but we don't do very much about it. We don't struggle to hold on to what we have nor do we try to get more.

There is talk General Motors decentralizing and putting in a plant in Massachusetts. I again talked to Mr. Sloane the night before last. I wasn't particularly concerned about what was happening in the strike; I was concerned about that plant coming into Massachusetts. He said that as far as he knew they were coming into Massachusetts; he hoped that everything would be fixed so that they could go ahead with their period of expansion and it would mean 3000 jobs and an expenditure of about 15 million dollars in this state.

Another thing I found out when I was in New York a week ago is that one of the big concerns in the business to hold their head up because they had given it up because they heard the taxes were bad in this state. Last Wednesday, I brought all the representatives of this corporation down here to talk with us. When they got through talking to him, they said there was nothing the matter with that—and I expect them to come into this state. Everybody has been so busy with a lot of other things they haven't given any consideration to problems like this. They really don't pay very much attention or they are superficial. They said, "Well, this thing will work out all right; it always has." But it may not always work out all right. Massachusetts is a great state to work for.

Now there is one other problem to think of, and that is, if you want to continue to live in this state and you think this is the state to live in, you will have to take a bigger interest, not only a Labor interest, but a community interest in everything that is taking place in the state.

You have another problem which I talked about the other day and that is about these youngsters who are coming home. A captain in the Navy called me in the other day and asked me, "How would you favor the new State Senators; they got in touch with the OPA; they were nice to us." And he stopped, and I said: "But why are you leaving this state, saying you are going to give me this nice to us." I said: "My God, are we going to lose a business because somebody is very nice to you and we aren't nice to you?"
If you ask me what I can do, I can only say, I don’t know.”

It is the same question that anybody would have asked of me the day I got out of college— “what have you learned and what can you do.” There’s one great thing about giving a child a college education. If he doesn’t specialize and pay good money to learn what he can do, he can always answer, “I don’t know.”

I told a fellow to go to a certain place to find out what they are doing to take care of those with mental problems. Whether he had the slightest idea about what a job meant or of how to give advice or suggestions, and the youngsters were getting more and more discontent.

I suggested to Industry that the shop man in every industry spend so much time each week in the office of the Veterans’ Bureau and heard them out. It is meeting the other night in Boston, one of the generals was sitting on the stage, and the lady in charge of the party said to the group, “I wish you would get up and talk to the general. He is over there.” One of the ladies turned around and said: “Why? The war is all over.”

As I say, I don’t worry so much about the general and his fellows. I have seen them all. When I was sent to represent the United States at the coronation of the present Pope, we went out to his summer home late in the afternoon, and we got by. I saw some youngsters, about four or five years old, and I was told to one of the sides who was with me, “What do they do with youngsters like these?” “Oh,” he replied, “they start drilling them at the age of five, that is not the worst of it.” They arrange it so that the important meetings always take place on Sunday mornings— so none of them can ever go to church.

But I think every one of them in the world and I have seen a great many things happen, and I say that this is the greatest country in the world, but unless we realize that all the other citizens are not going to make any leadership. That is what I think we have got to do in Massachusetts. It has the brains and the research facilities. And yet, less than one-sixth of the research is done by private industry, so by our concerns, and five-sixths of them are used by somebody from outside the state. For that reason, we need something to spark up this industry, it isn’t going to make resolutions. It is going to be a Commission that brings everything up-to-date.

When I went to Quincy the other day, I met a fellow and he said: “Hello, Joe.” I said: “Hello, how are you?” He said: “You don’t remember me?” I said: “Not very well.” “I used to play ball with you 55 years ago.”

We have to have a sufficiently large national income in order to pay the bills so that nothing can happen to the government securi- ties or to the economy.

We realize that we in this state want to have a state that is prosperous and successful, so that we can continue to bring up our families and live in peace and prosperity. There is one way in which a state can be made more prosperous, that is to realize that you will have to take a bigger community interest in this state than you ever took before.

I am very grateful for a chance to come out here and talk to you, and I don’t propose to say that I have anything new. But I have seen all of these things which I have said that things can be accomplished, and that is to realize that you will have to take a bigger community interest in this state than you ever took before.

Another group says, “Well, why do you work so hard for Tobin?” I said: “But I am not working hard for Tobin; I am working hard for a state. My children were all born in this state. I will not leave it because I have to leave it, but I came back”—and I say to you now, that if my judgment is worth anything, it needs that attention greater today than it ever did before.

We hope to make our Department of Commerce non-political. Everybody says, “My God, nothing can be non-political.” I say, “I guess you’re right.” I remember the day some one charged right straight up to me when I said they had made the courts non-political. So I said, “At least we’ve got to make the effort.”

I ask your help on this question; I ask you to get behind this department. We are not running into any particular opposition. It will be formed. It is merely a question of what form it will take and it will also depend on how much it matters to do the job right. We want a department that is good for small business; we want a department who will do something about housing; we want a department that you can count on can have the best port in the world or the best airport. But if you don’t do something about roads so that your cars can get in and out, it isn’t worth quarreling. So they who go through the East Boston Tunnel at five o’clock at night, particularly the day of a race, he might just as well go down to Worcester and get on a plane.

Those are the things which have to be done. It took them 20 years to get around to the Port of Boston. The members of the Maritime Commission said that in spite of all the advantages we had, Beaumont, Texas, out-ran us. I never heard of Beaumont, Texas. If we don’t get something like LaGuardia Field in New York, we are not going to take any leadership. That is what I think we have got to do in Massachusetts. It has the brains and the research facilities. And yet, less than one-sixth of the research is done by our concerns, and five-sixths of them are used by somebody from outside the state. For that reason, we need something to spark up this industry, it isn’t going to make resolutions. It is going to be a Commission that brings everything up-to-date.
he said, "My God," I said, "you must have been a good man. I was only two years old then."

But at least, I like to see that kind of enthusiasm. I like to hear fellows say, "Come on, let's go." That's what it needs here more than anything else, and that is why I ask you for your help.

Thank you very much for letting me come before you.

President Doyle: Mr. Kennedy, for the convention, I wish to thank you for coming here and giving so generously of your time and discussion on the problem. I assure you that you have won new legions of supporters to the Department of Commerce.

You can see that Joe Kennedy is a very democratic person. During his college years, he worked like the rest of us worked for our education. Again I thank Joe for coming to the convention and speaking to us this morning.

We have two guests with us this morning, and I am going to ask them to step forward on the rostrum and take a look at President Connor and Secretary-Treasurer Peacock of the New Hampshire State Federation of Labor. There being nothing further to come before the session this morning, we will now adjourn to meet at 2:15 p.m.

Whereupon, at twelve o'clock, the convention adjourned until 2:15 p.m.

**AFTERNOON SESSION**

The convention was called to order at 2:15 p.m. by President Doyle.

President Doyle: The Chair now recognizes Chairman Russell of the Officers' Report and Resolutions Committee.

Chairman Russell: I would be pleased to have the delegates take the Officers' Report and have it before them while we will attempt to give you the opinions and recommendations of your Committee on the Officers' Report.

The preface speaks for itself.

But at 2:16 p.m., I will make your acquaintance to the enumerated recommendations starting with Article No. 1 which I will read. Taking all of the factors into consideration, your Executive Council submits the following for your consideration:

We call upon Congress to enact legislation that will provide guarantees of full productive employment for all who are ready and willing to work.

Chairman Russell: Your committee concurs in that recommendation and I move the adoption of the committee's recommendation.

President Doyle: The committee moves the adoption of the resolution?

Is there anything to be said on the question?

The Chair recognizes Delegate McLaren.

Delegate McLaren (Stone Masons No. 9, Boston): In reference to Recommendation No. 1. I spoke to the Chairman yesterday about the procedure in reference to these points—I think there are nine other points.

I wish at this time to point out that the National American Federation of Labor forget when—but some time recently—adopted most of those points which are recommended in the President's report.

Now for practical purposes, Mr. Chairman, I think the points which are included in the national organization and would suggest, if I may, that these points be incorporated in your report, Mr. Chairman. The National American Federation of Labor agrees on the following points:

1. The abolition of poll tax.
2. The establishment of a National and State Fair Employment Practices Act.
3. A 65 cent minimum.
4. The President's recommendation of $25 per week until recipients are affected.
5. The Full Employment Bill, and
6. The Murray-Dingell Health Bill.

That is the program of the national organization. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it clear that we are not making a recommendation of a program that are good and constructive, and I would, therefore, suggest that these be incorporated with the other points that are out and we submit it to the convention for this reason: A great many people are saying: "What is the American Federation of Labor doing?"

The CIO was in Washington and they submitted a program which is identical, Mr. Chairman, with your program and the National American Federation of Labor program.

Now I think we are honor-bound to tell the public where we stand on all those measures. All organized labor within its ranks knows what we stand for, but I question if many of the locals have any idea what we have such a concrete program as this that I have just raised. Further, I think, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Kennedy's talk, in certain ways, was a great boost to this organization practically said that we do not let the people know exactly what we stand for because we do not have enough publicity—we do not go out and inform people about what we are doing—and I think as a method and a means to that end, that if the Officers' Report is accepted, that we take that report and print it as a leaflet to show where we stand, and that will put to right what I call an injustice to that great body of those in the American Federation of Labor.

We are easily equal to the best in the field today, and, further, we are interested in a great many candidates who are running for office.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that this is a splendid thing. We could have a questionnaire for the candidate representative or what have you—"Do you accept those principles for which we fight and which we think are necessary to reconversion?"

If you do that, I think, I think you will get more into your locality and you are letting the people know that it is not just an organization of officials. This program, if it is actualized in all the localities, is an asset and it is to the community in this reconversion period.

That is the only reason, Mr. Chairman, why I raise—not to antagonize, but to seek the cooperation to that end and its helping you in your initial work. This is the first year I have seen in any report what I would call an "immediately practical program" of the State Federation of Labor, and representing also the American Federation of Labor nationally. I make that suggestion, Mr. Chairman.

President Doyle: Well, for the point of information—if I may put it that way—we have before us the Officers' Report of the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor which contains many of the things the delegate just finished talking about. We do not have before us the program in toto of the American Federation of Labor, but we do have the State Federation of Labor program before us and that is the program on which the Officers' Report Committee has acted.

The Chair recognizes Delegate Murray.

Delegate Murray (Teamsters No. 880, Boston): In regard to the statement of the former speaker, the resolutions talked about yesterday practically simplify and explain the same
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statements which the gentleman has already made. We ought to take each resolution as the Officers' Report goes along.

President Doyle: The delegate is in agreement, the Chair. We have before us a motion by the Joint Officers' Report and Resolutions Committee for adoption of Section 1 of the Officers' Report. Are you ready for the question?

Those who are in favor will signify in the usual manner. Those opposed? It is a unanimous vote and it will be so recorded. Article 1 is adopted.

Chairman Russell: Article 2:

We call for the continuation and expansion of a high wage policy, and for the broadening of minimum wage laws. Investigation has disclosed that more than 10 million workers—more than one-third of our national labor market—receive less than 65 cents per hour. If all in this category were raised to a wage of 65 cents per hour, the cost to industry would approximate a cost of four billion dollars a year. It is our opinion that this cost can be absorbed by industry without substantially affecting profits, and in most instances, within present price ceilings. Here we point out that a raise in these obviously substandard rates would not be inflationary, since the recipients would use increased income to purchase the basic necessities of life now deprived them.

Chairman Russell: Your committee concurs in this Article and I move the adoption of the committee's recommendation.

President Doyle: It is regularly moved and seconded that Article 2 of the Officers' Report be concurred in. Anything to be said on the question? As many as are in favor will signify in the usual manner by saying "aye." Opposed, "no." It is a unanimous vote and Article 2 is adopted.

Chairman Russell: Article 3:

We call upon our State Legislature to enact legislation broadening unemployment compensation benefits to a maximum payment equivalent for a period of 26 weeks. The necessity for such a proposition is obvious, inasmuch as the Massachusetts Employment Security Trust Fund is adequate to meet the current demands of "free enterprise". Adequate payments must be provided for those who will suffer temporary unemployment during the transitional period, or the task of providing for the displaced worker will have to be assumed by local charitable and welfare institutions. If the volume of unemployment should be so great as to completely deplete the fund, the "experience rating" formula should be repealed and deficits made up by funds provided by the federal government.

Chairman Russell: There is only one observation. Please don't be confused—the words "experience rating" are synonymous and likened unto the term of "merit rating" of which we are all too familiar.

Your committee concurs in this recommendation and I move the adoption of the committee's report.

President Doyle: Do I hear the motion seconded? (It was seconded.) Is there anything on the question? If not, those in favor of the proposition to Article 3 will signify in the usual manner by saying "aye." Opposed, "no." It is a unanimous vote. Article 3 is adopted.

Chairman Russell: Article 4:

We call upon Congress to give immediate attention to a further downward revision of tax rates, both for personal and corporate income excises. We are fully conscious of the fact that the tremendous increase in the national debt has been necessary because of the war. We are convinced that this cost should be amortized over a long period, so as to release funds for purchase of consumer goods.

Chairman Russell: Your committee concurs in this Article and I move the adoption of the committee's recommendation.

President Doyle: It is regularly moved and seconded that Article 4 of the Officers' Report be adopted. Are you ready for the question? As many as in favor will signify in the usual manner by saying "aye." Opposed, "no." It is a unanimous vote and Article 4 is adopted.

Chairman Russell: Article 5:

We announce and reaffirm our adherence to the principle of "free enterprise" in industrial life. But while subscribing to this philosophy, we direct the attention of industry to the fact that, "free enterprise," "enterprise" must be earned and cultivated by collective bargaining. "Free enterprise" cannot flourish in a climate of monopoly, centralization or labor-baiting. "Free enterprise" has a corollary in free collective bargaining. We urge that we not resort to regiment or regulate the normal function of employee and employer in the course of free collective bargaining be repudiated and that present federal controls over labor and industry be ended immediately.

Chairman Russell: Your committee has taken the liberty to strike out the next to the last line of the first words being, "and that present federal controls over labor and industry be ended immediately."

We have stricken that out, and with that subtraction, your committee concurs in Article 5 and recommends its adoption.

President Doyle: The Chair now recognizes Delegate Murray of Teamsters No. 380, Boston.

Delegate Murray: Will you kindly have the Chairman read the clause as it now stands so that we can all be clear on it?

President Doyle: Article 5, as amended by the committee will read:

We announce and reaffirm our adherence to the principle of "free enterprise" in industrial life. But while subscribing to this philosophy, we direct the attention of industry to the fact that, "free enterprise," "enterprise" must be earned and cultivated by constant vigilance. "Free enterprise" cannot flourish in a climate of monopoly, centralization or labor-baiting. "Free enterprise" has a corollary in free collective bargaining. We urge that we not resort to regiment or regulate the normal function of employee and employer, the costs of which would be required to be repudiated.

Delegate Murray: Thank you, sir.

President Doyle: You have before you the motion of the Officers' Report Committee that Article 5 be adopted, as amended.

Are you ready for the question? As many as are in favor will signify in the usual manner by saying "aye." The votes opposed, "no."

It is a unanimous vote and Article 5 as amended, is adopted.

Delegate William Ward for the committee:

Article 6:

We condemn and denounce the actions of politicians who seek to develop a breach between labor and the veteran, or who labor unceasingly to discredit organized labor in the eyes of our community, and we repudiate those apostles of
totalitarian ideologies who seek to foment class hatred and friction for the purpose of subverting and destroying our American way of life. In a period of transition such as we face today, the seeds of discontent and prejudice fall on fertile soil, and in no way contribute to the solution of the economic problems to which we are confronted, but, on the contrary, serve to generate strife between worker and fellow worker, employee and employer. The solution of our economic problems "lies within the framework of our constitutional government.

Chairman Russell: Your committee concurs in Article 6 and recommends its adoption.

President Doyle: Chairman Russell moves and Delegate Ward seconds the motion that Article 6 of the Officers' Report be adopted. Are you ready for the question? As many as are in favor will signify in the usual manner by saying "aye." Opposed, "no." It is a unanimous vote and Article 6 is adopted.

Chairman Russell: In the opinion of your committee, Article 7 is of extreme importance and your committee has had full hearings and has taken the liberty to make a number of changes and certain recommendations which we have made with the approval of the representatives of the building industry who honored us with their presence in the hearing.

In reading Article 7, I am going to read the first paragraph before we come to the enumerated recommendations.

Realizing that the prospect of achieving a high stable level of total output depends in a large part upon the timing and volume of construction activity, we call for the adoption of a long-term works program in the government's fiscal policy, for the purpose of stabilizing our economy at high levels of production and employment. In our opinion that the federal government is not at present organized to make its maximum contribution toward the formation of a sound construction policy. We urge the formation of a federal authority, to guide a public works program toward a healthy stable growth of the construction industry as a whole.

Chairman Russell: In the last line ending with the words, "the words of a sound construction policy," we have struck out the words, "We urge the formation of a federal authority to guide a public works program toward a healthy stable growth of the construction industry as a whole."

Now, it may be necessary to divide this, Mr. Chairman, but I will go ahead with the whole committee's report to complete our picture, if you desire.

Then we come to the enumerated items:

1) We suggest that the appropriate federal agency compile information and statistics on construction and related production and employment, so as to provide a guide for the development of a public works construction policy.

2) Coordination of scheduling and planning on all federal public construction projects.

On Item No. 2 of Article 7, there again your committee attempts to delete it, making it a little more all-inclusive by striking out the words "federal public"—so that Item No. 2 will read:

2) Coordination of scheduling and planning on all construction projects.

3) Establishment of consultative, informative and statistical liaison with local and state construction projectors.

4) Cooperation and consultation with representatives of the construction industry, both management and labor, for the development of a program of full productive employment in that industry.

We are taking the liberty to suggest that Item No. 5 read as follows:—

5) A policy of awarding all construction to contractors, and strict adherence to paying of established and prevailing wage rates.

We call on Congress to retain control over prices of consumer goods, except in those instances where relaxation of price control will stimulate job opportunities. We urge that control of rents be continued until such time as the housing market reaches a more balanced condition.

Those are the best thoughts of your committee. We move concurrence in the recommendations of your Officers' Report as amended by our committee.

President Doyle: It is regularly moved and seconded that Article 7 of the Officers' Report Committee be concurred in, as amended. Are you ready for the question? As many as are in favor will signify in the usual manner by saying "aye." Opposed, "no." It is a unanimous vote and Article 7, as amended, is adopted.

Delegate Ward: Article 8:

We urge the cooperation of labor and management in the development of the Port of Boston, and we commit our fullest support and cooperation in any program devised by our delegation. Realizing that this port will bring new life to this Commonwealth, but we shall be ever vigilant in our efforts to maintain the high industrial standards required by law and union contract.

Chairman Russell: Your committee concurs in Article 8 and recommends its adoption.

President Doyle: It is regularly moved and seconded that Article 9 of the Officers' Report Committee be adopted. Is there anything to be said on the question? If not, as many as are in favor will signify in the usual manner by saying "aye." Opposed, "no." It is a unanimous vote and Article 9 is adopted.

Delegate Ward: Article 9:

If we have learned no other lesson from our experience in the war period than the necessity for unity in the labor movement, we have profited a lot. At this Special Victory Convention, called for the purpose of celebrating our victory over the forces of evil, we again reaffirm the position taken by the delegates at the special Emergency War Convention in 1942, as it applies to the need for unity in the labor movement in the United States. We urge that the leaders of the Congress of Industrial Organizations give heed to President Green's invitation for them to return to the fraternity of workers, from whence they sprung, and we call upon the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor to conclude its negotiations with the United Mine Workers of America, so that this great labor organization can return in honor to the conference tables of the American Federation of Labor.

Chairman Russell: Your committee concurs in Article 9 and recommends its adoption.

President Doyle: It is regularly moved and seconded that Article 9 of the Officers' Report Committee be adopted. Is there anything to be said on the question? If not, as many as are in favor will signify in the usual manner by saying "aye." Opposed, "no." It is a unanimous vote and Article 9 is adopted.
Today the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor stands on the threshold of a new era. The war has been successfully concluded, and we will take a little time and will call for the exercise of intelligence and vision on the part of those who must design the pattern that will lead to full employment, continuous prosperity, and economic tranquility.

Considering the seriousness of the situation, Labor must adjust itself to meet the changes in the times. This necessarily will take a little time and will call for the exercise of intelligence and vision on the part of those who must design the pattern that will lead to full employment, continuous prosperity, and economic tranquility.

The Massachusetts State Federation of Labor today must meet this challenge, and to you the delegates at this special convention falls the responsibility to chart the paths that will guide the federation safely toward the goal of a fuller, happier and more secure way of life for the workers and artisans of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Chairman Russell: Your committee concurs in the Officers' Report, as amended, and recommends that the Officers' Report, as amended, be adopted as a whole.

President Doyle: It is regularly moved and seconded that the Officers' Report, as amended, be adopted as a whole.

Are you ready for the question?

