650. Also, petition of Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence in Congress assembled, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their prayers for the success of the San Francisco Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

651. Also, petition of Florida Rural Electrification Administration Cooperatives' Association, Astatula, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposing the proposed transfer of Rural Electrification Administration from its rightful place as an independent agency of the Government to the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 15, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, April 16, 1945)

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:

Almighty God, grant to our anxious, groping hearts the assurance that behind the shadows and in them standeth One who slumbers not nor sleeps. We are beset by perplexity; our needs are many, but our greatest need is of Thee; unless we find Thee and art found of Thee the laws of Thy physical universe break our mortal life and the laws of Thy moral order make mockery of our futile rebellion.

Breathe now Thy peace on hearts that pray—the peace that comes only when our jarring discords are tuned to the music of Thy will; then as heralds of Thy love send us forth across all barriers of race and creed, bearing to yearning hearts, as a holy sacrament, the bread of human kindness and the red wine of willing sacrifice. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, May 14, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

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

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

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

Bailey	Hart	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hayden	Overton
Bankhead	Hickenlooper	Reed
Barkley	Hill	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hoey	Robertson
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Briggs	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Brooks	La Follette	Shipstead
Buck	Langer	Smith
Burton	Lucas	Stewart
Bushfield	McClellan	Taft
Butler	McKellar	Taylor
Capper	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	Millikin	Tunnell
Donnell	Mitchell	Wagner
Downey	Moore	Walsh
Ellender	Morse	Wherry
Ferguson	Murdock	White
Fulbright	Murray	Wiley
George	Myers	Wilson
Guffey	O'Daniel	Young

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business as a delegate to the International Conference in San Francisco.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent on official business for the Interstate Commerce Committee.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], as chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, is absent on official business in connection with the investigation of certain conditions in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business as a delegate to the International Conference at San Francisco.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are absent by leave of and on official business of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate and also because of an injury resulting from an accident.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is absent on official business by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

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

REPORT ON ATROCITIES IN CONCENTRATION CAMPS IN GERMANY (S. DOC. NO. 47)

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am about to make a report on behalf of the joint committee representing the two Houses named to investigate atrocities and other conditions in concentration camps in Germany; and in order that I may face the Members of the Senate, and probably be heard better, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak from the well of the Senate Chamber.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Also, Mr. President, in order that the report may appear in the RECORD without interruption and without break, I ask that I be permitted to conclude it without interruption, after which I shall be glad to answer any question any Senator may care to propound. Other members of the group which made the trip upon which the report is to be made will likewise be glad to do the same.

I intend to ask, when I conclude, that this report be made a Senate document, and I wish that it may appear as a Senate document as a whole and without any breaks in it.

REPORT TO THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE REPRESENTING THE TWO HOUSES NAMED TO INVESTIGATE ATROCITIES AND OTHER CONDITIONS IN CONCENTRATION CAMPS IN GERMANY, AS REQUESTED BY GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER THROUGH THE CHIEF OF STAFF, GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

Before relating the conditions found by the joint committee which recently visited Germany to investigate atrocities in concentration camps in that country, the committee desires to inform the Senate and House of Representatives the basis upon which the investigation was undertaken and the procedure by which Members representing the two Houses were designated.

The trip to Europe was wholly unexpected on the part of all those who made it. It was a mission undertaken with a view to the possible performance of a service to the Congress, to the American people, and to the cause of peace.

On April 20, at about noon, two representatives from the Office of the Chief of Staff called upon the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the Senate, and laid before them a cablegram received by Gen. George C. Marshall from Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Commander in Chief of the Allied Forces in the European theater of the war, which cablegram was as follows:

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

From: General Eisenhower.
To: General Marshall.

We are constantly finding German camps in which they have placed political prisoners where unspeakable conditions exist. From my own personal observation I can state unequivocally that all written statements up to now do not paint the full horrors.

In view of these facts you may think it advisable to invite about 12 congressional leaders and 12 leading editors to see these camps. If so I shall be glad to take these groups to one of these camps. Such a visit will show them without any trace of doubt the full evidence of the cruelty practiced by the Nazis in such places as normal procedure.

A similar invitation is being sent to similar representative British groups.

General Marshall requested these representatives to contact both Houses, in the manner above mentioned, for the purpose of arranging the designation of their respective Members to make this investigation with all the promptness possible.

In order that they might arrive at the scene of the atrccities which General Eisenhower desired the committee to view in person as soon as possible, it was stated that the group would be expected to leave Washington on Sunday morning, April 22.

These concentration camps had been uncovered by the advancing Allied armies and the conditions were such as to make it compulsory that they be cleaned up as rapidly as possible, and, therefore, such committee as might be designated would of necessity have to arrive on the scene and make such personal investigation as they might think proper while the conditions were as fresh and unchanged as possible following the occupation of these areas by our armed forces.

As will be seen from the cablegram, General Eisenhower also suggested the appointment of a similar committee from among the newspapers and other publishers of the country, in order that they might have a similar opportunity to investigate these conditions which prompted General Eisenhower's request. During our interview with him at his headquarters in Europe, he advised us that when he visited one of these concentration camps, which will be referred to later, he was so horrified at what he found that he felt it incumbent upon him to request that the committee mentioned should come at once and see conditions as they were.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the Senate at once set about to consult with the minority leaders of the two respective Houses, with a view of designating a representative committee to respond to General Eisenhower's request with all promptitude. The minority leaders of the House and Senate, respectively, were immediately conferred with, with a view to their cooperation in the selection of such a joint committee.

It was agreed that six Members from each House would be designated, to be equally divided between the majority and minority parties in both Houses. While the Senate was in session for a short period on Friday, the 20th, the matter had been brought to the attention of the two Houses so unexpectedly that it was impossible to do more on that day than discuss the matter informally because of the contemplated week-end recess of both Houses, and because, if the committee were to depart on Sunday, the 22d, as desired, it would be impossible to wait until the following week, either for the purpose of taking formal action in the two Houses of Congress, or to consult more leisurely with respect to the personnel of the joint committee.

Under these circumstances, it was agreed that the membership representing both Houses should be immediately named, in order that the mission might go forward without delay. In appointing the Members of the House of Representatives, the Speaker indicated his desire to have representation from three of the House committees, namely, Foreign Affairs, Military Affairs, and Naval Affairs. But this suggestion was informal and there was no definite agreement as between the two groups as to what committees should be represented. On the whole, however, this arrangement was followed.

During the afternoon and evening of Friday, the 20th, and Saturday morning, the 21st, the majority and minority leaders of the Senate frequently conferred as to the personnel of the Senate portion of the joint committee. During the morning of the 21st, the minority leader of the Senate, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], advised the majority leader he was ready to recommend, on the part of the minority, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL.]

The majority leader of the Senate asked the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, to become members of the Senate group; and he sought to have the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, included as the third member of the group to represent the Senate majority. The Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Utah indicated their willingness to accept this assignment, but the Senator from Massachusetts had left the city for his home in Massachusetts and was not expected to return until the following Monday. It was, therefore, impossible to confer with him about his possible appointment, as a member of the committee. He has since indicated that it would have been impossible for him to have become a member of the committee if he had been in Washington. After the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the minority leader of the Senate advised the majority leader of the Senate on Saturday morning the names of the Members designated by them, respectively, a conference was called of the entire group at 1 o'clock on Saturday afternoon to receive the information necessary from the War Department concerning the hour of departure and the requirements and needs of the various members of the group upon their arrival in Europe. During this conference the members of the group urged the majority leader of the Senate to become a member of the committee and make the trip, which he decided to do, and, therefore, he became a member of the group in lieu of the Senator from Massachusetts, chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. This, in brief, is the basis for the appointment of the various Members and the basis for the trip itself. The committee, thus appointed, consisted of the following members:

The Senator from Kentucky, Mr. ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

The Senator from Georgia, Mr. WALTER F. GEORGE.

The Senator from Utah, Mr. ELBERT D. THOMAS.

The Senator from Illinois, Mr. C. WAYLAND BROOKS.

The Senator from Nebraska, Mr. KENNETH S. WHERRY.

The Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

Representative R. EWING THOMASON from Texas.

Representative JAMES P. RICHARDS from South Carolina.

Representative ED V. IZAC from California.

Representative JOHN M. VORYS from Ohio.

Representative JAMES W. MOTT from Oregon.

Representative DEWEY SHORT from Missouri.

It ought to be stated that nobody in the War Department made any suggestions, directly or indirectly, as to who should be appointed on this joint committee. When the members of the committee were appointed, in the way which has been indicated, the War Department was advised of the personnel and was represented at the conference held on Saturday afternoon to make arrangements for the trip.

The entire group departed at noon on Sunday, the 22d, by air transportation arranged by the War Department, accompanied by representatives of that Department, and arrived in Paris in the late afternoon on Monday, April 23d.

Before setting forth the conditions which the committee found at the three camps which it visited, all of which will be described later, the committee feels that it is advisable to state the general character and purpose of the camps, as well as the character of the evidence which it obtained, and upon which this report is based.

There are more than 100 concentration camps for slave laborers and political prisoners in Germany. No attempt was made to conceal them and all were built in thickly populated areas and many of them along main highways. Your committee visited three of these camps located in widely separated parts of Germany—namely—Buchenwald in Thuringen Province, Nordhausen in Saxony, and Dachau in Bavaria. These 3 camps are typical of all the concentration camps in the Reich and their physical characteristics, functions, management, and

operation furnish an accurate cross-section of the entire German political prisoner camp system and policy.

Before proceeding with detailed statements concerning the several camps visited, we believe a preliminary word as to just what these camps are and just what they are used for would be of value. In the first place, the concentration camps for political prisoners must not be confused with the prisoner-of-war camps. No prisoners of war are confined in any of these political prisoner camps, and there is no relationship whatever between a concentration camp for political prisoners and a camp for prisoners of war.

The concentration camps for political prisoners are precisely what the name implies. They are places of incarceration, punishment, and liquidation of civilians who were opposed to or who were suspected of being opposed to the Hitler regime. A number of them were established at the beginning of that regime. At first these camps contained only German political prisoners. When the Germans overran and occupied the adjacent lands of Poland, Russia, France, Holland, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, and other countries, the camps were expanded both in size and number to accommodate the hundreds of thousands of additional political prisoners brought in from those countries.

