



Abba Hillel Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

MS-4787: Abba Hillel Silver Papers, 1902-1989.

Series I: General Correspondence, 1914-1969, undated.

Sub-series A: Alphabetical, 1914-1965, undated.

Reel
25

Box
9

Folder
564

Committee on Labor Injunctions (organized by the American Civil
Liberties Union), 1928-1932.

The Federal Anti-Injunction Bill

- ❏ Bills are pending before Congress restricting the power of the federal courts to issue injunctions in labor disputes
- ❏ The most sweeping injunctions in recent years crippling the rights of trade unions to organize, strike and picket have been issued by federal courts.
- ❏ The bill has the endorsement of the A. F. of L., with amendments, the National Civic Federation, and of leading attorneys in industrial relations.
- ❏ Here in this pamphlet is an abstract of the bill, arguments for and against, and the bill itself, (S.. 935; H. R. 5315) together with a summary of the National Civic Federation Report.

Read This Pamphlet!

Support the Bill!

Write Your Congressmen and Senators!

COMMITTEE ON LABOR INJUNCTIONS

(Organized by the American Civil Liberties Union)

100 FIFTH AVENUE—ROOM 1002

NEW YORK CITY



February, 1932

Abstract of the Anti-Injunction Bill

Sec. 1-3 No federal court may issue any injunction or restraining order in a labor dispute except in accordance with the following declaration of public policy:

- (a) The unorganized worker being helpless to improve his own conditions, the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively is recognized.
- (b) No contract in violation of the above right is enforceable.. *"Yellow-dog" contracts are specifically outlawed:*

Sec. 4 No federal court may enjoin:

- (a) a strike;
 - (b) workers from joining unions;
 - (c) the use of union funds for the benefit of members;
 - (d) restricting freedom of union members to carry on litigation;
 - (e) union members from publishing their sentiments and views;
 - (f) freedom of meeting;
 - (g) picketing;
- unless accompanied by fraud or violence.

Sec. 5 No federal court may enjoin any persons from doing any of the above things together on the ground that to do so constitutes "conspiracy."

Sec. 6 No officer or member of a union may be held accountable for the acts of others in which he has not definitely participated.

Sec. 7 An injunction may be issued *only after a court has heard both sides*, with opportunity for cross examination. It may then be issued only on the following conditions:

- (a) that unlawful acts have been committed;
- (b) that irreparable injury will follow;
- (c) that greater injury will be done to complainant by denying an injunction than to the defendants by granting it;
- (d) that there is no other remedy at law;
- (e) that public officers are unable to protect the complainants' interests.

An exception is made to the above proceeding in permitting the issuance of a temporary restraining order in emergencies without hearing both sides. This may run, however, for only five days, and the complainant must put up a bond to recompense the defendants for all losses, including cost of defense, if the injunction is denied.

THE FEDERAL ANTI-INJUNCTION BILL

- Sec. 8* No injunction may issue unless the complainant has complied with all the obligations of law involved in the dispute and has exhausted all available means for mediation or voluntary arbitration to settle the dispute.
- Sec. 9* An injunction may issue only on the basis of the facts filed with the court, and it may only prohibit the specific acts complained of.
- Sec. 10* Provision is made for prompt handling of appeals.
- Sec. 11* *Persons cited for contempt are entitled to jury trial* unless the contempt was committed in open court or so near to it as to obstruct its processes. Where contempt arises from alleged attack on a judge's conduct or character the defendant may be tried before another judge.

Arguments in Favor of the Bill

1. *Workers should have the unrestricted right to organize and bargain collectively in order to improve their conditions.* The public policy is declared in the proposed bill, and the courts will have to follow it. Congress has the right to declare public policy concerning labor if not in conflict with the constitution. Without such a declaration of public policy there can be no relief from the abuses of injunctions. (Sec. 2)

2. *The bill outlaws "Yellow-dog" contracts* in which the employee promises not to join a union. Unless the courts deny protection to these contracts the organization of labor unions is seriously hampered. (Sec. 3)

3. Now the courts by injunction write special laws, assuming a legislative function; they define the crime, prescribe the penalty, and punish the violator without a jury trial. By outlining the requirements necessary for an injunction *the bill will stop this law-making by judges*, and most important, will stop the common practice of making crimes, punishable by jail sentences and fines, out of perfectly peaceful and otherwise lawful activities of trade-unions. Free speech, distribution of literature, and freedom of assemblage could not and should not be enjoined. Nor should "conspiracies" be created by injunction when workers join together to exercise these rights. (Secs. 4 and 5)

4. *Officers or members of labor organizations should not be liable for the unlawful acts of others* on strike unless there is clear proof of actual participation. (Sec. 6)

5. Simple changes in procedure are suggested to provide reasonable notice of hearings and *adequate proof that unlawful acts have been threatened or*

