

My friends:

July 15, 1951

The House of Representatives continued to work long and late throughout the week on the Defense Production Act, otherwise known as the Wage and Price Control Bill. Speeches, speeches, speeches; amendments, amendments, amendments - like every other Member, I heard speeches and amendments until I grew good and tired, but still they came, more and more.

Under the best of conditions, enactment of an economic bill would be difficult and complicated, It is a tough job. *any way you look at it.* It is particularly complicated now by several facts:

First and foremost complicating fact is the complexity of our economy, itself, the diverse interests, ~~the~~ antagonisms, <sup>selfish interests and</sup> the lack of understanding of one another's problems.

Secondly, we are in that twilight zone of having neither peace nor all out war.

Thirdly, politics is rife, with both parties playing for whatever advantage they can obtain, while individual Members of Congress are turning their own weather eye to the political winds.

Fourthly, the poor caliber of administration <sup>We have had</sup> of the Economic Control Bill.

When all of these complicating conditions converge upon a bill calculated to have <sup>an</sup> effect upon not only every industry and business in the country but every working person; indeed, every man, woman and child in America, one need not be surprised that it would be a

long, drawn-out, difficult task with which for Congress to deal.

The House Banking and Currency Committee, itself, *which considered to report the bill, itself*

made 57 amendments to the Bill. The Committee should not be surprised, then, that the entire House Membership would have a plethora of amendments. Many of the amendments were minor in nature, but some of them went to the very heart *in* philosophy of economic controls in a time of shortages and heavy war production.

One particular amendment seemed to me to be a very serious mistake. I refer to the Amendment offered by Representative Davis of Georgia to absolutely freeze all prices and wages for 120 days with no flexibility for adjustment up or down regardless of how great the hardship might be. Several supporters of this amendment undertook to compare it with the over-all control bill which I introduced in the beginning of World War II. Actually, there is little comparison between the two. True, the bill which I introduced would have placed a ceiling upon all rents, prices, wages, profits, commissions, etc., as of a given time, but *the my* bill provided ample *latitude* to make adjustments in hardship and *Davis amendment* *in* inequitable situations. I thought the *bill* entirely too rigid.

Furthermore, I think an over-all bill need be adopted at the beginning of an inflationary period, not after prices and wages have jumped up here and there helter-skelter, thus getting things all out of joint. However, even though it would be wise to adopt an over-all freeze, I am

confident it would be unwise to adopt it for only four months.

If this proposal should become law, it would almost paralyze our national economy. That is, if it was enforced. I doubt, however, if such a program could be given adequate enforcement at this time.

Another amendment on which there has been wide-spread controversy was an amendment which sought to guarantee that no price ceiling would be clamped down on a commodity derived from a farm commodity in a manner to prevent the price of that farm commodity from reaching a parity price. As for me, I do not see how Congress could afford, or why it should consider, holding a price below parity. Neither do I see that Congress could, or at least should, try to hold wages below the minimum wage. I have never had any intention of supporting any bill that would do ~~either~~ of these things.

The trouble in Congress has been that everybody is trying to look out after the interests of the particular people which he represents, be they consumer, producer or distributor, and, in doing so, has been slow to recognize the over-all problem. I am not excepting myself from this criticism. I, too, am guilty of trying to do the best I could for the particular branch or branches of society to whom I owe maximum loyalty and responsibility. Even so, I have been willing, and I have found a great many other Congressmen willing, to compromise my views and interests, in order to <sup>pass</sup> accomplish a workable bill.

To avert war an

The years ahead will not be easy ones for our country. To meet Russian communist aggression, and turn it back, we must maintain large armed forces of our own, and keep them supplied with the newest and most deadly weapons. Much of the burden of arming our allies must rest on us, because their own economies cannot fully support the needed rearmament programs. In addition, we must keep up our production of atomic weapons, and make sure that we stay ahead in the development of new weapons.

These will not be easy tasks, even for so great and rich a country as the United States. We are blessed with a strong economy, planted firmly upon a system of competitive free enterprise, and with a land abundant in natural resources. Yet we must remember that a large portion of the world's area and population are subject to the absolute control of a government which is answerable to no electorate, is indifferent to all human values, and is bent on world conquest. The masters of Soviet Russia are diverting unlimited manpower and resources into maintaining huge armies and into the production of atomic weapons. No abhorrence or regimentation, no conception of human freedom and dignity, no concern for a decent standard of living for the common man, checks the zeal of these communist fanatics in funneling all their resources into their program of world conquest. Once they are certain that they can conquer, or at any sign of faltering on our part, they will strike for world dominion.