During the past month all of these camps have been uncovered by the rapid advance of the Allied armies. At the time of our visit the surviving prisoners were still in the camps and were being cared for by the American military forces. These liberated prisoners will be sent to their home countries when facilities for that purpose are available, and some, in fact, have already been sent home. When we saw the camps, however, they were filled practically to capacity with prisoners. This was especially the case at Dachau, which camp we inspected only 48 hours after the S. S. garrison in charge of it had been driven out by the American troops.

THE THREE CLASSES OF EVIDENCE UPON WHICH THIS REPORT IS BASED

We think it is important, also, to make a statement at this point regarding the character of evidence gathered on our visits to these camps, so that the basis for the detailed recital which follows may be clear and unambiguous.

Three classes or kinds of evidence were presented to us. The first was the visual inspection of the camps themselves freshly freed by the American troops of S. S. supervision. We saw the barracks, the work places, the physical facilities for torture, degradation, and execution. We saw the victims, both dead and alive, of the atrocities practiced at these camps. We saw the process of liquidation by starvation while it was still going on. We saw the indescribable filth and smelled the nauseating stench before it was cleaned up, and we saw a number of victims of this liquidation process actually die.

The second kind of evidence we obtained was the testimony of eyewitnesses among the prisoners themselves to these atrocities. Many of the prisoners had been in the camps we visited as long as 3 and 4 years. Many others had spent long terms as prisoners in several other similar camps. While these prisoners included men from nearly all the countries of central Europe, whose speech, whose station in life, and whose education and previous environment differed widely from one another, yet the testimony of all of these witnesses was substantially the same. Directly and through interpreters we talked to prisoners who had seen the hangings and the beatings and who had themselves experienced the systematic process of starvation, corporal punishment, and human degradation.

The third kind of evidence was what may be called the common knowledge of the camp—that is to say, evidence of things done in the camp which were not done publicly, but which, nevertheless, all prisoners were aware of. This is similar to certain knowledge possessed by prisoners generally in legitimate institutions like State penitentiaries. These prisoners, from custom and experience, from the conversation with the guards and among themselves, and from a very plain and almost mathematical kind of circumstantial evidence, have accurate knowledge of certain things which they have not actually seen with their own eyes. The prisoners at the camps speak about these things as though they had actually seen them. It was the unanimous opinion of our committee, after talking to hundreds of prisoners, that this third kind of evidence was often as accurate and reliable as the two kinds of direct evidence above referred to. An example of this kind of evidence will be found in that part of our report dealing with the torture chamber at Buchenwald, where no one actually saw the strangulations perpetrated in this chamber, but where the circumstantial evidence of it was so complete and clear as to leave no doubt in the mind of anyone.

The three kinds of evidence here referred to constitute the only evidence accepted by this committee in making its report. Rumor, hearsay, and every other form of information or testimony has been carefully excluded so that those reading the report may be assured that everything therein described was either actually seen by us or reported to us by competent and reliable eyewitnesses or that it is based on circumstantial evidence which we have considered to be trustworthy. One further preliminary observation may not be out of place here, and that is that all of the facts here recited are corroborated by the records of the investigation of the military authorities who have made a most minute, careful, and exhaustive examination of all of the prison camps. These authorities, who are specialists in their line, have taken the testimony of hundreds of eyewitnesses and have carefully authenticated and documented the same. The committee has examined some of this documented evidence but it has not used any of it in making this report. The report is based exclusively upon our own personal investigation of these camps.

PART 2. GEOGRAPHY AND STATISTICS—BUCHENWALD

On the morning of April 24, following its arrival in Paris on the afternoon of Monday, the 23d, the committee, accompanied by Brig. Gen. John M. Weir, Col. Robert H. Thompson, Col. John A. Hall, and photographers, left Paris by airplane for Weimar, which is located in the Province of Thuringen, about 120 miles southwest of Berlin, and proceeded from Weimar by automobile to the outskirts of the city where was located the German political concentration camp of Buchenwald.

This camp was founded when the Nazi Party first came into power in 1933 and has been in continuous operation since that time, although its largest population dates from the beginning of the present war. The camp was overrun by the American Army on April 12, 1945. The first appearance of the Americans at Buchenwald was made by a tank spearhead, which briefly engaged the enemy and withdrew. The garrison of S. S. troops at Buchenwald became so alarmed at the rapid approach of United States troops that they fled precipitately, abandoning the camp completely. On Friday, the 13th, the main body of advancing United States troops arrived with supplies and medicine and took over the camp.

The surviving population of the camp, as recorded on April 16, 1945, was about 20,000, divided into nationalities as follows:

French	2,900
Polish	3,800
Hungarians	1,240
Jugoslavs	570
Russians	4,380
Dutch	324
Belgians	622
Austrians	550
Italians	242
Czechs	2,105
Germans	1,800
Dutch	260
Anti-Franco Spanish and miscellaneous	1,207

The character of the surviving population was all male and included a thousand boys under 14 years of age. The prisoners at this camp included the intelligentsia and leadership groups from continental Europe, as well as democratic or anti-Nazi Germans and their relatives. Among the 20,000 survivors were about 4,000 Jews.

The mission of these camps was an extermination factory and the means of extermination were starvation, beatings, tortures, incredibly crowded sleeping conditions, and sickness. The effectiveness of these measures was enhanced by the requirement that the prisoners work in an adjacent armament factory for the manufacture of machine guns, small arms, ammunition, and other matériel for the German Army. The factory operated 24 hours a day, using two 12-hour shifts of prisoners. At the time your committee visited the camp the factories were no longer in operation, having been totally destroyed by remarkably effective precision bombing. The factory area was completely demolished, but not one bomb fell within the camp area, which was immediately adjacent to the factory area and separated from it only by a barbed-wire fence. In addition to those inmates performing slave labor at the munitions factory, other inmates were organized into labor parties to per-

form various kinds of work on farms in the vicinity of Weimar.

The main elements of Buchenwald included the "Little Camp," the regular barracks and the hospital, the medical experimentation building, the body-disposal plant, and the ammunition factory.

THE "LITTLE CAMP"

The prisoners in this camp slept on triple-decked shelves, the clearance between the shelves being little more than 2 feet. They were so crowded into these shelves that the cubic content figured out to about 35 cubic feet per man, as against the minimum for health of 600 cubic feet prescribed by United States Army Regulations. We were informed that after arriving new prisoners were initiated by spending at least 6 weeks here before being "graduated" to the regular barracks. During this initiation prisoners were expected to lose about 40 percent in weight. Jews, however, seldom, if ever, graduated to the regular barracks. Camp disciplinary measures included transferring recalcitrant prisoners back to the "Little Camp." As persons became too feeble to work, they were also sent back to the "Little Camp" or to the hospital. Rations were less than at the regular barracks and the death rate in the "Little Camp" was very high, recently about 50 per day.

REGULAR BARRACKS

The dormitory room here was approximately 42 by 23 feet and about 10 feet high, having a content of about 9,500 cubic feet. In each such room there was installed, triple-decked, 38 stacks of 3 bunks each, or a total of 114 bunks, each bunk 30 by 72 inches outside measurement. Most of these bunks were double—that is, 2 parallel bunks occupying the space of 60 by 72 inches. The aisles were narrow, being less than 24 inches wide, and permitted movement through them only with the body being kept edgewise; 114 bunks placed in 9,500 cubic feet makes less than 85 cubic feet per person. Since the beginning of the war, 250 persons have been made to sleep in each such room, or less than 40 cubic feet per person. There was less than 1 blanket per prisoner. Blankets were thin, shoddy, and undersized. There was substantially no heat in these dormitories.

THE HOSPITAL

This was a building where moribund persons were sent to die. No medicines were available, and, hence, no therapy was possible. Typhus and tuberculosis were rampant in the camp. About half of the wards of the hospital were about 15 feet deep and 5½ feet wide, with one window on the outside end. From 6 to 9 patients occupied each ward, lying crosswise on the floor shoulder to shoulder. The room was too narrow for most of them to extend their legs. The death rate in the hospital was from 5 to 20 persons per day.

MEDICAL EXPERIMENT BUILDING

Block No. 41 in the camp was used for medical experiments and vivisections with prisoners as guinea pigs. Medical scientists came from Berlin periodically to reinforce the experimental staff. In particular, new toxins and antitoxins were tried out on prisoners. Few prisoners who entered this experimental building ever emerged alive. Prisoners were induced to volunteer for experimentation on the representation that living quarters provided there were far superior to those in the barracks and that their rations were far superior to those received by ordinary prisoners.

THE BODY-DISPOSAL PLANT OR CREMATORY

The design of this installation was a striking example of German industrial efficiency. It had a maximum disposal capacity of about 400 bodies per 10-hour day, which is about 2 percent of the camp population at the time of liberation. We were informed that when the death rate exceeded the capacity of the crematory, the bodies were taken out and buried in pits without any means for identification. Teeth having gold fillings were extracted prior to cremating the bodies. We have been advised that on the day following our visit to Buchenwald, a large cache of gold fillings and gold jewelry was discovered in a quarry near the camp. Included were literally thousands of wedding rings alone.

The crematory was entirely enclosed within a high board fence. No one, except a small operating force of S. S. personnel, was allowed even to look inside this fence. No prisoner who passed within it—as a member of a labor party or for any other reason—came out alive. Inside this fence was the incinerator building, centrally located between two yards. This building was of substantial brick construction with cement floors, one story high, with full-size, 12-feet-high basement beneath. The main floor contained an administration office at the front end, a locker and washroom for S. S. personnel at the far end, and the incinerator room in the center. The latter contained, in line, 2 batteries of 3 firebrick incinerators each. Fifteen to twenty minutes were required for the incineration of a total of 18 bodies, each incinerator having a capacity of 3 bodies, or a total charge of 18 bodies. Fifteen to twenty minutes were required for the incineration of a charge.

The floor of each incinerator consisted of a coarse grate, through which the day's accumulation of bone ash was extracted at the end of the operation. The fire came from a furnace room occupying the rear two-thirds of the basement, the flames being deflected downward onto the bodies by baffle plates in the roofs of the furnace. Fuel used in this plant was coal. The front of the basement was occupied by the strangling room.