THE FEDERAL ANTI-INJUNCTION BILL

committed, before issuing injunctions. Unless these changes are enacted nothing will stop employers' applications for injunctions in order to break strikes rather than to protect their property. (Sec. 7)

6. *The complainant must have complied with the legal obligations in regard to the settlement of the labor dispute* in question and must have made every reasonable effort to settle it. He must not have caused the dispute or aggravated it by wrongful conduct or violations. Otherwise he would be allowed to seek relief by injunction from a dispute he himself had caused or aggravated. (Sec. 8)

7. Provision is made to insure a *speedy hearing of any appeal* from an order granting or denying an injunction. If such a provision were not made, a strike might be over before the issues could be determined. (Sec. 10)

8. The Constitution provides that "in all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy a speedy and public trial by jury" (Amend. 6). For contempts of court in violating an injunction the judge himself without a jury tries the accused for an act declared to be criminal by his order and not by statute. The right of trial by jury is thus seriously limited. Persons accused of such contempts, not committed in open court or near it, *should have a trial by jury as in other cases.* And if the contempt is based on an attack on a judge's conduct or character, it is obvious that another judge should try it. (Secs. 11, 12)

Arguments Against the Bill

1. *The State legislatures and not Congress should regulate industrial relations in the various states.*

2. A bill curtailing *the inherent powers of federal courts* to issue injunctions is unconstitutional. (Sec. 2)

3. "Yellow-dog" contracts are forbidden by the bill. Unless the right of the individual worker to contract not to join a union is recognized, *he will be subject to the control of organized labor.* Furthermore, the United States Supreme Court and many state courts have held such contracts valid. (Sec. 3)

4. Injunctions are forbidden even against *illegally conducted strikes and boycotts.* If there is no remedy against such strikes and boycotts, the employers are without adequate protection. (Secs. 4, 5)

5. The union and its members may not be held liable for the acts of individual members unless they have actually participated in such acts, authorized, or ratified them. This is opposed to the general law of agency that the principal is responsible for the acts of the agent within the scope of his authority. (Sec. 6)

6. (1) A temporary injunction for five days only is insufficient.
 - (2) There should be discretion to extend a temporary order without a hearing.
 - (3) An injunction on testimony only and not on affidavit is inadequate.
 - (4) Adding attorneys' fees, costs and expenses of defense is unnecessary.
 - (5) There is no remedy for irreparable injury to property rights.
 - (6) It is too harsh to require that there must be greater injury to complainant by not granting an injunction than defendant by granting it.
 - (7) It is very difficult to give public officials who fail to give adequate protection sufficient notice of a hearing. (Sec. 7)
-

Report to the National Civic Federation

Herewith are extracts of the essential portions of a report to the National Civic Federation, endorsing the pending injunction bill. This endorsement, coming from such a conservative source, representing employers as well as organized labor, is significant. The headings and italics are inserted.

The Federation's Committee was headed by James W. Gerard. The study of federal labor injunctions was made under the direction of William A. Glasgow, Jr., of the Philadelphia bar.

Study Reveals Abuses

The Committee on the Study of Injunctions in Industrial Disputes, appointed to investigate this subject and to submit a report of its findings and recommendations, has undertaken this study not alone from a legal point of view, but also because of the economic, industrial and social aspects involved. A most careful and thorough examination has been made of injunctions issued in labor disputes in our state courts as well as in our federal courts, which study has clearly indicated the validity of the complaint made by labor that the injunction writ has been subject to many abuses, thus confirming as well the declarations of the two major political parties, which have expressed themselves upon this question.

Legislative Relief Imperative

Your committee, has, therefore, no hesitancy in recommending the advisability of remedial legislation on this subject. Indeed it deems it imperative, if the workers are to be assured that the judiciary of our land and the great powers vested in it are not being unduly and unwarrantably used in determining the industrial relations and policies that should govern our industrial life.

Change in Substantive Law Needed

In considering the method and form of remedial legislation that should govern so as to prevent abuse of the equity powers in industrial disputes and yet grant full and adequate protection, both to property and persons involved in these disputes, your committee has given consideration to methods proposed by various groups and at various times.

We find, in order to deal adequately with the subject, that *there must be an expression and change in our substantive law as well as in the method of application of equity power.*

Insofar as the application of the equity procedure is concerned in the realm of industry, we feel that the equity power has its proper place and function to protect property in that field of human relationship, but we do not believe that *the method for the application of this judicial power ought to be surrounded by safeguards* that will fully protect the rights and freedom guaranteed to all our people, regardless of their stations in life or their relations to industry.

