By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 4901. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of Moore Air Field; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. J. Res. 286. Joint resolution providing for operating naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 287. Joint resolution to create a committee on Federal and State relations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 568. Resolution requesting information from the Attorney General as to arrival of refugees; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 569. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4771, a bill to amend the part of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1920, as amended, relating to the conservation, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves; to the Committee on Rules.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5768. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Mrs. Nehard Hansen and 41 other citizens of Waterville, Kans., requesting that cotton materials and overalls which are now being produced be placed at their disposal that they may continue to bring about the production of essential foods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5769. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Native Sons of the Golden West, Grand Parlor, San Francisco, Calif., relating to House bill 238; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5770. Also, resolution of Native Sons of the Golden West, Grand Parlor, San Francisco, Calif., relating to amending the reclamation law limiting the use of project water in the operation and administration of the Central Valley project; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

5771. Also, resolution of Native Sons of the Golden West, Grand Parlor, San Francisco, Calif., relating to taxation of federally owned lands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5772. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the director, political action committee, Local 840, United Automobile-Aircraft-Agricultural Implement Workers of America (U. A. W.-C. I. O.), petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to continuation of the Fair Employment Practice Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 31, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 9, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our fathers' God, author of liberty, Thou dost behold the goodly heritage of our fair land where, amid the noisy ongoing of life's busy traffic, are guarded the sacred islands of tranquillity where rests the dust of warrior hosts. From sea to sea of the homeland this radiant morning, where the grass has been trodden by reverent feet, and in little patches of foreign soil, where is kept the bivouac of our valiant dead, on countless graves we see the cross and the flag blending in their mute testimony. May that cross interpret the flag for our steadfast yet anxious hearts in this dread hour as the sharpened arrow of our might is pulled on the taut string of national strength. May that cross speak to the flag of strength that is increased by its spending, of life that is saved by its losing, of greatness that is measured by its serving.

Our glad hearts rejoice that by the sacrifice of which that linked cross and flag is the symbol—

"O'er the mounds where sleep the slaughtered,
Fired by hopes for which they died,
Lured by dreams which arched their heavens—
Human rights so long denied;
From the jealous feuds of ages
Moves a conquering army's van;
'Tis the crusade of the nations
For the brotherhood of man."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. GUFFEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, May 29, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 29, 1944, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 683) to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1941) to amend the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3054) to amend the Expediting Act.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 87. Concurrent resolution authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete Government publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Congress; and

H. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report (No. 1311) of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, dealing with the leadership of the Congress of Industrial Organizations Political Action Committee.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 29th instant,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. DOWNEY), on May 30, 1944, signed the enrolled bill (S. 1758) to amend section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Reynolds
Austin	Guffey	Robertson
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Bilbo	Hawkes	Shipstead
Buck	Hayden	Stewart
Burton	Holman	Taft
Butler	Jackson	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Tobey
Capper	La Follette	Truman
Caraway	McClellan	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McKellar	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Wallgren
Cordon	Mead	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Murdock	Weeks
Downey	Murray	Wheeler
Eastland	Nye	Wherry
Ellender	O'Daniel	White
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Wiley
George	Overton	Wilson
Gerry	Radcliffe	
Gillette	Reed	

Mr. GEORGE. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

WORK OF THE JUVENILE COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a communication from the judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, together with a report covering the work of the Juvenile Court during the fiscal year 1942–43.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 31, 1844.*

[NOTE.—The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.]

RESOLUTIONS OF WATERBURY LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL

Mr. DANAHER. I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter which has come to me under date of May 28, 1944, from the Waterbury Lithuanian Council. The letter embodies resolutions adopted by the council.

There being no objection, the letter embodying the resolutions was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATERBURY LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL,
Waterbury, Conn., May 28, 1944.

Hon. JOHN A. DANAHER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JOHN A. DANAHER: On May 28, 1944, some 574 delegates from all cities and towns in Connecticut gathered at a special conference at St. Joseph's Hall in Waterbury, Conn. The conference was arranged to commemorate the twenty-fourth anniversary of the first national conference in free Lithuania, the fortieth anniversary of the freedom of the Lithuanian press and the twentieth anniversary of the return of Klaipeda (Memel) to Lithuania.

The following resolutions were adopted:

"Whereas the Lithuanian-Americans of Connecticut, in union with their fellow Americans throughout the Nation, recognize that the most urgent problem of the day is the prosecution of the war to an early and victorious conclusion; and

"Whereas we Americans of Lithuanian origin have a very particular stake in its successful outcome, in the conviction that only an Allied victory can bring happiness and freedom to our mother country and its people: Be it

"*Resolved*, That we pledge our wholehearted support to every measure taken for the successful prosecution of the war and for the hastening of the day of victory, by the leaders of our Nation and of the United Nations;

"And that, in the name of the thousands of our young men now serving in the fighting forces, and in memory of those among them who have already made the supreme sacrifice, we enjoin upon the executive board of the Lithuanian-American Council and its associates to urge, by every means available, the united cooperation of all Americans of Lithuanian descent in the promotion of the war effort; by an ever-increasing purchase of War bonds, by sustained effort in every phase of war production, by the salvage of all essential materials, and by loyal compliance with the directives of our national and local governments.

"Whereas the Lithuanian-Americans of Connecticut are keenly aware of the tragic plight of their mother country today under the evils of Nazi oppression, and are anxiously concerned over its position in post-war readjustments: Be it

"*Resolved*, That we emphatically assert the right of Lithuania to its existence in a post-war world as a free and independent nation; as well as our unequivocal opposition to any scheme or plan that would infringe upon this right or do violence to its territorial integrity. To this end, we call upon our fellow countrymen, whether in America or in other parts of the world, to put aside all secondary differences of opinion or political persuasion, and to unite in the common effort for the restoration of Lithuania to its rightful position among the peace-loving nations of the world."

Respectfully yours,

ALEXANDER J. ALEKSIS,
Chairman.

CONSTANCE C. JEGELA,
Secretary.

POST-WAR PLANNING—RESOLUTION OF CONNECTICUT POST-WAR PLANNING BOARD

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter which I have received from Mr. Charles Seymour, who is president of Yale University and also acting at the present time as chairman of the State of Connecticut Post-War Planning Board. Attached to his letter is a resolution. I should like both the resolution and letter to appear in the body of the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent to that effect.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
POST-WAR PLANNING BOARD,
New Haven, Conn., May 29, 1944.

The Honorable JOHN A. DANAHER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DANAHER: I beg to enclose a resolution which was passed by the Connecticut Post-War Planning Board at its meeting on May 24 upon the recommendation of its committee on medical care and health, requesting that it be forwarded to you for your interest and such help as you may find yourself in a position to give.

With warm personal regards, believe me,

Faithfully yours,

CHARLES SEYMOUR.

RESOLUTION REGARDING EDUCATION AND RETRAINING OF MEDICAL STUDENTS AND DOCTORS PROPOSED BY THE MEDICAL CARE AND HEALTH COMMITTEE OF THE CONNECTICUT POST-WAR PLANNING BOARD AND ADOPTED BY THE CONNECTICUT POST-WAR PLANNING BOARD ON MAY 24, 1944

Whereas the education received by a great number of medical graduates has been curtailed by the war, medical-school programs have been accelerated and hospital internships have been reduced to 9 months in order that more graduates might be made available as medical officers for the armed forces; and

Whereas medical officers of an older age group, who were in practice at the time of their entry into military service, may because of the exigencies of the war find that their experiences in the Army have deprived them of the knowledge of substantial scientific advances in medicine; and

Whereas some supplemental training will be required for both these groups if the quality of medical care available to our people in the future is not to deteriorate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Connecticut Post-War Planning Board, at the request of its committee on medical care and health, respectfully urges that provision for the resumption of interrupted intern and hospital residency training for graduates in medicine and provision of appropriate supplemental medical training for medical officers honorably discharged from the military service be included in the law providing for the education and training of veterans of this war.

REPORT OF BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 29th instant,

Mr. WAGNER, on May 30, 1944, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 1764) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (Public Law 421, 77th Cong.) as amended by the act of October 2, 1942 (Public Law 729, 77th Cong.), reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 922) thereon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1100. A bill to provide for the promotion of officers on the retired list of the Army after specified years of service on active duty; with an amendment (Rept. No. 923).

By Mr. DOWNEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. R. 1046. A bill for the relief of David B. Turpel; without amendment (Rept. No. 924).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. R. 1675. A bill to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607) by providing for the computation of double-time credits awarded between 1893 and 1912 in determining retired pay; without amendment (Rept. No. 925).

By Mr. WILSON (for Mr. GURNEY) from the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. R. 3604. A bill authorizing the appointment of the Chief of Chaplains to the temporary rank of major general, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 926).

By Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 4102. A bill to extend for 1 additional year the reduced rate of interest on Land Bank Commissioner loans; without amendment (Rept. No. 927).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2469. A bill for the relief of Anna Charack; without amendment (Rept. No. 928).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 3125. A bill for the relief of Paul H. White; without amendment (Rept. No. 929);

H. R. 3137. A bill for the relief of Ruth L. Clapp; without amendment (Rept. No. 930);

H. R. 3324. A bill for the relief of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 931);

H. R. 3654. A bill for the relief of Byron Ennis; without amendment (Rept. No. 932); and

H. R. 4074. A bill for the relief of the estate of William Sandlass; without amendment (Rept. No. 933).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on May 30, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1029. A bill to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 1758. A bill to amend section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. REED:

S. 1959. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1960. A bill for the relief of Clifford E. Long and Laura C. Long; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1961. A bill conferring upon the State of Montana authority to exchange for other lands certain lands selected by the State of Montana for the use of the University of Montana for biological station purposes pursuant to the act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1080); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1962. A bill extending the provisions of Public Law 47, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended, to reemployment committeemen of the Selective Service System (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 1963. A bill to control the disposition of certain plants and facilities producing synthetic rubber, fibers, and other plants and facilities utilizing the products of farm and forest; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 1964. A bill to reimburse certain aviation cadets and former aviation cadets for property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at Carroll College, Helena, Mont., on January 8, 1944; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment, management, and perpetuation of the Kermit Roosevelt Fund; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

INVESTIGATION OF ACTIVITIES OF THE POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE OF THE C. I. O.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on several occasions Congress has expressed its desire to insure free and clean elections by legislative action. We have on the statute books today the Corrupt Practices Act and the Hatch Act aimed at achieving such worthy objectives, and until recently they have functioned satisfactorily.

Of late, however, we have witnessed a tendency on the part of the law-enforcement branch of this administration, and the administration itself, to wink at clear violations of clean election statutes. The Attorney General of the United States has gone out of his way to make excuses as to why he has not brought violators to the bar of justice.

As a result, Sidney Hillman's C. I. O. political action committee continues to go its merry way spending moneys collected from many reluctant union members, in the interests of the fourth term and the election of New Dealers to the Halls of Congress.

Mr. President, the failure of the law-enforcement agency of our Government to proceed in this flagrant case is a matter of concern to me, to other Members of this body, and, I am confident, to the majority of the people of this Nation who want to see preserved free and clean elections.

Because of the failure on the Attorney General's part it becomes imperative that the Senate immediately delve into this important matter. I therefore ask the Privileges and Elections Committee to institute an investigation, broad in scope, in an effort to determine how widespread this law violation is, and to ascertain why the appropriate authorities within the administration have not performed their sworn duties with respect thereto. I ask that the committee headed by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] proceed as quickly as possible toward that goal.

Flouting of the election laws of the United States on the part of the political action committee threatens the entire structure erected by the Congress to guarantee the people of this Nation free and clean elections.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the resolution providing for an investigation, which I now submit, and immediately following that I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a copy of a letter addressed to Hon. Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States, dated May 30, 1944, and signed Harrison E. Spangler, chairman, Republican National Committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska will be received and appropriately referred and the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 298) was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the activities of the Congress of Industrial Organizations Political Action Committee, with a particular view to determining whether such activities are in violation of existing Federal laws, whether the Attorney General and other law-enforcement authorities are failing to enforce such laws with respect to such activities, and whether additional legislation is necessary or desirable. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

For the purpose of this study and investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The letter presented by Mr. BUTLER is as follows:

MAY 30, 1944.

The Honorable FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I invite your attention to the fact that the Congress of the United States, in the furtherance of fair and clean elections, has enacted a law known as the Corrupt Practices Act. This statute clearly states in simple language that:

"It shall be unlawful for any corporation or any labor organization to make a contribution in connection with the election of a President, Vice President, or Member of Congress."

The statute also provides for an appropriate penalty for its violation.

In this connection, a political group known as the political action committee, organized by Mr. Hillman and Mr. Murray, has publicly admitted that they have received contributions amounting to over $750,000 from a labor organization known as the C. I. O. and further that they expect to increase such contributions to several million dollars. They are using this money, as they publicly declare, to promote a fourth term for Mr. Roosevelt and New Deal Members of Congress.