The method of collecting bodies was as follows: Roll call was held every evening outdoors, outside the dormitory buildings. Internees were required to strip and bring to roll call the naked bodies of all comrades who had died during the previous 24 hours. After roll call, a motor truck drove around the camp, picked up the bodies, and was driven to the front yard of the incinerator plant to await the next day's operation. But this was not the only source of bodies. Emaciated prisoners who had been around too long, or who had committed infractions of discipline, or who knew too much, or who had refused to be broken in mind were arbitrarily condemned to death. For instance, in the little camp, where prisoners slept 16 to a shelf, an infraction of discipline—particularly an attempt to escape—not infrequently resulted in all 16 being condemned. Such persons were immediately marched on foot to a small door in the fence of the back yard at a point immediately adjacent to the incinerator building. This door opened inward until it hit a doorstop which held it in a postion parallel to the building's wall, thus creating a corridor 4 feet wide and 3 feet deep. At the far end was an opening about 4 feet by 4 feet, flush with the ground, the head of a concrete shaft, about 13 feet deep, the bottom floor of which was a continuation of the concrete floor of the room at the front end of the basement. The condemned prisoners, on being hurried and pushed through the door in the fence, inevitably fell into this shaft and crashed 13 feet down to the cement cellar floor. This room, on the floor at one end of which they now found themselves, was the strangling room. As they hit the floor they were garrotted with a short double-end noose by S. S. guards and hung on hooks along the side walls, about 6½ feet above the floor, the row of hooks being 45 or 50 in number. At the time of our visit all of the hooks except 5 had been removed, but we could observe the holes where the other hooks had previously been. When a consignment had been hung up, any who were still struggling were stunned by a wooden mallet, which was exhibited to us in the chamber, still bearing stains of blood. The bodies were left on the hooks until called for by the incinerator crew. An electric elevator, with an estimated capacity of 18 bodies, ran up to the incinerator room, which was on the floor above the strangling room. The day's quota of approximately 200 bodies was made up of from 120 to 140 prisoners who had died (mostly in the "hospital," the medical experimental building, or the "Little Camp"), and from 60 to 80 were supplied by the strangulation room.

For a period of about 10 days in March, the coal supply for the incinerator ran out. The incinerator furnace grates had not been cleared of entirely unconsumed bodies, as we observed portions thereof. Awaiting the arrival of a new supply of coal, bodies to the number of about 1,800 were allowed to collect in the front yard, stacked up like cordwood. The sudden arrival of American armor prevented the S. S. garrison from disposing of the bodies which had accumulated, due to the lack of fuel for the incineration plant. At the time of our visit to the camp we saw a truckload of bodies within the area of the incinerator. It is estimated that there were about 60 bodies in this truck. Near the truck on the ground were piled about 20 or 25 additional bodies. We were advised that the death rate, prior to the liberation, was approximately 200 per day. At the time of our visit the American medical authorities had been able to reduce the death rate to about 20 per day. Upon liberation of the camp, the American authorities provided decent interment

for the unburied dead and for those who died thereafter.

The American surgeon stated that the adult corpses weighed from about 60 to 80 pounds each.

MISCELLANEOUS

Rations: We were advised that the ration allowance for the regular camp was between 600 and 700 calories per day and consisted generally of a very weak soup made from cabbage and other vegetables and a small piece of bread about 3 inches square. This meal was provided only once a day—in the morning—and in the evening another small piece of bread was furnished. The diet was heavily deficient in animal fats and vitamins and contained no meats. In the "little camp" the ration allowance was about 500 calories. About 3,000 to 3,600 calories per day are required for adult health. Red Cross packages were almost entirely appropriated by the S. S. camp commander and distributed to suit himself to S. S. personnel and to citizens of Weimar and even to Nordic German camp prisoners. Meals were prepared and "served" by prisoner personnel under S. S. supervision.

The committee was informed that the S. S. troops had received orders to destroy all the occupants of the camp prior to their departure, but in their haste to flee before the advancing American troops they had been unable to undertake such a large-scale operation.

The administration of the camp and the maintenance of records were carried on by prisoners under the supervision of S. S. troops. The available records at the time of liberation had been examined by the prisoners engaged in the administration of the camp, and the records revealed that 51,000 persons had died in the camp. At the time of our arrival the prisoners, in a pathetic gesture, had erected of flimsy materials a memorial to the dead of Buchenwald. Pictures and descriptions of the conditions at this camp cannot adequately portray what we saw there, and it is only when the stench of the camp is smelled that anyone can have complete appreciation of the depth of degradation to which the German Nazi Government and those responsible for it and its agencies, organizations, and practices had dropped in their treatment of those who had failed to embrace the doctrines of the "master race."

CAMP DORA AT NORDHAUSEN

The group visited the concentration camp at Nordhausen, which is located in the Province of Saxony, about 125 miles southwest of Berlin, on May 1, 1945. This was a political concentration camp and was known as the Dora Camp. It is located on the outskirts of Nordhausen, adjacent to a large underground manufacturing plant which produced V-1 bombs, the V-2's, airplane engines and parts, and other munitions of war. At the time of our visit to Nordhausen the camp had been in American hands about 3 weeks, and, of course, did not portray the filth and operating conditions which existed at the time of its liberation. The prisoners at this camp had been used as slave labor in the underground factory and for work parties in adjacent farms and in smaller munitions factories. The magnitude of the operation at Nordhausen is demonstrated by the fact that there were 31 miles of railroad track in the underground factory. The factory itself contained well organized production lines and enormous quantities of fine machine tools, many of which were new, and all in fine operating condition. The underground factory had also been used as barracks for prisoners until the death rate exceeded that apparently desired and began to affect the efficiency of production. We observed a crematory similar to the one that we saw at Buchenwald. We observed a large cement apron on which we were told by a reliable inmate that 135 prisoners had been executed by hanging, at the rate of 4 at a time, a few days before the camp was overrun by the American forces. This inmate stated that all of the prisoners who were physically able were required to witness the executions. He also told us that the executions had been for violations of camp disciplinary regulations and for alleged sabotage in the underground factory. He further stated that the individuals executed on this occasion were all Russians. At the time of our visit to the camp it was being additionally used by the American authorities as a rendezvous for displaced persons who had been wandering about in the area.

The prisoners had been segregated by our forces after liberation as far as possible by nationalities and every effort was made to alleviate their physical condition by food and medicine. On the whole, we found this camp to have been operated and administered much in the same manner as Buchenwald had been operated and managed. When the efficiency of the workers decreased as a result of the conditions under which they were required to live, their rations were decreased as punishment. This brought about a vicious circle in which the weak became weaker and were ultimately exterminated.

DACHAU

The committee next visited the infamous concentration camp at Dachau, in two groups, on May 2, 1945. Dachau is located in the province of Bavaria, about 325 miles south of Berlin. The groups visited Dachau within 48 hours after its liberation by American forces.

In the drive of General Patch's Seventh Army toward Munich, the Forty-fifth United States Division fought into Dachau 7 miles to the north and surprised and surrounded the concentration camp on the outskirts of the town. The camp was in charge of about 200 storm troopers who resisted as the American Army approached. The camp was occupied after many of the German guards were killed and the remainder captured.

Because of the surprise due to the speed of the American advance, this camp was captured practically intact. By orders of General Patch, the evidences of Germany brutality were left untouched awaiting our inspection. Two days later we arrived. We found a large rectangular-shaped camp filled with numerous barracks or sheds, in which were perhaps 30,000 political prisoners. Two high parallel barbed-wire fences surrounded the camp, the inner one 15 feet from the outside one which was electrically charged. At intervals of about 50 yards, 20-foot towers rose above the outer wire, and from these towers armed guards looked down on the interior of the camp. At one end of the large enclosure was an open space for assembling the prisoners, and at the extreme end was a large administration building.

When we arrived there were many prisoners lying dead between the inner and the outer barbed-wire fences—apparently shot by the guards. The living, Russians, Poles, Dutch, and in fact many nationalities, were being cared for by our army. We found women segregated in another enclosure behind the administration building. An inspection of one of the better barracks for men disclosed 390 jammed into a room built to accommodate 50. Most were suffering from typhus or tuberculosis, and all were living skeletons due to lack of food. The stench was sickening.

Outside, lying in rows, were about 300 bodies of those who had died and had been collected that morning from the various barracks. They were yet to be disposed of, as were those lying between the fences, and others, including the bodies of some of the German guards, which were strewn along the approaches to the entrance.

This camp was apparently built in 1933 or 1934 and we were told the original occupants were those who dared to oppose the Hitler regime. After their liquidation, fresh prisoners in ever-increasing numbers were furnished by the countries overrun by the German armies. The complete break-down by nationalities of the prisoners in the camp at Dachau was being undertaken by the American Army authorities while we were there, but the record has not yet been received in Washington.

Across a canal or moat filled with water which ran between this wire-enclosed camp and the highway, there was what appeared to be an old German Army casern, the buildings of which were scattered throughout an area of considerable size all completely surrounded by a stone wall. Trees lined the driveways in this secluded area in the center of which was a modern brick building where the executions of the prisoners from the camp across the street took place.

As we visited Dachau we saw on a railroad side track paralleling the main highway, and close to the gates of the prison camp, a train of cars which had been used to bring additional civilian prisoners to this camp. These cars were an assortment of odd boxcars, some of which could be locked, and some were the coal-car type. In each of them the floor of the cars was covered with dead, emaciated bodies. In some of the cars there were more than enough to cover the floors. In size, these cars were of the small European type which, when used for the movement of troops, would never accommodate more than 40 men. Nevertheless, the army officials in charge of this camp advised us that there were 50 of these cars in this 1 train and that at least 100 of these civilian prisoners

had been jammed into each car—locked in—and they had been on the road for several days without food or water, and that approximately 3,000 of them were dead upon arrival and most of the others were in a dying condition.

We saw many dead bodies on the ground. These prisoners had apparently crawled out of the cars and had died on the ground. Our officials advised us that many of the others who had survived the trip in the cars, had died since in the camp and many more, although still alive, were starved beyond redemption.

Directly across the road from the cars—near the entrance of this Dachau camp—we saw three dead members of the Nazi S. S. troops. Two had been shot and the skull of one had been crushed. We were advised that these three were members of the S. S. guards at the prison who were captured and killed by Russian inmates of the prison when the camp was liberated by the advancing American Army.

EXECUTIONS AT DACHAU

A distinguishing feature of the Dachau camp was the gas chamber for the execution of prisoners and the somewhat elaborate facilities for execution by shooting.