Delegate McLaren (Stone Masons No. 9, Boston): I'm sorry—but the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor is committed to the Fair Employment Practices Commission, and I think in all fairness, if we don't use the program that's being offered by the American Federation of Labor—and nearly every type of organization in the state takes the stand that a Fair Employment Practices Commission is a thing essential for our kind of democratic principles. We in this state are for that, and Brother Wilkinson represented the Federation of Labor and Brother Grages represented the Central Labor Union in favor of that. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that with that booklet program which you have accepted and which goes down the line almost on all the points raised by the American Federation of Labor and agreed to by them, that this be added to the program. I recommend, Mr. Chairman, if you see fit to add that to the program with this further stipulation, Mr. Chairman, that this program be the working program of the state's report and used as a leaflet in order to let everyone know what is the immediate legislative program of the American Federation of Labor in this state. I make that suggestion, Mr. Chairman.

President Doyle: We have a motion before us that the Report, as amended by the committee, be adopted. Delegate McLaren moves that the convention include in the Report that the convention approves the amended FEPC. Are you ready for the question as amended?

The Chair now recognizes Delegate Domey.

Delegate Domey (Machinists No. 634, Charlestown): I would like to have Article 7, as amended, read again.

President Doyle: Delegate Domey, we have disposed of Articles 7, 8 and 9, and now we are acting on the Conclusion and the report as a whole. The Chair now recognizes Delegate Mcloughlin.

Delegate Mcloughlin (Printing Pressmen No. 18, Boston): I don't see why there should be any need for the amendment as proposed by Brother Domey at the present time. There are various international unions throughout the country who have certain rules and regulations. Those international unions cross all boundary lines of all states. In those international unions there are certain rules which they live up to. If we are going to go on record to an amendment of the nature as put up to Brother McLaren, then we are violating, in my opinion, at least, the international autonomy of the various organizations.

I felt that the report as brought in here by the committee is sufficient without tying us up with any embarrassing amendments, and for that reason I call upon the delegates, in fairness to all the delegates of which the delegete body should be concerned. Many have taken the advantage of submitting resolutions to the convention. The Executive Committee has exposed us to this thinking and I call the thinking, and we, as assistants to this Congress, have an opportunity to file our additional suggestions.

I was hoping we would act solely upon the written document of the Executive Council and take intelligent action on that. Then if there are other matters which should come before this convention, they would be submitted in a proper way, which is, obviously, that of a resolution, and I am quite sure that the Committee was adequate for that on which the committee did report.

Inasmuch as the Chairman considers this as the report of the committee as a whole, your committee itself wishes to make a summary observation and therefore, I am going to take the liberty to read it and I am quite sure that it gives further food for thought for the Executive Council:

The Chair now presents the conclusion of your Officers' Report. Your committee congratulates the Executive Council in presenting a forthright far-seeing constructive program. We must, however, call for not too many amendments upon legislation for economic improvement. Our trade union sense revolts, and yet we realize with them that expediencies and sometimes weakness leads to legislation.

The committee observes future economic and trade union problems regarding continued upgrading of minimum wages. We heartily agree with the 65 cent minimum wage proposal, yet we must note that as minimum wages are increased, they never should militate against the wages of high paid labor.

The problems of "free" collective bargaining were not over-emphasized. The facts as seen by your committee indicates that to an amendment of the nature as called for under "free" and "free" trade unions depends upon not one, but by all those who believe in these institutions and by their mutual effort we will survive. If either fails, both will fall.

We now wish to submit that and recommend the committee's report in concurrence with the Officers' Report as report of the Executive Council Report to this convention.

President Doyle: The Chair recognizes Delegate Lorch.

Delegate Lorch (Teachers No. 441, Boston): I would like to second the proposal that we
should back a State FEPC bill. It would be possible even for the state organization to write its own bill. I think it is embarrassing to AFL to have a report on it, when all kinds of other organizations are out in front on it. I am sure that if one speaker here was speaking for certain internationals which have Federation of Labor, You will have to explain to your International, and most of them in Boston disregard it. They don't like the color clause here. If we don't have a good stand on it, there is real danger that there will be a pressure from outside groups toward including something on the trade unions in that bill, which would be a terrible disgrace to us and might even be an opening wedge for some kind of government over unions. I urge that we back a State FEPC bill.

President Doyle: The Chair recognizes Delegate Murray.

Delegate Murray (Teamsters No. 380, Boston): Mr. Chairman, in regard to Delegate McLaren's statement—during the last two days we have had some very good speakers. They have spoken on sincerity, community interest, and the welfare of organized labor. I submit that Delegate McLaren's statement is a source of error and humane principle and it should go along with the Officers' Report, submitted for publication to show that the American Federation of Labor in Massachusetts is alive. These resolutions that have been acted upon and passed today have not been sufficiently clarified because they have not taken the time—and I cannot blame them all—because I have spoken.

The Officers' Report, as far as I can see, has been very sound and constructive, but the Chairman himself admitted they have not entirely taken everything into consideration and they are open to further sound and constructive business which the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor can put across. So I say that Delegate McLaren's statement will not improve this situation. It is going to give the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor the uplift which it so sorely needs.

President Doyle: The Chair now recognizes Delegate Shea.

Delegate Shea (St. Carmen No. 22, Worcester): This is the first time that I have heard different delegates on the floor—say—that the Officers omitted something in their report. It may be true, but I want to say this: That I, as one delegate to the special convention, was submitted a copy of the Officers' Report, and I for one, as a delegate, was satisfied in it. I might not have seen where this so-called FEPC was not contained in the Officers' Report, and I believe that we, as delegates, have overlooked a matter just as much as the Officers. I also believe that if we were sincere, we could have submitted a resolution to this convention to go on record in favor of the FEPC.

President Doyle: I would like to answer the delegate. The delegate is quite correct. You have before you the Report of the Officers of the State Federation of Labor. I also have before you later resolutions submitted by delegates to this convention. The Chair now recognizes Delegate Bowles.

Delegate Bowles (Carpenters No. 1416, New Bedford): The Chairman has taken the words right out of my mouth. The fact that we are here to receive, as delegates, the Officers' Report of this Massachusetts Federation of Labor, and if there is any amendment to it, it would be out of order. The question should be "yes" or "no" on the Officers' Report.

President Doyle: You are raising a point of order?

Delegate Bowles: Yes.

President Doyle: Well, if you may have noticed, the Chair was quite hesitant in accepting the motion of the delegate on this question. The question is a most delicate one and any action by the Chair might be misconstrued. The press is here and the Chair has no desire to injure in any way the standing of the American Federation of Labor or the Federation of Labor in Massachusetts.

You have at hand the means of handling this situation. The Chair did accept it as an amendment. It is your privilege to defeat the amendment if you think it is not properly before you. The delegate had the opportunity to present a resolution as did all others on any question.

The Chair now recognizes Delegate McLaren.

Delegate McLaren: On a point of correction—the date given in the Call was the 15th of October. I took that as being final, when I spoke about this particular matter with you and Brother Robinson said that.

President Doyle: That does not change the picture I just painted. You had the opportunity to submit an amendment.

The Chair recognizes Delegate Moriarty.

Delegate Moriarty (Typographical No. 18, Boston): The Chair recognizes the floor. The Chairman of the convention is in and I think I feel what the sentiments of this convention are. I was wondering if it might be well for Brother McLaren to withdraw his motion and with full consent of this body offer a resolution on that matter?

President Doyle: Does Delegate McLaren withdraw his motion?

Delegate McLaren: I withdraw my motion if you give me the liberty to make that proposition independent from the President's report.

President Doyle: Under the Rules of the Convention, any resolution may be accepted in this convention after the closing of the time with unanimous consent. I can not predict what the action of the convention will be, but I think this is the proper way out of a very delicate situation, and I am pleased that the delegate has agreed to withdraw his motion.

You have before you now the acceptance of the Officers' Report with the summary of the Officers' Report Committee, as amended by the committee.

The Chair now recognizes Delegate Moriarty:

Delegate Moriarty: Do I understand that the secondor of it has also granted approval?

Delegate Lorch: Yes.

President Doyle: The secondor has consented to the withdrawal of the amendment.

Delegate Moriarty: I believe right now is the time to close this motion, if you may call it so, that this convention give Delegate McLaren full unanimous authority to offer his resolution.

President Doyle: At this moment, we have before us the Officers' Report. I will serve notice immediately after the disposition. I will accept that motion.

The question has been called for, but Delegate Murray is again on the floor.

Delegate Murray: I understand Delegate McLaren's withdrawal of motion to present before the convention now has to have unanimous consent.

President Doyle: That's under the Rules of the Convention, which you accepted for my guidance as your Chairman.
Delegate Murray: If there is one dissenting voice against this motion as a resolution, it is withdrawn and tossed aside. Is that right?

President Doyle: As a proponent of the measure, I am surprised that the proponent would bring that matter up now. But as he stated, he is exactly correct. You now have before you the acceptance of the Officers' Report, as a summary, as amended. Are you ready for the question? As many as are in favor will signify in the usual manner by saying "aye." Opposed, "no." It is a vote. The report as amended by the committee is adopted in full.

The Chair now recognizes Delegate Moriarty.

Delegate Moriarty: I will now make a motion that this convention give unanimous consent to Delegate McLaren to offer now his resolution.

President Doyle: The motion is regularly made and seconded that the resolution be drawn by Delegate McLaren and accepted. Are you ready for the question?

The Chair now recognizes Delegate McLoughlin.

Delegate McLoughlin: I object, and by my objection it cannot go through as a unanimous vote. I object to the Chair.

President Doyle: That is quite correct. The Chair now recognizes Delegate Murphy.

Delegate Murphy (Central Labor Union, Lawrence): Did I understand the Chair to say that the entrance of a resolution must be on the same day as the file, which is to say it requires a unanimous vote? Is that correct?

President Doyle: That is correct. Delegate Murphy, perhaps we could clear this entire matter up by calling on Acting Secretary Wilkinson to read to you the Rules of the Convention as adopted by the convention.

(Acting Secretary Wilkinson then reads the report of the Committee on Rules.)

President Doyle: The Chair now recognizes Delegate McLaren.

Delegate McLaren: I would like to move the suspension of the rules.

President Doyle: It requires two-thirds to suspend. Are you ready for the question? As many as are in favor of the suspension of the rules will signify in the usual manner by saying "aye." Opposed, "no." It is a vote. The rules are suspended as proposed.

The Chair now recognizes Delegate McLaren.

Delegate McLaren: I move, Mr. Chairman, that we, the State Federation of Labor, stand in favor of voting through a measure in the Legislature Assembly of Massachusetts in favor of a Fair Employment Practices Commission Law, corresponding to the law passed in New York. I make that as a motion, Mr. Chairman.

President Doyle: You have before you a motion which reads substantially: "We stand in favor of a Fair Employment Practices Act patterned along the lines of the Fair Employment Practice Act in operation in New York."

The Chair recognizes Vice-President Hull.

Vice-President Hull: Isn't it customary to introduce resolutions in writing so that we can intelligently know what we are voting on? A motion has been introduced and, in a few words, I don't think the majority of the delegates understand what we are voting on. I therefore, Mr. Chair, move the move of this resolution bring this in the form of a resolution so that we can intelligently act upon it.

President Doyle: The convention suspended the rules; Delegate McLaren moved and it was seconded, and the Chair declares it properly before you. Are you ready for the question? The Chair recognizes Vice-President Hull.

Vice-President Hull: I amend the motion, Mr. Chairman, permitting Delegate McLaren to present this resolution in writing.

President Doyle: Well, that's one that the Chair has to weigh. What is the Chair to do? Do the Chair force Delegate McLaren to write something because of an amendment? We have before us, nevertheless, a motion which substantially says this: "We stand in favor of a Fair Employment Practices Act patterned along the lines of the Fair Employment Practice Act in operation in New York."

The Chair now recognizes Delegate Reilly.

Delegate Reilly (Carpenters No. 40, Boston): I raise an amendment—this matter be laid on the table. I move you by way of the amendment, that this matter be laid on the table until tomorrow morning's session, when it shall be presented in the form of a written resolution.

President Doyle: We have a motion, as I have outlined, an amendment that the question be put in writing, and an amendment to the amendment that the matter be laid on the table until tomorrow morning. The amendment not being debatable, we will act on the amendment. The question of information cannot be given by the Chair now. We are going to vote on the question of laying it on the table; which is permissible under the rules, and giving a definite time, which is tomorrow morning. Are you ready for the question? We will now vote on the question. What time tomorrow morning?

Delegate Reilly: At the opening of the session.

President Doyle: Those in favor of laying it on the table until the opening of the morning session will signify by voting in the usual manner by saying "aye." Opposed, "no." It is a vote. It lays on the table until the opening of the session tomorrow morning.

Delegate: We have with us this afternoon, the Dean of the Harvard Law School, who has been recently serving as an American Director of Economic Operations in Cairo, with the personal authorization of the Foreign Minister of the United States. We are always interested in our problems. I present to this convention Dean James Landis, of the Harvard Law School.

JAMES M. LANDIS
(Dean, Harvard Law School)

Mr. Chairman, members of this convention: It has always been a pleasure for me in these last 10 to 15 years to come on occasion before you, or before one of your Institutes, to try and discuss with you certain phases of labor problems as I see them, from perhaps my secluded post in the law school.

During these last four years, I have been away on leave of absence. That leave of absence has carried me into quite a few activities, both in this country and abroad. I suppose I am now more traveling than I ever did before. In one year, I crossed the Atlantic six times and by six different routes. My activities were not directly concerned, as they have been in the past, with the discussions of what might be called the "overall labor problem." But I thought that I might, nevertheless, entrench on that field because my heart has always been in it in the discussion of the problems.

As I see the situation today, and after listening to people suggesting what we should do, I am reminded of the opening remarks by Mr. Lincoln, long ago, in that famous series of Lincoln-Douglass debates. After Douglass, with a flood of oratory, had expressed his ideas
to as how the slavery issue could be settled, Mr. Lincoln addressed his audience, and said:

"Before we find out where we want to go, let us find out where we are.

It will be the best thing to ask at that viewpoint—"let's find out where we are"—and then in the light of that, determine where we would like to be—

that I would like to approach this subject briefly what has happened on the labor scene in the last 15 years. Those last 15 years can be divided into two periods—the four years that are the pre-war years, and the years from 1918 to the war, which were years of enormous growth and progress in the labor field.

Those 12 years before the war, I think, produced the most definite considerations. The first of them was the recognition by law of the right of collective bargaining. Those of you who are older remember the scene before 1918 and how those places were placed on collective bargaining in the great industries of this country—great by reason of, we'll say, their membership such as automobile unions.

Collective bargaining did not exist; in fact, anti-unionism was the characteristic management policy of those industries. The shift from that scene to the scene as it is today, when the right of bargaining is first established by law until today is pretty well recognized as a long step. It wasn't an easy step. The first, of course, was the great legislative battle over the right to bargain collectively, as exemplified in the Wagner Act.

With the passage of the Wagner Act, that same battle had to be fought inch by inch through the courts against all prejudice; prejudice of many of the judiciary, and both in your unions and management. The battle was fought and won. Today, when one looks at the administration of legislation of that character, the battles that remain are really subsidiary and minor engagements.

You still have the question as to the position of the independent unions. You still have the problem of those 12 years that arise as to the extent of representation and the jurisdictional difficulties that arise in that connection. But, on the whole, the Wagner Act has been a very wiser method of dealing with contentious issues in the field of labor.

One outstanding feature of those early 12 years is the disappearance of government by injunction. That was a long battle. It took years to win that one and people were afraid of the fact that if equity judges withdrew their equity powers, violence would characterize labor struggles. The reverse has proved to have been the case. If one looks at the way in which labor difficulties have been handled in the last 15 years as contrasted to the years from 1915 to 1930, widespread violence is not characteristic. And you can remember, I can remember, periods of strikes, periods of difficulties, where these were characterized by activities of that type and where all the power of equity judges were fruitless against that kind of thing.

I think we can be happy to realize that the seal of restraint which labor puts on itself has proved far more effective than the domineering attitude of equity courts.

Another great consideration of those years is the introduction of the idea of minimum standards of fair standards of labor. Through the federal power, helped by the state power, a new formula. That was started and it shall not go has been accepted by society.

Today, the issue is not "shall there be such a floor?" The issue is just, "where the floor shall be?"

A fourth great consideration is that of the idea of security, that certain guarantees of security should be forthcoming from society as a whole—guarantees which will look forward to the problem of old age and to the problem of unemployment. The idea is bearing fruit, now that full employment is a duty of society, and a duty which shall be realized—if it can't be realized purely by private action—by the aid of the policies which management and labor have created for the purpose of government.

Those, as I say, are the main considerations of the pre-war years. Now let us turn to the war period and to what we have there upon which we can build.

The outstanding characteristic of the war period, to me, is one which I would call the full participation of Labor. You will be aware that war was war of productivity. Without that participation to the fullest extent on the part of Labor in the war, the overwhelming productivity of this Nation would never have been realized.

The strike record of the war is a good record, despite what is said to the contrary. To fight a war without labor difficulties, a war involving the nation of 130 million people is too much to expect. But our war was fought with a minimum, as I see it, of those difficulties, especially when one contrasts it with the same problem as faced us in the World War.

Some examples of Labor's wholehearted support of the war aims are worth passing note. Labor's wholehearted development of, of course, the federal government through the systematized purchase of bonds is worthy of notice.

As Director of the National Office of Civilian Defense, I had occasion, on an occasion, to call upon Labor to assist in that program, and I always found a ready reception, and a willingness when it was necessary to make financial considerations.

The glory, however, can be articulated more concretely than that. One of the prime gains of the war period is the wide participation by Labor in the machinery of government. I cite for illustration such things as the Labor-Management Committee of the War Production Board. The consideration of that committee deserves writing up.

Efficient production, of course, production came not only as a result of the insight of Management, but it came also as a result of the insight of Labor which saw again and again how difficulties in productivity could be cured by the use of wiser methods on the part of Management.

Labor participation in the work of price administration is another example of what I would call the growth of the present administration.

A second great gain, as I see it, has been the action of the recognition by both Labor and Management of the necessity during those war years of having an overall wage policy. A wrong wage policy or an unwise wage policy and an unwise employment policy would have been dangerous to this country.

Both Labor and Management I think recognized it and through that recognition they hammered out a policy which governed fairly satisfactorily during those years. It manifested itself, of course, through the creation of an agency such as the War Labor Board. We called the "Little Steel" formula which governed us important in those days. The approach of a matter like the "Little Steel" formula may be important in the evolution of whatever the new formula shall be.

I think that the sudden abolition of the War Labor Board without providing any other transition agency was an error of prime magnitude. We shall see the part of that in the future. Whether it can be cured, I do not know, but today it leaves one rather hopeless in try-
ing to find some method of approaching the problem.

The great advances in life, as I see it, have largely been tied in with procedure and if one can get a procedure whereby issues can be focused and people can debate issues, knowing what they are about, the chance of settling more and more of these problems is similar.

These gains of the war period as distinguished from the gains of the pre-war period are not very tangible things. They are not like the Magna Charta, they are not like the Constitution; you have difficulty putting your finger on them, but the gains, nevertheless, are there and the vote of the same kind of men. I think that the world is going to have a long period of rehabilitation and to mobilize men; if we had to build ships and tanks, we could build ships and tanks.

Now your problem, of course, is that of developing an orderly and productive economy during the war, for the purposes of a peace-time character. But the inescapable fact as we approach that problem is that we can’t do it by ourselves. We can’t sit here and neglect the rest of the world. And that is so, as I see it, for two reasons. One of them — a plain reason of economics; to wit, that one country can’t buy and dispose of products and maintain any sound production levels in this country; and the second is that we have to buy in an orderly and not too costly fashion a great variety of materials. Consequently, the economy of the world concerns us and its functioning is necessary to the well functioning of our own.

Men fight because they starve, and if men starve, they will fight. So if the economic conditions of the world as such are reasonably stable, then the chances for peace are bright. But a starving Europe holds no chance for peace in the world as a whole.

Somewhere, those problems have to be met and that is why I say that the attitude of Labor in the United States looks to me as if it is looking ahead in this country and peace generally, can be neither economically nor politically isolationist. It must have a world point of view.

To the problem that concerns us, of course, how can we continue to produce the wealth we need? Wealth, to me is not money. It is goods and services, and the more goods and services you have, the more wealth you have. The money you have in the bank means nothing unless it can be translated as of the time that you wish it into goods and services. Naturally, all of us wish wealth and, therefore, the productivity of our industrial and agricultural systems becomes the chief goal, and the productivity of the enterprise as a whole seems to me to be the central point of any policy that is concerned with the future. You must increase the equitable distribution of reward from enterprise. Without an equitable distribution of reward, the maintenance of any high degree of productivity is impossible.

A policy of higher wages, a policy of shorter hours, if won, increases our general productivity. It makes no sense if it makes us poorer than the advantage it has all over the world if it makes us wealthier than we were.

I think that frequently we tend to see that policy of higher wages and better working conditions means more money to us and them too closely to us; we are too short-sighted about it.

I think Management has too often demonstrated a shortsightedness with regard to the great issue of productivity, failing to recognize that higher wages may be essential for the distribution of its products, and if it fails to distribute its products, unemployment results and bankruptcy has occurred.

The same thing is true with reference to an issue such as the conditions of Labor. The history of the last year proves amply that improvement of the health and the morale of Labor increased its capacity to produce wealth. Similarly from the standpoint of Labor, productivity of the enterprise as a whole has not always been its greatest concern.