Your attention is also directed to the Hatch Act which declares:

"It is hereby declared to be a pernicious political activity for any person, committee, association, corporation, or any other organization to make contributions, directly or indirectly, in an amount in excess of $5,000 in connection with any campaign for the election of a President or other Federal officer."

This law further provides a penalty of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years.

The F. B. I. has reported that the Hillman-Murray committee received lump sums of $100,000 from several labor organizations, or 20 times the amount permitted by law.

The political action committee so financed asserts, and takes the attitude, that it is exempt and immune from prosecution under the law and they apparently base their claim on an opinion which you have rendered and upon your attitude of nonenforcement of the law.

If you will examine the facts as furnished by the F. B. I., the published statements of Mr. Hillman and Mr. Murray, and the mass of literature with which they are flooding the country, as well as their other activities, you will find a flagrant and bold violation of our clean election laws.

Your reasons for permitting such a clear violation of the law, which you are under oath to enforce, have not been made plain. It has been suggested, however, that you may have taken your position upon the theory that our laws and the Constitution of our country are not binding upon you in wartime as you recently ruled when you removed, without due legal process and with the help of soldiers, an unarmed storekeeper from his place of business in Chicago. In view of your ruling as Attorney General that this political action committee is within the law when it takes contributions, even beyond the Hatch Act limit, from a labor organization for political purposes, I desire an opinion from you as to other groups who wish to become active in this campaign against the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt for a fourth term.

Representatives of a number of farm cooperative associations (corporations) would like to know whether or not, if they form

a political action committee financed by their corporate funds for the defeat of Mr. Roosevelt, you would grant them the same immunity from prosecution as you have the committee of Mr. Hillman and Mr. Murray financed with money taken from the assessments on members of labor organizations.

A group of loyal Americans who are an important part of our national life and who represent what is known as little business, and is composed of many thousands of small corporations, would like to know where they stand with you. Many of these institutions have been forced out of business and ruined by the mismanagement of the New Deal agencies. They are the forgotten men of the New Deal. They desire the election of a Republican President and Congress and oppose Mr. Roosevelt's fourth term ambition. And they likewise would like to know whether or not they will be privileged to take from their corporate treasuries and from their stockholders unlimited sums of money to be used by a committee to be formed by them to elect a Republican President and a Republican Congress and for an educational campaign for that purpose.

The farmers of our country and the little businessmen above referred to are eager to have your answer to these questions soon, as they desire to become active at once in the promotion of political principles which they deem of the utmost importance to the preservation of America for free men and women.

These people are law-abiding citizens. They believe that the Corrupt Practices Act and the Hatch Act are wholesome law and helpful to clean and free elections. They would much prefer to have you, as Attorney General, give them rigid enforcement, regardless of whether their violators are your political friends or enemies, or whether or not they are supporters of Candidate Roosevelt. If you will not do so, they are surely entitled to the same immunity from prosecution that you have apparently given Mr. Hillman, Mr. Murray, and their committee. However, rigid law enforcement is desirable.

They await your decision.

Respectfully yours,

HARRISON E. SPANGLER,
Chairman,
Republican National Committee.

P. S.—We have been advised that the Political Action Committee, in many cases, takes the funds from the treasuries of the C. I. O. organizations without the consent of their members. Many thousands of these members are opposed to such unlawful and political use of money arbitrarily taken from them but are apparently powerless to prevent it. They resent the claim that such officials as Mr. Hillman and Mr. Murray control the vote of their organizations and that they can vote them as they will. They are independent, thinking Americans and cannot be deprived of the right of franchise as citizens of this country by so-called bosses.

H. E. S.

REPORT BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH ON INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION CONFERENCE

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a report on the recent International Labor Organization Conference submitted by Senator THOMAS of Utah, which appears in the Appendix.]

PAY OF COMBAT SOLDIERS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TOBEY

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on April 6, 1944, on the subject of pay of combat soldiers, a letter addressed to him by Ernie Pyle, and a copy of Senate bill 1787, which appear in the Appendix.]

CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES IN OREGON PRIMARIES

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement released by him to the Associated Press relative to the use of funds in the recent Oregon primaries, which appears in the Appendix.]

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMITTEE

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial relating to the Fair Employment Practice Committee, published in the Washington Post of May 27, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S RESPONSIBILITY AND POWER IN TIME OF WAR

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Arthur Dunn, published recently in the New York Times, which appears in the Appendix.]

EGGS AND EGG PRICES—ARTICLES FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. DANAHER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post of April 6, 1944, entitled "W. F. A. Will Buy Eggs to Bolster Market," and an article from the Washington Post of May 30, 1944, entitled "Eggs Going Into Animal Feed," which appear in the Appendix.]

INCREASE IN LIMITATION ON NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 4464, to increase the debt limit of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4464) to increase the debt limit of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4464) to increase the debt limit of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment of the committee.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, after line 5, it is proposed to strike out—

SEC. 21. The amount of obligations issued under the authority of this act shall not exceed in the aggregate $240,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time.

And to insert:

SEC. 21. The face amount of obligations issued under the authority of this act shall not exceed in the aggregate $260,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I offer a very brief statement of the bill.

The present debt limit is $210,000,000,000. The amount absorbed through April 30, 1944, will be $191,528,560,009. The amount of limit remaining will be $18,471,439,991.

The Budget estimate of the debt as of June 30, 1944, is $198,000,000,000. The Budget estimate of the debt as of June 30, 1945, is $258,000,000,000.

The Treasury requested a debt limit of $260,000,000,000. That would carry at least through May 1945. To carry through June 30, 1945, the debt limit should be $268,000,000,000.

The House bill raises the limit to $240,000,000,000. This limit will take care of the situation to March 31, 1945, only if the present method of computing the debt limit is abandoned, and savings bonds are computed on the basis of their current redemption value instead of on the basis of their face value.

If the present method of computing the limit were continued in the House bill, the limit would have to be increased to $250,000,000,000 to take care of the situation through March 31, 1945.

The committee proposes to raise the debt limit to $260,000,000,000, and to continue the present method of computing the debt limit. This should at least take care of the situation through May 31, 1945.

The committee was unanimously of the opinion that the present method of computing the debt limit should not be changed, and that we might as well extend the limit of $260,000,000,000 at this time.

That is all I have to say about the measure, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, at this time I wish to offer on behalf of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and myself an amendment which has heretofore been printed and is lying on the table, the effect of which is to reduce the cabaret tax from 30 percent to 10 percent. I hope the chairman and members of the Finance Committee may believe it proper to accept the amendment, but preliminarily I should like to make a few brief observations with respect to it.

When the tax bill was before the Senate no contention was made by the Treasury that the cabaret tax was a punitive or preventive measure, but it was clearly asserted that the cabaret tax was imposed for the purpose of revenue only. While there has been some loose discussion in connection with the cabaret tax as to its effect on alcoholic drinking, let me say, Mr. President, that whether we have cabaret entertainment or not, whether individuals are allowed to dance or not, whether they are allowed to listen to a singer or not will little affect their consumption either of food or liquor. Individuals are going to drink so much liquor and eat so much food, and no one can say whether individuals will drink a little more or a little less by reason of the fact that they dance with their meals or listen to singing as they eat.

Likewise I wish to say that the effect on the labor market through the closing of any cocktail lounges or cabaret entertainments is so negligible that no one can calculate any substantial result.

I wish also to make plain to the Senate that the cabaret tax not only applies to such places as we know in Washington,

in the great hotels, which are probably the largest and most important now in the Nation, but it applies in every village where the drug-store proprietor has allowed the young high-school students to dance in the rear of his store. He can no longer do so without charging everyone present who enjoys an ice-cream soda or indulges in any beverage 30 percent additional. The tax applies to every restaurant where there is any dancing or singing, even though nothing more than beer or soft drinks may be served.

Mr. President, I know of no tax which remotely approaches the cabaret tax in severity. The cost of the cabaret entertainment is comparatively slight, but for the providing of that cabaret entertainment a 30-percent charge is placed on all the food and other goods which are consumed. It would seem to be perfectly obvious that persons would not think it was worth while to dance once or twice while they were enjoying their food, or listen to someone singing, if for that privilege they would have to pay 30 percent additional to their bill in the restaurant.

As a matter of fact, the tax is not working out. I have reliable official information from the State of California that restaurants are no longer allowing their patrons to dance, and are discontinuing the services of singers, and giving up their other forms of entertainment to such an extent that cabaret entertainment has already fallen off some 70 percent. But, Mr. President, I was against the increase in the cabaret tax when the tax bill was before the Senate, not because there would be a falling off of cabaret revenue, but because the increased tax is illogical and unjust. Sometime ago I had a survey made of the restaurants and cabarets of the city of Los Angeles. It appeared there that from 40 to 50 percent of all patrons are members of the armed forces who desire a few dances or want to listen to a singer or enjoy some other form of entertainment while they are having their meals. When the matter was before the Senate I could not reconcile myself to a tax which fell very largely upon the service men and women of the Nation, compelling them to pay an excessive charge for the enjoyment of singing or the privilege of dancing during the course of a meal.

I might also say that our survey in the city of Los Angeles very clearly revealed that from 20 to 25 percent of all cabaret patrons were war and defense workers. The picture which some Senators may have of individuals, night after night, attending restaurants or cabarets is not a true one. As a matter of fact in the city of Los Angeles, aside from the attendance by members of the armed forces, most war workers who were talked to stated that they attended a cabaret once a month or at most perhaps once a week; that they desired some refreshments, and wished to have some relaxation in the form of dancing or singing while they were enjoying the refreshments. I cannot believe there is anything wrong in that. I cannot believe any good can be gained by the imposition of a heavy punitive tax. I do not think any matter of public policy is involved. The increased cabaret tax in no way limits the consumption of alcoholic liquor if anyone has that in mind. It merely tends to prohibit individuals, and particularly young people, who have a very natural inclination thereto, the enjoyment of dancing and of hearing a song while they are eating their meals.

Mr. President, I have no doubt that the war worker, especially a young man or woman, who goes out once a week or once a month and enjoys some form of entertainment, including dancing, while eating a meal, does better work than if he did not have the enjoyment thus furnished him.

The distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee recently stated in an interview published in the newspapers, when the tax bill was before the Senate, that the Senate thought it logical, and fair, and decent, if I may use that word, to exempt the service men and women from this tax. I am informed, and I think correctly—the distinguished chairman will correct me if I am wrong—that the Treasury Department insisted that it would be so difficult and complicated to enforce any cabaret tax if servicemen were exempted, that the tax must cover everyone; so the Senate amendment exempting members of the armed forces was stricken from the bill.

While, Mr. President, I am against the tax on general grounds, I am convinced that the tax has been so high that the revenues are steadily falling off. I have already stated the information which comes to me from California, namely, that so many restaurants and cabarets have given up their dance floors, their singing and other entertainment that such cabaret moneys subject to taxation have fallen off more than 70 percent and that the present tax of 30 percent will not bring in as much revenue as the 10-percent tax would have brought in on the business which formerly was done.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hold in my hand a statement including figures relative to certain establishments in Boston and New York. From them, I find that for the 25 days from March 1 to March 25, 1944, at the Latin Quarter Restaurant, in Boston, the business done amounted to $56,617.14, whereas from April 1 to April 25—the same number of days in 1944—the business done amounted to $39,806.58.

At the Mayfair Restaurant, in Boston, the business done between March 1 and March 25, 1944, was $32,240.35. The business done there from April 1 to April 25 was $17,582.88.

At the El Morocco Restaurant, in New York City, the loss was estimated at $250 a day. At the Hurricane Restaurant, the business done decreased from $78,754.55 for the period March 1 to March 25, to $50,396.67 for the period April 1 to April 25. At the Versailles Restaurant, the business done dropped from $77,374.92 for the period March 1 to March 25, to $56,461.69 for the period April 1 to April 25. At the Village Barn, the business done from March 1 to March 25 was $30,009, and the business done from April 1 to April 25 was $24,575. At the Billy Rose establishment, the business done from March 1 to March 25 was $106,878, whereas the business done from April 1 to April 25, was $68,342. At Leon & Eddie's the business done in March 1943 amounted to $68,519, in March 1944 to $80,441, and in April 1943 to $49,561, whereas in April 1944 it had dropped to $44,254.

I find further that in the city of Chicago, some of the leading establishments of this kind have suffered similarly. At the Rio Cabana the business was off 30 percent; at the Panther Room business was off 25 percent; at the Boulevard Room, 30 percent; at the Empire Room, 25 percent; at the Chez Paree, 30 percent; at the Marine Room, 25 percent; and at the Latin Quarter, 30 percent.

In Hollywood, Calif., with which the Senator is familiar, grosses in leading places fell off from 20 percent to 50 percent. One of them has sustained a loss of $1,500 a night since the inception of the 30-percent tax.