Abolish "Ex-parte" Orders

The issuance of injunctions merely upon affidavits and through "ex parte" hearings presents a most grave abuse that exists in the application of our equity power in industrial controversies. As a rule, all parties in interest *should of right be first afforded the opportunity of presenting testimony* and of having the right of cross-examination to test the credibility of evidence presented, before a restraining order of any kind should be issued, with the exception provided for in Section 7 of the Senate bill hereafter referred to, which provides for the granting of a temporary restraining order upon a showing that a substantial and irreparable injury to the plaintiff's property will result if the order is not granted without notice. . . . Then, too, restraining orders should be issued only where it is imperative to protect equally property as well as persons in their respective rights and with a speedy method of appeal in order that final issues may be quickly and definitely determined.

Specific Acts Only Should Be Enjoined

Section 9, though it does not change the substantive law in any respect in connection with the granting of injunctions, contains in our judgment some of the most salutary provisions in checking the courts from granting the omnibus injunctions in the form of restraining orders, temporary and permanent injunctions; for this section even *requires the court, in the case of granting a restraining order, to make findings of fact prior to the issuance of the order and further directs that the restraining order or injunction shall include only a prohibition of such specific act or acts* as may be expressly complained of in the bill of complaint and as shall be expressly included in

the findings of fact made and filed by the court as provided in the section.

Jury Trial for Contempts

Section 11 *provides for a jury trial for indirect criminal contempts* for violation of a restraining order or injunction issued by a court. There is no definition of an "indirect criminal contempt", but it seems that this may be fairly spelled out of the section, for it excludes contempts committed in the presence of the court or so near thereto as to interfere directly with the administration of justice, etc.

New Judges in Certain Contempt Cases

Section 12 contains a very salutary provision which provides that, in cases of contempt of court when the contempt arises from an attack upon the character or conduct of a judge (if such attack occurs otherwise than in open court) *the trial, upon the application of the accused, shall be heard by another judge.*

"Yellow-Dog" Contracts Should Be Abolished

It is evident from the foregoing that your committee, charged with the duty of investigating the subject of injunctions in industrial disputes, could not deal fully and comprehensively with this subject without venturing into the subject of the anti-association contracts which have been characterized as "yellow dog" contracts, which subject has been referred to another division of the general commission for investigation and report. We are confident that it is desirable that we should deal with this subject in a comprehensive and all-inclusive manner, rather than confine ourselves to a narrow construction of the subject. Your committee wishes likewise to report that, in approving the pending bill to which we have referred, *we likewise approve the provision therein dealing with the anti-association contracts.* As a matter of fact, the two subjects are inseparable and it, therefore, became necessary and unavoidable to give this consideration to a subject which, while not originally referred to this division of the general commission, nevertheless could not be ignored. . . .

Senate Anti-Injunction Bill Recommended

We have examined Report No. 1060 of the Senate of the 71st Congress, second session, of the Committee on the Judiciary to which was referred the Senate Bill (No. S-2497) to amend the Judiciary Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity. *This report contains the bill in full which your committee recommends, with the exceptions noted.* . . .

The Senate Bill in the 71st Congress as endorsed above is now before the 72nd Congress in essentially the same form except for slight changes in phraseology.—Ed.

THE FEDERAL ANTI-INJUNCTION BILL

72ND CONGRESS 1ST SESSION

S. 935* H. R. 5315

A Bill to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Sec. 1. That no court of the United States, as herein defined, shall have jurisdiction to issue any restraining order or temporary or permanent injunction in a case involving or growing out of a labor dispute, except in strict conformity with the provisions of this Act; nor shall any such restraining order or temporary or permanent injunction be issued contrary to the public policy declared in this Act.

Sec. 2. In the interpretation of this Act and in determining the jurisdiction and authority of the courts of the United States, as such jurisdiction and authority are herein defined and limited, the public policy of the United States is hereby declared as follows:

Whereas under prevailing economic conditions, developed with the aid of governmental authority for owners of property to organize in the corporate and other forms of ownership association, the individual unorganized worker is commonly helpless to exercise actual liberty of contract and to protect his freedom of labor, and thereby to obtain acceptable terms and conditions of employment, wherefore it is necessary that he have full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of his own choosing, to negotiate the terms and conditions of his employment, and that he shall be free from the interference, restraint, or coercion of employers of labor, or their agents, in the designation of such representatives or in self-organiza-

tion or in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection; therefore, the following definitions of and limitations upon, the jurisdiction and authority of the courts of the United States are hereby enacted.

Sec. 3. Any undertaking or promise, such as is described in this section, or any other undertaking or promise in conflict with the public policy declared in section 2 of this Act, is hereby declared to be contrary to the public policy of the United States, shall not be enforceable and shall not afford any basis for the granting of legal or equitable relief by any court of the United States, including specifically the following:

Every undertaking or promise hereafter made, whether written or oral, express or implied, constituting or contained in any contract or agreement of hiring or employment between any individual, firm, company, association, or corporation, and any employee or prospective employee of the same, whereby—

(a) Either party to such contract or agreement undertakes or promises not to join, become, or remain a member of any labor organization or of any employer organization; or

(b) Either party to such contract or agreement undertakes or promises that he will withdraw from an employment relation in the event that he joins, becomes, or remains a member of any labor organization or of any employer organization.