A wiser policy looks toward a fair distribution of rewards in the community. An unfair distribution of rewards cuts down on the potentiality of capital to earn the return, with the result that capital does not flow into new industries, or else fails to earn a return.

Those are the rocks between which any wise labor policy must steer, always searching for ways and means whereby to increase wealth. This period of war and reconstruction is a period of general refashioning of labor standards. That must be so. The policies under which we have lived during the past four years were war policies. We have defeated production, and we have this broad general problem of trying to see what kind of a peace-time economy we shall build for ourselves.

It is not necessary, nor is it wise, that as I look at it from the standpoint of government, it should have been apparent that with the end of the war these problems would face us, and also that we would have to continue to face them. I think the problem of the termination of war contracts for the demobilization of an army and a navy, for a shift in tax policies and even for dealing with price problems of unemployment, it seems to have been utterly barren of a plan for fashioning a wage policy for peace.

Today, that issue is upon us. I hope, as you hope, that during the coming weeks some advancement will be made along those lines. But in the absence of any planning for what was a certainty, are we surprised at the existence of labor unrest in this country? Are we surprised or shocked when we see that labor unrest has precipitated a series of strikes?

What are the factors that presently bear so strongly on the labor unrest? Let me mention just a few. The first one is the impact of taxation. I don’t think any labor policy today whether projected by Management or by Labor will have much effect until it sees the effect of a shift in tax policy on industrial enterprise.

As long as the excess profits tax was in existence, broadly speaking, an increase in wages was met by the government and not by the stockholder.

The excess profits tax is likely to go out, as I think it should go out. But as it goes out, income in costs of operation no longer becomes chargeable 80 to 85 percent against the government. It becomes chargeable to ownership. That means that you look at two new factors because the tax. The first is, the problem of the distribution of the rewards between ownership and labor has now assumed a new importance. The second is—and I warn you of this—whereas, before government was bearing the chief costs of labor increases, management did not fight too strongly against it. You may develop a newer and tougher resistance if the losses are going to be entirely on the management side. The impact of an increased burden of operation costs will fall more directly upon ownership.

I say no wise labor policy can neglect those changing factors. I hope to talk about that. The second broad factor which concerns the evolution of labor policy is the problem of rising costs. You have dealt with that problem partly in your resolutions today.
tions today call for the retention of price controls until certain things are more balanced. For my part, I would heartily support that, save that I would mention price controls until scarcities which make for high prices disappear because of a return of productivity on the part of enterprise itself. When the demand, of course, is the large issue of rents, I suppose no item affects the ordinary man's budget in a greater way than rent. With reference to rents, the nature of enterprise happens to be such that we can not look forward in the immediate future to that volume of housing which will promote and make possible fair rents. The housing problem is a problem in a position before an easing in that problem will occur as the result of an increase of housing facilities, to destroy or take away controls would seem to me to be disastrous from the standpoint of the man of meager income.

A third great factor which to my mind affects the formulation of a labor policy are the estimates of material costs. These may not be too difficult to estimate those factors, but price policy and labor and wage policies are always looking towards the future, and as far as I can see, these estimates are the estimates of management and to enjoin in those estimates and see how good they are and how well they can be relied upon.

I look to a development along that line that I happened to have played with a great deal in the last two years and of which I happen to have a considerable concern with at the present time and that is that the domestic market can not be our simple answer. In the years to come, our answer will include not only a domestic market but a foreign market.

Both from the buying and selling end, costs of raw materials will mean something to us in manufacture here and, therefore, inflationary phenomena will affect our own situation. In many instances, and I know of many cases where we, who have kept inflation thus far within bounds, are being forced to buy raw materials where the price has been inflated 400, 500 and 600 per cent over pre-war levels.

On the export side, we have enormous problems to face, problems that must be met not only because of the need of our industries at home to dispose of a certain surplus but of the need of the world for American goods, because America happens to be about the only country in the world to produce certain goods that the world needs.

A great problem of our export trade is not a problem of merchandising. It is a problem of financing and is something in return for what we sell. I speak of that because I think that Labor as a whole will have to face those issues in that field in the next few years.

To me, the problem of financing our foreign trade is inextricably tied up with our tariff policy. How can we continually sell and never buy? It can't be done文化创意的。
have discovered is the purchase of merchandise bearing the union label and the patronage of union service establishments displaying the shopkeepers. The Union Label Trades Department has developed a program of education and publicity. We are depending on your State Federation of Labor giving us the same support they gave us during our reconversion period that you did before and during the war. Without the cooperation of the State Federation of Labor, local union label leagues, central labor unions and women's auxiliaries, we should not be able to succeed in reaching the consuming public. Best wishes for a successful convention. Regards.

I. M. ORNBURN, Secretary-Treasurer
Union Label Trades Department
American Federation of Labor
Delegate Sullivan, Fire Fighters No. 718,
Boston, desires to make an announcement.

Delegate Sullivan: We have just organized a State Association of Fire Fighters affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and I would like to ask the delegates to take back a message to their cities and towns that the fire fighters in their communities are eligible for membership in the State F.F. Union. Many of the delegates do not know that fire fighters are eligible for membership in organized labor. In the State of Massachusetts, there are about 1500 members to add to the strength of our Fire Fighters' Unions in the local and central labor unions and to the State Federation of Labor and the American Federation of Labor.

President Doyle: I hope the delegates will take note and assist the fire fighters in any way possible to add to their already fast growing organization.

(Drawings were made for soap products contributed by Lever Brothers, and cakes and pies contributed by the Gradeley Baking Company, Cambridge.)

President Doyle: No words of mine would do justice to the next speaker. Therefore, I present to the convention, the Commissioner of Labor and Industries, a delegate from the Sheet Metal Workers Union, Local No. 17, Boston, Mr. James T. Moriarty.

JAMES T. MORIARTY
(Commissioner, Department of Labor and Industries)

Mr. President and fellow delegates: I know you have had a tiresome day, and I don't know anything that I could add to keep you in this warm room for any length of time. So I'm very much of the opinion of P. Kennedy this morning. I had the pleasure of serving with him as a co-committee on the recess committee. I have been at many gatherings with people of opposite views to you. He talked no differently at those gatherings than he talked to you this morning. I wonder sometimes if I am still with you when I hear people who have had the education such as Mr. Kennedy has had to see them coming and clamoring to talk to you and I think, as a banker and as an investment manager, I can't think of any better language in every word he uttered than anybody I ever heard before at one of your conventions. Then I heard the Dean of Harvard Law School. Now I want to tell you that I would have professors from Harvard come to us and tell us the plain language which the Dean used. I wonder if we are coming into our own without much real effort by ourselves as individuals.

We have to build our fences by trying to get legislation, and when we do get the legislation and think we have won a battle, we haven't, for the labor legislation year after year, but the Legislature, the Senate, the Governors, never think of giving us five cents to enforce those laws. Of all the legislation that has gone out this year, we have not received an increase for the enforcement of those laws, but you fellows were satisfied because you got the law.

If we don't enforce it, you don't criticize the Legislature, you don't criticize the Governor—you criticize the Department of Labor.

I have been coming here for nine years and I have worked and fought with you—I have gone to the central labor unions, the local unions—I have asked for money to carry out the intent and purpose of the law and I haven't been successful. That is no concern. I think you people ought to get concerned.

I suppose many of you would criticize some of the actions of the Department, and say that we have done some things for some organizations, but, of course, we don't expect any credit for that. That is our duty.

We are making mistakes. I can see some faces here who have been in the Department on some occasions who haven't received all of the things they would have liked to receive, and I can say that I have seen them receive. But, sometimes, I wonder whether I agree with the sanctity of an agreement. Up until a few days ago, I had always taken the things they fought for a few days ago, I always preached the living up to of agreements, but if the employer has found out new tricks to keep us from getting the things we were rightfully entitled to, then I am wondering whether I believe in the sanctity of agreements.

Of course, I hear criticism every time a craft goes out on strike. Even some of the business agents in some crafts have criticized because they are out on strike, but when they go out on strike, they don't want anybody to criticize them—they are doing it because they think that it is the right thing to do.

Of course, I wouldn't want to be placed in the position that I don't believe in agreements, because I do—but there is something that has happened in the last month or so that I was not a party to it. I happened to be away from town, so, I can't be criticized for the things that happened. The Eastern Massachusetts Street Railway went on strike a few days ago. They had been in negotiations with the Trustees—two appointed by the State and one appointed by the financial interests. They offered them something—the men refused it by a secret vote. They went back into conference again, and when they did, they gave an award of $255.84 to each employee of the Eastern Massachusetts Street Railway Company. Now the money which they gave to those employees could be used only for one purpose— they couldn't buy new buses—there was only one other place where they could have used it and that was to Uncle Sam, in taxes.

After the men went out on strike, they did sit down and they made an agreement which they could have made two months prior to the strike. They knew there were only two places where it could be spent—why the hell didn't they give it to their men right away?

Maybe it was one of those times when you talk this—maybe I shouldn't have said it—of course, I know that during that time a lot of people couldn't get buses, and I suppose if I were in town they might go on the Eastern Massachusetts Street Railway I might have criticized because I couldn't ride.

I wonder where we are going? If I could see through the glasses of Dean Landis, I
think we are going for a nice long ride. Still, I agree with Mr. Kennedy. I agree with him that many of the plants in Massachusetts are being industrialized, and the same goes for our labor laws. Most of the people who made the earlier labor laws have gone to their graves and we haven't done much about building the structure so that it will stand.

It is being reported that we increased the pay on compensation—which I think is a fine thing—and I have a little girl 14 years of age who lost her hand. But that mercantile establishment—a chain store to be exact—and all of the laws which we have to protect such a person have not been put into effect. Why shouldn't we, while we are in assembly here, have a law which provides that anyone hurt under those circumstances, and, at that age, the state will at least give them an education and pay for that education to help them along.

It is easy passing laws. I saw the Workmen's Compensation Act go into being some years ago and what have we gotten out of it? To begin with, you had one member of organized labor on it and that's the only one you had, and you have nobody else. Anybody who has been in that department to whom a representative of Labor can go to and talk to him in your language, and what are you going to do about it?

I did make arrangements with the manager of that store that he pay double compensation to that kid. There is nothing in my laws that gives me that right and maybe I shouldn't take it because they might stop me from making any more.

I had a boy killed in Chicopee. He was 17 years of age. He was to be 18 the day after he was killed. He was killed at 4:30 in the afternoon, I also got double compensation for that mother. There isn't anything that the state could pay to him for his education, so you couldn't compare that with the little girl who lost her left hand.

The state and the citizens of the state owe something besides compensation to people who are injured under those circumstances, in order to make it easier in life for them. I believe you are the only organization who is capable of it.

We hear about taking care of the boys coming home, for whom I have the greatest amount of sympathy, but what are you doing about the workmen's compensation? Anybody in industry or those who have been killed? We have more people injured and maimed in industry than were killed or maimed during the war.

The Department of Labor has had practically the same amount of Inspectors, with the exception of six, during the last 10 years. Increase it to prevent that type of injury in industry.

So if we are going forward, we ought to help those who are unable to help themselves.

I am going to conclude by telling a story. A friend of mine, who is an editor of a Boston paper came to me and wanted me to give him a story on what was going to happen in regards to all of the strikes which were going on. He said to me, 'I have a very fine one for you. There have been negotiations going on between a firm and their employees. This firm employs about 5,000 or 6,000 workers. One of the major labor organizations filed unfair labor practices before the Massachusetts Commission. The firm settled up by giving everybody an increase of one-quarter of a cent. They went to the Legislature one particular week. But on account of the Labor Relations Commission not handing down a decision, notwithstanding that they had it from March up until a month ago, I said that if that Board doesn't hand down a decision by 5 o'clock today, there will be pickets around the department by 6 o'clock. I said, 'Why did you tell me that? You know we won't publish the story.'

The company had decided that out of the 2,400 employees there were 600 they were not going to pay, and if they didn't pay those 600, the people were going out on strike. I said to him, 'don't I remember that your paper last Tuesday night had 20,000 and today they had 250,000 were going to be disconnected on the South Shore?' He said, 'That's right.' I said, 'Did it happen?' He said, 'No.' So I said, 'What did you say about it?' He said, 'That wasn't news, so we didn't say anything about it.' I said, 'Couldn't you have told the public why it didn't take place?'

Of course, you are going to do things that you are not going to like now. I don't think any of you are paying enough for what you are getting. I am talking to the membership. If ever there was a time when you needed money to carry on your work, this is the time. And there is only one way in which the labor movement can get money and that is from the labor dues you have to raise your dues in many instances.

I remember when the State Federation of Labor used to get along with one and one-half cent per capita. I remember when we criticized at times the American Federation of Labor because they didn't do this or they didn't do that, and you were liberal enough and I was liberal enough to pay to the American Federation of Labor 18 cents a year. But you were liberal. You didn't demand many reports on how they spent the money. Eighteen cents a year.

Of course, they did raise it a short while ago, which caused a lot of flurries within the movement. They raised it a half cent, and now you are a bit more liberal in this enlightened age and you are giving them 24 cents a year.

When you get money in here, you have to get it under subterfuge. You have to put on some special assessment in order to get money for the State Federation of Labor. I am going to tell you that you will need a lot of money.

Let's talk about Barnes. I know there used to be a time we used to have barns when there weren't any around the country. I don't know where it happened to be in a place, and this man and I met an assistant attorney general and he told us that a great deal of letters which were coming in of the illegal Barnes' Union, the inner members of members of labor, the criticism of our own movement was coming from members of our own organizations. And he said that Mr. Barnes is going to win those bills which he is going to have to have on the ballot. And I wonder what you are going to do about it?

He made an address in the City of Worcester last week to the Women's Republican Club and he talked about labor laws. Maybe many of you read it. He said he remembered the time when the Legislature was in the control of the employees and the net result was that they now it is in control of Labor and all they need to do is to write out checks and give it to the politicians.

When I was in Arizona, I wondered where the hell I had been all my life. But I go further. Mr. Barnes served in the Legislature when it was in control of the employer, he said, but every one of the bills that Mr. Barnes says are now in control, and I wonder what he did to turn it over to us? I wonder if he presented any bills to compel the corporations to file the same type of law he wants you to file?

I want to say to you, not as Labor Commissioner of Massachusetts, but as a trade union-
ist, as a member of a labor organization, as President of a local union in Boston, and as an International Vice-President of my own international organization, you will have to do something besides criticize. You will have to put your shoulder to the wheel and you will have to get behind the officers of this organization. You will have to find out what they are doing, and when they need help, you will have to give it to them, and don’t ask any questions. If you don’t do these things, they will have me stumping around, talking the same way as Mr. Kennedy did. You will be controlled from the grave, too.

I could stand here a great part of the day and I could tell you things that have gone on over a period of years. Of course, I know the young fellows say—those old fellows ought to take a back seat and let the young fellows do it. I think we gave you a foundation. If you can’t build from that foundation, it won’t be the fault of those who have passed on, it will be your fault. You have every opportunity—even Clarence Barnes, who is your enemy, claims you have control, and if you have control why not use it?

I agree with the Dean that maybe we are going into a political arena. Maybe we are going to be a part of some political group. I hope that I won’t be here when that time comes. I hope I will have gone to my resting place when that takes place. Of course, he’s learning; I’m not. I have had some experiences which he hasn’t had. But from that experience, if some of you fellows have ever been in a jurisdictional fight between two labor organizations, then any fight which takes place between employer and employee is only a skirmish, more so if you get a couple of Irishmen—one on each side. Neither will give but both of them will take.

I don’t think there ought to be such a thing as a jurisdictional strike within our movement. And I may change my mind in regards to it political party, because I have been in the middle of both of them, and I was always willing to take and never willing to give until they battered my brains out. Then the other fellow took and I didn’t even have the privilege of giving and that is generally the way jurisdictional disputes wind up.

I plead with your movement. I plead with the building tradesmen especially that strikes can be settled before just as well as they can be settled afterwards, and I would criticize them the same as I criticized the Trustees of the Eastern Massachusetts for not giving what they had an opportunity of giving, before they disconnected a half a million people and put them to an inconvenience for a period of days.

As I look and see these faces, they bring back memories of things that have happened in my time. Only the other day I saw a man and I said to him, “Why don’t you let me send a man to your international and you send one of your men in here?” “Oh, no,” he said. “I don’t want an international man.” I said, “You may lose.” “Well, I don’t care whether we lose or not,” he said. I said, “That’s funny.” “Well,” he said, “that’s it. Either take what I have offered or there will be no settlement.” There was a man from the same international with him, and this man said to me, “Of course, I don’t agree with him.”

And there is your situation. I think every difficulty can be settled if we will be reasonable.

Some fellow reminded me of what I said some years ago, and I make the same statement notwithstanding that I am a boss now. I said that I never met a good boss. I have always met some employers who are a little better than others, but I have never met a good one. And I assume that is what some of my employees say about me.

I have kept you longer than I intended. Bill Doyle told me that if I talked until five o’clock he would adjourn the meeting. I’ve gone beyond that.

I’m glad to have been with you. It is always a pleasure to come here; it is always a pleasure to serve you.

President Doyle: Thank you, Jim Moriarty. One thing we are grateful for is that you have always maintained your complete independence.

Delegates, before you leave, I would like to call to your attention that on the rostrum, during the entire afternoon session, Lt. Commander, and your Secretary, Kenneth I. Taylor has been with us. He will speak to you at the banquet tonight.

That is all on our calendar for this afternoon. I now declare the convention adjourned until 10 o’clock tomorrow morning.

Whereupon, at 5:15 o’clock p.m., the convention was declared adjourned until 10:00 a.m. Sunday.
The convention was called to order at 10:30 o'clock Sunday morning, by President Doyle.

President Doyle: Will the convention please come to order? The invocation this morning will be delivered by Rabbi Herman H. Rubenovitz of Temple Mishkan Tefila, Roxbury.

INVOCATION
Rabbi Herman H. Rubenovitz

Almighty God, and Father, Ruler, Creator of the universe, we approach Thee this morning in all humility to offer up our gratitude for the blessings of victory and the reestablishment of peace which Thou hast vouchsafed unto us.

In Thy inspired word recorded in Holy Scripture, thou hast taught us that man is created to labor, that he attains his true stature as child of God, as useful member of society, through honest work.

Do Thee grant, O Almighty God, that this organization, the State Branch of the American Federation of Labor, become a powerful instrumentality for establishing here in this blessed land of ours, man's right to work, man's right to a living wage, which the performer of honest work justly earns, and to a leisure consecrated through prayer, refined through the enjoyment of the arts, sweetened through wholesome recreation and friendly intercourse with fellow man.

May these principles which are indeed the guiding principles of this great organization of American labor be firmly established in this blessed land of ours, the United States of America, and may they be extended and spread all through the world wherever Thy children, human beings, have been exploited and oppressed, so that they, too, may come to share in these blessings, these rights, these privileges which we are striving for here.

Amen.

President Doyle: When we adjourned yesterday, the first order of business this morning was to be the resolution that was tabled. At the present moment, the writer of the resolution, the Chairman of the Resolutions Committee, and our Acting Secretary are working on a draft of it, that it is expected, when it is presented to the convention, will be immediately adopted. That being the case, we will await the presentation of the resolution.

We have with us this morning, Professor Taft, the Associate Professor of Economics at Brown University.

The subject he will speak on is, "The Outlook for Labor." Professor Taft spoke to our first Labor Institute in 1944, when he then took for his subject, "The Outlook for Labor."

I present to this convention, Professor Taft.

PHILIP TAFT
(Associate Professor of Economics, Brown University)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: It seems to me that it is very desirable, in periods of prosperity, to take stock of the past, and it is a very good thing for the labor movement to do that.

As I look over this audience, I see many older men who undoubtedly remember the time when Labor had much greater difficulty in organizing and in maintaining its unions. It isn't many years since the injunction in labor disputes has been abolished. It isn't many years since Labor has won the right to organize, and has been protected in that right by government, and for that reason, it seems to me, at least, that Labor must always take cognizance of the changing mood of public opinion.

Whatever one may say, public opinion, of course, while it is rather amorphous and indefinite, yet plays an important role, and the labor movement is too important, is too vital in our society, to be either injured or imperiled by a shift in public opinion.

It seems to me that organized labor has never set forth its real contribution to our society. You can pick up any newspaper and you can find all sorts of reports of what Labor is doing, how grievous crimes Labor is committing. You won't find many reports of the constructive contributions that Labor is making.

Now, it seems to me that Labor is one of the cornerstones of our democracy. The proof of that is that in every country where democracy no longer exists or has not been attained, you do not find, or there, an independent labor movement is absent.

Now, the reason Labor has a bad press is not alone due to the fact that the newspapers are controlled by corporate wealth. That may be a contributory factor, but that isn't all. Labor has never taken the time to inform the public of its many contributions to the welfare of the community: what it does to stabilize industry, what it does to eliminate oppressive conditions in industry, what it has done to improve the lot of women in industry, to abolish child labor and to raise the general standards of education.