I understand that it is believed that the best evidence that the industry faces ruin, and that prominent places and small places will close down, is that Brooklyn's Hotel Bossert announced on April 29 that it was closing its Marine Roof because of the 30-percent tax. I understand that room has been a favorite for 28 years, and especially in the summertime was a popular dining and dancing place because it was located on the roof of the Bossert Hotel, and overlooked New York harbor.

A tax of 10 percent will prevent places from closing down, prevent unemployment, be fair to members of the armed forces who frequent these places, and in the final analysis bring in to the Government the added and additional revenue originally contemplated by the Internal Revenue Act of 1943. A fair tax of 10 percent will not destroy this business and industry. If the 30-percent tax continues, the entire industry faces ruin and destruction. The conclusion is very clear, namely, that the Government will never receive either the original revenue heretofore received under the 5-percent tax or the revenue contemplated at the time of the passage of the Internal Revenue Act of 1943 which taxed admissions in cabarets at the rate of 30 percent.

I may say also that time is of the essence, and that if any relief is to be afforded this industry, it must come immediately, since once these places shut down and business continues to fall off at the rate it has, it is impossible to estimate how long it will take before business will again reach the position it occupied prior to April 1. Further, if any relief is to be granted, it must be granted quickly. The very purpose of the relief will be defeated by delay.

I have no interest in any hotel or restaurant, and do not suppose I attend a place of this kind once in 5 years; but I think it would be better for the Government and better for such places of amusement to have a reasonable tax adopted.

Under the circumstances it appears that perhaps the Government will lose money on account of having the tax so high. It would seem that an amendment such as the one offered by the Senator from California should be adopted by the Senate. I do not think anyone wishes to close businesses. I know we do not. I know that no Senator would wish to close such business places or amusement places, if we can call them that. Especially is that true if the Government will lose money by reason of the increased tax, either through the closing of various places—and some of them undoubtedly will be closed, even in these prosperous times—or through the reduction of their revenues. It is certain that the revenues of such places will be reduced to so great an extent that the Government will receive more revenue if the tax rate is reduced. I hope very much that the amendment of the Senator from California will be agreed to.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much. I appreciate the contribution he has made. While my mind is not particularly set upon the largest and most noted cabarets of the country, undoubtedly what the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has indicated is true all over the Nation; namely, that the large cabarets are giving up their taxable entertainment.

In order to understand just how this increased tax operates, it might be interesting to consider the Jack Dempsey cafe, in New York City. I am advised that that cafe has a gross income of $100,000 a month. When there was a 5-percent tax on such entertainment, the Government received $5,000 a month in taxes from the establishment. There was a total expenditure of approximately $10,000 a month for entertainment in that cafe. All such entertainment at the cafe, except for music, has now been given up, for the Government does not tax an establishment which provides only music. The cost of entertainment at that cafe has been cut approximately in half, or to approximately $5,000 a month, and the cafe pays no tax at all to the Government because of the music, which now is the only entertainment provided there. Neither the owner nor his patrons can afford to pay $30,000 a month in taxes upon entertainment which costs only $5,000. That, in effect, is imposing a governmental burden, by way of taxation of six times as much, as the cost of the cabaret entertainment itself. Clearly such a tax is so illogical that it cannot be successful.

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me suggest another matter to the Senator at this time. A reduction from 30 percent to 10 percent is, of course, quite a large reduction, but it seems to me it will have to be agreed upon and straightened out in conference. I very much hope that the Senate will adopt the amendment reducing the tax to 10 percent. I am really addressing myself to my good friend from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] the chairman of the committee. If it should be found in conference that 10 percent cannot be agreed upon, the conferees would be in the best possible position to adopt a reasonable rate, which would not destroy the businesses of these people, and would not materially hurt the income of the Government. It might be that 11 percent, 12 percent, or some other percentage would, under the facts, be a reasonable tax. The conferees could determine the proper tax. In order to bring about that result, I hope that the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. In view of his persuasive remarks, I shall not present further argument. I only want to say that the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] who offered the pending amendment on his own behalf and mine is unavoidably absent from Washington. I regret that he is not here to present this matter in his usually eloquent and forceful way.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I wish to make a few observations with regard to the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

My distinguished colleague from Los Angeles [Mr. DOWNEY] and my friend from Memphis [Mr. McKELLAR] hail from large cities with populations of 300,000, 500,000, or more. They feel very keenly the injustice which has been done the cabaret business by the 30-percent tax.

However, I happen to come from a small courthouse town in Mississippi, which has no cabarets or juke joints, but which does have theaters. I shall offer an amendment, when it shall have been properly prepared, providing that wherever a 20-percent tax on theater admissions is found in the Internal Revenue Code of 1944, a 10-percent tax be substituted, which would be in keeping with the amendment offered by the Senator with regard to cabarets.

Every week 95,000,000 American people—men, women, and children—attend the theater. I wish Senators to keep that figure in mind. The figures show that every week 95,000,000 of the 134,000,000 American people attend motion-picture theaters, which are found in every hamlet, village, and city of the Nation. It would be unfair to reduce the 30-percent tax on cabarets, where only a very small percentage of the population goes for amusement and recreation, to 10 percent, and leave the tax at 20 percent on 95,000,000 of the masses of poor people and children of the Nation.

We all understand that cabarets and juke joints are patronized by the well to do, the playboys, and the frolicking element of our population. Children are not admitted to cabarets. This amendment is an attempt to give relief in connection with a means of recreation for a small percentage of our population. As I understand, the sponsorship of the amendment, in addition to the authors of the amendment, comes from the music monopoly. It has an alphabetical name. This is the day of alphabetical names. The amendment is sponsored by ASCAP, the music monopoly. It is making a drive on Congress to reduce the 30-percent tax to 10 percent.

I am not opposing the reduction in the cabaret tax. I am inclined to favor the reduction of the tax; but I strongly object to reducing the cabaret tax to accommodate a few tooters of horns and a few frolicking citizens of the country, while at the same time leaving a 20 percent tax on 95,000,000 poor people of the Nation whose only means of recreation is the small theater in the small towns. It is all right to reduce the cabaret tax 10 percent, but let us reduce the tax on theater admissions to the same percentage. Let us treat the two elements alike, although one is a means of recreation for 95,000,000 people, and the other a means of recreation for only a very small percentage of the population. The cabaret caters to those who have money to spend, while the theater is a means of entertainment for poor people who have only a very small amount to spend. The 20-percent tax on the small theaters works a hardship on small places of amusement in their effort to continue in operation. They are suffering, as the owners of cabarets are suffering, because of a reduction in their revenues. The theaters depend upon the attendance of the poor people, to whom a few nickels and dimes mean something in their everyday life.

I take this occasion to remark that the owners of juke joints and cabarets have contributed absolutely nothing to the war effort except to furnish a place to spend money and have a good time. What have the motion-picture theaters done? They have been contributing in every way toward every war activity, including the Red Cross drive, the War bond drive, the WAC enlistment drive, the fats and salvage drive, and the infantile paralysis drive. They are also using the power of the screen to keep Americans thinking along the right lines as we make the greatest effort of our lives in the present World War. Those engaged in the motion-picture industry have been contributing weekly, monthly, and yearly to the success of our war drives of every sort. Without their efforts such drives would not be nearly so successful. The motion-picture theater owners are being penalized by a tax of 20 percent in order that they may carry on. In many instances the tax burden is passed on to the rank and file of the people.

We are asked to reduce the 30-percent tax on cabarets to 10 percent. Such a reduction would affect only those who have money to spend having a good time in the cities. I admit that incidentally such places furnish employment to a very small class of musicians and entertainers. As I have said, I am not opposed to the reduction in that tax, but it would be manifestly unfair to reduce the tax on cabarets to 10 percent and leave the 20-percent tax on theater admissions. If the cabaret tax were reduced, and the theater tax left where it is, more hell would be raised over those two taxes than we have ever heard in connection with the cabaret tax.

If we are to reduce the cabaret tax from 30 percent to 10 percent, let us at the same time reduce the 20-percent theater tax to 10 percent, and let the two

amendments go to conference to be adjusted, so that justice may be done to 95,000,000 poor people whose only means of recreation and pleasure is the theater. The motion-picture theater owners have contributed greatly to the war effort, whereas the cabarets have done absolutely nothing but rake in the golden shekels.

EXTENSION OF PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking and Currency has submitted an explanation of Senate bill 1764, to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 as amended by the act of October 2, 1942, together with a report thereon. The report contains a general statement and also a supplemental statement. I wish to say that I wholly dissent from the supplemental statement. The report is ambiguous with respect to whether the supplemental statement is a part of the report. It was clearly my understanding that it was not to be a part of the committee report: Yet, the general report, in which I concur, does not make it at all clear to my mind that the supplemental statement is not a part of the committee report. It seems to be a statement prepared by the Office of Price Administration which has never been approved by the committee, and does not in any way represent, in my opinion, the proper summary of the evidence which was submitted to the committee. If there is any question whatever about it being a part of the report, I desire to file minority views. I do not know whether the chairman of the committee regards the supplemental report as a part of the general report. However, I should like to know whether he does so regard it, because if it is a part of the general report I desire to file dissenting views.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, it is a part of the report submitted by the full committee. As the Senator will recall, a subcommittee was appointed consisting of three Senators, namely, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], and myself. All members of the committee on the side of the Senator from Ohio agreed to abide by the views as outlined by the junior Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. TAFT. However, the full report was submitted to the committee. The committee disagreed with it.

It was agreed that there should be a general report submitted, and that the supplemental statement should be attached as an exhibit, to which I had no objection. It was not, however, to be a part of the report. The subcommittee to which the matter was referred, consisting of the Senators whom the Senator has named, was authorized to carry out the wishes of the committee, but it was distinctly understood that the so-called supplemental statement was not to be a part of the report. In my opinion, it has simply incorporated all the evidence of the Office of Price Administration, which constitutes a propaganda statement of the position of the Office of Price Administration. It never was approved by the Committee on Banking and Currency. If the chairman of the committee intends that it shall be accepted as a part of the report, I ask for permission to file dissenting minority views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Ohio while I note that it is my belief his fears are unfounded. I first point out that on page 1 of the document known as Report No. 922, there appears the headline "General statement." Those words were not in the memorandum upon which the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and I agreed. I have no doubt, however, that they have been interpolated by the legislative draftsman with the view to explaining the basis upon which the report proceeds.

On page 3, in similar size type, there will be found the words "Text of reported bill."

At the top of page 8, in similar size type, there will be found the heading "Explanation of reported bill."

Similarly, at the top of page 20 we find the heading "Minority views." Obviously those minority views are the views stated by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER]. But granted that they are minority views, so submitted, and so incorporated in Report No. 922, obviously they are not the report of the majority of the committee, and that fact is so designated therein.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to make my next point if the Senator from New York will forbear.

Mr. WAGNER. Very well.

Mr. DANAHER. At the top of page 26 there appears the heading "Supplemental statement." Following that appears this language:

> The supplemental statement which the committee has caused to be attached is as follows:

Now, where did we cause it to be attached? If we will refer back to page 3, we will find that the concluding paragraph of the general statement reads as follows:

> The hearings on these measures have been so voluminous and so many witnesses have appeared that the record includes more than 1,600 pages of testimony, graphs, and other pertinent data. For the convenience of the Senate, the committee has caused to be attached a supplemental statement which will be found to abstract relevant material of assistance in understanding the background of such problems as rationing, wage and salary stabilization, rent control, and other phases of our wartime stabilization program. At appropriate points this statement includes illustrative graphs submitted by the Office of Price Administration in the course of its presentation.

I assume that if the Senator from Ohio wishes to read into the language after "supplemental statement," the words "as an exhibit" and so designate the part to which he has referred, no harm would be done. I assume that if that course were followed, the status of the matter in the mind of the Senator from Ohio would be entirely clarified.

Mr. TAFT. Not at all, because the chairman of the committee says that it is a part of the committee report, and inasmuch as he says that, I wish to state my dissent from it and my intention to file minority views. If it is submitted as an exhibit by the Price Administration stating their side of the case, very well, I have no objection; but certainly it seems to me it is at least ambiguous and, since the chairman of the committee says it is a part of the report, I assume that it is so intended to be. The chairman seems to differ from the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. WAGNER. There is no difference at all. The supplemental statement is added as a part of the report, of course. What else could it be but a supplement to the report?

Mr. TAFT. It is not a fair compilation of the evidence that was adduced before the committee. It wholly omits all the critical evidence; it wholly omits two-thirds of the witnesses who appeared before us and submitted a series of objections to the manner in which the Price Administration has been operated. It only summarizes the Price Administration's case. I think if it is to be there at all, it ought to be purely as an exhibit of the Price Administration. It is there now; but I wish to express my dissent from it, and my intention to file minority views. I have done my best throughout the hearings to reach a conclusion upon which the whole committee could agree, but if this is to be a part of the report my efforts along that line have come to an end.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I understand, of course, the point the Senator from Ohio is seeking to make, but I still insist that he is going afield from the way we looked at the matter in the committee when we had the subject under consideration. For example, let us take one of the graphs. I happened by accident to have turned to page 34, where I find this:

> Each week we get 4,500,000 telephone calls.