Sec. 4. No court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue any restraining order or temporary or permanent injunction in cases involving or growing out of any labor dispute to prohibit any person or persons participating or interested in such dispute (as these terms are herein defined) from doing, whether singly or in concert, any of the following acts:

(a) Ceasing or refusing to perform any

*S.935 as reported to the Senate by the Committee of the Judiciary has a few minor changes in phraseology.

THE FEDERAL ANTI-INJUNCTION BILL

work or to remain in any relation of employment;

(b) Becoming or remaining a member of any labor organization or of any employer organization regardless of any such undertaking or promise as is described in section 3 of this Act;

(c) Paying or giving to, or withholding from, any person participating or interested in such labor dispute, any strike or unemployment benefits or insurance, or other moneys, or things of value;

(d) By all lawful means aiding any person participating or interested in any labor dispute who is being proceeded against in, or is prosecuting, any action or suit in any court of the United States or of any State;

(e) Giving publicity to the existence of, or the facts involved in, any labor dispute, whether by advertising, speaking, patrolling, or by any other method not involving fraud or violence;

(f) Assembling peaceably to act or to organize to act in promotion of their interests in a labor dispute;

(g) Advising or notifying any person of an intention to do any of the acts heretofore specified;

(h) Agreeing with other persons to do or not to do any of the acts heretofore specified; and

(i) Advising, urging, or otherwise causing or inducing without fraud or violence the acts heretofore specified, regardless of any such undertaking or promise as is described in section 3 of this Act.

Sec. 5. No court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue a restraining order or temporary or permanent injunction upon the ground that any of the persons participating or interested in a labor dispute constitute or are engaged in an unlawful combination or conspiracy because of the doing in concert of the acts enumerated in section 4 of this Act.

Sec. 6. No officer or member of any association or organization, and no association or organization participating or interested in a labor dispute, shall be held responsible or liable in any court of the United States for the unlawful acts of individual officers, members, or agents, except upon clear proof of actual participation in, or actual authorization of such acts, or of ratification of such acts after actual knowledge thereof.

Sec. 7. No court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue a temporary or permanent injunction in any case involving or growing out of a labor dispute, as herein defined, except after hearing the testimony of witnesses in open court (with opportunity for cross-examination) in support of the allegations of a complaint made under oath, and testimony in opposition thereto, if offered, and except after findings of fact by the court, to the effect—

(a) That unlawful acts have been committed and will be continued unless restrained;

(b) That substantial and irreparable injury; to complainant's property will follow:

(c) That as to each item of relief granted greater injury will be inflicted upon complainant by the denial of relief than will be inflicted upon defendants by the granting of relief;

(d) That complainant has no adequate remedy at law; and

(e) That the public officers charged with the duty to protect complainant's property are unable or unwilling to furnish adequate protection.

Such hearing shall be held after due and personal notice thereof has been given, in such manner as the court shall direct, to all known persons against whom relief is sought, and also to those public officers charged with the duty to protect complainants property; Provided, however, That if a complainant shall also

THE FEDERAL ANTI-INJUNCTION BILL

allege that, unless a temporary restraining order shall be issued without notice, a substantial and irreparable injury to complainant's property will be unavoidable, such a temporary restraining order may be issued upon testimony under oath, sufficient, if sustained, to justify the court in issuing a temporary injunction upon a hearing after notice. Such a temporary restraining order shall be effective for no longer than five days, and shall become void at the expiration of said five days. No temporary restraining order or temporary injunction shall be issued except on condition that complainant shall first file an undertaking with adequate security sufficient to recompense those enjoined for any loss, expense, or damage caused by the improvident or erroneous issuance of such order or injunction, including all reasonable costs (together with a reasonable attorney's fee) and expense of defense against the order or against the granting of any injunctive relief sought in the same proceeding and subsequently denied by the court.

The undertaking herein mentioned shall be understood to signify an agreement entered into by the complainant and the surety upon which a decree may be rendered in the same suit or proceeding against said complainant and surety, and said complainant and surety submitting themselves to the jurisdiction of the court for that purpose. But nothing herein contained shall deprive any party having a claim or cause of action under or upon such undertaking from electing to pursue his ordinary remedy by suit at law or in equity.

Sec. 8. No restraining order or injunctive relief shall be granted to any complainant who has failed to comply with any obligation imposed by law which is involved in the labor dispute in question, or who has failed to make every reasonable effort to settle such dispute either by negotiation or with the aid of any avail-

able governmental machinery of mediation or voluntary arbitration.