Therefore we must be prepared, and for years if necessary, to dedicate much of our manpower, and more of our production, to the safeguarding of our defense and that of the rest of the free world. The strain on our people will be long and heavy. Our resolution and our patience will be put to severe tests. Our young men will be subject to call to the armed forces. Our standard of living will suffer. In this country our free enterprise system has until now made possible a steadily rising system of living. With much of our manpower and production diverted of necessity into military channels, the civilian standard of living surely cannot continue to rise as heretofore, and almost surely must decline.

In meeting these difficult years ahead, our government must, and I know it will, have the support of all parts of our population. Each and every group in this nation must not only itself give loyal support to our defense

The strange lack of disturbance in Congress and <sup>in</sup> other Washington officialdom to the slow program ~~of~~ of the Korean

cease fire negotiations can be attributed to the generally held opinion in the Capitol that ~~the~~ <sup>though the</sup> Communists will haggle and prolong, driving the best bargains possible, ~~but that~~, in the end, they will agree to terms ~~to which we will agree.~~ <sup>of a cease fire</sup>

This does not necessarily mean that the terms of ~~the~~

Representatives of the United Nations will be rigidly unbending <sup>undoubtedly, there will be give + take.</sup> ~~and uncompromising.~~ Well,

I mentioned on this broadcast last Sunday

that, as a result of the conflict in Korea, the United States <sup>mentioning several instances.</sup> had found it easier to negotiate for bases. Another instance

has come to light during the past week. It is now Spain with

which the United States is negotiating for bases in their home land.

I am all for this. Our preponderances are not in population, not in

ground troops, but rather in the products of our industry and

freedom. I am referring to the Air Force, to the Navy, Atomic Bomb

superiority, radar, and free man, himself. In order to bring

these material preponderances to bear upon our potential enemy,

the Soviet Union, it is necessary to have bases from which to

operate. I think we need bases in Spain, both naval bases and

air bases. In addition, many of our Generals and strategists

have talked in closed door hearings about the advantages of

<sup>protected</sup> the Iberian Peninsula, <sup>separated</sup> as it is from the ~~other~~ continent

~~to our defense~~ mobilization effort, but must avoid needlessly antagonizing other groups whose support is also needed. We must all make sacrifices, and no one group should seek to take selfish advantage of our country's peril, or to lay on another group a disproportionate share of the common burden. Rather we must make every effort to promote harmony among all elements in our society, and to avoid needless strife between groups.

In the field of industrial relations, particularly, we shall need harmony and ~~contentment~~, not ~~strife~~ and unrest. We shall need full production. To get full production not only must strikes be held to a minimum, but our workers must feel that they are being fairly dealt with.

of Europe by the Pyrnees Mountains, in the event Russia undertook

to overrun Western Europe.

*This being true,*

I do not quite understand or appreciate the strenuous

objections on the part of France and Italy to the negotiations

between the United States and Spain. True, Franco is a dictator

of Spain, but, like politics, war makes strange bedfellows.

What about Tito of Yugoslavia? Is he not a dictator, too?

Yet we have given aid to Tito with the approval and <sup>upon</sup> the

urging of our friends, the British and ~~the~~ French.

I am for mobilizing whatever strength we can honorably

mobilize. I am for enlisting the aid and friendship of whatever

nation, of whatever people, we can honorably enlist. I am in

favor of building up the preponderances we have and mounting

other preponderances, too, ~~if possible~~; to avert war, if possible, and

to win it if it is inevitable. Of course, I abhor and detest

dictator Franco. I remember his collaboration with Hitler and

Mussolini against us in World War II. I know that his personal

record and philosophy is contrary to the very precept and

principles of ~~the United States of America~~. But, even so, I am willing

to get along with him if he is willing to give us aid in this great,

noble effort the United States is leading to stop the onrush

of anti-God communist despotism.

So, I approve of Adm. Sherman's trip to Spain. I am all for

successful negotiation with Spain in order that we may have bases from which to operate.

As I have said before, I believe the principal reason why the Communist conspiracy has called for a truce in Korea is that they see the Western Powers drawing closer together <sup>+ stronger</sup> as a result of Korea. They see themselves being ringed with bases from which American air and naval power can operate against her, if necessary. They see, too, that the idea and ideal of freedom has not been crushed.