Mr. President, it is perfectly clear that what is being referred to there is the Office of Price Administration; the reference is not to Senators and not to the committee, although I admit there are weeks when it seems to me that I get 4,500,000 telephone calls. The fact is that no part of the findings of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

It goes on to say:

> Two million five hundred thousand letters—

An actual count in our offices will not run quite so high, I admit—

> 6,000 applications for price increases, 1,500,000 personal calls at O. P. A. offices.

It seems to me that a reference to the statement itself which is attached as a

supplemental statement will disclose that in fact that is all it is. I hope with this explanation the Senator from Ohio will concur ultimately.

Now, let me say further that, while it is true that in the compilation of this supplemental statement the Office of Price Administration, of course, had a great deal to do with its format and preparation, it was under the supervision of our legislative draftsmen, and much of it was the work of Mr. Charles S. Murphy, the assistant legislative counsel, who was in constant attendance upon our executive sessions.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. It seems to me that the supplemental statement heading to which the Senator from Ohio objects is the very language that was mentioned during the discussions of the committee. It was understood, as he says, that it would accompany the report either under the heading of an exhibit or as a supplemental or added statement. As I remember the action of the Banking and Currency Committee and of the subcommittee with respect to the matter, it was exactly that there would be added a supplemental statement or exhibit or appendix as a part of the report, with a proper title indicating what it was.

Mr. DANAHER. I think the Senator from Utah has stated the situation with substantial accuracy. The point about it was that when we were confronted with all these documents it became perfectly apparent that we were not going to have complete accord as to what would comprise the committee report. We therefore set out to subdivide and take into account everything that would be the basis for general agreement, and that much, on pages 1, 2, and 3, is the report. Then we report the bill with our committee changes and an explanation of the changes. All that is perfectly apparent from an examination of pages 3 to 21, and the Senator from New York and I and other Senators joined in minority views, appearing at pages 20 to 25.

There is then attached at page 26 a supplemental statement, which we submit for the convenience of the Senate, for its general understanding of the background and some of the data which were submitted in the course of the hearings.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to say that my understanding was distinctly different. When this was referred to the subcommittee I understood that the supplemental statement was to be printed in the Appendix as a statement from the Price Administration. As it appears here it looks as if the chairman was correct in his statement that it is a part of the report. Under those circumstances I wish to indicate my dissent and my intention to file dissenting views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has been granted permission to submit minority views on the O. P. A. bill.

Mr. TAFT. After all, the supplemental statement covers from page 26 to page 80. It comprises most of the report. It is the thing one would look to if he were interested in the subject at all and he would probably look mostly at the graphs.

Take page 46, from which I read:

Has price control hurt small business?

Then there is a series of figures tending to show that small business has been benefited. Those figures are absolutely at variance with the figures of the Committee on Small Business of the Senate. They were prepared by the Price Administration to prove their case. I do not think they are actually in accord with the facts at all.

Take the statement about rents on pages 50 and 52. On page 50 is shown the fact that no rents have been increased at all, but on page 52 the whole thing is contradicted by saying that "9,994 small buildings show net operating income up 44.4 percent." Certainly, if the small buildings were occupied by tenants and there had been no rent increases, the landlord's costs certainly increased. The two things contradict each other on their face.

I think it was not intended that it be submitted as a part of the report, but if it is, I shall in due time submit minority views.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I merely wish to make it perfectly clear that my understanding is that what now appears as a General Statement under those words on page 1, actually comprises the committee's report, reporting the text of the bill which commences on page 3, with the explanations which in turn supplement the reported bill, the explanations appearing at page 8. Then, for the convenience of the Senate, as we say on page 3, we attach a "supplemental statement" abstracting certain material and including "illustrative graphs submitted by the Office of Price Administration in the course of its presentation," and we hope that it will prove of assistance to the Senate. That is all it is. That is the way I view it.

DISPOSITION OF TRIBAL FUNDS OF THE MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE OF INDIANS

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, on May 25, the day on which the calendar was last called, Senate bill 873, to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians was passed. An identical House bill, H. R. 2085, at that time was pending before the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, which had considered the Senate bill.

In order to expedite the parliamentary situation with respect to the two bills, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the House bill and that it may be considered as having been read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and the Committee on Indian Affairs is discharged from the further consideration of House bill 2085.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2085) to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. With a view to the indefinite postponement of Senate bill 873, to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians, I now enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, and move that the House be requested to return the bill to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 873 was passed will be entered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota that the House be requested to return Senate bill 873 to the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

INCREASE IN LIMITATION ON NATIONAL DEBT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4464) to increase the debt limit of the United States.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, reverting to the bill to increase the debt limit, and particularly to the amendment presented by my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], let me say that this is entirely a tax problem. It is neither a police problem nor is it a manpower problem. It is not a question of the regulation or the control of entertainment, nor are those who favor the amendment, nor those who oppose the amendment, for that matter, taking a stand in support of or in opposition to the form of entertainment.

The province of the Federal Government in this matter pertains entirely to the question of taxes. The power to regulate and control is a question for the States to determine. This might better be referred to as a tax on food, because where food is served, under the law, which the pending amendment seeks to moderate it is the subject of the tax, while the radio, the juke box, and the orchestra, as such, are not taxed. Entertainment, if it confines itself to orchestral entertainment, is not taxable, but if someone were to sing, or if dancing were permitted, even though it might be at a benefit affair, open to the public, conducted by a fire company, a fraternal or civic organization, then it would become taxable.

So, Mr. President, having in mind only the province of the Federal Government insofar as the principles of the pending bill are concerned, I feel that we should direct our attention in such a way as to bring about the largest financial return to the Treasury of the United States.

The pending amendment is based on experience under the present law, and very naturally over a very short period of time, but nonetheless it indicates that the tax returns are diminishing, at a time when it is essential for us to increase the tax revenues in order to carry the burdens of the war.

As I stated in the beginning, the question is not one of regulation of entertainment, nor of the places in which entertainment is provided. This is a tax

problem. In my judgment the tax applies unreasonably, at least in some instances, as a charge superimposed upon the cost of food. It is unlike the tax on the movies in that, in that particular case we adopted a provision exempting servicemen, for example, from the imposition of the tax.

It is my opinion, Mr. President, that an adjustment of this tax, as indicated by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], which can be brought about in the conference, if we adopt the amendment offered by the junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], will result in increasing the income of the Treasury of the United States.

In that connection, let us remember that the juke box, the radio, and the orchestra as such are not taxed, and where they serve as the only source of entertainment the food is not taxed; but where, in addition to the music, there is some form of entertainment, whether it is provided by a charitable organization, a civic organization, a labor organization, or any other organization, the tax is applied. The tax is levied on the meals one buys, and the tax is levied uniformly on all who purchase meals, whether they be servicemen or others.

Before I close, I reiterate that I am not an advocate of entertainment of a questionable character, and were I in authority in any State or city where such entertainment existed I should endeavor to put a stop to it.

I wish to read into the RECORD at this point a letter from Mr. Edward Flore, general president of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees International Alliance, together with a resolution adopted unanimously by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor. The letter is as follows:

HOTEL AND RESTAURANT EMPLOYEES' INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCE AND BARTENDERS' INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
Cincinnati, Ohio, May 26, 1944.

Hon. JAMES M. MEAD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The enclosed resolution was adopted unanimously by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor.

Kindly read it into the records of the United States Senate.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD FLORE,
General President.

The resolution enclosed in the letter reads as follows:

Whereas the so-called cabaret tax, the tax on amounts paid by guest in hotel dining rooms, restaurants, roof gardens, cabarets, and the like, was increased sixfold, from 5 percent to 30 percent by the Revenue Act of 1943; and

Whereas the increased tax has proved excessive, in that it has caused many hotel dining rooms, restaurants, roof gardens, cabarets, and the like to discontinue furnishing entertainment to patrons; and

Whereas as a result of the increased tax many musicians, waiters, entertainers, and other employees have lost employment; and

Whereas members of the armed forces and persons of moderate income and means have been denied a source of entertainment, in that such persons cannot afford to pay a 30-percent tax on the amount spent in hotel dining rooms, restaurants, roof gardens, cabarets, or other places furnishing entertainment while meals, food, and beverages are being served; and

Whereas the increased tax has failed in its purpose, to increase revenue, and has in fact resulted in a loss of revenue to the Federal Government: Be it

Resolved, That the American Federation of Labor favors the adoption of legislation to amend the Revenue Act of 1943, by the enactment of the bills introduced in the Senate and in the House to reduce the cabaret tax from 30 percent to 10 percent, and that the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives be advised of the action of the American Federation of Labor.

The reference to the bill introduced would mean, of course, in this case, the amendment offered by the junior Senator from California.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be taken to conference by the chairman of the Committee on Finance, whose reasonableness in matters of this kind is very well known to all his colleagues in the Senate. I am sure the conference committee would have the latest information, the very best information, on the returns being received under existing law, and the possibilities of higher returns being received under a more moderate amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement by the Treasury Department, made under date of May 18, opposing the pending amendment, and I ask that it be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON in the chair). Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 18, 1944.

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Further reference is made to your letter of May 3, 1944, enclosing a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 126 (78th Cong., 2d sess.), entitled a "Joint resolution to reduce the tax on admissions to cabarets, roof gardens, and similar entertainments," for consideration and report.

The bill proposes to amend section 1700 (e) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code by striking out "30 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "10 percent." The amendment would be applicable only after 10 a. m. on the first day of the first month after the enactment of the resolution.

Section 302 of the Revenue Act of 1943 increased the rate of tax imposed by section 1700 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code from 5 percent to 30 percent, effective 10 a. m., April 1, 1944. When it first passed the act, the House of Representatives voted a 30-percent tax on cabarets and a 20-percent tax on general admissions. In the Senate the cabaret tax was likewise fixed at 20 percent. The House provisions subsequently prevailed in the conference report which the Congress adopted.

Since the effective date of the legislation two changes in the cabaret trade have been reported. First, it is asserted that there has been some reduction in the volume of business of places subject to the cabaret tax. Second, it is reported that adjustments are being made in the manner in which these places are operated, designed either to remove a particular place of business from the coverage of the tax or to reduce the customer's bill to which the 30-percent tax is applicable. Such adjustments take the form of discontinuance of any entertainment which causes a restaurant to be classified as a cabaret so that the restaurant is removed from that category, segregation of entertainment in a part of the establishment so that the entire restaurant is not classified as a cabaret and receipts for food and drinks in one part are not subject to the tax, and postponement of entertainment until later in the evening so that the tax will not apply to the dinner trade.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue to date has not received accurate information indicating the extent of these developments or the revenue consequences of the tax increase. The returns for the month of April, the first month the increased rate was in effect, are not due until the end of May, and collectors' reports of collections from returns for April will not be available before the middle of June. However, it is possible to state that a 10-percent rate would produce substantially less revenue than a 30-percent rate.

The Dominion of Canada appears to have been successful with a cabaret tax of 25 percent. The tax was introduced at a 20-percent rate in 1942 and increased to 25 percent in 1943. The tax base in Canada is comparable to the United States base, and the tax is imposed under substantially similar conditions. It should be pointed out that the general admissions tax is the same in both countries. Information on Canada's experience indicates that business has not suffered under the high cabaret tax, but has increased and that new establishments have been opened.

At the time when the increase by the Revenue Act of 1943 was considered the possible effects of the tax were recognized and revenue estimates took account of diminished trade and changes in operation. It was apparently believed that in view of the luxury aspects of the trade and the general employment and manpower situation, these consequences were no deterrent to the increase and a 30-percent rate was justified. In addition, it was recognized that it is not unusual in the case of new or increased excise tax rates for the volume of business to decline temporarily, the decline to be followed by a recovery and stabilization at the new tax level. Until there is available information sufficiently reliable to indicate that these effects are considerably greater than was anticipated, consideration of a change of rate would not appear to be justified.

One technical observation concerning the resolution should be made. The increase in the cabaret tax was made, along with other war tax increases, through the enactment of section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code, and not by an amendment of section 1700 (e) (1). The resolution should, therefore, be directed to that part of section 1650 related to the rate of tax imposed by section 1700 (e) (1).

The Director, Bureau of the Budget, has advised the Treasury Department that there is no objection to the presentation of this report. A copy of their letter is attached.

Very truly yours,

JOHN L. SULLIVAN,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1944.