As a matter of fact, the school that all of us boast of, everyone boasts about free public schools, was at first suggested by the organized labor movement, and it seems to me that that is one of the fields that the state federations and the city centers could become more active in, to tell the story of organized labor to the general community, and I think there is danger in not doing it, because labor people tend to mix with labor people. As a matter of fact, a good union man's friends are usually good union men, and you do not meet those groups in the community that are either hostile or indifferent to organized labor.

If they are indifferent, it means, of course, that they are susceptible to the propaganda of the other side, and the radio programs that the labor organizations have are very small and rather puny. They are all right, but they don't play a very important role in this entire picture, and that is one of the jobs that the state federations and the city centers have, to inform the community of the constructive efforts—what labor is doing, and to inform the community of why certain demands are made, to inform the community just what is the view, what is the outlook or the attitude of the organized labor movement on all of the issues of the day. And the community should be told of the contributions, such as the Community Fund, and other activities that the organized labor movement participates in. Those should be told about more loudly, more vociferously than is being told today.

Now, here is one place that the labor movement seems to me has failed, in not telling
what it actually has done to improve the standards of America. It has not done that job, and there isn’t any doubt about it in my mind, and all you need to do is to ape the people who are not union men, and you find that out.

There is another place where the organized labor movement might very well improve, and that seems to be in the direction of getting better information on economic and social events to its leaders. The American labor movement has done very well, but not well enough, and in that direction, there is need for better information, especially if we get—and I hope we do not—but if we even get a repetition of the situation that existed in 1917, the labor movement must be prepared with facts. They must be prepared with arguments, and some organizations did extreme, and it is going to make any invidious comparisons, but if I may say, because I know the work of this organization better than any in New England, I think on the whole, the teams to cases before the regional area of the War Labor Board were well presented.

The reason I am singling out the teamsters is because I was on the teamster panel of the Regional Board, and met a good deal of their men, and I may say that on the whole, they always came armed with facts and arguments. They made a good case for their people, and that is something that the rest of the labor movement must learn to do, because with 13 or 14 million people organized, and with organization in the strategic industries, public utilities and otherwise, the labor movement itself or may be reluctant to use the strike weapon as readily as if you have a clothing factory or some small retail outlet.

There is a problem there for the labor movement because when you pull a strike, that inconveniences thousands of people, even though your cause is just. You are likely to get some public reactions, and the leaders of labor know that and they are very reluctant to strike in those instances, and for that reason, you may be thrown either before a governmental or a private arbitration, and it is necessary to be equipped with facts and figures.

Now those are two directions, it seems to me, the labor movement can very well improve, and expand the services that it gives to the local.

Now what is the general outlook for the future of organized labor?

Of course, there is one difference, and a very important difference between the end of this war and the end of the last war, and from the point of view of the labor movement, it is very important. Those of you who recall the events after the last war, we had what was called an American plan, and the purpose of the American plan was to allow American workers whom we found. It was an open shop movement strongly financed and supported by large industry, very aggressive leadership, and we know we had many industrial managers an uncomfortable FRN of the efforts of many industrialists to rout out the labor organizations that had been formed in their plants during World War I or a little before World War I.

This time, the situation is changed. There is as yet no organized opposition, no organized attempt to attack labor organizations as such. Cervenident, and as an interlude, it is something, it is very quiet and doesn’t have the great publicity support, and if there are leaders of that, they are certainly keeping very much more of a low profile, and the labor organizations, and most of the post-war strikes in World War I were the result of industry’s efforts to rout out the organizations of labor.

We have changed in that regard. The organized labor movement, at least, it seems to me, from any employer at- tack, either because of changing public sentiment or because of the large growth of labor organization which makes neither feasible nor advisable, even from the point of view of the most hostile employer.

The organized labor movement has established itself as an integral and important part of the American economy.

Now, the important objective of the organized labor movement must be to maintain itself, and may I say, upon the wisdom of our action or of the action of the labor movement in the immediate future, will, to some extent, depend how well that is going to be done. I have no doubt that the organized labor movement is going to remain strong and powerful in the United States. It will. There is no substitute for it.

Moreover, if certain segments of industry ever eliminated the unions, they would find that they would not solve their problems, but that their problems might increase for quite some time.

So far as the general picture is concerned, the outlook for American labor, though we must expect some decrease in membership; that is almost inevitable; you can’t avoid that. There will be some increases, but it will be by no means drastic, it doesn’t seem to me to be at all drastic, nor is there any immediate prospect of an attack upon labor, and that is something, I think, that should be borne in mind, and that labor must keep public sentiment in line so that there are not any fundamental attacks or modifications of the protection that labor has, especially protection against the injection of the courts into labor disputes. That would be very dangerous, and that imposes upon every official of the labor movement, the obligation to remain calm, and I think especially in the issuance of public statements, that we must not antagonize the community, because there are attempts being made to cut us off some of the rights, to modify some of the protections that are now given to organized labor.

I think by following a moderate policy, such as the American Federation of Labor has followed throughout its history, by being careful in public relations and by improving public relations, it seems to me that Labor has the great opportunity of maintaining its position, and in the years to come, of re will, to some extent, depend how well that is going to be done. I have no doubt that the organized labor movement is going to remain strong and powerful in the United States. It will. There is no substitute for it.

That is all, I think, that I have to say this morning.

I want to thank Mr. Wilkinson and the Executive Board for inviting me to speak to you, because I find that it is a great pleasure and a privilege for me to come and to speak to you gentlemen who have, many of whom have made and are making a most significant contribution not only to the life of your state, but to the life of the nation.

Thank you.

President Doyle: Thank you, Professor Taft. It is our pleasure, I assure you, to have you with us this morning.

I believe Delegate McLaren is now prepared to put before the convention his resolution that was tabled yesterday. Delegate McLaren.

Delegate McLaren (Stone Mason Bost): Gentlemen and fellow members of the Federation of Labor: I de-
RESOLUTION No. 12
FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES LAW
Whereas, This great democracy called America, was founded in freedom, and
Whereas, At the New Orleans convention of the American Federation of Labor, the resolu-
tion of 

the evil of drunkenness, unless it is accom-
panied by an educational program that will cure 
the underlying facts, that this underlying ill that causes all racial and religious discrimina-
tion.
And in all probability, if a bill was intro-
duced here, a bill drafted by somebody outside the 
Federation of Labor—and you can natu-
rlly understand—and that such a bill is long 
and involved—in the interests of the protec-
tion of the Federation of Labor, I would take 
the floor and I would urge the defeat of any 
resolution calling for the adoption of a specific 
and effective to cure the ill that 
we are speaking about. So therefore, if this 
resolution is adopted, it will become the 
responsible of the State Branch of the Ameri-
can Federation of Labor, the Massachusetts 
Federation of Labor, through its execu-
tive officers, to prepare a measure that will 
meet the requirements of your resolve and to 
heed that. The President: I have no doubt 
of that. I have. So that if we are going to at-
tack the problem correctly, if we are going to 
approach it intelligently, then the proposi-
tion proposed in this resolution should be 
adopted.

President Doyle: The Chair now recognizes 
Delegate Reilly.

Delegate Reilly: (Carpenters No. 40, Boston): 
To keep the record straight, Mr. Chairman, on 
a point of parliamentary procedure, this entire 
resolution was on the table to be acted on 
this morning with various amendments in-
cluded in the original resolution. Therefore, 
Mr. Chairman, I move at this time that we 
take the matter off the table and substitute 
the previous matter with this resolution and 
proceed on debate.

President Doyle: Naturally, I have not in 
front of me the record of yesterday’s meeting, 
but as near as I can remember, the matter 
was laid on the table to be acted on 
this morning with various amendments in-
cluded in the original resolution. Therefore, 
Mr. Chairman, I move at this time that we 
take the matter off the table and substitute 
the previous matter with this resolution and 
proceed on debate.

President Doyle: I am afraid again, Dele-
gate Reilly, that we agreed that we would take 
off the table this morning and I don’t think 
you can take any action of the convention is necessary be-
cause the convention already decided that it 
should be taken off the table at the 
time that it must be taken off the table.

Delegate Reilly: My point, Mr. Chairman— 
President Doyle: Is the Chair wrong? (The 
delegates answered “no”)

Delegate Reilly: We could substitute this 
resolution for another matter.

President Doyle: The Chair not being 
wrong, as near as I can remember the resolution 
as presented by Delegate McLaren. Are you ready for the question?

Delegate Stefani is on the floor. The Chair 
recognizes Delegate Stefani.

Delegate Stefani (Cooks and Pastry Cooks 
No. 186, Boston): Mr. Chairman and dele-
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gates: I am not against that resolution being presented here about discrimination, but before we do this and that on that resolution, it is very necessary that the Executive Board take into consideration several aspects as to the result of legislative non-discrimination among the American populace. You cannot legislate discrimination against the populace, Mr. Chairman, until we have educated the American people that intolerance is un-American.

Delegate Bowles (Carpenters No. 1416, New Bedford): Mr. Chairman, a point of order. At yesterday's session, if I recall correctly, this matter was laid over for a stated time, and the time has arrived, and we are now assembled and the matter warrants no debate.

President Doyle: Are you ready for the question? It has been regularly moved and seconded that the resolution as read by Delegate McLarn be adopted. Is there anything to be said on the question? If not, as many as are in favor of adoption of the resolution will signify in the usual manner by saying "aye". Those opposed "no". The "ayes" have it. It is a vote and so ordered. The resolution read by Delegate McLarn be adopted.

Delegates, I would like to announce that it is the intention of the Chair to present to the convention President Green at quarter of two.

The next speaker is one I think will prove of interest to all of us. He is Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, the fellow that makes the money out of our envelopes every week. I present to the convention, Roy Blough, Assistant to Secretary of the Treasury of the United States. Mr. Blough.

ROY BLOUGH
(Assistant to Secretary of the Treasury)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: I am very happy to be here today to participate in the convention of the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor. My subject is "The Budget Situation". This fact that you have set aside time on a crowded program for a discussion of this subject indicates your recognition of the importance of taxation to American labor. In the years of hardship, the labor statesmen have shown such active interest in the subject of Federal taxation. This does not mean that the working man has only received all his tax money back in his taxes. He has received back the money that was put aside to pay taxes. Some he was aware of, but many were hidden. He has paid local property taxes, either through taxes paid as a home owner or through higher rents paid as a tenant. He has paid state sales and excise taxes, motor vehicle taxes, and franchise taxes, chiefly through higher prices for the goods and services he bought. He has paid payroll taxes for social security. He has also paid Federal taxes through excise taxes and tariffs, and to an undetermined extent through the shifting of corporation income and profits taxes.

However, it is only recently that many in the ranks of Labor have paid the Federal individual income tax. As recently as 1939, a married couple had an exemption of $2500 plus personal exemption of $2500; which means that about $30 million taxable income tax returns were filed in 1939 income. The war has drastically changed this picture. Exemptions for the sur-
tax have been reduced to $1250 for husband and wife, $500 for the taxpayer, $500 for his wife, and $500 for each dependent. For the normal tax, the exemption fell to a straight $500 for each income group except in his man's case, the status or the number of his dependents. These decreases in exemptions, when combined with the rapid rise in income over the past few years, have increased the number of returns filed more than ten-fold. Nearly 42 million taxable returns have been filed this year on returns filed in 1944 income tax returns. As taxable incomes have fallen, tax rates have greatly increased. The upshot has been that the Federal income tax for the wage earner has grown from a $1000 per year or so to a little more than $500 a year.

But I think the growing interest of Labor in Federal taxation is not due solely to the fact that a very great many more working people pay a great deal more this year than they did a few years ago. I think it is due also to a realistic appreciation of the role that taxes play in the economic system. Taxes running into the trillions and billions and billions profoundly not only the distribution of the national income but also the volume of income, production, and employment. And increases in taxes. Today it is considered determined that those influences shall be in the right direction.

Federal revenues increased from $5.4 billion in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945 to $46.5 billion in the fiscal year 1945. That is a tremendous increase. It was due in part to much heavier tax rates and new taxes and in part from a rapidly rising national income. During the same period the expenditures of the Federal Government increased from $9.1 billion for 1940 to $100 billion for 1945. War activities in 1945 exceeded $52 billion out of the total $100 billion expenditure. The deficit for the fiscal year 1945 was $53.6 billion.

Of course these wartime expenditures are declining. The latest budget estimates for the fiscal year June 30, 1946 indicates expenditures for war activities at $50.5 billion out of total Federal expenditures of $66.4 billion. Tax revenues for the fiscal year 1946 are expected to total $36 billion with a deficit of $30.4 billion. The last time the Federal deficit was running at the rate of $30 billion a year the Congress was considering larger increases in taxes. Today it is considering some tax reductions. Of course, last time the deficit was rapidly expanding while today it is rapidly shrinking. The rate of Federal expenditure increases is at a cost of more than $5 billion a year for interest alone. Moreover, the peace must be won. Enemy countries must be occupied to make them powerless and to start them toward a democratic, peaceful future. A sufficiently large military establishment must be maintained in the interests of defense. There will also be non-war programs to aid agriculture, the depressed and the aged. Public works expenditures have been at a standstill. All these, together with the ordinary civilian expenditures of Government, will require money. I will attempt to estimate the probable normal postwar budget. That will depend largely on Congressional policy. Most of the well-considered estimates which have been made have in the main assumed a total of about $20 billion a year. Some of them have been much higher than that.

I think it is clear that postwar tax reduction, even when it has run its full course, will leave the total Federal tax burden several times as high as it was before the war.

The financing of the war has been on a mass basis, with about $50 million people paid Federal income taxes, to say nothing of excises and other taxes. More than $6 million bought War Savings Bonds. It is an in-
escapable fact that the heavy responsibilities placed on the Federal Government will require a continuance of mass taxation in peacetime. Without amendments in such a tax base, they can be met, if desired, from a fairly narrow base affecting only a minority of the population. But the leeway to do this disappears when the same money demands are made on the economy we now face. Statistics demonstrate what our common sense tells us, namely, that a tax bill of, say, $20 or $25 billion cannot be met without taxation on a broad base. Thus in the calendar year 1946, it is expected that out of $180 billion of income payments only about $6.4 billion will be received in taxable income. Brackets and exemptions must therefore be seen in the light of what is needed before tax. Even 100 per cent taxation at these higher levels would do no more than make a dent on a $20 or $25 billion budget. Less than $10 billion. A further stricture has come in the form of tax brackets above $2000. Obviously, the bulk of the population will necessarily bear the Federal tax burden.

With taxes so large in the post-war budgets of the Nation and its citizens, and with the room for tax reduction correspondingly limited, it becomes critically important to examine the general outlines of our tax policy. A first principle now and always is that taxes should be fair and equitable, that they should be distributed in accordance with the ability of the burden to bear it. Tax proposals of the worst kind have sometimes been presented to the public in the attractive garb of ability to pay. Where the zany assumption behind this is that tax was tax and rapid growth would keep it from being noticed. Despite such occasional abuse, the principle of taxing according to ability to pay stands as our best guide to a fair distribution of the postwar Federal tax burden.

A second guiding principle for postwar tax revision is that tax policy should promote a sound national income. All high levels of employment and national income are free from the stabilizing influence both of inflation and of deflation. Taxation of the national income is economic and of basic relationship to the health and stability of our national economy. Taxation is too powerful an instrument to be used blindly without economic objective of economic welfare. The raising of revenue itself is an economic objective. Both in reducing taxes and in distributing the heavy load that is left, the economic policy of each tax change must have to be given full weight.

The discussion of taxation in terms of its effect on production and employment is not new. The great emphasis placed on this relationship is new. Today all sorts of tax plans are presented to the public and defended in terms of the jobs they would allegedly create. Just as in the case of the ability-to-pay principle, it is necessary to distinguish those which have merit from those in which this talking point is used to mislead the public and to hide the true facts of taxing.

It is easy to emphasize the importance of the tax policy to a high level of employment and income. It is much more difficult to outline a distribution of the tax burden which will, to the greatest extent, promote a high level of employment and income. Employment is created and maintained by expenditures. Apart from production and government expenditures, these expenditures consist of two kinds: expenditures by businessmen on production and expenditures by consumers. Since the tax base is the target at which the productive machine is aimed, the remaining expenditure is really the prime mover of our economy. Without consumption expenditures to take goods and services off the market, production and investment would rapidly shrivel up.

Our peacetime economy in the past has repeatedly suffered from a lack of the volume of consumer purchasing power which is necessary to buy the products of industry at full employment levels. The result has been a slackening of production and a loss of employment. To maximize consumer spending for the long pull and thus to bolster employment and production calls for taxes which tend all the way as possible on consumer purchasing power. In the long run, as Secretary Vinson has repeatedly pointed out, this means that the progressive personal income tax should be the chief source of tax revenue and that sales and excise taxes should be eliminated as far as possible.

There are, of course, unusual and exceptional times. But the usual thing is to collect taxes for inflation. The period of the war was marked by strong inflationary pressures. Those inflationary pressures have not ended. It is probable that they will continue for some time to come. One of the great puzzles in determining the amount and distribution of desirable tax reduction is the probable balance between inflationary and deflationary forces. If the economy shrivels, measures to increase aggregate purchasing power will not be needed. If deflationary forces prevail, measures to reduce the burden of purchasing power will be very much in point.

We have noted that consumer purchasing power is the very cornerstone of investment and employment and of our economy. But something more than the existence of consumer markets is needed to put a private enterprise system of production into motion. That very essential something is the opportunity to make a profit. If consumers spend their incomes so much in their role of providing additional funds for investment as in their role of providing an incentive to risk funds in productive enterprises. In the large amount of available funds is to be coaxed into investment and production in the face of very real risk of loss, there must also be a very real opportunity for profit. It follows that taxes must not take away the opportunity for a net profit sufficient to stimulate investment and production.

Now the dilemma of taxation is that taxes must be borne somewhere. If they are lifted from mass purchasing power they must fall somewhere else, and that somewhere is very often the burden of business, which is the hand, if they are lifted from the profits of business they must in many cases fall on consumer purchasing power. The shuffling of taxes in ways to interfere the least with consumer, production and the balance of the tax load effectively and fairly between consumers and business are undoubtedly the most difficult of all problems.

In considering how to distribute taxes most equitably, it is important to bear in mind the ways in which taxes affect real wares. Income taxes decrease real wages by reducing the take-home pay of dollars by lowering the hands of the worker. Under our present system of income tax collection through withholding, the impact is directly on the take-home pay of workers, who are particularly vulnerable. Taxes are unpleasant and when we are made continually conscious of something unpleasant we try to get rid of it. It follows that the foundations of taxation, whether producing or eliminating direct taxes like the income tax, can be built on rather readily.

But it must be remembered that indirect taxes are the chief burden of taxes imposed by the Federal Government. By
increasing the prices of commodities and thus reducing the amount which an individual can buy with his wages, they eat into the amount of wages he gets. It is also to be expected that a number of unknown parts of the corporation tax may also result in price increases and thereby reduce the real wages of the worker. These indirect taxes may make it much more apparent that the income tax because they are more or less unseen and unrecognized. They are, nevertheless, burdens just as direct taxes are burdens.

The Administration has opposed consistently the imposition of a general sales tax largely because, unlike income taxes, sales taxes result in consumer purchasing power at the lowest levels of income. There is no practicable method for recognizing family responsibilities or imposing progressive rates in a sales tax, as there is in the income tax.

Another guiding principle of tax revision for the postwar period is that payment should be simple and convenient. The Income Tax Act of 1944, together with the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943, went a long way toward modernizing the Federal income tax. The taxpayer has been made currently responsible for his payments and does not have the overhanging liability to meet in case of declining income and employment. The tax withholding process enables him to meet his tax liability week by week; month by month, without disrupting his family budgeting. Although withholding is not perfect in all its details and will no doubt be improved, both employers and employees have expressed general satisfaction with the withholding system. Taxes can be made still more simple and convenient and this should be done. However, it must be borne in mind that any simplification must be preferred only at the price of causing inequity. A gross income tax would perhaps be more simple than a net income tax, but it would certainly be far removed from the principle of a direct tax. Taxation is a large price to pay for additional simplicity.

Thus far, I have been reviewing some of the general considerations that are important to the consideration of new policy, and I should like to devote my remaining time to the record of action in this field to date.

Even while the war was going on, the postwar tax problem was not overlooked. In fact, formal study was begun as early as June 1944, pursuant to a resolution of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. That resolution called for the Treasury tax staff and the staff of the Joint Committee to work together in analyzing the problems of postwar taxation. These problems have been under vigorous study by the two groups ever since that time. In addition, the views of Labor, agriculture, and business have been sought in a series of conferences. Not all of the groups invited to present their tax views have taken advantage of the opportunity to do so, but a great deal of valuable insight into the points of view and needs of various groups of taxpayers has resulted.

The first fruits of this joint study are reflected in the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945, which was enacted early this past summer. The intent of this Act was to help industry get over the hump of readjustment as speedily as possible. It has been seriously misrepresented in many quarters as being a great tax relief act for corporations. In point of fact, the Act in no way reduced the tax liabilities of corporations, except in its provision designed to aid small business by increasing the excess profits tax rate from 50 per cent to 75 per cent on all income between $50,000 to $250,000, beginning in 1946. The rest of the provisions of the Act merely moved up the dates for the payment of certain refunds to which those corporations and individuals belatedly entitled under wartime tax laws. Particularly in view of the early end of the war, the wisdom of thus converting the tax assets of business into cash at an early date is not clearly demonstrated. Had the Act not been passed, the refunds would in large part have been received too late to be of any value in speeding the readjustment of industry and thus shortening the period of temporary unemployment.