The gas chamber was located in the center of a large room in the crematory building. It was built of concrete. Its dimensions were about 20 by 20 feet and the ceiling was some 10 feet in height. In two opposite walls of the chamber were airtight doors through which condemned prisoners could be taken into the chamber for execution and removed after execution. The supply of gas into the chamber was controlled by means of two valves on one of the outer walls, and beneath the valves was a small glass-covered peephole through which the operator could watch the victims die. The gas was let into the chamber through pipes terminating in perforated brass fixtures set into the ceiling. The chamber was of size sufficient to execute probably 100 men at one time.

The room in which the gas chamber stood was flanked on both ends by warerooms in which the bodies were placed after execution to await cremation. The size of each room was approximately 30 by 50 feet. At the time we visited the camp these warerooms were piled high with dead bodies. In one of the rooms the bodies were thrown in an irregular heap. In the other room they were neatly stacked like cordwood. The irregular pile of bodies was perhaps 10 feet high, covering most of the floor space. All of them were naked.

It was quite evident that the daily death rate at Dachau, by execution and otherwise, far exceeded the daily capacity of the crematory to dispose of the bodies. The stench indicated that some of them had been there for several days. In the rear of the crematory building was an enclosure where the executions by shooting were carried out. There were three separate places for execution in this yard. One, we were informed, was for common political prisoners; one was for women; and one was for prisoners of distinction, including those who at some time had had military records. The latter were not prisoners of war. As had been stated, no prisoners of war were kept in any of the concentration camps, but all of the camps had political prisoners who had served in the armies of their countries prior to the beginning of the present war, and, particularly, during the First World War.

These three places of execution, which were separated from each other by tight board fences, consisted of banks of earth some twenty feet in length and three feet high. The condemned prisoners knelt down facing the bank and were shot through the back of the head. The only difference between these separate places of execution was that in front of the bank of earth where the distinguished prisoners were shot there was a small boardwalk upon which the prisoners knelt, while the common prisoners and the women knelt on the bare ground. A considerable amount of blood still remained on the ground at two of these execution places.

In the enclosure was a pile of rough wooden coffins. Since we had seen no coffins at the other camps visited, we inquired why coffins were used at Dachau, and were informed that these coffins were reserved for prisoners of distinction. The bodies of ordinary prisoners, if not cremated, were buried without coffins and usually without clothing.

PART 3. CONCLUSION

While the above three camps, which were visited by the joint committee, differed in some details, they were all of the same general pattern and design and administered for the same purpose.

At each of these camps we found four general classifications of prisoners: (1) political prisoners, (2) habitual criminals, (3) conscientious or religious objectors, (4) persons who were imprisoned for failure to work.

Although differing in size, they all carried into effect the same pattern of death by hard labor, starvation, hanging, strangulation, disease, brutality, gas chambers, gallows, and filthy and unsanitary conditions, which meant inevitable death eventually to every imprisoned person.

We found, in each case, that the supervision of the camps was carried out by the criminal tactics of S. S. troops, who, in addition to their own brutality, assigned some of their punitive duties to the prisoners, especially the habitual criminals who had charge of the barracks in which all types of prisoners were subject to their vicious and inhuman methods.

We found that this entire program constituted a systematic form of torture and death administered to intellectuals, political leaders, and all others who would not embrace and support the Nazi philosophy and program. We found the extent, devices, methods, and conditions of torture almost beyond the power of words to describe.

We found, from all the evidence available, that in these camps the Jews and Russians and Poles were treated with a greater degree of severity than other nationalities. We found that a colossal scheme of extermination was planned and put into effect against all those in occupied countries who refused to accept the principles of nazism, or who opposed the saddling of the Nazi yoke on their countries. The Nazi leadership in the pursuit of this policy found especially expedient the use of various forms of terrorism calculated to reduce the opposition and to render futile all efforts to throw off the yoke.

The over-all pattern of the scheme varied but little. First, vast numbers of nationals of overrun countries were abducted and brought into Germany—sometimes whole families, sometimes just the men. The number of these persons is variously estimated at between twelve and twenty million. These people were forced to labor long hours by their Nazi masters, and for slight infractions they were placed in concentration camps.

Likewise, the intelligentsia, college professors, former army generals, business leaders, and professional men of the occupied countries were taken captive and placed in these camps, unless they agreed to spread the doctrines advocated by the Nazis.

The treatment accorded to these prisoners in the concentration camps was generally as follows: They were herded together in some wooden barracks not large enough for one-tenth of their number. They were forced to sleep on wooden frames covered with wooden boards in tiers of two, three, and even four, sometimes with no covering, sometimes with a bundle of dirty rags serving both as pallet and coverlet.

Their food consisted generally of about one-half a pound of black bread per day and a bowl of watery soup for noon and night, and not always that. Owing to the great numbers crowded into a small space and to the lack of adequate sustenance, lice and vermin multiplied, disease became rampant, and those who did not soon die of disease or torture began the long, slow process of starvation. Notwithstanding the deliberate starvation program inflicted upon these prisoners by lack of adequate food, we found no evidence that the people of Germany as a whole were suffering from any lack of sufficient food or clothing. The contrast was so striking that the only conclusion which we could reach was that the starvation of the inmates of these camps was deliberate.

Upon entrance into these camps, newcomers were forced to work either at an adjoining war factory or were placed "in commando" on various jobs in the vicinity, being returned each night to their stalls in the barracks. Generally a German criminal was placed in charge of each "block" or shed in which the prisoners slept. Periodically he would choose the one prisoner of his block who seemed the most alert or intelligent or showed the most leadership qualities. These would report to the guards' room and would never be heard from again. The generally accepted belief of the prisoners was that these were shot or gassed or hanged and then cremated. A refusal to work, or an infraction of the rules, usually meant flogging and other types of torture, such as having the fingernails pulled out, and in each case usually ended in death after extensive suffering. The policies herein described constituted a calculated and diabolical program of planned torture

and extermination on the part of those who were in control of the German Government. These camps, on the whole, were conducted and controlled by the S. S. troops and the Gestapo, who acted under orders from their superiors, or who were given wide discretion in the methods which they were to adopt in perpetrating these hideous and inhuman sufferings.

It is the opinion of your committee that these practices constituted no less than organized crime against civilization and humanity, and that those who were responsible for them should have meted out to them swift, certain, and adequate punishment.

We found that the propagation of the Nazi theories and the practices which were carried forward under those theories created within Germany a disregard for human rights and for the dignity of the individual human being, which not only degraded the life of the people within the German Reich, but which was inevitably calculated to bring about war between Germany and her neighbors, and was calculated also to subject the conquered nations to the brutalities and indignities which struck fear and terror into the hearts of those who might otherwise oppose these policies which we have attempted to describe.

With reference to the punishment of those guilty of war crimes, which an indignant world will expect and demand, we desire to report that at the present time various agencies are actively and comprehensively engaged in the gathering of evidence throughout the regions where these atrocities were committed. The officers of our armies, and of the Allied armies, have been alert for many months to the conditions which prevailed in all Nazi-occupied territories and a very competent corps of investigators in each military area, under the control of our armed forces and those of our allies, has been for months engaged in gathering and documenting testimony which will be available for use when when those guilty of these atrocities are brought to trial. The Army of the United States alone has already gathered testimony and sworn statements that will fill many volumes.

In Paris the French Provisional Government has set up a commission for the investigation of war crimes. The Allied Nations have set up a War Crimes Commission, with its headquarters in London, made up of competent men representing 16 of the Allied Nations, and already specific charges are being made against many of the outstanding leaders of this criminal program.

It was the high privilege of the members of your committee to confer with our military authorities in Europe, with the French Commission in Paris, and the Allied Commission in London, concerning their methods and procedures and the results intended to be obtained by their activities, and the members of this committee were gratified at the thorough way in which this work is being undertaken. It has already been announced by the President that Justice Robert H. Jackson, of the Supreme Court of the United States, has been designated to represent this country in the preparation and presentation of the evidence which will be brought before such tribunals as may be in existence, or may be established, for the trial of major war criminals.

In view of all these activities, the committee does not feel at liberty at this time to recommend the creation of an additional agency for the investigation of these war crimes or for their ultimate disposition, but feels that the agencies now dealing with the problem are approaching the subject from the standpoint of practical justice in every area and in all categories of crimes that may be involved.

The committee is happy to report that each and every member approached the performance of this task with solemnity and with a sense of responsibility which deserves the commendation of our people. It was approached without regard to differences of political affiliation or geographical location. The committee feels that out of it all justice will emerge, and that through the sickening spectacle which we have witnessed of the degradation to which human beings have been subjected, will come ultimately a firmer realization that men of all nations and all tongues must resist encroachments of every theory and every ideology that debases mankind, and that a more just and enduring peace may arise upon the ruins and from the sacrifices which the human race has endured through one of the most crucial periods of its history.

ALBEN W. BARKLEY.
WALTER F. GEORGE.
ELBERT D. THOMAS.
WAYLAND BROOKS.
KENNETH S. WHERRY.
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.
R. EWING THOMASON.
DEWEY SHORT.
JAMES W. MOTT.
JAS. P. RICHARDS.
JOHN M. VORYS.
ED. V. IZAC.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be referred as requested, and will also be printed as a Senate document.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in the corner of the Senate Chamber Senators will observe a large map of Germany which has been prepared by the War Department, indicating the location of practically all or most of the concentration camps, as well as the prisoner-of-war camps. Down in the corner of the map is a key which indicates which is which. The map will be left here as long as is necessary to enable Senators to inspect it, to see how generally distributed over Germany were these camps of various kinds.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to ask the Senator whether, on this trip through Europe, he had any reason to believe that these camps could have been administered by the Government of Germany without the knowledge and consent of the members of the German General Staff.

Mr. BARKLEY. My answer to the question is that I cannot conceive how these camps could have been constructed and administered by the German Government without the knowledge of the General Staff of the German Army. In the first place, as stated in the report, they were constructed in thickly populated areas, frequently on main highways, so that anyone could see them. While I, of course, have no direct knowledge from which I could state that the German General Staff knew about them, in my judgment it would be trespassing grievously upon the credulity of mankind to assume that they did not know about them. My own belief is that they did.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator. I felt sure that would be the answer. I think it is an answer which should be broadcast throughout the country, because there have been so many obvious attempts upon the part of the officers of the German General Staff to ingratiate themselves not only among our armies, but in the opinion of all mankind. It seems to me to be an effort which should be condemned to failure from the beginning.