Sec. 9. No restraining order or temporary or permanent injunction shall be granted in a case involving or growing out of a labor dispute, except on the basis of findings of fact made and filed by the court in the record of the case prior to the issuance of such restraining order or injunction; and every restraining order or injunction granted in a case involving or growing out of a labor dispute shall include only a prohibition of such specific act or acts as may be expressly complained of in the bill of complaint or petition filed in such case and as shall be expressly included in said findings of fact made and filed by the court as provided herein.

Sec. 10. Whenever any court of the United States shall issue or deny any temporary injunction in a case involving or growing out of a labor dispute, the court shall, upon the request of any party to the proceedings, forthwith certify the entire record of the case, including a transcript of the evidence taken, to the circuit court of appeals for its review. Upon the filing of such record in the circuit court of appeals, the appeal shall be heard and the temporary injunctive order affirmed, modified, or set aside with the greatest possible expedition, giving the proceeding precedence over all other matters except older matters of the same character.

Sec. 11. In all cases where a person shall be charged with indirect criminal contempt for violation of a restraining order or injunction issued by a court of the United States (as herein defined), the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the contempt shall have been committed: Provided, That this requirement shall not be construed to apply to contempts committed in the presence of the court or so near

THE FEDERAL ANTI-INJUNCTION BILL

thereto as to interfere directly with the administration of justice or to apply to the misbehavior, misconduct, or disobedience of any officer of the court in respect to the writs, orders, or process of the court.

Sec. 12. The defendant in any proceeding for contempt of court is authorized to file with the court a demand for the retirement of the judge sitting in the proceeding, if the contempt arises from an attack upon the character or conduct of such judge and if the attack occurred otherwise than in open court. Upon the filing of any such demand the judge shall thereupon proceed no further, but another judge shall be designated in the same manner as provided in case of the approval of an affidavit of personal bias or prejudice under section 21 of the Judicial Code. The demand shall be filed prior to the hearing in the contempt proceeding.

Sec. 13. When used in this Act, and for the purposes of this Act—

(a) A case shall be held to involve or to grow out of a labor dispute when the case involves persons who are engaged in the same industry, trade, craft, or occupation; or have direct or indirect interests therein or who are employees of the same employer or who are members of the same or an affiliated organization of employers or employees; whether such dispute is (1) between one or more employers or associations of employers and one or more employees or associations of employees; (2) between one or more employers or associations of employers and one or more employers or associations of employees; or (3) between one or more employees or associations of employees and one or more employees or associations of employees; or when the case involves

any conflicting or competing interests in a "labor dispute" (as hereinafter defined) of "persons participating or interested" therein (as hereinafter defined).

(b) A person or association shall be held to be a person participating or interested in a labor dispute if relief is sought against him or it and if he or it is engaged in the same industry, trade, craft, or occupation in which such dispute occurs, or has a direct or indirect interest therein, or is a member, officer, or agent of any association composed in whole or in part of employers or employees engaged in such industry, trade, craft, or occupation.

(c) The term "labor dispute" includes any controversy concerning terms or conditions of employment, or concerning the association or representation of persons in negotiating, fixing, maintaining, changing, or seeking to arrange terms and conditions of employment, or concerning employment relations, or any other controversy arising out of the respective interests of employer and employee, regardless of whether or not the disputants stand in the proximate relation of employer and employee.

(d) The term "court of the United States" means any court of the United States whose jurisdiction has been or may be conferred or defined or limited by Act of Congress, including the courts of the District of Columbia.

Sec. 14. If any provisions of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Sec. 15. All Acts and parts of Acts in conflict with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed.

THE FEDERAL ANTI-INJUNCTION BILL

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE in charge of the work on injunctions is composed of over 400 lawyers, clergymen, editors, professors and publicists all over the country, headed by former U. S. District Judge Charles F. Amidon. Among the members of the National Committee are:

Attorneys—John F. Finerty, Washington, D. C.; Frank P. Walsh, New York City; Amos Pinchot, New York City; Thomas W. Hardwick, Albany, Ga.; Donald R. Richberg, Chicago, Ill.; E. M. Grossman, St. Louis, Mo.; Jerome Walsh, Kansas City, Mo.; Nelson S. Spencer, New York City; William S. U'Ren, Portland, Oregon; Ed. D. Tittmann, Hillsboro, N. M.; W. D. Lane, Seattle, Wash.; Jackson H. Ralston, Palo Alto, Cal.

Clergymen—Harry Emerson Fosdick, New York City; John A. Ryan, Washington, D. C.; Harry F. Ward, New York City; Edward L. Israel, Baltimore, Md.; Aba Hillel Silver, Cleveland, Ohio; Sidney E. Goldstein, New York City; James R. Cox, Pittsburgh, Pa.; W. H. Fineshriber, Philadelphia, Pa.