The tax bill now nearing completion in Congress is my own personal effort in that it is designed to reduce taxes. It is, of course, a transitional measure that is not intended to constitute a postwar revision of the tax system. It is intended to cut the most practicable tax reductions at the places where they are expected to do the most good in promoting a high level of employment and income in the transition period. So far as I am aware, there is no precedent for the bill. In view of postwar needs, the bill has been set to very simple terms. Congress has been moving it through at high speed in order to give the Bureau of Internal Revenue time in which to impose the increased tax reductions into effect by January 1. About two months are needed to permit new withholding tables to be printed, distributed, and put into the hands of employers. The speedy action of Congress will be reflected after the first of the year in smaller tax withholdings from pay checks and a larger proportion remaining for the pre-paid payment of taxes.

You are probably familiar with the tax reduction program for 1946 which Secretary Vinson submitted to Congress. However, a brief review of his program and of the action of Congress may be of interest to you in picking up the tax picture as it stands today. In the face of budgetary necessities and continuing inflationary possibilities, the Secretary set $5 billion as the upper limit of postwar tax reductions at the present time. Within that limit, he proposed that four steps be taken, namely: that the individual normal tax be repealed effective January 1, 1946; that the social security tax be repealed as of the same date; that the date for automatic reduction of certain excises to their 1942 levels be set at July 1, 1946; and that social security and unemployment taxes be reduced 1 per cent each on employer and employee instead of rising to 2½ per cent on each in 1946 as provided by existing law.

In suggesting repeal of the so-called normal tax, the Secretary made clear that this levy is in fact merely a modification of the Victory Tax imposed by Congress in 1942. You may recall that the Treasury Department described the Victory-normal tax because of its unfairness and complexity. In his recent statements to the Congressional committees on the tax bill, Secretary Vinson has stated that the Victory-normal tax fails to take account of marital and dependent status and thus "violates a fundamental principle of the individual income tax, namely, that tax burdens should be adjusted to differences in family responsibil- ities." He noted that the 12 million taxpayers brought into the tax system by the normal tax added up to a total of more than $1 billion. Regarding this figure, he said: "The contributors of tax are relatively small from the viewpoint of the Government. . . . The amounts are, however, very real and negligible to hard-pressed families with small incomes and large numbers of dependents."

He stated further: "In the process of re- conversion, a shrinkage of income is inevitable;
Purchasing power is cut by reductions in overtime and by unemployment. To resist the resulting downward pull on the economy calls for tax reductions, which bore the brunt of the change-over from war to peace. The repeal of the normal tax is one of the best forms of tax reduction for main- taining the purchasing power. As you have probably seen in your morning paper, the tax bill has just emerged from the House-Senate Conference Committee, which ironed out the differences between the House and Senate version of the bill. The bill in effect, though not in name, follows the Treasury's suggestion that the most burdensome part of the wartime tax be repealed. However, by adding to this a five-per cent reduction of the tax that is left, the bill goes beyond the relief proposed by the Secretary, par- ticularly in the higher brackets. In addition, it makes special provision for servicemen, in- cluding full exemption of the service pay of enlisted men during the war years, beginning with 1941. The revenue loss for 1946 for the individual income tax was estimated at $2.1 billion under the Treasury proposal and at somewhat more than $2.6 billion under the conference bill.

Further relief to individuals, especially those in the lower and middle income groups, would be provided under the Treasury proposal to tax books which would amount to about half a billion dollars for 1946 and an additional half billion for 1947, was adopted by the House but not by the Senate, and was dropped out of the final bill with further consideration of the matter next year. The bases of automobiles and boats were dropped at a cost of $146 million.

In selecting taxes for reduction, the Treas- ury has had uppermost in mind the two tests which were examined above, namely, that the changes serve the objective of equity and that they promote a sound economy. By relieving the direct pressure of war time taxes on those least able to pay them and by supporting pur- chasing power, the proposed normal tax repeal and excise tax reductions would clearly serve those two objectives. 

The excise profits tax was a necessary part of our wartime tax structure, not so much as a source of revenue—though its yield has been handsome—but rather as a control meas- ure to prevent war profiteering. While it has not altogether succeeded in that purpose, it has been of invaluable service in recapturing war profits and thus contributing to the financial resources of the war. But in peacetime, when war profiteering fades out of the picture, the case for the excess profits tax turns into a case for the excess profits tax turns into a case for the excise taxes on business equipment and expansion and by wiping out the most inequitable part of the business tax structure, would similarly serve these ob- jectives.

The excess profits tax was a necessary part of our wartime tax structure, not so much as a source of revenue—though its yield has been handsome—but rather as a control meas- ure to prevent war profiteering. While it has not altogether succeeded in that purpose, it has been of invaluable service in recapturing war profits and thus contributing to the financial resources of the war. But in peacetime, when war profiteering fades out of the picture, the case for the excess profits tax turns into a case for the excise taxes on business equipment and expansion and by wiping out the most inequitable part of the business tax structure, would similarly serve these ob- jectives.

In time of peace its drastic curb on profits serves not to stabilize the economy but rather to cut it off. Facing the prospect of taxes which would take a third to a half of their profits, businessmen, large and small, hesitate to run the risks of substantial losses. Yet such risks must be taken if we are to achieve that expansion needed to bring the economy necessary to maintain high levels of employ- ment and income. Repeal of the excess profits tax would remove the chief tax deterrent to vigorous business expansion.

This is not to say that the idea of taxing truly excessive profits, even in peacetime, does not have much to commend it. But the diffi- culty is, as Secretary Vinson has pointed out, "that calling profits excessive does not make them excessive. Calling profits normal does not mean that normal profits and excessive profits look alike. There is no chemi- cal reagent to distinguish them." It is widely recognized that the formula adopted in the wartime profits tax, the excise profits tax, despite repeated efforts to improve it, is seriously defective and erratic. It favors two types of corporations in particular: first, those long-prosperous corporations which enjoy high wartime war earnings, and second, those long-established corporations with inflated capital struc- tures which have an unduly high invested capi- tal credit. In both cases, the excess profits tax fails to hold until the companies have earned large amounts of profits labelled "normal." New and growing corporations with unduly high stock or invested capital are thus placed at a competi- tive disadvantage. Clearly, this tax has no place in a peacetime tax structure.

As approved by the conference of the House and the Senate, the tax bill provides for repe- al of the excess profits tax, effective Janu- ary 1, 1946. In addition, the bill reduces the regular corporate income tax for the current year in two steps, to 50 percent of the base and 30 percent of the base, and repeals the combined capital stock and de- clared value taxation during the entire period. The reduction in corporate taxes under the Treasury proposal was estimated at $2.6 billion. The reduction under the bill as it emerged from the Conference Committee yesterday would be somewhat over $3.1 billion.

Both the House and the Senate followed the Treasury's suggestion to hold the social security payroll tax rates at 1 per cent until Congress takes action on the introduction of social security financing as a whole.

The over-all tax reductions under the bill ap- proved by the conference will amount to nearly $6 billion of tax liabilities of an income and busi- ness for 1946, an amount several hundred mil- lion dollars higher than provided in either the House version or the Senate version of the bill and almost a billion dollars more than the limit urged by the Secretary. After the action of the conference committee has been carried through both Houses, the bill will go to the White House. The President, of course, has the right to call on the statute books by the end of this week.

But as I have indicated earlier, this is only the first step toward that modernization of the tax structure which Secretary was characterized as "the foundation of our entire program to reach and maintain full employment after the war." Further tax legislation will undoubtedly be undertaken during 1946, and studies to that end are already in full swing. Attention will be focused on such basic questions as the balance between individual and corporate income taxes, the proper level of surtaxes, the tax treatment of farm income, the called double taxation of corporate dividends, the reduction or repeal of various excises, spe- cial tax treatment for small business, methods of social security financing, the treatment of estate and gift taxes. While taxes will neces- sarily remain high, the goal of tax revision will be to achieve that distribution of burden which is most efficacious in stimulating the consumer and business expen- diture needed to achieve peacetime full em- ployment.

I thank you very much for your attention.

President Doyle: Thank you, Mr. Blough. We will be glad to have you come again next year and tell us you saved us some more money.

Delegates, the time is now here that we have all been waiting for. Your next speaker cer- tainly needs no introduction to this group. He
comes to us directly from a most important meeting of the Executive Council. I have no advance information on what he is to discuss with us.

I was just informing him of the problems confronting us on the various legislation pending in Massachusetts, and he is quite familiar with them, and the first thing he wanted to know was how we intended to oppose it, and we said we were going to oppose it every inch of the way. We already have his notice of his support of our endeavors.

I present to the Special Victory Convention of the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor, the President of the American Federation of Labor, William Green.

WILLIAM GREEN
(President, American Federation of Labor)

Mr. President, officers and delegates in attendance at this historic convention of the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor, distinguished guests and friends: I responded with a feeling of deep satisfaction and pleasure to the very warm and cordial reception that was extended me by the officers of your state organization to attend a session of this convention. I was somewhat in doubt as to whether I could accept the invitation and be here, but it became clear that I could do so, so out of the busy activities of my life, I made the trip here with the feeing, as I say, of pleasure and satisfaction to meet you and to greet you.

I am happy, further, to bring to you in my official capacity, the sincere and warm greeting of the membership of the American Federation of Labor. You are a part of that great family of devoted, loyal members of the parent organization, the American Federation of Labor. I know you will feel pleased when I say to you that as members of that family, you are a part of the largest, most influential organization in the United States of America, and second organized labor movement in the entire world, the American Federation of Labor. You are a part of the seven million paid-up members of the American Federation of Labor which was incorporated by a financial report which was submitted to the Executive Council at its meeting which was held in Cincinnati recently.

And, another fact that our great movement is recognized and regarded as the dominant, most representative labor movement in the United States and Canada, may I refer to this fact: That the charter of the International Labor Organization, a great movement that was formed at the close of the first world war, formed at a conference over which my distinguished predecessor, the late Samuel Gompers presided in Paris, a movement that has functioned continuously since the first world war, without interruption, without pause, and when it came—when it came—when it came—a movement which has been recognized as the representative organization of labor from each country shall be selected from and designated by the most representative labor organization in that country. The representative of management should be selected by the same way.

Now, when it came to the selection of the labor delegates to represent Labor at the International Labor Organization, which is now meeting in Paris, France, this convention was to come into that question in order to determine whether the parent organization was the most representative organization, whether the dual labor movement was the most representative organization in the United States of America. And after examining the facts carefully, all of the facts, all of the arguments presented by both sides, the President of the United States and the Secretary of Labor decided that the American Federation of Labor was the largest, the dominant organization, and the Federal government and the labor organization in the United States and conferred upon us the authority to designate the labor representative from the United States to this convention.

So I am supporting my statement of the standing and strength and influence of the American Federation of Labor with an unsailable fact. This year, the facts speak for themselves and our delegate, a member of the American Federation of Labor, a man from Massachusetts, Robert J. Watt, is at the Paris convention, representing all Labor in the United States at that great, important conference.

I reflect quite often over the loyalty and devotion of the membership of the American Federation of Labor in the State of Massachusetts and throughout New England, to the principles and the philosophy and the policies of the American Federation of Labor. I have refused to listen to the siren voices of those who would lead you into the by-ways and paths of experimentation, but instead, you have stood solidly and immovably with this great organization which was formed more than one-half a century ago.

You have occupied a room in the house of labor ever since the days when the pioneers of our movement laid the foundation upon which the great structure has been erected. You still occupy that room in the house of labor. The splendid men and women of New England, who identified themselves voluntarily with our movement in the beginning, are still with us, except for those who have passed to the Great Beyond.

And, you, I am proud to tell you, are the most advanced and invulnerable of our millions of members affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

The American people are now beginning to realize the full value of the contributions to the great military victory which the United Nations scored over the forces of Nazism, Fascism and Japanese Imperialism. It is not only our duty, but our privilege to recognize the contributions to the great military victory which the United Nations scored over the forces of Nazism, Fascism and Japanese Imperialism. It is not only our duty, but our privilege to recognize the contributions to the great military victory which the United Nations scored over the forces of Nazism, Fascism and Japanese Imperialism.

Organization and the patriotic contributions to the great military victory which the United Nations scored over the forces of Nazism, Fascism and Japanese Imperialism. It is not only our duty, but our privilege to recognize the contributions to the great military victory which the United Nations scored over the forces of Nazism, Fascism and Japanese Imperialism.
present reconversion difficulties, and policies designed to strengthen the firm purpose of the American people, to establish world peace based upon justice, are as vital as the struggle itself. In reporting to you on these matters, I should like to deal first with international policies, because we have learned through our recent experience that to end completely war and the threat of war can disrupt the home life of every American family.

Labor is not satisfied with the progress thus far. Under the terms of the armistice the United Nations. The Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor, after careful analysis and consideration of international developments, has reached the conclusion that the cause of world peace has suffered severe setbacks since the victories of the United Nations in Europe and the Pacific. Let us be frank and outspoken. It does not pay to hide facts, nor to dodge facts.

Under pressure of selfish power politics, our promises of according to each liberated nation the right to democratic self-government have not yet been fulfilled. This is a highly dangerous situation, one which calls for clear thinking and courageous action to guarantee the future safety of the peoples of the world. Even our own plan can fail for its future security or prosperity when the continuance of world peace is menaced by manifest injustice.

On one point, the United Nations are still firmly agreed. Faced with the power of Germany and Japan to wage war at any time in the future must and shall be forever destroyed. But the controversial issue which is causing serious dissatisfaction among the United Nations is how to set up post-war order and stability in Europe and Asia. An attempt was made to settle this issue at the recent conference of foreign ministers, but unfortunately, that conference ended in disagreement. We were all disappointed over the reports of the outcome of that historic conference. We, the working people of the country, believed that a great purpose would be realized there. Our hopes were raised and built up, and how disappointed we were when it became clear to all of us and to the people throughout the entire world that the conference ended without agreement.

The public reports made by Secretary of State Byrnes and British Foreign Minister Bevin that the reason for the non-cooperative attitude of Soviet Russia was largely responsible for the failure.

The American Federation of Labor has no hope of success that by any nation to dominate post-war Europe and Asia are dangerous to world peace. We insist that the nations which were overrun and victimized by the Nazis, Fascists and the Japanese Imperialists must be accorded full opportunity to establish free and independent governments in accordance with a democratically-expressed will of the people. We of Labor are opposed to any influence exerted by any nation, no matter how powerful, to set up a post-war world order. There must be no exercise of selfish purposes and selfish designs. There must be no dominating sphere of influence.

In the absence of such a moral inch of territory, no other nation should seek any selfish advantages out of this world war. We fought this war to make the world free, and we maintain that the only way to maintain the peace is to make sure that nations will respect the rights of each other. In Europe and other places, other countries, shall be accorded the fullest and freest opportunity to select their own government, free from the domination of any single power, and make the government democratic as they wish it to be.

Now, if that principle is carried out, there is no reason why any cooperation agreements should not be reached at these conferences, such as the one which was held in London a short time ago.

Today, the United States has the power to insist upon and to obtain fair dealing among nations. If we hold out for a peace based upon justice to all, the cause of lasting peace and world security will be advanced. On the other hand, if we adopt a policy of mere appeasement, abandoning principles for the sake of peace and price, justice will be interpreted as a sign of weakness and further concessions will be demanded.

Our course is clear. We must be firm for the rights, and do our part in the defense of justice and fair play. The same reliance upon high principles and justice will fix America in good stead in dealing with the grave domestic problems which for so long, as the just conclusion of war. Anyone with a fair and unprejudiced mind who studies the causes of the present industrial unrest and turmoil in our country will discover at once that injustice is at the bottom of most all of the trouble.

At the outset of the war, Labor gave a "no-strike" pledge to the President in order to increase war production and speed victory. In return for sacrificing this most powerful weapon of self-protection, the Nation's workers were promised that disputes would be settled by the unions, and that the courts would decide the merits of each case. This procedure was followed for only a brief period. Then it collided headlong with mounting prices for the necessities of our war.

The National War Labor Board then decided to permit wage increases of 15 per cent to match a similar increase in the cost of living. This was followed by adoption of the Economic Stabilization Act which fixed wages and prices at existing levels and would maintain parity between them. That was an Act of the Congress of the United States.

You know what happened, don't you? You men who toiled in mills and the mines and the factories of the Nation. You know the War Labor Board did freeze wages rigidly, but on the other hand, prices continued to soar. Attempts to enforce price control regulations were evaded at almost every point. The cost of living skyrocketed, parity between wages rates and living costs was destroyed. Workers were told they would have to depend upon take-home pay, upon the compensation received by the workers at the same old time. This was unjust and unsatisfactory, but American workers endured the wrong as long as the war lasted.

When victory came, Labor was at a disadvantage of at least 30 per cent in relation to prices of the commodities and services which made up the average worker's cost-of-living budget. But the worst was still to come.

Sudden cancellation of war contracts caused an almost immediate denivelation of labor market. Hundreds of thousands of workers lost their jobs almost overnight, and as a result of that, the purchasing power of the masses of the people was reduced by billions and billions of dollars. Those who were fortunate enough to keep their jobs lost all overtime bonus and incentive payments. As a result, a worker's income was reduced between for a 48-hour week, including overtime of eight hours at time and one-half, dropped abruptly to $40 a week for a 40-hour week.

I give you the facts of the situation as they might, in a simple way, see the fact—a comparable loss of earnings was suffered by workers throughout the Nation. Their wage rates were not increased. The extra take-home earnings disappeared.

Meanwhile, prices stayed high. They haven't come down. There they are way up
there still, and you know it, the housewife knows it, it is a reality and a fact. Up there, up there soaring high, and high, and lofty. Down here at home, millions stayed high and heavy taxes still were being deducted from the pay envelope. Congress has taken a step now to help reduce that burden to some degree. We are not going to fight more and more and on and on until the workers are relieved of the wartime tax burden which they have been compelled to do.

Now, in the light of these incontrovertible facts, I place emphasis upon that incontrovertibility. Is it any wonder that unrest and dissatisfaction spread throughout the ranks of labor? Is it surprising that strikes began breaking out? Let us pause for a moment and make just a speedy survey.

We in this generation have gone through, I think, the most interesting experience of any generation in the history of our national life. The United States, for the first time in its history since 1861, was in a total war, with mass production of war goods, and millions of men in uniform. Men and women in every part of the land, left the peak of living. Almost overnight, prices stayed very high and heavy taxes still were being deducted from the pay envelope. Congress has taken a step now to help reduce that burden to some degree. We are not going to fight more and more and on and on until the workers are relieved of the wartime tax burden which they have been compelled to do.
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isms, new techniques, new developments in electronics, and so forth, and as a result of it, fewer men will do more work. That is being done now in many industries. You would be surprised if you knew how fewer men are producing more in the mining industry of the country.

Old methods have been discarded and new methods employed. Now we are facing that era of new technique and new change. We are on the threshold of it, and as a result of it, they are making plans for the shorter work-day and the legal work-day. That will mean marching up and down the highways, armistice of unemployed. So the argument now, in the face of the development—more production, more increased opportunities for thousands and millions of workers, who, in all probability, will be displaced because of the introduction of new technique, new methods, and new techniques.

I have said that we therefore must be prepared to offer a remedy for that, and the remedy we offer is the remedy we developed in our own minds, and that is, that the work-day and the work-week must be reduced in proportion to the development of science. They cannot develop new means and hold on to old methods. They cannot do more work with fewer men and continue the longer work-week and the longer work-day. That will mean marching up and down the highways, armistice of unemployed. So the argument now, in the face of the development—more production, more increased opportunities for thousands and millions of workers, who, in all probability, will be displaced because of the introduction of new technique, new methods, and new techniques.

Another important factor must be considered in the economic picture. During the war, enormous profits were reaped by American industry and business. Even after taxes these profits were higher than ever before in history. Even though war production has ended, for the most part, these high profits are being maintained in most industries. Labor now asks for its just share of these profits which it helped create. It demands the increases in wage rates which were promised it in the time of war. Labor cannot afford to pay these increases. We have examined the facts, and because of an examination of the facts, we know they can pay them out of the profits they now enjoy.

The productivity of the individual worker increased enormously during the war, thereby lowering labor costs. When a producer works more, he is entitled to more pay. That is elementary justice.

New methods of production also have reduced industrial costs. Industry is going to save huge amounts through tax relief voted by Congress. It will not have to pay continuous overtime. These savings, coupled with continued high profits, must be shared with the workers in the form of increased wage rates. Labor now demands a just share in the name of justice, but for the national welfare. Unless purchasing power, as I stated, of the masses of the workers is increased through higher wages, there will be no end to the problem of unemployment. Business will suffer. So will the farmer. They need a market for their products or they will start losing money. The best market in the world is more cash in the pockets of the workers. The longer you can work, the more money they need for themselves and their families.

The American Federation of Labor is not laying down any hard and fast standard for new wages. Our Comité Permanent is in the best position to know how much their members deserve and how much each industry can afford to pay. We rely upon them to exercise sound judgment. And they can rely upon the full power and strength of the entire organization of the American Federation of Labor to back them up to the limit in obtaining their just wage demands.