The honorable the SECRETARY
OF THE TREASURY.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This will acknowledge the receipt of the letter of May 15, 1944, from Administrative Assistant Bell, transmitting the original and two copies of your proposed report to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 126, a resolution To reduce the tax on admissions to cabarets, roof gardens, and similar entertainments.

The resolution would reduce from 30 percent to 10 percent the tax on admissions to cabarets, roof gardens, and similar enter-

tainments. Your proposed report discusses the effect on Treasury revenues of such a reduction, and indicates that there is not available sufficiently satisfactory information to show that continuance of the present 30-percent rate will result in any such decrease in trade as to require the establishment of a lower rate for the purpose of maintaining the revenue level contemplated by the 30-percent rate.

In reply, you are advised that there would be no objection to the submission of the proposed adverse report to the committee, the original of which report is returned herewith.

Very truly yours,

PAUL H. APPLEBY,
Acting Director.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have asked that the letter be read at the desk in order that the Senate might know the position taken by the Treasury Department. When this matter arose in connection with the tax simplification bill, I stated that I personally would not offer objection to an amendment reducing the cabaret tax, but I stated at the same time that when this matter arose in the Senate Finance Committee it was the opinion of the majority of the members of the committee that the cabaret tax should be brought into line with the tax imposed on other so-called luxury entertainment or articles which were subjected to tax. The Senate Finance Committee recommended a tax of 20 percent on cabarets. Subsequently the Senate approved that recommendation, and also approved an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] exempting from the tax men and women in uniform.

The tax bill, after passage in the Senate, went to conference, and the House conferees, backed by strong statements from the Treasury Department, insisted that the provision exempting service men and women from the cabaret tax would make the whole cabaret tax administratively impossible, and the House conferees also insisted strongly on the 30-percent rate on cabarets which the House had previously adopted. The matter was discussed many times in conference, and the House conferees were adamant upon the 30-percent rate. So the result was that the bill finally passed with a provision for a 30-percent tax on cabarets.

Mr. President, personally I have believed from the beginning, and I now believe and am satisfied that I am correct in making the statement, that a 30-percent tax on cabarets will actually reduce the revenues to the Government. I cannot see how any question of manpower is vitally or substantially involved in connection with the tax. My understanding is that everyone subject to the draft is either taken and placed in military service, or he is deferred, or is relieved from service. That is true in baseball. It is true in other kinds of sports, and I presume it is true of those individuals who serve in the various cabarets of the country. So I do not see how any question of manpower is involved.

Certainly I do not think the cabaret tax ought to be considered as a punitive measure. I regarded it as a matter of revenue, and I am still of the opinion that a 30-percent tax on cabarets will produce less revenue than a 20-percent tax, or even, perhaps, a 15-percent or a 10-percent tax.

But, Mr. President, I could not approve, and I hope the Senate will not approve, a cabaret tax of 10 percent, primarily for this reason: We are in war. Taxes are high; some of them extremely high; but they are war taxes. That is the only justification for them. The House and the Senate placed a tax of 20 percent on ordinary admissions, and I do not see how we can justify a tax of 10 percent on the cabarets and yet collect a 20-percent tax from the children of the country and persons who wish to go to the ordinary moving-picture theaters.

If the Senator will not agree to a 20-percent tax, I think I shall have to move to amend his amendment, because my judgment is that the cabaret tax should not be more than 20 percent, and that it should remain in line with the other so-called luxury taxes, especially the taxes on general admissions, which now are 20 percent, as I have already stated. At the same time I am convinced that the present cabaret tax will really result in a decline in revenue.

I should like to state further that my observation has been that when the members of the armed services, who are away from their homes, unacquainted in the cities and towns which are located near their camps or wherever they may be stationed, have a day or 2 days off, they wish to have some form of recreation or entertainment. They do not know the people of the city or of the nearby village. They feel at liberty to go to a place where there is a little music and some dancing. A 30-percent tax thus levied on the men and women in the armed services, which is the effect of the cabaret tax, is a tax which very greatly affects the attitude of the servicemen, and is a very great injustice to them.

But a reduction of the tax to 20 percent is the only reduction I could favor in this instance. I very much hope the Senator from California will amend his own amendment and will offer to fix the tax on cabarets at 20 percent, in line with the other luxury taxes provided in the law.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Of course, I appreciate the logic of the suggestion made by the chairman of the Finance Committee, namely, that we bring the cabaret tax into line with the movie admission tax and though I still maintain that a 20-percent tax is much too high, nevertheless I always like to follow the advice of the senior Senator from Georgia.

So I now wish to present to him a suggestion which I hope will meet with his approval. One of the worst features about this tax, to my mind, has been the fact that a great and wealthy people should wish to impose a tax which falls with greater or less severity in different places of the country upon the service men and women who are on furlough or who have returned from actual service abroad. It has seemed to me that it is a sad thing that the Treasury Department had to evolve a particular tax which fell so heavily on them. As I have already stated, I think that in California at least half the tax is now being paid by servicemen and servicewomen. It is true we have a 20-percent movie tax, but it should be noted that the servicemen and women are exempted from paying it.

Would the distinguished chairman of the committee think it would be proper to take to conference for further consideration by the Treasury, an amendment to have the cabaret tax made 20 percent, but at the same time exempting the service men and women of the Nation from paying even that tax? I am very sure that 90 percent of the American people would immediately say "aye" to such a proposal, and I believe it would remove a sore spot from the hearts of many of the service men and women.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I would not oppose an amendment of that kind. I think it would be very difficult for us to secure favorable action on it by the conferees, in view of the fact that we previously had the same question, or substantially the same one. But if the amendment is limited only to the tax on servicemen in uniform, I have no objection to it, because that was precisely what the Senate approved on a vote when the tax bill was before it. However, I am afraid we would not be able to sustain it in conference.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, am I to understand, at least, that the distinguished chairman of the committee is willing to accept that modification of the amendment, namely, to have the amendment made 20 percent, instead of 10 percent?

Mr. GEORGE. If it is made 20 percent, and if the exemption is limited to men and women in uniform.

Mr. DOWNEY. The prior amendment which was presented was carefully worked out so that the exemption was to be allowed only to men and women in uniform who themselves enjoyed the entertainment and who themselves paid the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. DOWNEY. So, Mr. President, in accordance with the suggestion of the distinguished chairman of the committee, I now offer the amendment to reduce the cabaret tax to 20 percent, and I add to it an amendment in the same language as that which was previously presented, exempting service men and women in uniform from the payment of that tax when they actually pay the bill and when they themselves enjoy the food and the entertainment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has modified his amendment. The question is on agreeing to the amendment modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, in the meantime I had prepared an amendment

reducing the rate of the amusement tax from 20 percent to 10 percent. I did that in anticipation of the adoption of the amendment originally offered by the Senator from California.

However, inasmuch as it has been agreed that the cabaret tax shall be 20 percent, with exemption of members of the armed forces from payment of the tax, and since they receive similar consideration with respect to the tax on theater admissions, I shall not at this time press my amendment. But I wish it understood that the point I was making was to see that the cabarets did not enjoy a 10-percent tax while the theaters had a tax of 20 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4464) was read the third time and passed.

DISPOSITION OF NONCURRENT AND OBSOLETE CONGRESSIONAL PUBLICATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 87, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall prepare a statement showing the noncurrent and obsolete congressional publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and to submit an itemized list thereof, in duplicate, to the Joint Committee on Printing, which is hereby authorized and directed to dispose of the publications enumerated on such lists as follows:

First. A printed statement of such publications shall be submitted to each Senator, Representative, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, and officer of the Senate and House of Representatives, and any Member or officer of either House having any of such publications to his credit may dispose of the same in the usual manner at any time before September 1, 1944.

Second. Upon the expiration of the aforesaid time the Joint Committee on Printing shall furnish to all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, as promptly as practicable, a list of the publications herein referred to then remaining in the folding rooms, and thereupon such publications shall be subject to the order of any Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, in the order in which they are applied for, for a period of 30 days after the day when such list shall be furnished by the Joint Committee on Printing, but no application for the transfer of these publications may be honored.

Third. The Joint Committee on Printing shall furnish a list of all such publications remaining in the folding room at the expiration of the last-named period to the various departments, independent offices, and establishments of the Government at Washington, including the Superintendent of Documents, Smithsonian Institution, Library of Congress, National Archives Establishment, Bureau of American Republics, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and such publications shall be turned over to any department, independent office, or establishment making written request therefor and shall be allocated in the order in which their application is made, and all such publications which shall remain in the folding rooms for a period of 10 days after such list shall have been furnished to the departments, independent offices, or establishments, aforesaid shall be delivered to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, for such disposition as he may deem to be in the best interests of the Government, and submit a report to the Joint Committee on Printing showing the tonnage so disposed of, together with the amount of money derived from such sale which shall be deposited to the credit of miscellaneous receipts in the Treasury of the United States in accordance with existing law.

Fourth. No publication which is described in the list aforesaid shall thereafter be returned to the folding rooms from any source.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, adoption of the resolution will make available for use, in order to help meet the paper shortage, a considerable quantity of papers now stored in and around the Capitol. It is highly desirable that the concurrent resolution be agreed to. I now move that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator indicate what the resolution is?

Mr. HAYDEN. The resolution provides for the disposition of certain noncurrent and obsolete congressional publications which now are stored in various places in the Senate and House Office Buildings and the Capitol, and which have been thoroughly examined. The disposal of such papers will help meet the paper shortage. The proposal is very well worked out, and I think is satisfactory to all concerned. I think the concurrent resolution should be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona to concur in the House concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ON C. I. O. POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 88, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 50,000 additional copies of the report (No. 1311) of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, dealing with the leadership of the Congress of Industrial Organizations Political Action Committee, of which 6,000 copies shall be for the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House and 44,000 copies for the use of the House document room.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, adoption of the concurrent resolution is desired by the House. I move that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, there is on the calendar order of business No. 915, House bill 3961, being the River and Harbor bill which was recently passed by the House, and which was considered for a number of days by the Commerce Committee of the Senate. I am desirous of proceeding——

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. For what purpose?

Mr. AIKEN. I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum. Other Members of the Senate are interested in the Senator's explanation.

Mr. OVERTON. I shall be glad to yield now for that purpose, or I can yield later. I had not finished my statement. Perhaps I had better complete my statement. I myself had in mind suggesting the absence of a quorum.

I realize that the O. P. A. bill has not as yet been reported. It is expected that it will be reported within a few days. I consulted with the majority leader the other day, when it was anticipated that the price-control bill would be reported so that it could be considered by the Senate tomorrow. I had a tentative understanding with him that it would be agreeable for me to call up the river and harbor bill immediately following the passage of the price-control bill, which, as I stated, the majority leader said would be taken up tomorrow. It is not my desire to interfere with the consideration of the price-control bill. If my motion is agreed to, it is my purpose to request that the river and harbor bill be temporarily laid aside in order to permit the consideration of the price-control bill. In the meantime, I do not expect to present any controversial features in the bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I talked with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] just before he left. He stated that it was his understanding that any controversial amendments would be passed over until the conclusion of the consideration of the price-control bill. Is that the understanding of the distinguished Senator?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct—unless the price-control bill should be unduly delayed, until next Tuesday, for example.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. AIKEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum. What the Senator is saying is of interest to every Member of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Reynolds
Austin	Guffey	Robertson
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Bilbo	Hawkes	Shipstead
Buck	Hayden	Stewart
Burton	Holman	Taft
Butler	Jackson	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Tobey
Capper	La Follette	Truman
Caraway	McClellan	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Cordon	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
Davis	Murdock	Walsh, N. J.
Downey	Murray	Weeks
Eastland	Nye	Wheeler
Ellender	O'Daniel	Wherry
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	White
George	Overton	Wiley
Gerry	Radcliffe	Wilson
Gillette	Reed	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Louisiana will not press his motion. I believe we have had a pretty definite understanding in the Senate for some days as to what the legislative program should be. I feel very sure that it was understood generally by all Senators that today we would take up the debt limitation bill, and that the remaining time would be devoted to the consideration of the so-called O. P. A. bill. I understand that the O. P. A. bill is not ready to be taken up immediately. However, I believe that we have a right to rely upon the agreed sequence of events, and that it was definitely understood that the river and harbor bill would not be taken up until after disposing of the O. P. A. measure.

Mr. President, I believe that we should be jealous to the extreme with respect to agreements entered into, whether they be as the result of formal unanimous consent requests, or of some other nature.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. WHITE. I think we should be careful to see that understandings entered into are faithfully observed by all Members of the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I yield no further. The Senator has involved me in an agreement of which I have never heard.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, was I recognized or not?

Mr. OVERTON. No; I yielded to the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana yielded to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senator will permit me as a matter of courtesy, I shall be very glad to explain that there has been no agreement of which I know about anything of the nature he has suggested. If there had been such an agreement, it seems to me that those responsible for it would have consulted the Senator in charge of the river and harbor bill. If any such agreement was entered into, it was between Senators who never spoke to me about it.