Mr. BARKLEY. I might say that the committee did not include any statement on that subject in its report for the vary obvious reason that we were trying to make a factual report, and so we limited it as nearly as we could to what we saw, and the evidence we obtained in the manner set out in the report. There are many things which we saw in Europe, upon which we might have commented, but we tried to confine our report to the thing which took us to Europe, namely, the investigation of the atrocities in various camps in Germany.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wonder if the Senator would advise us whether or not the committee visited any prisoner-of-war camps, and what the committee found with reference to such camps.

Mr. BARKLEY. We did not visit actual prisoner-of-war camps, because they were in the possession of the enemy. As our armies advanced in Germany they liberated those in the prisoner-of-war camps, so that we could not see behind the German lines actual prisoner-of-war camps in operation. But we saw hundreds, if not thousands, of prisoners of war—American, British, and French—who had been liberated and released as our armies marched forward. We talked to them by the hundreds concerning the conditions which they found in prisoner-of-war camps.

Mr. HILL. Would the Senator advise the Senate what those men stated as to conditions in the prisoner-of-war camps?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the general trend of their comments was that there was some arbitrary treatment, and brutality in some cases, but their greatest complaint was lack of food. They all

testified that if it had not been for the packages sent over by the Red Cross they would have been practically starved to death. They lost weight. Those with whom I conversed—and there were many of them, both English and American, and some few French and some Canadians—advised me about conditions. At one of the camps the released prisoners had been segregated according to States and regions, and I was permitted to visit a large number of Kentuckians who had been captured, some of whom had been in German prison camps for more than a year.

The testimony of this group was that, depending on how long they were in the camps, they lost anywhere from 15 to 55 pounds. I saw a group who had been released and were about to be flown to England from a place in Belgium to which they had been brought out of Germany. They gave testimony as to their own lack of food and their own loss of weight, and the loss ran from 15 pounds up to 55 pounds each. I might say, in that connection, that in this same group of prisoners with whom I conversed—and no other member of the congressional delegation was with me at this time, because it was a group who represented my State, and one or two other States in the region near Kentucky—were some boys who had been captured in Italy, and they told me that they were required to march on foot from Italy into Germany for 19 days, and on the last day they were herded into boxcars, and for 36 hours they had neither food nor water on the trip. Some of them gave statements as to the treatment on the part of the guards on the way from Italy up to Germany. If a prisoner fell out or fell behind and could not keep up with the pace, some of them said the guards prodded him with a bayonet. I do not know how many incidents of that kind may have occurred. I would not say, from the statements I heard, that that was the general practice, but it did happen in some instances.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. According to the report, these concentration camps were located in thickly populated districts. I wonder if the members of the committee interrogated the civilians in those districts to ascertain whether they had knowledge of the atrocities perpetrated in the camps.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the committee did not have much opportunity to talk with civilians. The camp which is known as Buchenwald is just outside the city of Weimar. Weimar is the city in which the German Republic, following the last war, was founded. It is the seat of the adoption of what is known as the Weimar Constitution. The Buchenwald Camp is only a short distance outside the city of Weimar. We were told that especially in moving back and forth between the camp to the factory in which many of these prisoners worked there was no attempt made to conceal their movements. Of course it would be obviously impossible for a large camp of that kind, surrounded by a high fence, occupying many acres of land, and containing from twenty to forty thousand prisoners—there were 20,000 in it when our Army got there, but we were told that the peak of the population of that camp had been 48,000—it seems impossible that such a camp could be located in close proximity to a large city like Weimar without the people knowing about it. But we did not have much chance to interrogate those people. We did ask some of the inmates in the camps if the people outside knew about them, and the universal answer was a gesture of assent—"Yes, they knew about them." But we did not have a chance to interrogate the people within the cities.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Does the Senator know whether other investigating committees are making investigations along that line among the German civilians, to ascertain whether they were acquainted with and knew about these conditions?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not certain. In response to General Eisenhower's request the House of Commons sent about a dozen members, and some British newspaper publishers and American newspaper publishers were over there at practically the same time. Our Army, through its corps of investigators, is making a minute investigation, and as I said, getting sworn and documented testimony, and some of the leads which are given to these investigators come from civilians who happened to know about some of these things which took place in the vicinity.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, in behalf of the membership of the committee I wish to pay my respects to our majority leader for the splendid manner in which he directed its efforts, and to say that a most cordial and cooperative spirit prevailed.

As the report just read shows, we were invited to visit one camp. When we visited it, it was the consensus of the delegation that we ought to go farther and find more evidence, even more conclusive evidence than that disclosed by the awful atrocities perpetrated in that first camp, which were conclusive within themselves. By reason of the excellent cooperation of the membership of the committee, and with the cooperation of the Army, as the report further shows, we waited and finally saw a camp which was overrun during our stay in Europe. I wish to add that we saw evidence of atrocities other than those which have been reported.

I do not think the report ought to be closed without paying tribute to the exceedingly able leaders of our armed forces, and to the men and women in our Army which overran these camps and set their inmates free, and finally won the war in Europe.

Mr. President, we saw the war close. We heard orders given from general to general when they finally established the last line and the farthest forward movement of our troops. At the conclusion of the war we saw the high spirit that prevailed among all the men and women of our armed forces. We saw the team work that prevailed among the leaders of our armed forces. It was most gratifying to hear the tribute which was paid to our ground forces by the Air Corps. It was most heartening to hear the leaders of the Air Corps say, "We were but a portion of a team," and to hear them praise in the highest terms the men who shouldered the guns, and who marched on the ground.

Then there was the tremendous picture presented to us of the Germans on their retreat blowing up the bridges behind them, and how our Army on the other hand, to stop the retreat of the Germans, blew up the bridges before the retreating Germans. And then there was the inspiring scene of our engineers moving in and within the shortest possible time making repairs and clearing the way for our troops. In the meantime we saw our magnificent Air Force carrying to our troops supplies which, because of broken bridges and blown-out highways, could not otherwise be transported to them.

We were told in one Army headquarters that during one day 700 of our C-47's, which are the counterpart of the transport planes used by the air lines in America, delivered 30,000 tons of gasoline to the advanced units of our mechanized army which were driving forward to overrun the concentration camps the report describes, and the prisoner-of-war camps in which our own sons, our own loved ones, our own American men, were confined.

We heard not a single criticism by any leader of any of the branches of the service. We heard only the highest praise given by members of one service for the members of other services. The same thing is true with respect to our Army equipment. We heard nothing but praise for its excellence and efficiency.

Mr. President, it was a high privilege for us, under the able leadership of our majority leader, to see the closing hour of the war in Europe. We had the duty to make this tragic report of what we found; but it is impossible fully to describe the inhuman and sadistic treatment by the Nazis of their fellow human beings.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to add to the words of the Senator from Illinois one word of commendation respecting our military leadership. In that word of commendation I would mention not only the fine spirit shown by the officers who bore the responsibility of direction, but the high spirit of the men in the ranks. It went all the way down to the privates in every division and in every company and in every field of operation. Though we actually saw what our armies had done over there, we found it almost unbelievable that an army of such great size could have been transported 4,000 miles and have accomplished what it did accomplish in such an incredibly short time.

Not only do the Army and the fighting men deserve this commendation, but I am sure that the members of our committee will all agree that the Medical Corps and the medical officers of the

Army, and the nurses, as well, are entitled to similar commendation. Our Army Medical Corps, whose higher officers are largely volunteer doctors, and all their assistants, have done a thing in this war which was never possible to do before. During the Battle of the Bulge in Belgium in December many men who were severely injured in the morning of the fighting and who were taken back to a field hospital or temporary first-aid station in the rear, were before sundown flown into the hospitals in Paris where they could receive the most skillful treatment from the finest medical men ever gathered together in any army in the history of the world.

Then, Mr. President, as to our nurses who are working over there, the women who have gone out from their homes and families and from their schoolrooms to do this work, are likewise performing a duty which cannot be described in words. They are doing it with a spirit and a determination which makes us all proud of every phase of this great accomplishment and of their branch of the service.

I saw in the hospital in Paris men who had been so badly injured that one could not imagine they would ever want to go back into battle or that they would be permitted to go back into battle, but who were impatient for their injuries to heal so they might go back to fight in Japan in the Pacific before the war is concluded.

Mr. President, I feel that these words of commendation should be spoken respecting the different branches of the service, and I am sure the Senator from Illinois meant to include them all in his remarks.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 383) to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2347. An act to provide and insure a dependable supply of domestic natural rubber, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 2875. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department in the District of Columbia."

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2992) to extend the provisions of the act of July 11, 1941 (Public Law 163, 77th Cong.), and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

REPORT OF WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

The 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 Military Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a report of the War Production Board covering operations under the Property Requisitioning Act of October 16, 1941, as amended, for the period from October 16, 1944, through April 15, 1945.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 15, 1945.*

(NOTE.—The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.)

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on May 14, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 62. An act to amend section 3 (b) of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, so as to permit exemption of security issues not exceeding $300,000 from the provisions of such act;

S. 70. An act for the relief of Maria Manriquez Ruiz;

S. 71. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Estella Ruiz;

S. 174. An act for the relief of Mary Martha Withers, as trustee; Mary Martha Withers, as administratrix of the estate of Beatrice Withers, deceased; and Mary Martha Withers, individually;

S. 316. An act for the relief of June I. Gradijan;

S. 328. An act for the relief of James A. Kelly;

S. 359. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ellen McCormack;

S. 407. An act for the relief of Pierce William Van Doren and Elmer J. Coates;

S. 467. An act for the relief of Maj. Malcolm K. Beyer;

S. 569. An act to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in the training building at the Marine Corps air station, Cherry Point, N. C., on June 3, 1944;

S. 591. An act for the relief of Chesley Brezil;

S. 655. An act amending the act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1207), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salary and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and interpreter of the Klamath General Council, members of the Klamath business committee and other committees appointed by said Klamath General Council, and official delegates of the Klamath Tribe, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 701. An act to provide a method for the wartime reduction of temporary grades held by general officers of the Army of the United States.