Now, let me emphasize that the American Federation of Labor is not promoting strikes. We believe that necessary and deserved wage adjustments are best arrived at by the peaceful and orderly processes of collective bargaining. We are convinced that the time has come for American labor and industry to establish and settle that stable and cooperative relations without government regulation or interference. That is why we have called for the prompt dissolution of the National War Labor Board. We have given our full endorsement to the purposes and objectives of the forthcoming Labor Management Conference called by President Truman.

We believe in the free enterprise system. And if I understand the free enterprise system, it means less government domination and control in the economic life of the Nation and not more. We have had enough of governmental control during the war. In order to give government the power and authority to control more, we placed our weapon, the right to strike, back of our backs, that we had left it there until the war was won, and we kept our promise. But now the war is over. Government agencies must be wiped out, and we, the workers, must be allowed to take the weapon from behind the door and we don't intend to use it except when we are driven to the extreme need to use it, but if we are compelled to use it, the right to strike will be exercised by the workers of the Nation.

The right to strike, the economic power of the worker, is similar to the capital of the employer, the worker's capital. That is the only capital he has by which he can work behind the back of his economic strength, and I would like to see a democracy exist where men are not free to strike. They sacrifice it under totalitarian forms of government, and behold the picture as we look across the vast area between America and Soviet Russia, and there we find the totalitarian government where the workers are dominated by the government and they never exercise the right to strike.

But we in America are free men, living in a democracy, and as sure as we live, we will never surrender it to any government under the sun.

The delegates representing the American Federation of Labor will enter the Labor Management Conference which meets in Washington next Monday, November 11th, determined to do everything in their power to bring about an effective agreement between organized labor and management for lasting industrial peace. We are willing to examine the facts, analyze it all carefully, and go as far as we can in a free democracy, to minimize strikes and strife and to establish harmony, cooperation and understanding in labor and industry. In fact, that is a part of the philosophy of the American Federation of Labor.

We have been faced with a most extraordinary and unusual situation ever since 1935. We were dealt, in the early days, a tide unionism, that unity and solidarity was the chief asset of Labor; that united through a mobilization of our economic strength in a labor organization we can work out this unity and solidarity—no foe, no matter how great, could stop us, and at the same time, we were taught that division and discord within the ranks of Labor produced weakness, and we paired our great asset of unity and solidarity.

We emphasized that fact when some leaders of Labor decided to form a rival movement. And we have told them ever since, that a great
injury was done Labor when that division within the ranks of Labor took place. Families are happy when they are united. They are unhappy when they become divided. What price families have paid, that sacred institution has paid, because of division and hatred and bitterness. Abraham Lincoln said there was more division upon America for two governments. He declared that the United States must be a united nation. And what a price we paid in order to maintain a united nation here, but we won.

Now, what we have tried to do is to impress upon Labor that the same principle applies to Labor as applies to the Nation. Evil days are yet to come, if the division within the ranks of Labor continues.

Since 1935, we have been moving upward. The stream has been running high, and we have been moving along the stream. The economic situation was different than it was in the late 20s and early 30s. Because of this movement of the stream in a favorable direction, we have not felt the effect, the full effect of division upon Labor. And so is there any one of us so optimistic as to believe that the stream will continue to run high forever. The tide will turn, and then what will happen to us if the division within the ranks of Labor? I am not going to dwell on the details. I am merely referring to it to you in order to stimulate thinking.

Now, my friends, we have appealed to those who have been born with the sin of having themselves been told they would be accorded a hearty welcome back in the home and house of Labor. Is there any of us who believes that the American Federation of Labor would accord them a hearty welcome back to them? Never. We are the parent body, and I said that fact was demonstrated when our delegate to the International Labor Organization was selected. Now, if the parent body surrender to the rebels? We cannot think of that. What are we going to ask them to come back home where they were before they left, and we will accord them a hearty welcome. Perhaps we will have to wait until they learn in the bitter school of experience that they made a mistake, and then, perhaps, like the prodigal son, they will turn their faces homeward. But some of them have already learned that.

You remember, don’t you, a short time ago when the great, wonderful, influential International Ladies Garment Workers Union turned their backs on us? They have learned that they can come in and stand with us and work with us, and enhance the value and the asset of Labor by reuniting the labor movement. They can come in and stand with us. The men and women of Labor in America and throughout the world than to abandon this indivisible position they have occupied—turn their faces homeward in the mistake and come back to the house of labor.

How long shall this raiding go on? It is not a fight altogether now on our part with employers. We have learned just what will happen if we go on strike. Many times when we have gone on strike for the purpose of redressing wrongs, united, and the strike continues for some time, we find the represen-

tatives of the duel movement among the strikers undermining their morale, telling them to desert us and come with them. I have examined our own vocabulary and the English language, and I cannot find a word in either our vocabulary or the English language that would adequately express my contempt of men who, when engaged in the strike, undermine their morale and weaken them. You here in New England know about it, don’t you? They have raided your unions.

On Labor Day, a short time ago, a fine, splendid, strong federated Labor union of the American Federation of Labor engaged in a strike for the purpose of redressing grievances, longstanding grievances, 5000 of them engaged in the strike. The strike continued for more than six weeks, and do you know what happened? Before the strike was three weeks old, the representatives of the duel movement were in among them, undermining them, calling the American Federation of Labor a failure, a traitor, and all that—“come with us, leave them.” What effect did that have? Well, I am happy to say, it had no effect on the workers. They stood like the Rock of Gibraltar, and after six weeks’ strike, they won a complete victory and defeated the employer who was their duelist.

I merely refer to that as evidence of the difficulties we are all encountering as a result of this division within the ranks of Labor. My conscience is clear, as yours is clear. We have nothing to be ashamed of, or sign of condemnation of it. We are not responsible for it.

But I am wondering how the leaders of that movement and many others associated with it can lie and say that we would be good to them? Never. We are the parent body, and I said that fact was demonstrated when our delegate to the International Labor Organization was selected. Other than the parent body surrender to the rebels? We cannot think of that. What are we going to ask them to come back home where they were before they left, and we will accord them a hearty welcome. Perhaps we will have to wait until they learn in the bitter school of experience that they made a mistake, and then, perhaps, like the prodigal son, they will turn their faces homeward. But some of them have already learned that.
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Legal Department of the American Federation of Labor, we have defeated practically every measure that was passed in the different states. In the courts of the Nation, they have been defeated in constitutional.

But information reaches me here that they are trying that method here in Massachusetts. Somebody who thinks that he knows what the remedy for social and economic conditions may be a circulating petition to get some objectionable, anti-labor measure upon the statute books of Massachusetts. Now that means a fight for us. I know you will all have moved down to that, and you have never been stirred before, and that you will all unite in order to bring about the defeat of this program, if it is possible for you to do so. We must defeat it, if we can. I earnestly appeal to you and your friends in Massachusetts to defeat this legislation if it lies within your power to do so. At least put forth every effort you can, to prevent them from getting the number of signatures first. Then, if they get them, prevent it from being adopted by the sovereign citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Now, in it all, I want you to know that you will have the full support of the American Federation of Labor in this fight that you will make here in Massachusetts. And if, in spite of it all, they succeed in passing it, then we will go to the courts, and I think that we will defeat it in the courts of Massachusetts, just as we defeated it in Colorado, Arkansas and elsewhere. The fight won't stop at any stage. It will go to the bitter end, and if it is ever put on the statute books, we will be rebels. We will never submit to it willingly. Now I have covered the point that I wished to talk to you about in this frank and open way.

It is our firm conviction that peace in industry can be obtained through genuine—mark you, I put emphasis on the word genuine—free collective bargaining and voluntary arbitration where parties to a dispute will agree to submit issues to arbitration. But under no circumstances will we, now or ever, agree to accept any form of compulsory arbitration, I cannot what is, to say it is, a free, voluntary arbitration, in the event we want to accept it.

Now, if industry wishes to establish fair dealing with Labor, if it hopes to escape government regimentation of both management and labor, then the conference—meaning the Labor-Management Conference in Washington—in a spirit of helpfulness and full cooperation with other groups who will participate in the Conference. The success of the conference depends altogether and absolutely, I think I can say, upon the spirit that will be displayed and manifested in the conference.

I have been inspired today in this meeting. I read your faces, and there I gained the impression that you are searching for the truth. That there is a determination on your part to maintain the American standard of living at no values. That under which we suffer must be righted, that justice must be done, and we have enlisted in this fight for life, in order to secure freedom, democracy, liberty, justice for ourselves, and for all the people throughout the world.

I thank you for the fine, cordial, warm reception you accorded me. I interpreted it as extended to those millions of workers whom I have the honor to represent, more than to myself. It was an inspiration and a pleasure to talk to you today, and I am going back to my pressing duties and hard work carrying away from Cambridge, Massachusetts, and this convention hall, the fondest memories of a delightful visit spent with you.

I thank you.

President Doyle: President Green, on behalf of the convention, I thank you for coming to Massachusetts and speaking to us today.

I assure you that we will go from this convention determined to exert greater energy to our problems. I assure you that your visit here will cause us to spend greater effort in the interest of the American Federation of Labor.

We will adjourn the convention now. The convention rules call for reconvening at 2 o'clock. It is now ten minutes of one, so if there is no objection, we will move that ahead to 2:15, and I think we can all get back here by that time. We have one speaker this afternoon, and we have about seven resolutions which I don't expect to be controversial, and if all goes well, we should be finished, with the convention completed, by 4 o'clock.

I hope you will all attend the afternoon session so that we can complete our business.

The convention is now adjourned until 2:15.

Whereupon, at 12:50 o'clock p.m., the convention was so adjourned.

**AFTERNOON SESSION**

The convention was called to order at 2:45 p.m., by President Doyle.

President Doyle: The convention will please come to order.

The Chair recognized Chairman Russell of the Resolutions Committee.

Chairman Russell.

Delegate Russell: Resolution No. 1:

**RESOLUTION NO. 1**

**PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S PROPOSALS**

Whereas, The gun-shooting part of World War II has abated, and the voice-shooting part has begun, and the scene of conflict has been transferred from the foreign fronts to the home fronts, and the new warfare seems to be centering up the economic life of our Nation, through a strategic attack upon the workers in general, and a tactical assault upon organized labor in particular, and

Whereas, These attacks appear to be directed by the old-line reactionaries and labor baiters, who withdrew underground during the period of active combat abroad, lest it imperil their personal safety at home, but now feel safe to emerge into the open and to assault those who did so much for so many during the long tough days and black tragic nights of a world peril that menaced all human rights and which destroyed so many human lives, and

Whereas, Many of these lives were from the ranks of Labor and of whom many gave their life in a struggle that was supposed to make this world a better place in which to live, work, and enjoy the natural rights of human beings, in a manner which their Creator intended, and therefore, be it

Resolved, That we endorse a system of economy that is based upon the premise of equity, and without malice or prejudice, and which will provide adequate employment, meaningful production, adequate distribution, with a decent living profit for the employer, and a decent living wage for the employee, as ad-
vocated by the American Federation of Labor, and be it further
Resolved, That we endorse President Tru-
man's proposals to Congress for a free en-
terprise planning, through the joint repre-
sentatives of management, labor and govern-
ment; free collective bargaining and equal pay-
offs for equal work in industries whose products enter interstate commerce; help for the returning service man, through an economy of plenty, that will never again permit our country to be sold down the river of a depression and idleness, that will ravage our people with hunger and want, in the midst of resources and plenty. Let us resolve to plan and build our country, with a
strong heart and a high spirit, for the present
and future of the greatest country of all—
America.

[Submitted by Delegates Peter A. Reilly and
William L. Ross, Carpenters Union No. 40,
Boston.]

Your committee concurs in this resolution and
moves the adoption of the committee's re-
port.

President Doyle: It has been regularly moved and
seconded that the committee's report be
adopted. Is there anything to be said on the
question? If not, as many as are in favor of
the committee's report will signify in the usual
manner by saying "aye". Those opposed "no".
The "ayes" have it. It is a vote and so ordered.
The resolution is adopted.

Delegate Russell: Resolution No. 2:

RESOLUTION NO. 2
WAGNER-ELLENER HOUSING BILL

Whereas, This great Nation in concert with
its Allies has brought to a victorious conclu-
sion its war to make the world and the Na-
tion a better place in which to live, and
Whereas, The exigencies of war have proven
that the combined resources of government,
labor, and capital can accomplish the well-

Whereas, The transitional or reconversion
period from war to peace is one of paramount
importance, which may affect the economic
status of the Nation for many years; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the body in convention as-
sembled reiterate and again record itself in its
deleterious and do all in its power to bring
about the ideals for which the youth of the
nation fought, bled, suffered and died, and
be it further

Resolved, That this body act to make pos-
sible two of the aims of every veteran and
worker in the Nation, the right to a job at a
saving wage and the right to a decent house
in which to live; surely in this Nation and
in this day, not too much to expect, and be
it further

Resolved, That this organization petition
the next session of the General Court of
Massachusetts for appropriate enabling legis-
lation to make effective the terms and con-
ditions of the Wagner-Ellender Housing Bill,
(S 1349), and be it further

Resolved, That this body record itself in
active support of a bill now before the Con-
gress of the United States, known as S 1342,
or the "National Housing Bill," which
seems destined, if passed, to become a mile-
stone on the road to a good home for every
citizen to be supplied by both private indus-
try and government, and in so doing will cre-
ate a new type of American homeowner in
the transition period, and be it further

Resolved, That the officers of this organiza-
tion be directed to make known the views of
this organization and the contents of this
resolution to every member of the Congress in
this Commonwealth; to every member of the
Committees of the Congress concerned with
the bill; to the parent body of this organiza-
tion; to His Excellency the Governor of the
Commonwealth, and to such other persons,
groups, or organizations as seemed desirable.

[Submitted by Delegate John Carroll, Ce-
mentfinishers No. 534, Boston.]

Your committee concurs with this resolution, and
I move the adoption of the committee's report.

President Doyle: It has been regularly moved and
seconded that the committee's report be
adopted. Is there anything to be said on the
question? If not, as many as are in favor of
the committee's report will signify in the usual
manner by saying "aye". Those opposed "no".
The "ayes" have it. It is a vote and so ordered.
The resolution is adopted.

President Doyle: Delegates, Chairman Rus-
sell got out of a sick bed to come to this con-
vention and press your Resolutions. He is Res-
olutions Chairman, and he is not feeling
well at the moment, and I have volunteered
to read into the convention the resolutions.

RESOLUTION NO. 3
FORMATION OF CONSUMER COOPE-
RATIVE COMMITTEES

Whereas, The American Federation of Labor
in convention at New Orleans in 1944, adopted
the report of the Executive Council on Credit
Unions and Consumer Cooperatives,

Whereas, This unanimously adopted report
contained a recommendation to the Central
Labor Bodies of the Nation that they appoint
a Cooperative Committee to work closely with
the Cooperative League of the United States
department of Consumer Cooperatives
within the Federation, whose function it
would be to disseminate to its members
information about Credit Unions and Consumer
Cooperatives, through literature or other
means, aid members of the local unions or of
the central bodies during the transition period
or orientation prior to their entrance into an
economic venture, and

Whereas, The Massachusetts State Federa-
tion of Labor has knowledge that this recom-
mandation of the American Federation of
Labor Convention of 1944 has not been acted
upon to the fullest extent, and in order that
this recommendation may be given further
impetus, and the intent and spirit of the
adopted report of the Executive Committee
more completely carried out; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts State
Federation of Labor appoint a Cooperative
Committee charged with the responsibility of
calling to the attention of the central bodies
of the state the desire of the American Fed-
eration of Labor that Cooperative Commit-
tees be established within the central bodies;
and be it further

Resolved, That this committee act as a
source of information and guidance for co-
aparative committees of the central bodies
now formed or to be formed.

[Submitted by Delegates John Carroll, Ce-
mentfinishers Nos. 534, Boston; J. Arthur
Moriarty, Typographical Union No. 13, Bos-
ton; Mary C. Cadigan, Teachers No. 66, Bos-
ton; Margaret J. Donahue, Waitresses No. 112,
Boston; Mary A. Kelley, Boston Teamsters 29,
Central Labor Union, Boston, and Daniel J.
Goggin, Boot and Shoe Workers Union No.
188, Boston.]
Delegate Russell: I move the adoption of the committee's report, Mr. Chairman.

President Doyle: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the committee's report be adopted. Is there anything that is said on the question? If not, as many as are in favor of the committee's report will signify in the usual manner by saying "aye". Those opposed "no". The "aye" is a vote and so ordered. The resolution is adopted.

Delegate Ward: Resolution No. 4

RESOLUTION NO. 4

FEDERAL LEGISLATION

Whereas, The following bills are pending before Congress: namely, the Kilgore-Ferand Bill (S 1274) (HR 3891) calling for unemployment compensation of $25.00 per week up to 26 weeks, and

Whereas, The Full Employment Murray-Patman Bill (S 330) (HR 2202), promising the right to a good job was advocated in the Roosevelt platform and judging from the overwhelming victory Roosevelt won in 1944, it is the desire of the people that this bill be passed, and

Whereas, The Pepper-Thomas Bill (S 1349) (HR 3914), calling for a 65 cent per hour minimum wage immediately, and 70 and 75 cents after one year and two years respectively; this is necessary for the protection of millions of workers, and

Whereas, The Rankin Amendment (HR 3749) to the "GI Bill of Rights" is inadequate; the law should be amended to $25.00 per week unemployment compensation with additional amounts for veterans with dependents; also a generous bonus for military service compensation, and

Whereas, The Ball-Burton-Hatch Bill (S 1171), would destroy the National Labor Relations Act, and the democratic principles of free collective bargaining, and

Whereas, President Truman's program included federal funds to supplement state unemployment compensation is an emergency measure in an attempt to bring benefits up to the level recommended by the Social Security Board. Objection is based by Senators and Congressmen who have an ulterior motive to cut the wages to substandard levels; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Special Victory Convention of the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor vote unanimously in favor of ascertaining from Massachusetts Congressmen and Senators their position on the above-mentioned bills, as essential to our position in developing our post-war reconvension program.

(Submitted by Delegates Joseph A. White, Manuel Goulart, James Donnellon, Henry A. Lima, John Curley, and Robert Cusick, Seafood Workers No. 1572-1, Gloucester.)

The committee recommends adoption, as amended, and I move concurrence.

President Doyle: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the committee's report be adopted. Is there anything to be said on the question? If not, as many as are in favor of the committee's report will signify in the usual manner by saying "aye". Those opposed "no". The "aye" have it. It is a vote and so ordered. The resolution is adopted.

Delegate Russell: Your committee wishes to report that Resolution No. 5 has been withdrawn.

Delegate Ward: Resolution No. 10. This has been substituted for Resolution No. 9.

RESOLUTION NO. 9

40-HOUR WEEK FOR EMPLOYEES OF STATE INSTITUTIONS

Whereas, Certain public employees are not now receiving the advantages of the 40-hour workweek enjoyed by most private and federal government employees, and

Whereas, Many public employees' problems in employment are as great as those of employees of the above categories, and

Whereas, Provisions should be made to enable public employees to be in conformity with the commonly accepted 40-hour workweek; therefore, be it

Resolved, That Section 38, Chapter 149 of the
General Laws, Tercentenary Edition, as amended by Chapter 444 of the Acts and Resolves of 1935, be stricken out and inserted in place thereof the following section:

"Section 39. The hours and labor of laborers, workmen, wardnurses, industrial and occupational therapists and watchmen, and employees employed in the kitchen, dining room and domestic services, in state institutions, and of officers and instructors in state penal institutions, shall not exceed 40 hours in any work week and shall not exceed 8 consecutive hours within 9 consecutive hours in any one day and that hours worked in excess of 8 hours in any one day shall be considered overtime and shall be compensated for at the rate of time and one-half. Any person whose hours of labor are regulated by this section and whose presence is required at any such institution 7 days a week shall be given at least 8 days off in each month, without loss of pay, in addition to regular vacations. This section shall not prevent the Superintendent, Warden, or Executive Officer, from requiring the services of any person in any emergency when health or safety of patients or inmates would otherwise be endangered, in any extraordinary emergency, or in apprehending an escaped inmate."

[Submitted by Delegate William S. Gallagher, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees No. 448, Norfolk.]

RESOLUTION No. 10

35-HOUR WEEK FOR STATE EMPLOYEES

Whereas, It has been announced by President Green that all efforts should be made to shorten the workweek, and

Whereas, The Commonwealth of Massachusetts is pledged to a policy of support and assistance to the returning servicemen and women of Massachusetts, and

Whereas, A reduction in the weekly hours of employment will provide additional jobs for returning veterans and civilians; therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention go on record and sponsor legislation providing for a 35-hour workweek, beginning in September, for the Commonwealth's laborers, laborers, workmen, and mechanics, and the personnel in any institution, board, service or commission including the Metropolitan District Commission, in the State of Massachusetts, and be it further

Resolved, That the Federation encourage, aid and assist the organized employees of the various political sub-divisions of the Commonwealth to adopt as a standard workweek the above-stated 35-hour schedule for all employees in the above-mentioned jurisdictions.