All I know about the situation is this: A few days ago I saw the majority leader and told him that I should like to bring up on Monday—that is last Monday—the river and harbor bill, and make it the unfinished business. He said in effect, "We are going to take up the O. P. A. bill next Thursday, and I think it would be better for you to wait until then. On that day we can proceed to dispose of the O. P. A. bill."

I now understand that the O. P. A. bill, which was expected to be reported today, will not be reported until some time next week. That is my understanding of the suggestion made by the majority leader.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I did not undertake to state that there had been a specific agreement entered into with the Senator from Louisiana, but it was stated upon this floor what would be the sequence of legislative matters to be taken up. We were told that the debt limitation bill would be taken up today. We were told that the O. P. A. bill would come next. What is now being proposed is not a following of that sequence but a rearrangement of the program.

I understand also that the evidence heard before the committee, upon which this bill rests, and upon which the report is based, has not been printed, and is not yet available to Senators.

Mr. President, when I learned that I did not have the floor I was about to say that we ought to be most jealous in respect to our understandings, whether they be expressed or implied. Otherwise, agreements cannot be entered into, and understandings cannot be reached.

As a practical matter, I understood the Senator from Louisiana to suggest that only noncontroversial matters in the bill would be taken up.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. If my information is correct, most of the bill is controversial.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator's information is incorrect.

Mr. WHITE. If we take up the bill now, substantially nothing will be accomplished in the way of progress, because I believe that objections will be made to many if not most of the sections of the bill. I appeal to the Senator because I believe I am appealing in behalf of a common understanding in this body. I appeal to the Senator not to press his motion at the present time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. OVERTON. Allow me to make a few brief remarks and then I shall be glad to yield.

Today the Senate is doing nothing legislatively. There is perhaps nothing to be taken up this afternoon. The remainder of the afternoon may be wasted so far as the consideration or passage of any bill is concerned. I know of nothing in prospect to be taken up until tomorrow. That may be true on the following day. Will the Senate stand idle and wait until the Committee on Banking and Currency brings in a report on the O. P. A. bill? I wish to be perfectly fair and frank about the matter. All I ask to do is to take up the river and harbor bill, in which the people of the United States are generally interested. A great many sections of the United States desire to see action taken by the Senate upon the bill. What I desire to do is merely to take up the bill, make it the unfinished business, and dispose of the noncontroversial items contained in it.

The Senator from Maine makes the surprising statement that practically everything in the bill is controversial. If so, it is strange that no one appeared before our committee, which spent days in considering the bill, in opposition to very many of the items. I have in mind the Beaver-Mahoning Rivers item in Pennsylvania, the Tennessee-Tombigbee River, the Missouri River, and the Central Valley Authority.

Those are the projects which are controversial. There is also another item which does not appear as an amendment which originates in California, and that is the Central Valley project. There was a provision in the bill in connection with the Central Valley project which was eliminated by the Senate Commerce Committee.

Those are the controversial items. If controversies concerning other items spring up it is simply because of a determined desire on the part of some people to delay the consideration of the bill. I merely want to advance it to the point where it can come up and the controversial items be considered immediately following the O. P. A. legislation.

Mr. ROBERTSON and Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield first to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I must oppose the motion to bring this bill up at this time, for the reason that there are being prepared minority views opposing the bill. I advised the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that such minority views were being prepared, and I also advised the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. The delay in preparing the minority views is being caused by delay in receiving the majority report. The majority report was not available until Monday. The minority views will be ready to be presented for printing tomorrow. The minority views go to the entire bill. I must oppose the motion for the further reason that the hearings on the bill have not as yet been published in their entirety.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Have they been printed?

Mr. NYE. Not in their entirety.

Mr. ROBERTSON. A small portion of the hearings have been printed and released, but the great majority dealing with the controversial provisions of the bill have not been printed. I feel it impossible for Senators to arrive at a proper understanding of the bill until such time as they are enabled to read the hearings.

Mr. OVERTON. In reply to what the able Senator from Wyoming has said, I am dumbfounded when he advises that he is going to submit minority views and object to practically every item in the bill. The Senator served on the subcommittee and was also, of course, present in the full committee and there were only three or four controversial items,

only one of which he opposed, and that was the Missouri River navigation project. Possibly he voted against one other project, I do not recall as to that; but, anyway, there were not more than four controversial projects before the committee of which the able Senator from Wyoming is a member, and he participated in the hearings of the subcommittee, and in the deliberations of the full committee. I will ask the Senator frankly if the purpose is to filibuster this bill on the part of certain Senators.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have no knowledge of any filibuster on this bill, I will say to the Senator from Louisiana. I should like also to correct the Senator by saying that the vote in the committee was largely on bringing the bill to the floor. It was pointed out in the committee that, regardless of what took place in the committee, discussion on the bill would be continued on the floor of the Senate. There was, therefore, very little opposition expressed in the committee meeting, in order to save time and get the report printed and brought to the floor of the Senate. At least, that is my understanding.

Mr. OVERTON. Senators reserved the right to vote as they saw fit with reference to certain of the controversial items I have mentioned. Certainly any Senator has a right to vote as he pleases on the floor of the Senate on any item of the bill and is not bound by his vote in committee.

The hearings have not been fully printed, but I understand they will be printed completely by tonight or tomorrow, although I may be misinformed. The sole purpose is to make this bill the unfinished business, which will carry out what the able minority leader has in mind, and that is that it will follow immediately upon the O. P. A. legislation. What I desire is to have it placed in a position where it will follow the O. P. A. measure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say to the Senator that I see in the bill there is an item for a waterway connecting the Tombigbee and the Tennessee Rivers.

Mr. OVERTON. I mentioned that, I will say to the Senator, as one of the controversial items that will not be considered until it is reached in the consideration of the bill after consideration of the price-control bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know about it. As I recall, it was defeated the last time it was before the Senate. I know it was defeated in the Congress. I notice that it is to cost $66,000,000. We already have a waterway to the Gulf of Mexico, and it seems to me that it would be very unwise to provide for the project. I have not had an opportunity of examining the hearings and I should like very much if the Senator would postpone the matter until we could have time to look over the hearings.

Mr. OVERTON. The hearings on the Tennessee-Tombigbee project are printed and they are available to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall certainly look into them. I did not know they had been printed.

Mr. TOBEY and Mr. STEWART addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield first to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. What is the total amount of money involved if all the projects are carried out? Would it call for half a billion dollars?

Mr. OVERTON. I do not recall the exact amount.

Mr. TOBEY. Can the Senator give us an idea of the relative amount? Would he say it was half a billion dollars, or more, or how much?

Mr. OVERTON. I should say that the amount is perhaps approximately $500,000,000.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. My recollection from a hasty glance at the report is that the amount carried is $498,000,000-plus.

Mr. TOBEY. I should like to propound a further question. In the Senator's judgment, what proportion of the projects and appropriations in this bill are for post-war work and what for work incidental to carrying on the war?

Mr. OVERTON. All the projects are proposed as post-war projects, "unless," as stated in the bill, "the construction of such project has been recommended by an authorized defense agency and approved by the President as being necessary and desirable in the interest of the national defense and security, and the President has notified Congress to that effect." In that event a project may be undertaken before the termination of the war.

Mr. TOBEY. In the Senator's opinion, would it not be a germane and constructive thing to do to segregate those portions of the bill which have to do with the present carrying on of the war and leave the others in futuro?

More than that, I find that hardy perennial, the Tombigbee project, calling for $66,000,000, which is the largest single amount in the bill. As long as I have been a Member of the Senate it has cropped up each year. Is that project incidental or is it necessary in carrying on the war, in the Senator's judgment?

Mr. OVERTON. In my judgment, it is not necessary for carrying on the war.

Mr. TOBEY. Would the Senator join with me and other Senators, perhaps, in putting into the bill a provision preventing the inauguration of such projects as are not needed for the prosecution of the war saying "à bas," down with them, and let the American people say what constructive action shall be taken when the war is won?

Mr. OVERTON. I regret that I cannot comply with the suggestion of the Senator. I do not think that the Congress could properly do that. It is a matter to be determined from time to time, and a provision is inserted in the bill that projects may be undertaken on recommendation made by an authorized national defense agency, and approved by the President. If the President determines that a project should, in the interest of the war, be immediately prosecuted, then it is submitted to Congress for proper appropriation.

Mr. TOBEY. Would it not be practical and helpful and encouraging to let the country know that the Senate of the United States had put into force a policy by which we embalmed, cremated, and buried a number of these projects for the duration?

Mr. OVERTON. That is an argument on the merits of the bill.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I wish to ask the Senator a question with respect to the Tombigbee Canal provision.

Mr. OVERTON. Of course, that is controversial, and could not be taken up until after the O. P. A. legislation is disposed of.

Mr. STEWART. It is in the bill as an amendment, I understand.

Mr. OVERTON. It is.

Mr. STEWART. The bill has already passed the House?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes; the bill has passed the House.

Mr. STEWART. That is, the bill the Senator is seeking to have taken up now has already passed the House?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STEWART. Was the Tombigbee amendment offered in the House and defeated there to this bill, or was it another measure?

Mr. OVERTON. To the bill we are now discussing.

Mr. STEWART. So it is here as a new committee amendment?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me ask, who came before the committee to testify in regard to it?

Mr. OVERTON. We spent some time on it, and the engineers testified in reference to it. We heard General Robins and Colonel Feringa, as well as the Chief of Engineers, and there was testimony by citizens of the State of Alabama, and of Mississippi, and railway representatives with reference to it. Representative RANKIN appeared before the committee and so did the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO].

Mr. McKELLAR. Did the Chief of Engineers recommend it?

Mr. OVERTON. I am afraid I cannot yield further on this matter, because if we get into the Tombigbee Canal project, we will be 2 days in the discussion of that item alone.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not want to do that, but inasmuch as the same amendment was offered a year ago, I believe——

Mr. OVERTON. Three years ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. And voted down by a vote of 56 nays to 17 yeas, I never dreamed it would be put into this bill, and I am greatly astonished to find it in the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. I shall be glad to undertake to explain it when we reach it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to omit, from my objection to the request for the consideration of the bill any project which has been recommended by an authorized defense agency and approved by the President as being necessary or desirable in the interest of the national defense and security, and the President has notified the Congress to that effect.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will not the Senator from Wyoming repeat his remark? The Senator from Louisiana and I could not hear it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I said I would omit from my objection to the request for the consideration of the bill any project which has been recommended by an authorized defense agency and approved by the President as being necessary or desirable in the interest of the national defense and security, and the President has notified the Congress to that effect.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I am about to yield the floor. I repeat, I have moved to proceed to the consideration of the bill. No controversial items will be taken up until we get through with the O. P. A. bill. It is my desire to bring the bill to full consideration after the passage of the O. P. A. bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am sorry the Senator from Louisiana has made the motion he has made. This rivers and harbors bill is one in which I am much interested; it is a measure in which some Senators who are not present today are much interested, and I am sure that those who are absent had not the slightest idea that any move would be made to bring the bill before the Senate today.

I spoke to the majority leader last week about the bill, the same majority leader whom we all respect, and who was reelected unanimously by his party as majority leader not long ago, and he told me that this bill would not come up until after the O. P. A. bill has been voted on.

Mr. OVERTON. Did he not tell the Senator that the O. P. A. bill would be reported Thursday and come up on Thursday?

Mr. AIKEN. It was expected at that time that it would, but the rivers and harbors bill is going to take a long time before it is passed. If we cannot take a statement of the majority leader, who in heaven's name should we ask about these bills? It is unfortunate that the majority leader cannot be here today. I do not know whether or not he will be surprised to find that a move was made to take the bill up in his absence, because I am sure what he stated was regarded as an agreement, even though it was not signed, sealed, and witnessed, that the rivers and harbors bill would not be brought up until after the O. P. A. bill had been disposed of.

I do not see why the Senator from Louisiana wants to take it up now, anyway. He says he desires to take up the noncontroversial items in the bill. As I look through the bill, I find that there are about a dozen amendments in it which might be considered noncontroversial. I do not think that, altogether, it would take over 10 or 12 minutes to dispose of them. What is the use talking of taking up this bill to be worked on today and tomorrow, when there will not be over 10 minutes' work connected with it when it is brought up?

Furthermore, how do we know what will be controversial and what will be noncontroversial? The hearings have not been printed a sufficient length of time to enable us to have a chance to study the testimony. I understand some of the testimony has not been printed at all, and why should this measure be brought up now, when we have not had a chance to read the hearings, or even to read the minority views which are to be filed?