TRIAL PIECES OF COINS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3539 of the Revised Statutes, relating to taking trial pieces of coins, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Joint Resolution 32

"Whereas the United Nations are convening in San Francisco, Calif., this April 25 for the purpose of setting up a world-wide international organization to assure the peoples of the world of the greatest degree of security against aggressors; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has appointed delegates from the United States, representing all sections of political life in our country, to represent our country in the coming Conference, and

"Whereas former Secretary of State Cordell Hull, Secretary of State Edward Stettinius, Dean Virginia Gildersleeve, Representative SOL BLOOM, Senators THOMAS CONNALLY and ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Lt. Comdr. Harold Stassen, and Representative CHARLES A. EATON are the members of the delegation from the United States to the coming San Francisco Conference; and

"Whereas the elected representatives of the people of the State of Illinois can effectively help in giving vocal support to the delegations from the United States by making known its earnest desire for our country to actively participate in keeping the peace of the world by force, if necessary: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fourth General Assembly of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), call upon the delegation of the United States to the coming United Nations Conference on International Organization to vote for effective world organization for peace giving authority to the proposed international organization to enforce the peace by force, if deemed necessary; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That suitable copies of this preamble and resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Governor of the State of Illinois, Lieutenant Governor of the State of Illinois, Cordell Hull, Secretary of State Edward Stettinius, Dean Virginia Gildersleeve, Senators THOMAS CONNALLY and ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Lt. Comdr. Harold Stassen, Representatives SOL BLOOM and CHARLES A. EATON, and Members of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Library:

"Assembly Joint Resolution No. 33

"Relative to memorializing Congress to erect a Statue of Freedom on the coast of California.

"Whereas since she was unveiled to the world in 1886, the Statue of Liberty has stood at the Atlantic threshold of our Union as a glorious symbol of American heritage—those four great freedoms: Freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from fear, and freedom from want; and

"Whereas to 'the tired, the poor, the huddled masses,' she has brought hope and inspiration; to 'the homeless and the tempest tost she lifts her lamp beside the golden door,' pointing the way toward the peace and security of freemen; and

"Whereas the torch she bears aloft on Bedloe Island is as a beacon of enlightenment to the troubled lands across the waters, shrouded in darkness, desolution, and despair; and

"Whereas similar darkness reigns across the waters of the Pacific but no such beacon lights the way; and

"Whereas more and more, as the present conflict proceeds toward Allied victory does an awakened Asia look toward our western shores, in search and contemplation of those principles and ideals for which our Nation stands; and

"Whereas in these years of war, California has risen to prodigious heights as the great military and industrial center of the West—where troops embark for the Pacific, where most of the Nation's ships and planes are built, where much of the Nation's food supply is grown; and

"Whereas in the postwar years California will emerge as the great center of Pacific commerce and travel by air and sea—the great link between the east and west; and

"Whereas it is fitting that there be on the California coast a visible symbol of freedom, a sister, as it were, to her who graces New York Harbor, that Asia as well as Europe may view the essence of our great ideal and feel the impact of its promise: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That Congress is hereby respectfully memorialized to erect upon the coast of California a Statue of Freedom similar in import to that upon our Atlantic shore; and, be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

PEACETIME UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference resolutions adopted by Charles Walters Post, No. 8, American Legion, of Fredonia, Kans., taking a stand for peacetime universal military training.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the American Legion, in its wisdom appreciates the need and has endorsed a program for peacetime universal military training; and

Whereas Charles Walters Post, No. 8, of the American Legion, Fredonia, Kans., has investigated said program and finds the adoption of universal military training in peacetime a definite need for future peace; and

Whereas Charles Walters Post, No. 8, is proud to commend the national organization upon its action in reference thereto: It is therefore

Resolved by the Charles Walters Post, No. 8, of the American Legion, That it commend the national organization upon its patriotic act in endorsing universal peacetime military training; and be it further

Resolved, That its officers exercise every influence at its command to help write the idea into the law of the land; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the national adjutant and copies to each of the members of the National Congress from Kansas and the appropriate congressional committees.

CHARLES WALTERS POST, No. 8,
FREDONIA, KANS.,
LOYD L. STEWART,
Commander,
CHAS. OSBURN,
Adjutant.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD resolutions adopted by members of the Great Northern Turkey Cooperatives, Inc., with headquarters at Minot, N. Dak., in annual convention at St. Paul, Minn., relating to the Missouri Valley Authority.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the harnessing and utilization of the waters and other resources of the Missouri Valley region afford the greatest opportunity of any great region during the postwar era for the development of agriculture, commerce, industry, conservation, and recreation; and

Whereas the urgency of the problems caused by the recurrence of devastating droughts in the upper agricultural area of the valley and disastrous floods in the lower portion of the watershed, together with the related problems of soil erosion and loss of soil fertility, the pressing needs for low-cost transportation and cheap and abundant electric power, and the necessity for the balanced development of the other natural resources of the region, demand that the Missouri River system and its watershed be controlled and utilized for purposes of irrigation, flood control, navigation, electric power, municipal uses, and recreational and other incidental purposes, and that adequate measures for water control on the land and the development of the other natural resources of the region be undertaken, all in such a manner as will promote the balanced agricultural and industrial development of the Missouri Valley region; and

Whereas all of these purposes and measures can be achieved to the most desirable extent for the benefit of the 7,000,000 people who live in the Missouri Valley only through a well-integrated program of unified water control and resource development with responsibility for planning, construction, and administration clearly fixed in a single regional agency that will become intimately acquainted with the needs and desires of the people of the valley; and

Whereas for the past 12 years the Nation has witnessed in the Tennessee Valley region a practical demonstration of the most efficient and democratic method of developing natural resources, where the Tennessee Valley Authority—a Federal regional agency responsible directly to the President and Congress and authorized to deal with the development of all the resources of a great river region as a unified whole in cooperation with the people of the region and their institutions, local, State, and Federal—has successfully provided for the unified control and utilizations of water in the river and on the land, and the integrated development of the other resources of the region, in cooperation with existing Federal agencies, State governments, and local authorities to the great benefit of all people, improving the condition of farmers, stimulating new industries, and making more prosperous existing business enterprises: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Great Northern Turkey Cooperatives, Inc., with headquarters at Minot, N. Dak., in annual convention in St. Paul, Minn., on April 3, 1945, endorse legislation, such as the pending Senate bill 555, creating a Missouri Valley authority which shall be patterned upon the administrative principles of the Tennessee Valley Authority as a genuine decentralized regional agency directly responsible to the President and Congress and the programs of which shall be designed to meet the particular conditions, problems, and opportunities of water control and resource development of the Missouri Valley region, including responsibility for the formulation and carrying out of a plan for the unified control and development of the waters of the Missouri River system in cooperation with and with due respect for the rights of the various States and local governing authorities of the Missouri region, and utilizing and improving the basic engineering proposals jointly prepared by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Members of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives from the States in which Great Northern Turkey Cooperatives, Inc., operates—namely, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Colorado, Wyoming, and Montana—and that this resolution be spread on the minutes of the association.

L. A. JOYCE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

IMPROVEMENT OF JUSTICE BY PRESCRIBING FAIR ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Cass County Bar Association at its meeting held in Fargo, N. Dak., favoring the enactment of legislation to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved by the Cass County Bar Association at its meeting held at Fargo, N. Dak., on April 12, 1945, That this association having studied and carefully considered the McCarran-Sumners bill to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedures, now pending in the Senate and House of Representatives (S. 7 and H. R. 1203), and finding that said bill contains the fundamental requirements for fair hearings and decisions before administrative agencies of the Federal Government, and that its passage now and without waiting for the termination of the present war is essential and in the public interest.

We do hereby approve said bill and recommend its immediate passage by Congress, and urge our Representatives and Senators to actively support said bill and diligently work to secure its prompt passage.

That copies of this resolution be transmitted to Senators LANGER and YOUNG and Representatives LEMKE and ROBERTSON by the officers of this association.

HOSPITAL FACILITIES FOR VETERANS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have a communication from a fellow Nebraskan, Mr. Reed O'Hanlon, who is department commander of the American Legion for the State of Nebraska. His letter has to do with the expansion of hospital facilities for veterans in our State. I ask consent to present for printing in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, and to have appropriately referred the letter which I have received from Mr. O'Hanlon and, following it, the resolution which was adopted by the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Nebraska, on the 2d day of May 1945. The resolution is self-explanatory.

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

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF NEBRASKA,
May 9, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: I have been directed by the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Nebraska, to forward for your consideration a resolution passed at their meeting of May 2, 1945, concerning the urgent need for an additional veterans' hospital in Nebraska. Unless some definite action authorizing the construction of at least one additional hospital in this State is taken in the near future, the delay before actual construction can be completed

is going to cause a serious situation in this State.

The Department of Nebraska has no direct interest in the location of such additional facilities feeling that this should properly be left to proper authority. We are deeply concerned, however, with the delay in the Veterans' Administration, notwithstanding congressional authorization, for additional facilities. It is our hope that you will find time, busy as you are, to personally urge General Hines to make a definite commitment.

Sincerely,

REED O'HANLON.

Whereas it is the belief of war veterans of Nebraska that the construction program for Veterans' Administration hospitals has been conducted along entirely too conservative lines, especially in view of the anticipated need for new hospitals and new beds, which should be in readiness before any emergency occurs; and

Whereas experience in the past has proven that the present veterans' hospital facilities in Nebraska are inadequate even for the veterans of wars prior to World War No. 2, as we have seen long waiting lists of men desiring hospitalization and in need of it; and

Whereas a comparison of Veterans' Administration facilities available to veterans of Midwestern States shows that the Nebraska veterans are the victims of unjust discrimination in respect to the facilities provided for them, as shown by the following table:

State	Men in World War No. 1	Veterans' Administration hospital beds	Beds per 1,000 men
South Dakota	32,017	[1] 2,632	87
Wyoming	12,348	745	62
Kansas	81,724	4,369	53
Colorado	43,421	805	19
Iowa	114,292	1,655	15
Nebraska	57,329	280	5

[1] Does not include 150-bed hospital now authorized.

Therefore be it

Resolved by the department executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Nebraska, in regular session convened this 2d day of May 1945, That we demand that the war veterans of Nebraska be given the consideration to which they are entitled in the way of hospital facilities in their own State, and that the Veterans' Administration be urged to proceed with a construction program, in accordance with the provisions of the G. I. bill of rights, which will provide adequate hospital facilities in Nebraska for the war veterans of this State that the situation may not become a stark tragedy when veterans of World War No. 2 return home; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans Affairs, to all members of the Nebraska delegation in the Congress of the United States, and to Edward McKim, chief administrative assistant to President Truman.

