

SCHWABE COLL

January 15, 1946

Mrs. Lillian C. Koehler  
2240 East 26th  
Tulsa, Oklahoma

My dear Mrs. Koehler:

Your interesting letter of January 7th, setting out clearly your ideas relating to labor unions and the so-called full employment bill, has been received in the absence of Congressman Schwabe, who is out of the city on official business. However, it will be placed before him immediately on his return to Washington, and you may be sure he will appreciate your interest in writing and be grateful for the benefit of your views.

Congressman Schwabe is at all times eager to have the opinions of the people of his District on the issues of the day, in order to more truly represent them in Congress. To that end, he recently sent out forty thousand questionnaires and made a personal visit to every county seat and post office in the ten counties of his District, in order to afford an opportunity to all who wished to do so to tell their problems and opinions personally to him.

Despite all this effort, there remain many persons who neither received a questionnaire nor conferred with Mr. Schwabe. Hundreds, like yourself, are expressing their ideas by letter, and thousands have answered the questionnaire; Congressman Schwabe will undoubtedly be much gratified at this evidence of the public spirited attitude of the people of Oklahoma.

Thanking you for your letter, and assuring you the Congressman will have your views in mind when considering future legislation on the labor situation, I am

Sincerely yours,



January 7, 1946

Hon. George Schwabe  
House Office Building  
Washington 25, D.C.

My dear Congressman:

As a voting citizen of Tulsa County, Tulsa, Oklahoma, I should like to see you as representative from this district recommend legislation that would bring to an immediate termination the strife between labor and industry and would furthermore disrupt the labor block that is actually threatening the democracy of these United States.

I am in favor of the organization of men to gain better working and living conditions, but to the extent that:

1. They do not hamper full enterprise--the right of employer to hire and fire; the right of an employer to invest or use his earnings as he sees fit, without the supervision of any outside agency.
2. Strikes be permitted only when picketing, with the often resultant violence, is outlawed.
3. That men on strike be liable for their own loss of earnings during the period of strike.
4. That union books be subjected periodically to federal inspection, particularly in regard to collection and disbursement of dues and funds.
5. That quality as well as classification of work done be considered the basis of pay, and not the ability of an organization to meet the pay demand the basis. (This latter could prove to be the detriment of labor in some locals as well as to favor it in others).

I am not in favor of the full employment bill as it is now stated, for I believe this to put too great an additional *burden*



on our governmental tax structure and would tend to turn out a citizenry of sluggards with an attitude such as, "The world owes me a living". I think it would also tend to destroy our competitive system of enterprise.

I ~~do not~~ believe in unemployment insurance only in so far as it is met by the individual himself. In our part of the country labor often keeps itself on the unemployed list by failure to accept jobs open and excessive pay demands.

Sincerely,

*Lillian C. Koehler*

(Mrs.) Lillian C. Koehler  
2240 East 26  
Tulsa, Oklahoma

LCK:TH