If the bill shall be brought up now, the effect will be, as I understand, to give it right-of-way after the O. P. A. bill shall have been disposed of. It seems to me that if this is a worthy measure it can stand on its own feet after the O. P. A. bill is disposed of, without bringing it up in the manner now suggested. If it is brought up now and worked on for 10 minutes and then suspended for a week, it will merely mean it would have precedence over a great deal of "must" legislation, which we have to take care of before we can consider any recess. It would have precedence over the independent offices appropriation bill, which we have not as yet acted on finally; it would have precedence over the agricultural appropriation bill, which has not been disposed of, if my understanding is correct; and other "must" legislation. Why should we take this bill up now, particularly in the absence of the majority leader, when it is comprised almost wholly of projects which cannot be started until 6 months after the end of the war?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Reynolds
Austin	Guffey	Robertson
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Bilbo	Hawkes	Shipstead
Buck	Hayden	Stewart
Burton	Holman	Taft
Butler	Jackson	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Tobey
Capper	La Follette	Truman
Caraway	McClellan	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Cordon	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
Davis	Murdock	Walsh, N. J.
Downey	Murray	Weeks
Eastland	Nye	Wheeler
Ellender	O'Daniel	Wherry
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	White
George	Overton	Wiley
Gerry	Radcliffe	Wilson
Gillette	Reed	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3961. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD. My colleague the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is necessarily absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent. If he were present and were permitted to vote, he would vote "nay."

Mr. TRUMAN. The senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] is absent on official business. If he were present and were voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. OVERTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] has been called from the Senate on public business. I am advised that if present and voting, she would vote "yea."

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business. I am advised that if present and voting, they would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to his State.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] are necessarily absent. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS].

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—21

Bankhead	Chavez	Ellender
Bilbo	Connally	George
Byrd	Downey	Hatch
Chandler	Eastland	Hayden

McClellan	Overton	Truman
Maybank	Radcliffe	Wallgren
Murdock	Russell	Walsh, Mass.

NAYS—45

Aiken	Jackson	Stewart
Austin	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Buck	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	McFarland	Tobey
Butler	McKellar	Tunnell
Capper	Mead	Tydings
Cordon	Millikin	Vandenberg
Danaher	Murray	Wagner
Davis	Nye	Walsh, N. J.
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Weeks
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Green	Reed	Wherry
Guffey	Reynolds	White
Hawkes	Robertson	Wiley
Holman	Shipstead	Wilson

NOT VOTING—30

Andrews	Clark, Idaho	McCarran
Bailey	Clark, Mo.	Maloney
Ball	Gillette	Moore
Barkley	Glass	Pepper
Bone	Gurney	Revercomb
Brewster	Hill	Scrugham
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Brooks	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Lucas	Willis

So Mr. OVERTON's motion was rejected.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO CONSIDER BILL EXTENDING THE PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I announce that on Monday, next, I shall move the consideration of Calendar No. 935, Senate bill 1764, extending the Price Control and Stabilization Act.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. GEORGE. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Commerce:

Lorne G. Taylor, to be aide, with relative rank of ensign, in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Captain Worrall R. Carter, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander Service Squadron Ten; and

The following-named midshipmen to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of June 1944 in lieu of appointment as ensign in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed:

William L. McCulloch, Robert J. McDevitt, and Sumner A. Vale.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

ARMY NOMINATIONS PREVIOUSLY PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army, which had previously been passed over.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, at my request these nominations were passed over at the last call of the Executive Calendar. I have no desire to have them passed over further, but I bring the matter to the notice of Senators who may have different ideas on the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph F. Deeb to be United States attorney for the western district of Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Cleon A. Summers to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., to be United States attorney for the western district of Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Julius J. Wichser to be United States marshal for the southern district of Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert L. Shivers to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 32, with headquarters at Honolulu, T. H.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the Public Health Service nominations be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

AUTHORIZATION FOR JUDICIARY COMMITTEE TO SUBMIT REPORT DURING RECESS

Mr. GEORGE. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that motion for a moment?

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly.

Mr. HATCH. Let me ask the acting majority leader if it is planned to hold a session of any length tomorrow. The reason I ask is that the Judiciary Committee is to have a meeting at 11:30 in the morning, which may require an hour or two. It may be desired to submit a report tomorrow. The report may not be ready until late in the afternoon.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not know of anything which will keep the Senate in session very long tomorrow, but we cannot take a recess from today until Monday.

Mr. HATCH. In view of that situation, perhaps I should ask unanimous consent to submit a report from the Judiciary Committee during the recess of the Senate. I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, there will be four important nominations to be considered tomorrow. So far as I know there will be no objection to any of them. I refer to the reappointment of four judges of The Tax Court, whose terms expire tomorrow night at midnight. It is desirable that those nominations be acted upon tomorrow.

As in legislative session, I renew my motion that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, June 1, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 31 (legislative day of May 9), 1944:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

George M. Barnard, of Indiana, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1950, vice Joseph B. Eastman, deceased.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

Howard J. Woodbridge, passed assistant dental surgeon, to be temporary dental surgeon effective April 1, 1944.

Sidney Frederick, assistant dental surgeon, to be temporary passed assistant dental surgeon effective April 1, 1944.

Charles F. Blankenship, surgeon, to be temporary senior surgeon effective May 1, 1944.

John W Cronin, surgeon, to be temporary senior surgeon effective May 1, 1944.

Ralph Erhart Wenzel, passed assistant surgeon, to be temporary surgeon effective May 1, 1944.

Alfred H. Lawton, assistant surgeon, to be temporary passed assistant surgeon effective May 1, 1944.

Walter B. Quisenberry, assistant surgeon, to be temporary passed assistant surgeon effective May 1, 1944.

Albert Henry Stevenson, assistant sanitary engineer, to be temporary passed assistant sanitary engineer effective May 1, 1944.

Frank Tetzlaff, assistant sanitary engineer, to be temporary passed assistant sanitary engineer effective May 1. 1944.

August T. Rossano, Jr., assistant sanitary engineer, to be past assistant sanitary engineer effective June 2, 1944.

IN THE NAVY

The following to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Henry S. Bennett, January 21, 1942.
Paul R. Gottschalk, February 11, 1942.
Henry S. Colony, March 9, 1942.
John J. Milici, March 27, 1942.
John C. Thorn, April 1, 1942.
Roger H. Fuller, April 28, 1942.
Douglas J. Giorgio, May 24, 1942.
Arthur VanB. Miller, Jr., July 13, 1942.
John T. Simonton, July 14, 1942.
John I. Rinne, Jr., September 24, 1942.
John O. Ryan, March 18, 1943.
Clarke M. Young, June 21, 1943.
Francis G. Geer, July 1, 1943.
Richard A. Nelson, July 7, 1943.
David Eder, July 9, 1943.
Charles P. De Lawter, July 10, 1943.
Howard L. Evans, July 10, 1943.
Rudolph P. Nadbath, July 10, 1943.
William V. Luetke, July 11, 1943.
Joseph H. Smith 2d, August 9, 1943.
Dean Schufeldt, August 22, 1943.
Robert W. Hyatt, September 6, 1943.
Francis R. Buchanan, September 10, 1943.
Robert J. Davis, October 3, 1943.
Edwin A. Rasberry, Jr., November 29, 1943.
Allen B. Barbour, January 1, 1944.
Douglas H. Robinson, January 1, 1944.
Arthur L. Haskins, Jr., January 1, 1944.
Raymond A. McCanse, January 1, 1944.
John J. Stanton, Jr., January 1, 1944.
Edward M. Greaney, January 1, 1944.
Ralph E. Faucett, January 1, 1944.
Eugene Loopesko, January 1, 1944.
Robert D. Dunbar, January 1, 1944.
Henry F. Albronda, January 1, 1944.
Frederick Murtagh, Jr., January 1, 1944.
Perf P. Riparetti, January 1, 1944.
Orliss Wildermuth, January 1, 1944.
John Lingenfelder, January 1, 1944.
Thomas G. Hennessy, January 1, 1944.
James J. Benn, Jr., January 1, 1944.
Matthew E. Kuber, January 1, 1944.
Harry LeR. Allen, January 1, 1944.
Robert B. Roach, January 1, 1944.
Truman S. Smith, January 1, 1944.
William C. Thompson, January 1, 1944.
Manley J. Capron, Jr., January 1, 1944.
Walter E. J. Maher, January 1, 1944.
Robert D. Gilliam, January 1, 1944.
Marshall M Parks, January 1, 1944.
Charles R. Oliphant, January 1, 1944.
John S. Miller, January 1, 1944.
Duncan B Marsh, January 1, 1944.
Joseph D Knobloch, January 1, 1944.
Donald S Williams, January 1, 1944.
Frederic B. Breed, January 1, 1944.
DeWitt S. True, January 1, 1944.
Alvis B Dickson, January 1, 1944.
John W. Cederquist, January 1, 1944.
John E. Goebel, January 1, 1944.
Albin A. Jankowitz, January 1, 1944.
William Rottschaefer, January 1, 1944.
Byron J. Casey, Jr., January 1, 1944.
Robert H. Palmer, January 1, 1944.
Samuel H. Jacob, January 1, 1944.
Lloyd J. Hill, January 1, 1944.
John R. Riesen, Jr., January 1, 1944.
George E. Vaupel, January 1, 1944.
Robert A. Crawford, Jr., January 1, 1944.
John J. Price, Jr., January 1, 1944.
Jerman W. Rose, Jr., January 1, 1944.
James M. Hunter, January 1, 1944.
John F. Flynn, January 1, 1944.
Edward E. Bell, January 1, 1944.
Floyd R. Mays, Jr., January 1, 1944.
David J. Williams, Jr., January 1, 1944.
James L. Dean, January 1, 1944.
Merrill W. Rusher, January 1, 1944.
Joseph A. Michaud, January 1, 1944.
Frank W. Cleary, January 1, 1944.
Irving K. Neece, January 1, 1944.
Edward F. McCabe, January 1, 1944.
Francis L. Richardson, January 1, 1944.
Wilson O Wagner, January 1, 1944.
Robert F. Meeko, January 1, 1944.
Jeptha R. Macfarlane, January 1, 1944.
James R. McArtor, January 1, 1944.
John B. Reddy, January 1, 1944.
William H. Jeric, January 2, 1944.
James A. Smith, January 2, 1944.
Allen "B" Wheelis, January 3, 1944.
Herbert E. Hamel, January 3, 1944.
Philip L. Cenac, January 5, 1944.
Roy K. Goddard, Jr., January 5, 1944.
Robert B. Cochran, January 5, 1944.
Lawrence Rockwood, January 6, 1944.
Dale B. Patterson, January 7, 1944.
John I. McGirr, Jr., January 8, 1944.
Joseph M. Lubart, January 9, 1944.
Richard R. Gratton, January 9, 1944.
Robert F Keadle, January 9, 1944.
Cornelius J. Sullivan, January 9, 1944.
Thomas E. Atkinson, Jr., January 9, 1944.
Sydney G. Willner, January 9, 1944.
Dale B. Watkins, January 10, 1944
Ralph R. Snowball, January 11, 1944.
Gerald M. Eastham, January 12, 1944.
Charles B. Newton, January 12, 1944.
Peter J. Guthorn, January 12, 1944.
Chester B. Noyes, Jr., January 12, 1944.
James T. Thickstun, January 12, 1944.
Earle K. Harris, January 12, 1944.
Frank B. Clare, January 12, 1944.
William E. Morris, January 12, 1944.
Albert R. Allen, January 12, 1944.
John S. Shaffer, January 12, 1944.
Eldred W. Barnes, January 12, 1944.
Paul C. Roock, January 12, 1944.
Eugene V. Bigelow, January 12, 1944.
Martin S. Barnes, January 13, 1944.
Mervyn J. Sullivan, January 13, 1944.
John E. Hertner, January 13, 1944.
Joseph L. Bordenave, January 14, 1944.
Alfred F. Kandlbinder, January 14, 1944.
Lawrence E. Banks, January 14, 1944.
Fernly E. Johnson, January 15, 1944.
Marvin D. Courtney, January 15, 1944.
Cloyd L. Arford, January 15, 1944.
Mark E. L. Nolte, January 15, 1944.
Wayne A. Chadbourn, January 15, 1944.
Benjamin Bofenkamp, January 15, 1944.
Howard W. Hill, January 16, 1944.
David L. Hearin, January 16, 1944.
Boyd K. Black, January 16, 1944.
Arthur M. Knight, Jr., January 17, 1944.
Frederick A. Waldron, January 17, 1944.
Ralph L. Wilkening, January 17, 1944.
Fred M. Harper, January 17, 1944.
Gilman C. Paynter, January 17, 1944.
Wendell W. Robley, January 17, 1944.
Donald D. Albers, January 18, 1944.
Walter M. Glass, January 18, 1944.
Carl E. Pruett, January 18, 1944.
Robert H. Wyatt, January 19, 1944.
Arthur H. Parmelee, Jr., January 19, 1944.
Eugene W. Huntley, January 19, 1944.
Neal F. Yeomans, January 19, 1944.
Donald M. McIntyre, January 19, 1944.
John K. Barbieri, January 20, 1944.
Raymond C. D. Youngberg, January 20, 1944.
William W. Miller, Jr., January 20, 1944.
G. Alan Neufeld, January 21, 1944.
Bruce H. Smith, Jr., January 22, 1944.
Harvey T. Pullen, January 22, 1944.
John D. Bolton, January 23, 1944.
Philip Shulman, January 23, 1944.
Edward R. Hawkins, January 23, 1944.
Russell N. Snead, January 23, 1944.
Carol L. Plott, January 23, 1944.
Sidney W. Cohen, January 23, 1944.
Charles A. Hudson, January 23, 1944.
John D. Adams, January 24, 1944.
Harold B. Lehrman, January 24, 1944.
David J. McMurray, January 24, 1944.
Henry A. Dahlsrud, January 24, 1944.
William A. Klauber, Jr., January 24, 1944.
Frederic W. Reichardt, January 24, 1944.
George M. Stubbs, January 24, 1944.
Ralph H. Dickinson, Jr., January 24, 1944.
Peter Hydrick, January 25, 1944.
Robert B. Burtch, January 25, 1944.
Jesse F. Adams, January 25, 1944.
Malcolm F. Simmons, January 26, 1944.
Giles Q. Gilmer, January 26, 1944.
James G. Brown, January 26, 1944.
Anthony R. Furmanski, January 26, 1944.
William Toth, January 26, 1944.
Robert J. Golden, January 26, 1944.
John D. Barnes, January 27, 1944.
Curtis G. Rorebeck, Jr., January 27, 1944.
Albert L. May, Jr., January 27, 1944.
Ralph C. Frank, January 27, 1944.
Henry H. Turner 2d, January 27, 1944.
Joseph L. Kirby, Jr., January 27, 1944.
Robert L. Rouen, January 27, 1944.
George H. Tarr, Jr., January 28, 1944.
Raymond E. Lowe, January 28, 1944.
Robert E. Heerens, January 28, 1944.
Richard Q. Lewis, January 28, 1944.
Vincent J. Ritacca, January 28, 1944.
Robert J. Boucek, January 29, 1944.
Robert E. Lamberson, January 29, 1944.
Oliver W. Williamson, January 29, 1944.
Gilbert P. Lee, January 30, 1944.
Israel R. Berger, January 30, 1944
Everett C. Eickhoff, January 30, 1944.
Edwin A. Taylor, January 30, 1944.
Henry R. Cooper, February 1, 1944.
Charles W. Trader, February 1, 1944.
Howard C. Van Keuren, February 2, 1944.
Arthur O. Wooddy, February 2, 1944.
Robert E. Wise, February 2, 1944.
Nathaniel Sharp, February 3, 1944.
Albert J. Ellinger, February 3, 1944.
Irvin H. Mattick, February 3, 1944.
Leon Moses, February 6, 1944.
William E. Torrey, Jr., February 6, 1944.
Paul I. Bookstaver, February 6, 1944.
Kurt M. "D" Hansen, February 6, 1944.
James W. Taft, February 7, 1944.
John F. McCabe, February 7, 1944.
Alfred G. Green, February 7, 1944.
Philip D. Cronemiller, February 7, 1944.
Cabell Young, Jr., February 7, 1944.
Robert B. Chodos, February 8, 1944.
Kenneth P. Bachman, February 8, 1944.
John G. Sellers, February 8, 1944.
Lester W. Fix, February 8, 1944.
Alvin C. Wyman, February 10, 1944.
John H. Stover, Jr., February 10, 1944.
Irvin L. Chipman, Jr., February 10, 1944.
Leonard R. Duszynski, February 10, 1944.
Joseph F. Morabito, February 10, 1944.
Edward A. John, February 11, 1944.
John A. Ritchie, February 11, 1944.
John C. Gaffney, Jr., February 12, 1944.
Richard E. Welch, February 13, 1944.
Russell A. King, February 14, 1944.
Norman J. Robinson, February 15, 1944.
William I. Neikirk, February 15, 1944.
Peter V. Siegel, February 17, 1944.
Clyde J. Fairless, Jr., February 17, 1944.
Eugene R. Johnston, February 17, 1944.
George F. Meisinger, February 19, 1944.
Frank F. Kalchuk, February 20, 1944.
Ralph K. Brooks, February 22, 1944.
Wayland T. Coppedge, Jr., February 24, 1944.
Alfred Q. Hyde, February 24, 1944.
Robert G. Allen, February 26, 1944.