Professors—John Dewey, New York City; Herman Oliphant, Johns Hopkins University; Edwin M. Borchard, Yale University; John A. Lapp, Marquette University; Jerome Davis, Yale University; Alva W. Taylor, Nashville, Tenn.; Clark Warburton, Emory University; Paul H. Douglas, Univ. of Chicago; Ernst Freund, Univ. of Chicago; Edward A. Steiner, Grinnell College; Broadus Mitchell, Johns Hopkins University; Alice Hamilton, Harvard Medical School; A. J. Todd, Northwestern University; Carter Goodrich, University of Michigan; Colston E. Warne, Amherst.

Mary E. Woolley, Mt. Holyoke College; H. W. Edgerton, Cornell University; Tyrell Williams, Washington University Law School; R. G. Tugwell, Columbia University; Edward A. Ross, University of Wisconsin; Vida D. Scudder, Wellesley College; Hornell Hart, Bryn Mawr College; W. Carson Ryan, Jr., Swarthmore College; Robert Herrick, York Village, Me.; John R. Commons, Madison, Wis.; Kemper Fullerton, Oberlin, Ohio; William N. Neilson, Smith College; James H. Dillard, Charlottesville, Va.; M. C. Otto, Madison, Wis.; W. M. Leiserson, Antioch College; A. P. Winston, Austin, Texas.

Editors, Authors and Others—Fremont Older, San Francisco; William Allen White, Emporia, Kans.; Elizabeth G. Evans, Brookline, Mass.; Dr. John B. Andrews, New York City; John A. Fitch, New York City; Waldo Frank, New York City; A. J. Muste, Katonah, N. Y.; Sherwood Anderson, Marion, Va.; William A. Anderson, Mayor, Minneapolis; Edwin E. Witte, Madison, Wis.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR INJUNCTIONS

Room 1002—100 FIFTH AVENUE

New York City

Date.....

1. Put me on your mailing list for further information as to when and how to help the passage of the federal bill.

2. Remarks:

Signed

Address

City

INJUNCTION PLANKS IN THE PRESIDENTIAL
CAMPAIGN PLATFORMS OF 1928.

- - - - -

REPUBLICAN

We believe that injunctions in labor disputes have in some instances been abused and have given rise to a serious question for legislators.

DEMOCRATIC

We recognize that legislative and other investigations have shown the existence of grave abuse in the issuance of injunctions in labor disputes. Injunctions should not be granted in labor disputes except upon proof of threatened irreparable injury and after notice of hearing and the injunction should be confined to those acts which do directly threaten irreparable injury. The express purpose of representatives of capital, labor and the Bar to devise a plan for the elimination of the present evils with respect to injunctions must be supported and legislation designed to accomplish these ends formulated and passed.

oOo

CHAIRMAN
Hon. Charles F. Amidon
Former U. S. Dist. Judge

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
John B. Andrews
Roger N. Baldwin
Prof. Paul F. Brissenden
Prof. J. P. Chamberlain
Morris L. Ernst
Nathan Greene
Arthur Garfield Hays
Henry T. Hunt
Prof. Karl Llewellyn
Rev. James Myers
Arthur E. Saffern
Robert Szold
Philip Wittenberg
Dr. Leo Wolman
Dr. Alexander Fleisher
Secretary

COMMITTEE ON LABOR INJUNCTIONS

*(Organized by the American Civil Liberties Union to help secure the passage
of federal and state legislation to end the abuse of injunctions in
restricting labor's rights to organize, strike and picket)*

ROOM 1002, 100 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK CITY

Telephone, TOMpkins Square 6-4330

March 3, 1932.

To the members of the National Committee,

Friends:

Please note the enclosed pamphlet on the Federal Injunction bill, just off the press. The bill seems assured of passage in substantially its original form. The vote in the Senate shows the overwhelming sentiment for it.

It is important now that every one of our committee write to their local Representatives in support of H.R. 5315, calling attention to the favorable report of the National Civic Federation reprinted in this pamphlet. It will help break up the employer opposition, for the Civic Federation numbers among its members some of the most powerful employers in the United States.

Let us report to you that the Committee is also working on injunction bills in the legislatures of New York, New Jersey, Kentucky and Massachusetts, with uncertain prospects of success.

If any of our friends can help get any contribution to the work at a time when help is vital, we would appreciate it. All the service is volunteered, but printing and postage run up beyond our resources.