[Submitted by Delegate William V. Ward, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees No. 648, Boston.]

Your committee recommends adoption of Resolution No. 10, to take care of both resolutions, Nos. 9 and 10, and I move concurrence.

President Doyle: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the committee's report be adopted. Is there anything to be said on the question?

The Chair recognizes Delegate Vozzella.

Delegate Vozzella (American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees No. 477, of Information. We have a good number of part-time employees, and, as I understand it, this resolution embraces five, seven hour days. That cuts the work-week of the per diem employees down one day. Is that going to affect their week's pay?

President Doyle: I will let the Chairman of the Resolutions Committee, or one of his committee members, answer that.

Delegate Russell: It would not be possible to answer authoritatively the delegate's question, other than good common trade-union sense is this: If we have in the nature of our employment, on the one hand, work under the 40-hour week, in the other, work on per diem, at each time that our hours of labor per day or per week have been reduced, I have yet to find any trade union negotiations which did not provide that shall be reduced, that it would be in any new legislation affecting our employment.

I have been assured by the officers of your organization that if the hours of labor were reduced, it obviously would be based upon no reduction in the total weekly pay and in the total daily pay. That is the intention and purpose and proposal of the committee.

President Doyle: Anything further on the question?

Delegate Reilly (Carpenters No. 40, Boston): Wouldn't it be nice if we could have that language written into the resolution, that it would be the objective of the State Branch to maintain the existing system of wage rates at the lesser hourly workweek.

President Doyle: Well, the remarks from the floor and the reply of the Resolutions Committee, I know, are part of the record of the convention. Does that take care of the matter?

If there is nothing more to be said on the question, as many as are in favor of the committee's report will signify in the usual manner by saying "aye". Those opposed "no". The "ayes" have it. It is a vote and so ordered. The resolution is adopted.

RESOLUTION No. 6

PENSION FOR FIRE FIGHTERS

Whereas, The rehabilitation of our returning honorably discharged servicemen, veterans of World War II, who will need the sincere help and cooperation of every citizen, as well as the full cooperation of the State, city and town, to establish themselves again in civil life, and

Whereas, The members of the Lynn City Fire Fighters Union Local No. 739, International Association of Fire Fighters (AFL), do fully realize and appreciate the fact that ways and means must and shall be had to provide jobs for the returning veterans; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Lynn City Fire Fighters Union, Local No. 739 do hereby petition the Massachusetts Legislature and its members of both branches, therefore, that Senate Bill No. 110 be passed, whereby at the expiration of 20 years, that members of the Fire Department who have faithfully served the city as such members, shall be retired and pensioned from said department, regardless of age, at three-fourths of the highest compensation paid them annually, and be it further

Resolved, That the State Branch, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, at its Special Victory Convention, Oct. 26-28, 1945, in Cambridge, Massachusetts, be forwarded a copy of this resolution for their endorsement and cooperation, in our honest and sincere efforts to assist in the rehabilitation of the returning veterans of this war.

[Submitted by Delegate William E. Sexton, Fire Fighters No. 739, Lynn.]

Delegate Ward: Resolution No. 6 is a matter
affecting the proper, adequate and justifiable pension plan for the organized fire fighters of the State of Massachusetts, that with some older pension plans in existence or having been before the 1944 convention of the Massachusetts Federation of Labor, in which the present Executive Council is still in office, and, as a move toward cooperation and recommendation of the committee, we recommend that these matters be referred to the Executive Council, who, in turn, will be requested to call a conference between the organizations affected with the State Branch, for the purpose of presenting an acceptable pension bill to the 1946 Legislature. It is acceptable to the proponents of the resolution.

The recommendation of the committee is that it be referred to the Executive Council with instructions, I move the adoption of the committee's report.

President Doyle: You have heard the recommendation and the motion of the Resolutions Committee on referral to the Executive Council. Is there anything to be said on the question? [I then move for the adoption of the committee's report.]

President Doyle: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the committee's report be adopted. Is there anything to be said on the question?

The Chair now recognizes Delegate Lorch.

Delegate Lorch (Teachers No. 411, Boston): I agree with the resolution, which I think is a very fine one, but I would like to bring up a couple of points. In connection with free scientific research. The scientists who worked on the atomic bomb have come forward to ask that this bill be defeated, because they feel that the reason that the United States was first in discovering this was that it did have free scientific research. This bill would also prohibit physics teachers from teaching modern physics in the classroom, and puts a $10,000 fine or jail sentence on people discussing or writing articles or teaching anything at all about atomic energy. I would like to ask that this resolution go down.

One question is the May-Johnson Bill, which is now before the House, which would prohibit free scientific research. The scientists who worked on the atomic bomb have come forward to ask that this bill be defeated, because they feel that the reason that the United States was first in discovering this was that it did have free scientific research. This bill would also prohibit physics teachers from teaching modern physics in the classroom, and puts a $10,000 fine or jail sentence on people discussing or writing articles or teaching anything at all about atomic energy. I would like to ask that this resolution go down.

President Doyle: Anything further?

Delegate Sullivan (Teamsters No. 25, Bos- ton): I don't expect that the Chairman is going to be able to answer the question, the Chairman of the convention, but I am wondering if the Chairman of the Resolutions Committee can answer the question: Does that resolution provide that atomic energy shall be used by the workers who are members of the various trade unions to help them carry on further work in the interests of the union?

The Chairman of the Resolutions Committee, in my opinion, should be able to qualify to answer.

Delegate Russell: I appreciate that Brother Sullivan has raised a very important question, and it is somewhat dependent upon the strength of our organization when it comes to the element of control. I still hope that we gain power economically, physically, morally, spiritually, and atomically.

President Doyle: Delegate Carroll.

Delegate Carroll (Cement Finishers No. 534, Boston): I would like to know from the Chairman of the convention whether or not this resolution expresses our will that we wish the secrets of atomic energy to be kept by the State?

President Doyle: The Chairman of the Resolutions Committee is also the author of the resolution, and I think about this time he wishes he didn't write it.

Delegate Russell: Right. I think it might be nice for us to make a public pronouncement, and we admit that it is under the control of Canada, Great Britain, and the United States. We say it has been kicked around, and then we finally resolve that it might be a good thing for the people of Massachusetts to so lead their lives that we could be in peace and harmony and prosperity, and that atomic energy secrets and all be damned, that it would
not be used for war because it would not be necessary, but that it could be used for construction of a better world. This was just a hope and aspiration and perhaps too much time at home to think and write foolish things.

President Doyle: Are you ready for the question?

Delegate McLaren (Stone Masons No. 9, Bostons): I went over the resolution, but from the remarks just made, I have just gotten the gist of it, and I tried to think of the suggestion made the other day in the press by President McLaren of Connecticut, in my opinion, is a splendid elaboration as to the value of this new implement of destruction.

I think that the nearest we can get to effective control is by sharing the secret without putting over the invention to Russia. I think we ought to give it to Canada, to the United States and Canada share, because Canada is already in on this patent. I think that these three nations together, working under the United Nations, might effectively build up a condition that will be agreeable to every nation on the face of the earth.

I wonder, at times, why it is that working people are not active in this matter. It is upon the trade union condition, and having lived here for quite a number of years, I have found that all the treachery, all the inconvenience, all the suspicion, all the fear for the working people of this country has been made by the other fellow who controls the economic resources of this country.

I cannot, at this present time, get any definite action from our present Congress. Why? Because they know we are not strong enough, not united enough to enforce our will through telling them what they must do, what they shall do, for the conduction and building up of this country to a truly democratic position.

I am amazed, really amazed, to think we call ourselves a democracy, and as things go today in the world, we are the greatest democracy on the face of God’s earth, but when we have people like Rankin from these states, who can come here in a meeting of your and five per cent of the votes of their community, and destroy any re-conversion program that is good for America and good for the world, and, so far as we were, seek to make a truly, great use of our great economic resources, I say it is time to take stock. It is time for us to put less trust in those who control us, either in Congress or out of Congress, and to broaden the base in such a way that the whole world ultimately will have something to say truly, and by truly, I mean in a democratic way.

This country for some years has tried to correct the bad condition, so far as government is concerned, in Europe and Asia, but let me tell you, friends, unless we take care of our own democratic position, it militates against any and every much that we might make to help the conditions in Europe and Asia. And I somehow think, with all due respect to the Chairman of the Resolutions Committee—he has given his attention and perhaps too much time to those matters—I think, somehow or other, that a resolution of that type is not adequate, because, when you have, as you have had from Section No. 2 of Connecticut, the Committee now on that committee, when you have such men in contact with scientists of the country, not too sure of themselves so far as their approach to this great thing that we have now, they are not sure how to act, I think it behooves the labor movement to have more due deliberation on such a resolution as that, and I have been trying to ask this body to instruct its Executive Board to refer, with participation on the part of the executive board, to refer the matters to the American Federation of Labor Executive Committee to get their reaction as to how we shall frame the resolutions or proclamations as to how we should use this great power that we do possess.

Mr. Chairrem, Mr. Chairman, the last war this country, which had billions, lent it to a great many nations. Having the money, they could do it, but in addition, they exercised a coercive force that lifted up the debts so high—

President Doyle: Delegate McLaren, will you please conclude now?

Delegate McLaren: To this day, we have not been able to collect those debts, and in the same way, this big stick, this terrible thing in our hand, will create a condition similar, so far as the thinking and the actions of the people in Europe and Asia are concerned.

President Doyle: Are you ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes Delegate Stefani.

Delegate Stefani (Cook’s and Pastry Cooks No. 186, Boston): Mr. Chairman, on this subject of atomic discovery that we have made in America: I hope and pray to God that it will never be used, in my opinion, that we are not taking a stand now of humanity. I think that the militarists of America made the biggest mistake when they went over the city with the bomb, because when the bomb was dropped, and women who had no part in the war. If they had used the atomic bomb over the battlefields, it wouldn’t have been as much of a stain on winning this war in Japan.

I hope and pray that in the future no atomic bomb will be used, and the only way we can stop it, Mr. Chairman, is not by lip-talking, but by every human being in this room to see that no other war reoccurs, and the only way that you can stop these wars is to bring about, not an American economy, but a world economy, a world justice, so that every human being in this world can live up to the standard of American living.

Then, brothers and sisters, it will not become necessary to use any destructive weapons in the future.

Remember, we are sons of God, no matter where we are, and we, as Americans, should go forth, and not only bring up the standard of living in America, but we should be interested in the whole world, so that in the future, Mr. Chairman, there will be no more wars in this world, so that human nature will not be destroyed.

President Doyle: Thank you. We will now vote on the question.

It has been regularly moved and seconded that the committee’s report be adopted. Is there anything further to be said on the question? If not, as many as are in favor of the adoption of the committee’s report will signify in the usual manner by saying “ayes”. Those opposed “no”. The “ayes” have it. It is a vote and so ordered. Resolution No. 8 is adopted.

Delegates, we have with us this afternoon, Dr. Alvin T. Hansen, Littauer Professor of Political Economy at Harvard College, a recognized economic authority who, at the Conference in New York, of the American Federation of Labor, delivered a very fine address. We are indeed most fortunate in having Dr. Hansen with us.

I present to you, Dr. Hansen,
DR. ALVIN T. HANSEN
(Littauer Professor of Political Economy, Harvard University)

Mr. Chairman and delegates: In the inter-war years, after World War I and up to World War II, we went through, in this country, first a depression, then a great boom, and then a depression again.

If we look at the whole record of unemployment in the United States in that entire 20-year period, we find that it ranged from some things as high as 10 per cent and 25 per cent, an average something in the neighborhood of 12 or 14 per cent in the entire period.

In England, at no time did unemployment fall below 10 per cent, and it rose as high as 22 per cent and averaged in the neighborhood of 14 or 15 per cent in the entire period.

It is obvious that in this interval of time, two decades, neither of these two great countries succeeded very well in using their productive resources. It is obvious that such a vast amount of unemployment means that our standard of living as a people has not at all been raised to the level that would be possible, and in particular, certain sections of the community have suffered very seriously.

Now, after World War I, there was a disposition in all countries to go back to the old conditions, to so-called normalcy.

After this war, it was at least heartening to see that these countries learned something from their recent experiences, that these countries—in England, Canada, the United States, Australia, the Scandinavian countries—and in a few other countries, there is a new attitude on the part of government and on the part of the general public.

Now this new attitude is revealed specifically in certain important state papers in these different countries. In the first place, in England, something like a year and one-half ago, under the Churchill government, there was issued a famous paper, called the White Paper, on unemployment and its remedies, submitted by the British Cabinet to the British Parliament, it was stated that the government assumes as a primary aim and goal, as a principle of the employment policy, the maintenance of high and stable levels of employment. Now that was something new, and the paper itself went out of the way to explain that it was something new, that it was a new responsibility that government was undertaking.

Now more recently, within the last six months or so, a similar White Paper—so-called in Canada, has been issued by the Canadian Cabinet to the Canadian Parliament, and which is also entitled a paper on employment policy. And in Canada, they also said that the government assumed responsibility for a high and stable level of employment, and then they added, "when we say high and stable level of employment, we do not thereby mean that we take as a goal something short of full employment", they said, "but we realize that the problem is a difficult one, and consequently they put it in terms of a high and stable level of employment," and they added, "the support of all classes of the community in order to carry through this great goal. It will not be an easy task.

Now, in the United States, we have thus far no governmental official statement which is equivalent to the British White Paper on employment policy, and the Canadian White Paper. But the Employment Bill, which we have in Congress and which has passed the Senate and which aims to do substantially the same thing, so far as we are concerned, as the British White Paper and the Canadian White Paper on employment policy.

Now the government does recognize that if we are going to have full employment in the years to come, there are a great many things that it is necessary to do. But above all, it is an essential factor that the total volume of expenditures made by private consumers, made by business on plant equipment and inventories, made on houses and overhaul of property and other things by government, the total volume of expenditures, public and private, a continuous volume of expenditures adequate to employ the labor force.

Now, that is a very fundamental thing, that was our aim, that is one of the aims. But that volume of expenditures, public and private, is somewhat analogous to a good diet on the part of an individual. Now a person who is not suffering may still be afflicted with certain diseases. That is quite true, and similarly, our economy, even though there is a total volume of expenditures, public and private, may still present all manner of things that are wrong in our economy.

There may be maladjustment of income, even though there was an adequate volume of expenditures. There may be industrial relations that are not satisfactory, they are not in agreement. There may be a warped price structure. There may be monopolies here and there, and so on.

So it is certainly true that mere total volume of outlays is not enough. We have to get the whole thing into a proper ratio and proportion. We have to have the right kind of outlays, certainly, but we have to have the right kind of production. We have to have the right kind of expenditures. And yet, I venture to say that the one main difficulty, more than anything else, that has confronted us between the two wars, is the fact that we have allowed, at times, the total volume of outlays to fall very drastically, as in fact occurred after 1929.

In 1929, we had a net national income of something like 35 billion dollars. We dropped that in three short years, to only 40 billion dollars. Now the cause of that decline started with a decline in the outlays made on capital goods. We had a huge volume of construction and other capital goods running up to about 17 billion dollars in the late 20s, and that declined to something like two billion dollars in 1932 and 1933, and when all the workers in the construction industry were unemployed, and then the people and the farmers and everyone else in the industry—heavy industry, and agriculture—we were unemployed, that, in turn, induced a decline in private consumption expenditures, so that you had a magnified effect from this decline of 15 billion dollars in capital outlays. The result was that consumers' expenditures declined by something like 30 billion dollars by reason of the unemployment that had been started in the capital goods industries.

Thus, all told, the total volume of outlays fell from say 85 billion dollars to about 40 billion dollars, and that decline in 1929-30 and 1931-32, was a tremendous decline.

Now in the kind of countries that we live in and that I have referred to, we operate in the market. Employment comes about by reason of demand and supply. Demand comes about by reason of production, public and private. Employment in our society is not a matter of a totalitarian state assigning people to do something that they may not be satisfied to do, but our society is a matter of job opportunities which spring from an adequate volume of demands. If the total demand is not adequate, then the labor force will not be employed, and so it is a matter of satisfaction and the feeling that the aggregate demand of goods and services shall be numerous.
We can break that down into different categories. There is, first of all, private consumer expenditures. Now we know that private consumption expenditures are quite high when employment is high, and we know that it is going to be low if employment is low. If we have full employment, we can calculate pretty accurately what the private consumer outlays to be. We know that at no time have they been adequate, and this is a very important point. At no time have consumer outlays adequately provided full employment. The reason is that in a society such as ours, business units and individuals save a very large part of their income, and therefore when we say consumer outlays alone was anything like adequate to employ the entire labor force, we could calculate pretty accurately, if all other elements in the economy were making a proper contribution and we had full employment, how much of a contribution to total outlays, to total demands, will be made by private consumers. It is not nearly high enough; however, at any point, has been. We are forced to increase consumer outlays and thus help to create full employment, to provide as high a wage as industry can pay without having to raise prices. That is the question we are now concerned with.

Another important item is that we shall have taxes which shall not weigh unduly upon the portion of the wage or salary which we will be able to retain their incomes and spend it rather than be taxed by sales taxes and all that kind of thing.

Well now we come to the second category of tax, an important category, namely, the outlays by business on plants and equipment and the outlays made by the public on house construction and the like. Now this particular item is not a dependable one. It is highly unpredictable. It fluctuates very violently, and this is one of the fundamental causes why we have unemployment, that the outlays made on construction, capital goods of all kinds, fluctuate so violently as it does, and consequently, it is for that reason important that we go on and consider the other outlays.

Now we come down to governmental outlays. Governmental outlays can be divided into two parts: One, the standard ordinary run of government services such as services for education, police, fire protection, the general run of municipal and state services that we enjoy from government.

Now these services can be set down, also, as a pretty accurate figure. We know approximately what they are. They ought not to decline in depression. We ought not to reduce our outlays on education, public health and the like when depression comes. We know approximately what this figure is. It may rise over time, but over the short run, it is a pretty definite figure.

We come then next to a fourth item, namely, governmental outlays on public works and development of projects of all kinds, such as the TVA or the proposed Missouri River Valley, such as public housing and the like. Now public works, in my opinion, should be laid off in the boom and accelerated in the depression so that we can and should increase the public outlays on public works and public development projects so as to offset the decline in private consumer outlays.

Take Sweden, for example, in the housing field. In Sweden, it is now the declared purpose of the Swedish Government to stabilize house construction, to see to it that the fluctuations that have occurred in the past in this very important field shall not occur again. Now that involves, among other things, a systematic program of developing and summing up so as to make room for new construction and new housing, and of course, part of the housing program is public housing for low income groups and for private.

We have now a bill in Congress, the Omnibus Urban Redevelopment and Housing Bill, which provides for a very considerable program of development of obsolete and sum housing so as to make room for new construction and new housing, and of course, part of the housing program is public housing for low income groups and private.

We have now a bill in Congress, the Omnibus Urban Redevelopment and Housing Bill, which provides for a very considerable program of development of obsolete and sum housing so as to make room for new construction and new housing, and of course, part of the housing program is public housing for low income groups and private.

We have now a bill in Congress, the Omnibus Urban Redevelopment and Housing Bill, which provides for a very considerable program of development of obsolete and sum housing so as to make room for new construction and new housing, and of course, part of the housing program is public housing for low income groups and private.

We have now a bill in Congress, the Omnibus Urban Redevelopment and Housing Bill, which provides for a very considerable program of development of obsolete and sum housing so as to make room for new construction and new housing, and of course, part of the housing program is public housing for low income groups and private.
Compensatory fiscal policy. Now in addition to compensatory fiscal policy, there is also what is known as developmental fiscal policy. In other words, the developmental fiscal policy has to do with those public outlays which tend to increase the productivity of the community, which tend to improve the human resources, which tend to increase the physical resources of the community so that we can produce a higher level of income and achieve a higher standard of living.

Now, there are two ways also, of course, to add to the aggregate demand, and thereby to maintain full employment, and these outlays in many cases, not only do they employ labor directly, but they also indirectly in direct employment of labor because, if they are well chosen, they can increase the opportunities for private investment.

For example, the TVA, which is a notable example of what may be called developmental fiscal program. In the TVA, we have made large public expenditures, now running up toward 750 millions of dollars in that Tennessee Valley area.

Now the result of those basic public investments, the development of cheap electricity and water power, are in the long run that has been done in that area, has been to increase the opportunities for private investment in that area. It has increased the purchasing power of the people living in that area. It has thereby increased the demand for the human and natural resources to the people living in that area, and thus has stimulated investment all around in different parts of the community.

Thus when we engage in developmental projects of that sort, the result is not only that you employ labor directly on these projects, but the result is also that you increase employment indirectly by creating those private investment opportunities are open. Now that is one of the important things which we need to learn in the years ahead. We need to be ingenious about finding more and more areas in which we can develop our resources and in which we can open up new private investment outlets by such expenditures, and we must be careful not to limit ourselves to merely what is self-liquidating in the narrow and direct sense.

Now there is a phrase in the amendment to the TVA bill that would mean, I think, if interpreted, a very narrow way. On the other hand, I think it could be interpreted in a broader way. It does use, among other language, self-liquidating in the narrow sense, of course, self-liquidating in the sense that it must pay directly for itself, then the question might well be asked, "Why doesn't private enterprise do it?"