The foregoing resolution was adopted unanimously.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 917) to provide for payment and settlement of mileage and other travel allowance accounts of military personnel, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 271) thereon.

INTERIM REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY ON INVESTIGATION OF PRODUCTION, DISTRIBUTION, AND CONSUMPTION OF FOOD (S. REPT. NO. 270)

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, on March 19, 1945, the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 92, authorizing the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to make an investigation of the production, distribution, and consumption of food. The committee as a whole held hearings for approximately 5 weeks. Therefore, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I ask unanimous consent to submit an interim report. Inasmuch as the Committee on Banking and Currency has jurisdiction of the bill proposing to extend the O. P. A. for another term I ask that a copy of the report be referred to that committee. I also request that the report be printed in full in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and printed in the RECORD, and a copy thereof referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The report is as follows:

[S. Rept. No. 270, 79th Cong., 1st sess.]

INVESTIGATING CERTAIN MATTERS RELATING TO FOOD PRODUCTION, DISTRIBUTION, AND CONSUMPTION

Mr. Thomas of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, submitted the following interim report (pursuant to S. Res. 92):

STATEMENT

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 92) providing for the investigation of matters relating to food production and consumption, makes the following interim report on the production, distribution, and consumption of meat.

The committee had before it not only representatives of the Office of Price Administration, War Food Administration, and the armed forces but many livestock producers, feeders, meat packers, and others from all parts of the United States. The findings and recommendations herein are based upon the testimony of these witnesses.

HIGHER PRICES FOR TOP GRADES OF CATTLE

It is estimated that there is a record number of about 82,000,000 cattle on farms and ranches in the United States. In 1943 Federal agencies controlling meat production and prices in an effort to best utilize available feed deliberately discouraged the feeding of cattle to the top grades by reducing the normal spread in prices between the top and lower grades. The failure to change this policy in spite of adequate feed supplies during and since the last half of 1944 resulted in discouraging the sending of sufficient numbers of cattle to feed lots. Therefore, it is apparent that the controls now in effect do not give the necessary spread to a cattle feeder to permit him or to encourage him to purchase feeders and adequately finish them in the feed lot.

One quick way to increase the available meat supply is to add to the weight of cattle which are now in the feed lots. The way to stimulate the feeder to place the cattle on feed and hold them until they are finished is to give him a price sufficiently above the market on feeder cattle to permit him to do the job and earn a reasonable profit.

ENCOURAGING MARKETING OF GRASS CATTLE

All estimates indicate that there are sufficient grass and unproductive dairy cattle on farms and on ranges to permit an increased marketing of them during late spring and early summer. Such marketing would aid in relieving to some extent the present shortage of meat, and it would also bring these cattle to market before the usual late summer and autumn rush. The time for grass feeding has now arrived, permitting the carrying of these cattle on the farms and ranges at the minimum cost. Therefore, some incentive is necessary to bring them to market in the next few months. Furthermore, this type of beef is urgently needed now for the canning program of the armed forces.

RAISING AND EXTENDING THE SUPPORT PRICES OF HOGS

Failure of governmental agencies to judge meat requirements resulted in a series of conflicting policies both on hog production and feed supplies. Producers of hogs were confused and discouraged and hog production declined approximately 35 percent in 1945 in comparison to 1944.

To again encourage needed hog production a strong stimulant is necessary. This must take the form of an increase in the support price for best hogs and an establishment of satisfactory support prices of all weights. Further, the hog producer must be assured that there will be no lowering of such support prices or of ceilings before the pig crop which he is about to raise will be marketed.

PROCESSORS NEED A REASONABLE MARGIN FOR PROCESSING

The committee are convinced from the testimony that at the present time substantial losses are being incurred by processors on both beef and pork operations. Many small packers have been forced to close, curtail their operations, go broke, or go "black," because of their inability to continue to take these losses. The Office of Price Administration officials have assured this committee from time to time that they would correct these inequities administratively. In the case of pork an announcement was made which purported to make pork operations profitable. The Office of Price Administration has since admitted that such relief was inadequate. Later they announced their 10-point program for beef which they said made beef operations profitable. Testimony produced before this committee clearly established that this program causes packers greater losses than they were sustaining under the program it superseded. This committee believe processors should have a margin of profit for processing of each species of livestock. In view of the recent court decisions, Congress must amend the Emergency Price Control Act so that it will be unmistakably construed in that manner. This committee, therefore, recommend that the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, which now has before it a bill to extend the Price Control Act, incorporate in that bill an amendment that will accomplish this result.

SLAUGHTERING LICENSES AND PERMITS

The War Food Administration set up a permit-and-license program to control slaughterers, and issued to other than farm slaughterers about 26,000 permits against what might be called a normal number of 2,000. Since only meat from plants having Federal inspection can be shipped in interstate commerce, a large percentage of this meat from locally slaughtered animals never reaches normal channels of distribution. The armed forces and lend-lease purchase only federally inspected meat and therefore, the amount of meat which would otherwise be available to civilians from this source is substantially curtailed, thereby accounting for the extreme shortages in urban areas.

The committee recommend that all slaughtering licenses and permits be can-

celed and reissued only to applicants who are in compliance with Office of Price Administration, War Food Administration, and Defense Supplies Corporation regulations, who, except in unusual circumstances, have been in business over an extended period of time, and who contribute to normal channels of distribution. Quotas should be established for all nonfederally inspected slaughterers limiting the amount of meat they distribute.

The committee recommend as a further means of equalizing distribution of meat to civilians and as a means of making a larger portion of meat supply available for the armed forces and other Federal agencies that Federal inspection be required of slaughterers above the farm and retail level and that such slaughterers be required to set aside meat for Government use.

ENFORCEMENT

The committee believe that the Office of Price Administration has failed miserably to enforce price- and ration-control regulations. We recognize that effective enforcement is difficult, but we believe the enforcement staff, to a large extent, is inexperienced and unqualified and that it has failed to obtain the cooperation of the public generally. The committee believe further that the Enforcement Division has concerned itself too much with petty and technical violations of legitimate operators rather than concentrating on an effort to criminally punish those who have been engaged in diverting meat from normal channels in total disregard of price and rationing restrictions.

LEND-LEASE

The committee believe that the reasonable requirements of lend-lease for meat products should be taken care of, but recommend to appropriate governmental agencies that supplies furnished to lend-lease should recognize and be consistent with existing civilian shortages in meat supply.

MISCELLANEOUS

The committee found no evidence that there was any appreciable percentage of meat wasted by reason of incompetent handling by the armed forces or other Federal agencies. The committee find further that reputable livestock producers, feeders, slaughterers, and processors have cooperated in supplying the war needs and in doing as satisfactory a job as possible under wartime restrictions and regulations.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION'S AND WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION'S FAILURE TO COOPERATE

The Office of Price Administration was created for the specific purpose of controlling and keeping prices down; hence such Administration is not charged with responsibility of inspiring and increasing production of meat and food products.

Further, the Office of War Food Administration was created for the special purpose of securing the necessary production of meat and food products and in order to secure production the element of price is a necessary adjunct.

The evidence produced before the committee demonstrates that the Office of Price Administration and the Office of War Food Administration have failed to cooperate, thereby failing to secure a real understanding of and a solution of the problems of the producer, feeder, and processor of livestock and to coordinate in the public interest the control of production, distribution, and the price of meat.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION

The Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Shipment recently submitted a food report wherein he said that we already have a shortage in beef, pork, lamb, mutton, fats, oils, and sugar.

The chairman of the said committee is without power either to control prices or to expand production, hence, for his needs, he is at the mercy of the Office of Price Administration and the War Food Administration.

MISMANAGEMENT OF APPLES BY OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

As a concrete example of mistakes made by the Office of Price Administration, we cite the item of apples. Of this commodity there is an admitted surplus, so that the law of supply and demand, if permitted to operate, would have enabled the apply growers to have disposed of their products in the same manner as they have operated heretofore in times of peace.

Notwithstanding the surplus of apples, ceiling prices were placed on the various brands and grades and the retail merchants were restricted by orders limiting the sales of such product. Retail merchants oftentimes construe ceiling prices to be selling prices and in the case of apples such prices were fixed so high as to prevent the apples from moving into consumption. The Office of Price Administration prices and regulatory orders have interfered with the marketing and distribution of the 1944 apple crop and the result is that there will be millions of bushels of apples which will go to the dump pile.

Mr. E. B. Moore, an apple grower of Winchester, Va., testified that on April 1 there were 1,800,000 bushels of apples in Virginia that could not be sold under Office of Price Administration prices and regulations.

Mr. John Peters, of Gardners, Pa., testified that because of Office of Price Administration prices, regulations, and management, some 800,000 bushels of apples would have to be dumped.

The committee are of the opinion that in the case of apples all restrictions should have been removed, thus permitting the 1944 crop to have been sold, without either ceilings or limitations.

Using apples as an example, the committee is of the opinion that when any commodity becomes plentiful so that the law of supply and demand can operate to keep the price of such commodity within reason, all control prices and restrictions with respect to such commodity should be removed.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Nation-wide shortage of meat; complaints against the Office of Price Administration by livestock producers, processors, distributors, and consumers; reports of widespread black markets and diversions of livestock from normal channels of slaughter and distribution decided the committee to make an extended inquiry into the question of the supply and distribution of meat.

The armed forces are receiving the meat they actually need for consumption by military personnel for current supplies. Their needs were met first and must continue to receive priority. Lend-lease also receives substantial quantities of meat products. What remains is available to civilian consumption. The amount so remaining is inadequate to provide for the usual per capita civilian consumption. This shortage in civilian supply is accentuated by greatly increased consumer purchasing power.

The committee's findings and recommendations summarized are:

FINDINGS

Causes which have contributed to the shortage of meat for civilian consumption include:

1. The substantial and increasing quantities purchased by the armed forces and lend-lease.

2. A decrease in pork production of over one-third in 1945 compared with 1944 resulting from a decline in the 1944 hog production of approximately 30 percent.

3. The marketing of improperly finished cattle and calves and the failure to market the number of cattle warranted by the record numbers of cattle on farms and ranges.

4. The "squeeze" of processors of livestock between livestock prices and product ceilings resulting in losses and causing many reputable processors to curtail their operations.

5. The diversion of livestock from normal channels of slaughter and distribution into the black market, and the failure of the Office of Price Administration to take effective enforcement measures.