With appreciation,

Sincerely yours,

Alexander Fleisher

AF/GH

Word has just been received that the bill has been reported by the House Judiciary Committee with instructions to the Chairman to secure legislative right of way. This means that you should write at once.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Alabama Walter D. Agnew Morris Newfeld	W. E. Payne H. F. Rall Donald R. Richberg Raymond S. Sanford H. H. Schroeder Harold G. Shields Ernest F. Tittle Arthur J. Todd W. B. Waltmire Lisle T. Ware H. V. Weiman Jacob Zeitlin	Michigan E. Albert Cook Morris A. Copeland Carter Goodrich Karl W. Guenther Samuel M. Levin Wesley H. Maurer Walter M. Nelson Philip L. Schenk A. E. Wood	Charles C. Webber Leon R. Whipple Robert Whitten L. Hollingsworth Wood H. N. Wright Arthur Wubnig DeWitt Wykoff	Hornell Hart Darlington Hoopes Carl W. Kaiser Hy. E. Kagan Noel P. Laird Paul M. Limbert Walter C. Longstreth George Lundburg E. C. Marianelli Albert B. Maris Charles D. McAvoy Theodore Miner Hannah Morris Abraham A. Neuman Clyde L. Nevins Allen S. Olmsted, 2nd J. Roland Pennock Francis S. Philbrick Clarence E. Pickett Leo L. Rockwell W. Carson Ryan, Jr. J. Russell Smith Francis D. Tysch David Wallerstein Dr. Clair Wilcox T. Richard Witmer Albert Bayard Wright
Arizona J. G. Brown E. R. Riesen Edwin A. Streeker	Indiana R. A. Archer Powers Hapgood Fowler Vincent Harper M. C. Hunt S. H. Markowitz Frank H. Streightoff U. G. Weatherby	Minnesota Wm. A. Anderson O. W. Behrens Thomas P. Beyer Arthur Le Sueur F. M. Rarig J. S. Robinson Norman Wilde	New York State Philip S. Bernstein Coleman B. Cheney Robert E. Cushman Horace E. Eaton Henry W. Edgerton Herman L. Fairchild C. W. Fowler W. Leon Godshall Chas. G. Girelius H. J. Halen Samuel G. Inman Vladimir Karapetoff Charles Leese Louise R. Loomis Thornton W. Merriam A. J. Muste Harvey W. Peck Donald C. Riley David T. Saposs Nathaniel Schmidt Winifried Smith Alice D. Snyder Donna T. Thompson Paul L. Whitely W. E. Willcox James M. Williams L. Foster Wood	Rhode Island Walter G. Everett
Arkansas R. J. Hammond W. B. Mahan	Iowa Florence Armstrong William E. Berry Sudhindra Bose S. H. Bush Elizabeth E. Hoyt Wm. Krummel J. H. Leek G. W. Mitchell Richard W. Nelson I. L. Pollock E. B. Reuter Max Schlenk Edward A. Steiner E. D. Strong Dale Yoder	Missouri Orval Bennett E. M. Grossman Joseph M. Klamon O. Myking Mehus Ernest S. Reynolds Jerome Walsh Tyrrell Williams	North Carolina Dr. R. O. Moen G. T. Schwenning	South Carolina H. Babcock H. P. Burbage Oscar L. Keith
California John Beardsley Helen Cherington John W. Darr Norman M. Goldberg David Harris Graham A. Laing A. M. Kidd Anne Martin E. H. Noble Fremont Older Hubert Phillips D. W. Prall Jackson H. Ralston Chas. W. Reynolds Robert C. Root H. C. Tilton Oscar W. Willits Ada Fay Wyman	Kansas E. E. Baylis Seba Eldridge William Ford Domenico Gagliardo J. Arthur Hamilton John Ise Asa A. Schaeffer William Allen White	Montana W. R. Ames W. P. Clark	North Dakota L. L. Wallace	South Dakota Daniel J. Gage
Colorado Edith C. Bramhall Mrs. Edward P. Costigan D. N. Donaldson J. G. Johnson E. F. Meyer Lawrence W. Miller Charles E. Schofield Carle Whitehead	Kentucky Forrest R. Black James W. Martin C. L. Pratt Franklin Reynolds Edward Wiest	Nebraska L. E. Aylsworth J. Harold Ennis H. C. Gossard R. A. Lyman J. O. Rankin Arthur L. Weatherly	Ohio Isaac E. Ash Read Bain C. C. Bayard George W. Biddle Herbert S. Bigelow Rabbi Barnett R. Brickner Mary D. Brite Henry M. Busch Frank T. Carlton Edwin L. Clarke Abraham Cronbach Kemper Fullerton L. C. Grant C. H. Handschin James G. Heller Harry Henig Hiram L. Jone Paul Jones F. K. Kruger W. M. Leiserson Lee J. Levinger Clara H. Mueller W. H. McPherson E. L. Mills Cecil C. North Victor Emanuel Reichert Mrs. Frances G. Richard J. F. Schreiner C. W. Shull Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver Newell L. Sims J. J. Spengler Louise Stitt Ernest L. Talbert Warren S. Thompson Robert Leonard Tucker P. K. Whelpton Howard White Arthur C. Wickenden Edwin H. Wilson	Tennessee William S. Knickerbocker Alva W. Taylor