Horace H. Stovall, February 26, 1944.
Carey C. Womble, Jr., February 27, 1944.
Robert M. Brooker, March 8, 1944.
Harold H. Jones, March 8, 1944.
Lloyd H. Koelling, March 9, 1944.
Anol W. Beahm, March 9, 1944.
Harry J. Brown, March 10, 1944.
Winston R. Miller, March 10, 1944.
Chester M. Lessenden, Jr., March 10, 1944.
Walter S. Keifer, Jr., March 10, 1944.
Harlan K. Sowell, March 11, 1944.
Almon D. Blanchat, March 14, 1944.
Charles L. Johnson, Jr., March 18, 1944.
Francis M. Morgan, March 24, 1944.
Wilbur E. Gabbert, March 26, 1944.
Louis E. Adin, Jr., March 27, 1944.
David Weinstein, March 28, 1944.
James W. Tabler, March 28, 1944.
Phillip K. McNair, Jr., March 29, 1944.
John G. Thompson, March 29, 1944.
William G. Payne, March 30, 1944.
James W. McPheeters, Jr., March 30, 1944.
John Holland, 3d, April 9, 1944.
Howard Mauthe, April 10, 1944.
James I. Tyree, April 11, 1944.
David Minard, April 12, 1944.
George C. Beattie, April 12, 1944.
Richey F. Dodds, April 12, 1944.
Robert A. Morse, April 13, 1944.
Victor J. Wicks, Jr., April 13, 1944.
James T. McRee, April 15, 1944.
Frederick E. Wachter, April 16, 1944.
John W. Baird, April 16, 1944.
Herbert L. Burrows, April 17, 1944.
Enoch C. McReynolds, Jr., April 20, 1944.
Lewis H. Thomas, April 29, 1944.
Harley J. Gunderson, June 15, 1944.
Frederick C. Meadows, June 15, 1944.
Woodson C. Young, June 15, 1944.
Maitland Baldwin, June 15, 1944

The following named officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

George R. Cadman, August 10, 1942.
Edward R. Hildreth, September 1, 1942.
William F. Brooks, September 1, 1942.
Charles R. Crook, September 1, 1942.
Allan L. Springer, September 2, 1942
Robert H. Plumer, October 5, 1942.
James T. Ashwell, October 5, 1942.
Edwin B. Nutting, November 2, 1942.
Walter P. Whittaker, January 4, 1943
John B. Ferris, February 3, 1943.
Edward S. Holman, March 15, 1943.
Roger R. Nolop, April 5, 1943.
James M. Riley, April 14, 1943.
Floyd E. Dewhirst, Jr., May 4, 1943.
Loren M. Waxler, May 10, 1943.
Alvin B. Noble, May 19, 1943
Donald E. Walker, May 20, 1943.
Myron R. Pope, May 20, 1943
Dillard P. Eubank, Jr., May 31, 1943
Frank L. Packwood, June 8, 1943.
William J. Dolan, June 15, 1943.
Kenneth L. Brandt, July 21, 1943.
Arthur J. Block, July 25, 1943
Jesse E. Owens, August 8, 1943.
Wayne E. Hess, August 23, 1943.
Wayne S. Paullus, October 6, 1943.
George R. Rodelander, October 25, 1943.
Robert B. Murray, November 22, 1943.
Nathan Rogers, Jr., December 1, 1943.
Gilbert H. Larson, 2d, December 6, 1943.
Richard E. Gladziszewski, December 6, 1943.
Stanley T. Smith, December 10, 1943.
Lee H. Whitson, Jr., December 13, 1943.
Frank L. Davis, December 20, 1943.
Donald J. Farr, December 20, 1943.
George F. Smith, December 20, 1943.
Reuben W. McKee, Jr., January 5, 1944.
William L. Darnall, Jr., January 10, 1944.
Maurice M. Mosier, January 18, 1944.
William M. Harper, January 24, 1944.

Ensign Joseph A. Kriz, U. S. Navy, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of ensign, to rank from the 19th day of June 1942.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

David L. Soper, October 1, 1939.
William D. Arnold, June 6, 1941.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Arthur A. Shawkey to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 14th day of January 1944, to correct his name as previously nominated and confirmed.

Assistant Dental Surgeon Frederick T. Wigand to be an assistant dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 30th day of June 1941, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed

The following ensigns to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Robert O'Toole, Jr., January 22, 1941.
Joseph A. Locke, Jr., July 15, 1941.

The following-named assistant paymasters to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the date stated opposite their names, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Peter M. Lindsay, July 27, 1941.
John M. Law, July 28, 1941.
Edward F. Hines, July 28, 1941.
William M. Wilson, Jr., August 7, 1941.
Robert H. Tobias, August 14, 1941.
David D. Ryus 3d, December 20, 1941.
James E. Raynes, March 12, 1942.
Donald A. Hempson, February 17, 1943.
Robert F. Henderson, July 2, 1943.
Richard G. Henninger, July 2, 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 31 (legislative day, May 9), 1944:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Joseph F. Deeb to be United States attorney for the western district of Michigan.

Cleon A. Summers to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma.

Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., to be United States attorney for the western district of Virginia.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Julius J. Wichser to be United States marshal for the southern district of Indiana.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Robert L. Shivers to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 32, with headquarters at Honolulu, T. H.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be temporary surgeons, effective April 1, 1944

Terrence E. Billings	Robert C. Dunn
Harold T. Castberg	Randall B. Haas
Louis F. Cleary	Leon S. Saler
Vernam T. Davis	Clarence A. Smith
Wightman R. Duke	Richard H. Smith
Robert D. Duncan	

To be temporary passed assistant surgeons, effective April 1, 1944

James L. Baker	Harold J. Magnuson
Donald J. Birmingham	Robert E. Miller
Paul C. Campbell, Jr.	Charles W. Parker
John F. Flynn, Jr.	Russell I. Pierce
William D. Hazlehurst	Robert T. Potter
Richard G. Henderson	David E. Price
Robert V. Holman	Edmund J. Schmidt
James M. Hundley	Charles C. Shepard
Llewellyn E. Kling	Charles L. Williams, Jr.
Edward W. Kunckel	Norman Wagner

To be temporary passed assistant sanitary engineers, effective April 1, 1944

Callis H. Atkins
August T. Rossano, Jr.

To be temporary sanitary engineers, effective April 1, 1944

Vernon G. MacKenzie
Frank E. DeMartini

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be major generals to rank from dates shown with their respective names

Jonathan Mayhew Wainwright, August 31, 1943.
Joseph Warren Stilwell, September 1, 1943.
Brehon Burke Somervell, September 3, 1943.
Joseph Taggart McNarney, September 4, 1943.

To be brigadier generals with rank from September 1, 1943

Brehon Burke Somervell
Joseph Taggart McNarney
George Churchill Kenney
Carl Spaatz
Omar Nelson Bradley
Ira Clarence Eaker
Millard Fillmore Harmon
Robert Lawrence Eichelberger
Thomas Troy Handy
Walter Bedell Smith
Mark Wayne Clark

To be brigadier general, with rank from March 10, 1944

Frank Thomas Hines

POSTMASTERS

MASSACHUSETTS

Henry R. Garvey, Chelmsford.
James F. Tobin, Salem.

NEW JERSEY

Hannah S. Roberts, Chews.
Charles E. Hauck, Clayton.

TEXAS

Eugene Bottom, Abbott.
Viola Rose, Allen.
Robert E. Brinkley, Bloomburg.
Heins Ulrich, Burnet.
Clarice M. McDonald, Clarkwood.
Robert L. Eaton, Comanche.
Grover C. Hudson, Corsicana.
Marcus L. Beck, Darrouzett.
Walter O. Cravens, Honey Grove.
Faye Underwood, Mercury.
William H. Spratt, Mingus.
Bertha E. Obrecht, Nome.
Fred N. Bland, Orangefield.
William D. Wall, Poolville.
Jesse S. Jones, Redwater.

WASHINGTON

Carl T. Haskin, Almira.
Orley B. Gwin, Benton City.
Raphael H. Gossom, Clallam Bay.
Harold F. Peugh, Harrah.
Maude R. Joyce, Kingston.
Lucy F. Bushnell, Napavine.
Louis J. Rexroth, National.
Carey W. Green, Outlook.
Mary R. Creech, Vader.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 31, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COOPER.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of light and Lord of love, how manifold are Thy mercies. Thou art a perennial spring by the way, a guiding star in the night of uncertainty, a refuge immovable forever. Not in vain do