Now on the other hand, let me explain that even though a project such as the TVA should not return 100 cents on the dollar plus interest to the treasury directly, that does not prove that it would not be profitable to the society as a whole, many times over even though the treasury should receive back, let us say, only 60 cents on the dollar expenditure. Why is that? The reason is, when you take account of what has happened in that area, the increased private investment, the increased production in that area, the increase in purchasing power and the effect of that, in turn, upon the whole community, that venture may have been profitable many times over even though the treasury gets only 60 cents.

So we must be very careful not to interpret public investment projects in too narrow a way. We are all familiar with that with respect to public roads. Public roads that are free, and they ought to be free. Public roads don't bring in a single cent directly to the treasury.

Nevertheless, we are all agreed that they are productive investments, that without an adequate system of highways and transportation facilities, we could not do the dollar expenditure that we do in our own day.

Now, we need, more and more, to search out areas of public investment and public development that are not self-liquidating in the narrow sense. We need, rather, are highly productive of the community as a whole, and which will open up public investment outlets and increase standards of living, and purchasing power in the community as a whole.

That is one of the areas in which we need to be ingenious, and in which we need to have a new statement and not the narrow point of view that we must only do those things that are directly profitable.

If that were indeed so, why should the private enterprises do it? There is a wide area for public investment which we haven't begun to touch. We cannot buy all the whole area of public development, our cities in this country. Our cities in a country which is as productive as ours are nothing short of scandalous, the slums in all our, large cities, the rivers that are still polluted in this country. Our cities, in a great many examples, I think one of the worst is the Delaware River. There you have a great metropolitan community which still has a very seriously polluted river, and you have that in many places in the country.

Now, with all the slum and blight in our cities, with our inadequate urban transportation systems, with ourbacks on one hand to say that we can't find adequate investment outlets to give us full employment to Labor and to increase, as a result of these basic developments, private investment opportunities.

If you bought up all the slum and blighted land in this country, the whole amount of it, the buildings and the land in our urban communities, it would cost you, I have estimated, something in the neighborhood of 15 billion dollars. Well, that is quite a sum, but when you set that sum against the hundreds of billions of dollars that we have recently spent on war, it seems to me that we think what this is a pretty insignificant sum, and if you spread that 15 billion dollars expenditure over, say, a 15-year period, it would amount to only a billion dollars a year, as a result of which, gradually the slums and blighted areas and thereby making room for new construction projects, laying out the land as it ought to be with less density of population than is now true in most of our great cities, open it up with parks and playgrounds and adequate transportation and parking facilities, and plan it in a thoroughgoing sound way, and then sell this land to private enterprises on terms on which it can go ahead, or use it for public projects, such as public housing for low-income groups, and like.

Now, let me express this to the effect that this can really go forth and achieve a high standard of living in the United States. Indeed, it has been estimated that not only the purchase of the slum and blighted land, but the rebuilding of this land, may cost you, but more than something in the neighborhood of 50 to 60 billion dollars.

Now, again, set off against the expenditure of this kind, there would not be a bigger, and while before the war, we would have thought that was a fantastically high figure, as a result of the war expense, I think we all have to recognize that it is not a fantastically high figure.

During the war, we have spent every year in recent years 90 billion dollars on war. Set.
that off against the figure that it would take to rebuild our entire urban communities in the manner that I have indicated.

It is important that in this discussion we have to talk in bold terms, if we are going to really use the prodigious productive power which our community has now achieved. We cannot talk in small terms, nor is it possible to submit them to a financial analysis at this time and in this place.

I want to say a word as to how do we finance a large volume of governmental expenditures. Before I do so, I ought to say a word about the productive power of the nation, for I do not want to give the impression that I am talking merely about brick and mortar. We also need in this country to spend much more money than we have on education. We still have in the United States a tremendous number of illiterates, an enormous number of people who have had less than four years of education. We still have very serious deficiencies in the area of public health, and I could go on to illustrate many other areas. We need to do a great deal in order to improve our human resources in terms of health, nutrition, education, and all that sort of thing.

How do you finance these things? In the same general way as we have been financing the government during the war, but in different ways, and on a much larger scale. You cannot do it first by taxes, and you may, quite appropriately, finance a certain amount by borrowing, particularly with respect to the developmental projects. But we have always done with respect to our road and improvement projects of that sort, and there is no reason why we should not use the public credit for the developmental projects and road improvement projects just as we have in the past, on public roads and basic improvement projects of that sort.

In this way, you open up outlets for the people of which, apparently, in our country, cannot find adequate outlets, or at least, has not, over a good many years past, in private investment, and if you open up outlets for the people's savings from productive projects of the sort I have mentioned, TVA, Missouri Valley Authority, and that kind of thing, and public housing and so on, then you, in turn, open up a larger outlet for private investment, and therefore, gain larger outlets for the people's savings. Consequently, there is no particular difficulty, as I see it, in a financing program that we need to do is to assure that we do have full employment, that we have high levels of income. If we have high levels of income, we can find the financing means. There is nobody that believes that we are not in a position to finance the charges on our war debt. I do not know of anybody who thinks that we cannot quite well manage our federal finances. There never was a government that has had a higher standard of credit than this country has at the present time, which can be revealed from the fact that we have such a low rate of interest, and we have a general willingness to buy the government's securities, even at this low rate of interest. Consequently, we have the means by which we can meet our obligations, and if we have the means by which it can be financed on a thoroughly sound and stable basis, on the one side preventing inflation, and on the other side, deflationary influences, stability and expansion, these are the things that we need to strive for in the modern world.

President Doyle: Thank you, Dr. Hansen. I well realize that you could have gone on and on with this subject, but you are able to furlough us, and we appreciate your coming here and doing the job, and explaining to us the way you view the problem at hand.

Delegate Sullivan (Teamsters, No. 25, Boston): It is not my intention to transgress upon the privileges of the Chair or the privileges of the Executive-Council of this State Federation of Labor, but I have a resolution that is very important, not only for the Teamsters Union, but the water fronts in our Commonwealth, and I would like to ask the Chair to seek unanimous consent of this delegation to permit me to submit this resolution.

President Doyle: Delegate Sullivan requests unanimous consent for the submission of a resolution. Is there any objection? There being no objection, will Delegate Sullivan bring forth the resolution?

The Chair now recognizes Delegate Ward.

Delegate Ward: Resolution No. 7:

RESOLUTION NO. 7

POSTWAR POLICY OF FEDERATION

Whereas, The day for postwar planning has resolved itself into a day of postwar living, such thoughts, projects, organizations and proposals must now be received and acted upon as a vital part of the national program; and

Whereas, Generalization will be no longer sufficient, specific requests and demands will require understanding. research, preparedness, presentation and a will, and

Whereas, The Massachusetts State Federation of Labor can and will represent the best thinking, better thinking and stronger presentation, with the interests affecting the workers of Massachusetts, leaving national and international problems to labor institutions adapted to and equipped for the handling of such problems;

Whereas, No departure from the above policy is now necessary, and

Whereas, The life, the hopes and aspirations of Massachusetts Labor can best be served by securing for its members a more fuller life within its borders, this can be assured by efficient, cooperative action in all of its ramifications; a reasonable workweek with maximum employment and adequate wage, with participation in all phases of the social and economic development of our State and the New England region, being vocal and understanding on matters affecting our national and international problems; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor, at a meeting held in the Commander Hotel, Cambridge, Massachusetts, on October 26-28, 1945, record itself and recommend to its executive officers the following postwar policy and program:

1.) That the hours of labor be reduced to the minimum in keeping with the ability of our workers to serve and pursue other vocations,

2.) That the hourly wage and yearly income be increased progressively, in keeping with the highest standard of living possible under the present eco-
nomic system, recognizing all relative factors in the cost of production, our geographical location and competitive factors, also the element of profits and other recognized factors in an honorable and adequate wage program.

3.) The determination by our Federation of the union policy and program, affected by local, state, area and national industrial developments and representative participation on all matters affecting our well being.

4.) Presenting and securing the minimum of state legislation that further imposes government into matters directly involving the employer and employee, together to work out mutual understandings and benefits, and

5.) That emphasis be placed on organization and education in the foregoing proposals, on energetic promotion of councils, and conferences and that classes be instituted to unify, strengthen, and promote, not only understanding, but also promotion of this program.

[Submitted by Delegate Harry A. Russell, Engineers No. 849, Boston.]

The committee recommends adoption of this resolution, and I move concurrence.

President Doyle: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the report of the committee be adopted. Is there anything to be said on the question? If not, as many as are in favor of the committee's report will signify in the usual manner by saying "aye". Those opposed "no". The "ayes" have it. It is a vote and so ordered. The resolution is adopted.

The Chair now recognizes Acting Secretary Wilkinson to read into the convention the resolution as submitted by Delegate Sullivan.

Acting Secretary Wilkinson: Resolution No. 13.

**RESOLUTION No. 13**

**REQUEST ARMY-NAVY RELINQUISH PIERS AT PORT OF BOSTON**

Whereas, During the war emergency the government, for military purposes, acquired for their use some of the publicly-owned piers and shipping facilities in the Port of Boston, and

Whereas, Now that the European and Pacific hostilities have been terminated and these piers are still being used by the government, thus causing the diversion of much of the shipping transportation that would normally come to them through the Port of Boston to other ports of the United States, thus causing tremendous unemployment in the state and the city; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Special Victory Convention go on record as urging the officials of the Army and Navy to relinquish all or some of the piers now being used by them, and to restore them to the Commonwealth so that private shipping interests may again engage those facilities, and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary-Treasurer stand instructed to communicate with the proper authorities affecting our well being.

[Submitted by Delegates John M. Sullivan, Teamsters No. 25, Boston, Herman Koster, Central Labor Union, Boston, and John J. Murphy, Bricklayers No. 6, Worcester.]

President Doyle: As it appears to the Chair that this resolution is not in the least controversial, and if there is no objection, I will submit it directly to the convention without submission to the Resolutions Committee.

Delegate Veleman (Central Labor Union, Malden): I so move.

President Doyle: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the resolution be submitted directly to the convention. Is there anything to be said on the question? Is not as many as are in favor of acting on the resolution will without submission to the Resolutions Committee signify in the usual manner by saying "aye". Those opposed "no". The "ayes" have it. It is a vote and so ordered. The resolution is adopted.

The Chair now recognizes Chairman Russell.

Delegate Russell: With the exception of a request upon the part of the delegate body to join with the Resolution and Officers' Report Committee in thanking the officers of the Cambridge Central Labor Union and such speakers as we have had, your Officers' Report and Resolutions Committee have concluded their work with this recommendation. That the executive officers be instructed to proceed with their customary and usual expressions of thanks, and with that, we now move the concurrence of your Joint Officers' Report and Resolutions Committee as a whole.

President Doyle: Delegate Lorch.

Delegate Lorch (Teachers No. 441, Boston): I would like to ask what disposition has been made of some resolutions which have not been put in. I would like to ask especially about those which would require legislative action, since it would soon be time to take some action on them, and we want to report back. I want to ask especially about equal pay for men and women teachers, the right of teachers to marry without losing their jobs, and third, the nursery schools to continue for the children of soldiers still in service or established we will be able to.

President Doyle: This question is not properly before us. We have a motion before us, as submitted by the Chairman of the Resolutions Committee, which calls upon the Executive Council to recognize the visitors that came and talked with us, and so forth.

Is there anything to be said on the question? If not, as many as are in favor of the adoption of the resolution will signify in the usual manner by saying "aye". Those opposed "no". The "ayes" have it. It is a vote and so ordered. The motion was adopted.

The Chair now recognizes Acting Secretary Wilkinson, who wishes to reply to Delegate Lorch.

Acting Secretary Wilkinson: Through you, Mr. Chairman and delegates, the State Federation of Labor makes its representatives in recent conventions on resolutions dealing with various legislative matters, that in the opinion of the Executive Council did not confine themselves to the purposes for which this convention has been called.

On receipt of the resolutions, the sender of the resolutions was advised that inasmuch as they could not properly be considered by this convention, that it was suggested that the resolutions be submitted, for legislative program of the Federation be submitted to the Executive Council at its meeting later in this month.
President Doyle: The Chair recognizes Delegate Hull.

Delegate Hull (Central Labor Union, Westfield): Mr. Chairman, I have been deeply impressed with this convention, and I think the large number of delegates who have been present here have been under the same impression.

I was pleased to have you announce that the fire fighters only yesterday formed a state association. I am pleased with the progress that the municipal employees and state employees are making in this state. I believe that if the municipal employees in different cities and towns would cooperate and interview fire fighters who are not members of organized labor, that with their close contact they would accomplish a great deal.

Now, the fire fighters have, as I understand it, approximately 2000 members in the state, and there is a probability of 6000 firemen. There has been no group of workers, in my opinion, that has been exploited more than the fire fighters, and I believe that we should go to bat for them.

You heard the wonderful address by William Green. You heard the address by John Murphy, who urges central bodies to go out and help organization. Let these 500 delegates, or over, we have here, appoint themselves as individual organizers, and let us go out and organize our communities.

I am proud to say that I have only one CIO outfit in Westfield, and I hope to abolish that soon. I think it can be done. That is, taking this labor movement to our hearts, not only as members, but to our hearts, and bringing the fold in with us, and urging these various organizations who are not affiliated with the State Branch to become affiliated. They don't know what the State Branch is doing. They don't know how hard your officials of the State Branch are working in order to get these various organizations to affiliate with us.

We are going to be confronted with this bad situation, which is going to cost us a pile of money, and those not affiliated with the State Branch are going to enjoy the fruits of our labor, and we need their support and finances.

President Doyle: The business of the convention having been concluded, the Chair now declares the convention adjourned, sine die.

(The Special Victory Convention adjourned at 4:15 o'clock p.m.)

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Secretary-Treasurer.
Executive Council Report
to the
Special War Convention
Because of a critical shortage in transportation facilities, the War Committee on Conventions requested the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor to forego holding its annual convention this year. The conclusion of the war having relieved shortages in transportation and hotel facilities, the War Committee on Conventions relaxed its rules, so that under certain conditions conventions could be held.

In view of these facts, the Executive Council decided that inasmuch as the regularly-constituted date for the annual convention of the Federation had passed, and because of the pressing need for the development of a program designed to meet the changes that are upon us, that a Special Victory Convention should be called.

This report is presented with the hope that it will aid in the development of the overall program which will guide the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor during the months that are ahead.
SPECIAL VICTORY CONVENTION

To the Delegates to the Special Victory Convention
of the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor:

Greetings:

The victorious conclusion of the most costly and destructive war in world history has precipitated the economic life of America into an abyss of unpreparedness for peace-time living—not that a man or woman worthy of the name would entertain the thought or the wish that the war might have continued for one fraction of a second beyond that which it did. Nevertheless, we cannot fail to recognize the fact that those in authority have failed to prepare definite plans to aid in the reconversion of our productive economy to a peace-time basis.

Primarily it is the responsibility of Congress, to prepare and put into execution an overall program, to make the change from a war-time economy to that of peace, as smooth as conditions will permit. However, outside of passing legislation to eliminate part of the Surplus War Profit Tax imposed on industry, and to provide processes to liquidate war contracts, the Congress has not as yet enacted one single law that will remove the shock and displacement of workers because of the sudden termination of war production.

In January 1942, at our Emergency War Convention, your Executive Council called upon the delegates to adopt a policy of full cooperation in prosecuting the war and in producing the materials of war. The production records established during the war are sufficient evidence that you lived up to the high resolve that was adopted by the delegates in attendance.

It now is the responsibility of your officers to bring before you for your careful thought and consideration, a program which we consider as being a basic necessity, if we are to prevent industrial collapse with its attendant hardship and misery to the thousands of members of American Fed-
eration of Labor unions, whom you as delegates to this convention represent. The compelling necessities of war no longer dictate the course that will be followed by government, industry and labor here in America. Nevertheless, the obstacles that must be surmounted and the problems that await solution are no less important for the survival of democracy and freedom, than was the winning of the war. Therefore, it is your responsibility and at the same time your privilege, to do your bit in seeing to it that while winning the war we will not lose the peace.

Taking all the factors into consideration, your Executive Council submits the following for your consideration:

1. We call upon Congress to enact legislation that will provide guarantees of full productive employment for all who are ready and willing to work.

2. We call for the continuation and expansion of a high wage policy, and for the broadening of minimum wage laws. Investigation has disclosed that more than 10 million workers—more than one-third of our national labor market—receive less than 65 cents per hour. If all in this category were raised to a wage of 65 cents per hour, the cost to industry would approximate a cost of four billion dollars a year. It is our opinion that this cost can be absorbed by industry without substantially affecting current profit levels, and, in most instances, within present price ceilings. Here we point out that a raise in these obviously substandard rates would not be inflationary, since the recipients would use increased income to provide some of the basic necessities of life now deprived them.

3. We call upon our State Legislature to enact legislation broadening unemployment compensation benefits to a maximum payment of $25, for a period of 26 weeks. The necessity for such a proposition is obvious, inasmuch as the Massachusetts Employment Security Trust Fund is adequate to meet liberalized payments. Adequate payments must
be provided for those who will suffer temporary unemployment during the transitional period, or the task of providing for the displaced worker will have to be assumed by local charitable and welfare institutions. If the volume of unemployment should be so great as to completely deplete the Fund, the "experience rating" formula should be repealed and deficits made up by funds provided by the federal government.

4.

We call upon Congress to give immediate attention to a further downward revision of tax rates, both for personal and corporate income excises. We are fully conscious of the fact that the tremendous increase in the national debt has been necessary because of the war. We are convinced that this cost should be amortized over a long period, so as to release funds for purchase of consumer goods.

5.

We announce and reaffirm our adherence to the principle of "free enterprise" in industrial life. But while subscribing to this philosophy, we direct the attention of industry to the fact that like liberty, "free enterprise" must be earned and cultivated by constant vigilance. "Free enterprise" cannot flourish in a climate of monopoly, centralization or labor-baiting. "Free enterprise" has a corollary in free collective bargaining. We urge that every effort to regiment or regulate the normal function of employee and employer in the course of free collective bargaining be repudiated.

6.

We condemn and denounce the actions of political demagogues who seek to develop a breach between labor and the veteran, or who labor unceasingly to discredit organized labor in the eyes of our community, and we repudiate those apostles of totalitarian ideologies who seek to foment class hatred and friction for the purpose of subverting and destroying our American way of life. In a period of transition such as we face today, the seeds of discontent and prejudice fall on fertile soil, and in no way contribute to the solution
of the whole vast problem of reconversion, but, on the contrary, serve to generate strife between worker and fellow worker, employee and employer. The solution of our economic problems must be solved within the framework of our constitutional government.

7.

Realizing that the prospect of achieving a high stable level of total output, depends in a large part upon the timing and volume of construction activity. We call for the integration of a long-term public works program in the government's fiscal policy, for the purpose of stabilizing our economy at high levels of production and employment. It is our opinion that the federal government is not at present organized to make its maximum contribution toward the formation of a sound construction policy.

1) We suggest that the appropriate federal agency compile information and statistics on construction and related production and employment, so as to provide a guide for the development of a public works construction policy.

2) Coordination of scheduling and planning on all construction projects.

3) Establishment of consultative, informative and statistical liaison with local and state construction programs.

4) Cooperation and consultation with representatives of the construction industry, both management and labor, for the development of a program of full productive employment in that industry.

5) A policy of awarding all construction to contractors and strict adherence to paying of established and prevailing wage rates.

We call on Congress to retain control over prices of consumer goods, except in those instances where relaxation of price control will stimulate job opportunities. We urge
that control of rents be continued until such time as the housing market reaches a more balanced condition.

8.

We urge the cooperation of labor and management in the development of the Port of Boston, and we commit our fullest support and cooperation in any program devised that will bring new industry to this Commonwealth, but we will be ever vigilant in our efforts to maintain the high industrial standards required by law and union contract.

9.

If we have learned no other lesson from our experience in the war period than the necessity for unity in the labor movement, we have profited a lot. At this Special Victory Convention, called for the purpose of celebrating our victory over the forces of evil, we again reaffirm the position taken by the delegates at the special Emergency War Convention in 1942, as it applies to the need for unity in the labor movement in the United States. We urge that the leaders of the Congress of Industrial Organizations give heed to President Green's invitation for them to return to the fraternity of workers, from whence they sprung, and we call upon the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor to conclude its negotiations with the United Mine Workers of America, so that this great labor organization can return in honor to the conference tables of the American Federation of Labor.

CONCLUSION

Today the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor stands on the threshold of a new era. The war has been successfully concluded and America convulses under the impact of post-war economic adjustment. What this new era holds for us, will be determined in no small degree by the trends of national and international events.

Considering the seriousness of the situation, Labor must readjust itself to meet the changes in the times. This necessarily will take a little time and will call for the exercise of
intelligence and vision on the part of those who must design the pattern that will lead to full employment, continuous prosperity and economic tranquility.

The Massachusetts State Federation of Labor today must meet this challenge, and to you the delegates at this special convention falls the responsibility to chart the paths that will guide the federation safely toward the goal of a fuller, happier and more secure way of life for the workers and artisans of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM J. DOYLE, President
THOMAS E. WILKINSON, Acting Secretary-Treasurer
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