Connecticut H. Berozheimer Edwin M. Borchard Carroll D. Clark Jerome Davis C. D. Edwards C. O. Fisher Robert D. French Fleming James K. Kingston Wilbert Snow N. J. Ware Chester H. Wheldon, Jr.	Louisiana C. L. Brown Charles W. Pipkin	New Hampshire Wm. A. Carter Thorstein Kalijarvi H. W. Smith Nelson Lee Smith Stacy May	Vermont George G. Groat	Texas Leo Brewer R. L. Bunting Henry Cohen Ormond C. Corry Edwin W. Elliott Ephraim Frisch E. E. Hale L. M. Hollander Chas. S. McCombs Edward D. Tittmann A. P. Winston
Delaware J. Sidney Gould	Maine Marion J. Bradshaw Warren B. Catlin Walter F. Greenman Robert Herrick	New Jersey E. A. Belfer Frank D. Graham Howard S. Piquet Edward H. Zabriskie	Virginia Sherwood Anderson Merwyn Crobaugh J. H. Dillard Chas. N. Hulvey Henry J. McGuinn Samuel Chiles Mitchell H. H. Seay, Jr.	Washington E. R. Atterbery W. D. Lane Winter S. Martin Robert E. Montz H. V. Tartar Francis G. Wilson
District of Columbia Linna E. Bresetti Dorothy Detzer Lynn Ramsey Edminster John F. Finerty Gilson Gardner Mercer G. Johnston Alain Locke Donald A. MacLean Charles F. Marsh R. A. McGowan John A. Ryan Sumner H. Slichter Frank Tannenbaum	Maryland William R. Barnhart Edward L. Israel Morris S. Lazaron Broadus Mitchell Herman Oliphant Elinor Pancoast Cromwell A. Riches Naomi Riches	New Mexico W. R. Williams	West Virginia A. Coleman Brown C. C. Carpenter A. J. Dadisman Albert M. Reese Jacob Saposnekow J. P. Scott	Wisconsin L. A. Boettiger Elizabeth Brandeis Alfred W. Briggs Oscar F. Brown John R. Commons Lyle W. Cooper L. S. Donsey J. E. Eunig Leo R. Faville Robert G. Gronewald Harold M. Groves F. J. Haas John A. Lapp S. A. Leonard A. J. Muench M. C. Otto Paul A. Raushenbush W. G. Rice, Jr. Edward A. Ross Lewis Severson Malcolm P. Sharp Perry J. Stearns Jonathan Taylor M. W. Thompson Edwin E. Witte
Florida John Page Jones Jacob H. Kaplan Jessie L. Murrell	Massachusetts Newton Arvin Emily Clark Brown John S. Codman Edward E. Curtis D. H. Davenport Smith O. Dexter Elizabeth Donnan Elizabeth G. Evans Burt B. Farnsworth Harold U. Faulkner Norman D. Fletcher B. L. Gabine Ralph E. Gardner Elliott M. Grant Lawrence R. Grose Alice Hamilton I. H. Hankins S. Ralph Harlow Muriel K. Hessler Amy Hewes Hector M. Holmes Rebecca W. Holmes Julian E. Jackson Leland N. Jenks Walter B. Jerge Robert W. Jones Henry Raymond Mussey W. A. Neilson Henry W. Pinkham Charles W. Putnam James A. Ross, Jr. A. M. Schlesinger Vida D. Scudder Sara H. Stides George Taylor G. L. Thompson Willard L. Thorp John B. Troxell C. E. Warne Mary E. Woolley	New York City Leonard P. Adams Edward J. Allen Elizabeth T. Baker Jeanne C. Barber Harry Elmer Barnes Morton M. Berman James C. Bonbright Louis B. Boudin LeRoy E. Bowman Robert L. Carey Elliott E. Cheatham Ida S. Craven R. P. Currier Addison T. Cutler Horace B. Davis Max Delson John Dewey W. E. B. DuBois Robert W. Dunn Ephraim Fischhoff John A. Fitch Harry Emerson Fosdick Waldo Frank Walter Frank Lewis S. Gannett Meredith B. Givens Sidney E. Goldstein John Haynes Holmes F. E. Johnson Montefiore G. Kahn Dorothy Kehn Daniel F. Kulp II Elias Lieberman E. C. Lindeman Henry R. Linville J. B. Matthews F. C. Mills G. S. Mitchell Loyle A. Morrison Gardner Murphy Wm. L. Nunn Samuel H. Ordway, Jr. Wm. Pickens Amos Pinchot Carl Raushenbush John Noyin Sayre George Soule Nelson S. Spencer Helen Phelps Stokes Benjamin Stolberg Arthur L. Swift, Jr. R. G. Tugwell K. E. Walser Frank P. Walsh Harry F. Ward	Oklaoma E. N. Comfort James W. Errant J. Rud Nielson Sobin C. Persefull Frederick L. Ryan H. Grady Sloan	Wyoming D. C. Coulter H. J. Peterson O. C. Schwiering