6. The diversion of livestock and meat into local distribution channels and away from interstate distribution.

7. An increased purchasing power resulting in a record civilian demand for meat.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee recommend for the purpose of improving the supply and distribution of meat the following:

1. A forthwith increase in the return to the feeders of AA and A grades of cattle through a fair and sufficient subsidy to feeders to encourage them to feed out range cattle to the maximum degree, thereby encouraging the feeding of more cattle and increasing not only the quality but the weight of AA and A grades of cattle.

2. An immediate incentive program to encourage, during the spring and early summer, the marketing of more grass and unproductive dairy cattle.

3. Raising the support price of hogs and extending support prices to cover all weights of hogs.

4. That assurance be given producers that support prices and ceilings for livestock will not be lowered unless adequate notice of such change be given.

5. That the Price Control Act be amended to require and direct the Office of Price Administration to give processors of livestock a reasonable margin of profit for processing each species of livestock.

6. The withdrawal of all slaughtering licenses and permits and a sharp reduction in the number reissued together with restrictions on slaughter by use of quotas so that meat will be directed into the normal interstate channels of distribution. The refusal to issue new slaughtering licenses and permits to known violators of governmental regulations and the concentration of enforcement efforts on fundamental major problems instead of marginal technicalities.

7. The extension of Federal inspection and set-aside orders to small slaughterers above local farm and retail level.

8. The limiting of lend-lease purchases of meat products consistent with domestic civilian supply.

9. That the Price Control Act be further amended to direct the Administrator to proceed without delay to remove all price controls and regulations from any and all commodities just as fast as any such commodity becomes sufficiently plentiful so as to permit the law of supply and demand to operate to keep the price of any such commodity within the range of the cost of production plus a reasonable profit.

10. The committee recommended that a supreme Administrator for Food be created to have supervision and jurisdiction over both the Office of Price Administration and the War Food Administration.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. TYDINGS (by request):

S. 1002. A bill to provide for the submission to the people of Puerto Rico of alternative forms of political status to the end that, by mutual agreement between the people of Puerto Rico and the Government of the United States, a permanent political status may be established in Puerto Rico mutually satisfactory to both; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1003. A bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Public Health Service, and their dependents, to occupy certain Government housing facilities on a rental basis without loss of rental allowances; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1004. A bill to authorize the Bloedel Donovan Lumber Mills to cut and remove from certain public lands in Snohomish County, Wash., certain timber purchased and paid for by it; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

S. 1005. A bill granting a pension to Ezma Areta Perry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1006. A bill to provide for the release of certain persons over the age of 38 from military or naval service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 2347. An act to provide and insure a dependable supply of domestic natural rubber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 2875. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION—ADDRESS BY JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley before the annual meeting of the Hazleton, Pa., Chamber of Commerce on May 9, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

POSTWAR ERA BIG CHALLENGE TO DAILY PRESS—ARTICLE BY AGNES E. MEYER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Postwar Era Big Challenge to Daily Press," written by Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer and published in the Washington Post, which appears in the Appendix.]

F. E. P. C.—A CHALLENGE TO DEMOCRACY: ARTICLE BY RICHARD J. ROCHE

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "F. E. P. C.—A Challenge to Democracy," written by Richard J. Roche and published in America, issue of April 14, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR-MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT ON BONNEVILLE POWER PROJECT

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Paul J. Raver, administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, and certain editorial comments on the labor-management agreement between the Bonneville Power Administration and the Columbia Power Trades Council, which appear in the Appendix.]

DEVELOPMENT OF COOPERATIVE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORK

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 383) to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. BILBO, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. CAPPER, and Mr. SHIPSTEAD conferees on the part of the Senate

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, as a result of the investigation conducted on the trip to Europe, the report on which was made today, I have had several invitations to make addresses in different cities, primarily in Seventh War Loan drives. I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from tomorrow night until the 1st of June.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRIGGS in the chair). Without objection, the leave of absence is granted.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that members of a subcommittee of the Mead committee, consisting of the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], and myself may have leave of absence from the Senate for a period of 15 days on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and leave of absence is granted.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have an engagement to make a delayed Jefferson Day address in Knoxville, Tenn., on Thursday. I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the Senate from tomorrow afternoon until my return, which will probably be on Friday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Tennessee is granted.

EXTENSION OF PERIOD OF OPERATIONS UNDER SECTION 409 OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3038) to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Senate bill 807, a bill reported from the Committee on Civil Service, dealing with the salaries of workers in the Government, made the unfinished business for next Thursday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRIGGS in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the freight forwarders bill is the unfinished business. I would not like to have it interfered with. The law expires on the 16th of May, which is tomorrow. If the bill is to be enacted, it is necessary to enact it at once. I would not like to give consent to take up another bill on Thursday unless consideration of the pending bill were finished. I have no objection to taking up the Senator's bill on Thursday if the pending bill is then out of the way.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who is in charge of the naval appropriation bill, stated on the floor of the Senate that he was very anxious to obtain consideration for that bill as soon as possible. In fact, he is rather insistent that the Senate consider that bill some time today if possible. The appropriation bill should be considered as soon as it is reasonably possible to do so.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I wonder if it would be agreeable to the majority leader to have Senate bill 807 made the unfinished business for Thursday, provided the pending bill is disposed of by that time, and provided also that the naval appropriation bill is disposed of. Would it be agreeable to the majority leader for me to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of Senate bill 807 on Thursday, provided the two measures which have just been mentioned are disposed of before that time?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is a little out of the ordinary to give consent for the consideration of a bill on a certain day in the future, with one or two bills still to be disposed of. What would be the advantage in obtaining unanimous consent today? I anticipate no difficulty about the consideration of the bill of the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am concerned because the time is growing short. The bill must go to the House of Representatives. Action must be taken during the present fiscal year.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall be glad to cooperate with the Senator on Thursday, or even tomorrow, if we should complete consideration of the pending bill and the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. Would the Senator prefer not to have me ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill on Thursday?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not like to establish that precedent.

Mr. DOWNEY. Very well. I withdraw the request.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have an engagement uptown at 2 o'clock this afternoon. I wonder if I may have consent to be absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent of the Senate is granted.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, through the courtesy of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], I am prompted now to make a motion temporarily to lay aside the unfinished business——

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I should like to know what is happening over on the majority side. Is the Senator from Colorado proceeding with his bill at this

time, or does the naval appropriation bill have the right of way?

Mr. OVERTON. I was about to make a statement in explanation.

The Senator from Colorado has stated that he has no objection to my now making a motion temporarily to lay aside the unfinished business and to proceed to the consideration of House bill 2907, the Navy Department appropriation bill.

I was about to make a motion to that effect.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2907, the Navy Department appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2907) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The first amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Naval Establishment—Office of the Secretary—Miscellaneous expenses," on page 3, line 18, after the word "and", to strike out "not to exceed $28,000."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, in presenting the pending bill to the Senate, I wish to say that this is the fourth consecutive annual appropriation bill for the Navy Department that I have submitted to the Senate on behalf of its Appropriations Committee. I consider it quite an honor that I have been privileged to report each of these supply bills since our entrance into the present gigantic conflict. The first bill that I handled on the floor of the Senate was in January 1942, being the annual appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1943. That bill carried a sum total of appropriations of $23,000,000,000, representing an increase of appropriation over the preceding fiscal year of approximately $20,000,000,000.

A dastardly attack on Pearl Harbor had occurred the preceding December. Our Nation leaped promptly to arms. The Congress responded to the recommendations of President Roosevelt and the Navy Department and provided, as rapidly as expenditures could be made, the funds to retrieve the disaster of Pearl Harbor and to build our Navy into the greatest sea force in the annals of history.

Each year since 1942 the Congress of the United States has increased the annual Navy Department appropriations. Last year the bill amounted in cash items to the sum total of $27,569,798,301 and was the largest allocation for the Navy Department in the history of our Nation. It will probably remain the largest during the present war at least. I say this, Mr. President, because we have constructed such a fleet of combatant ships, auxiliaries, and small craft that today we have attained the goal of having steaming across the world's oceans by far the most powerful navy in the history of any nation. In surface vessels we possess today a navy stronger than the combined navies of the rest of the world. We are now at war only with Japan; our naval strength is ten times the strength of the Japanese Navy. Consequently, there will not be in the foreseeable future the necessity to lay down additional tonnage in the vast quantity with which our resources, management, and labor have startled the world. We are well up with our program of construction. We have by naval engagement and aerial bombing depleted the strength of the Japanese Navy by at least 60 percent. Furthermore, we have, for all practical purposes, almost wiped her merchant marine from the high seas. In subsequent appropriations the main item will not be for construction, but it will be for maintenance and operation.

I make the observation unhesitatingly, Mr. President, that the moneys that we have appropriated for our fleet have been well and wisely expended. The results speak for themselves. I congratulate our Secretary of the Navy and the officers and men handling our ships and Navy planes upon the successes, unparalleled in the annals of naval warfare, which they have achieved and are still achieving to the eternal glory of America and American arms. Never before, Mr. President, since the advent of modern arms, and particularly since the rise of aviation, has a fleet, at such tremendous distances from its home bases, been able to assault and carry the bastions of an island empire and defeat its fleets and shore-based aviation in the home waters of the enemy.

TOTAL PROGRAM

It may be interesting to note that since June 30, 1940, the total cash appropriations and contract authorizations for the Navy Department, including the items in the present bill, aggregate the sum total of $139,000,000,000. By the end of the coming fiscal year there will have been obligated against this total amount $134,000,000,000, and there will have been actually disbursed between one hundred and eighteen and one hundred and nineteen billions of dollars. The Navy currently is spending at the rate of approximately two and one-half billions of dollars a month. Of the entire program to date 40 percent is shipbuilding, 17 percent is aviation, 17 percent is military personnel, 9 percent is ordnance, 8 percent is public works, and 9 percent is miscellaneous.

GENERAL ANALYSIS OF 1946 BILL

I now present, Mr. President, a brief summary of the 1946 bill. The largest single item in the pending measure is pay of personnel, including Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, amounting in round figures to $7,000,000,000 or 29 percent of the total.

The shipbuilding appropriations account for $2,870,000,000, or 12 percent of the bill. This is a marked reduction from the amounts devoted to shipbuilding in the past few years. For example, in 1945 the appropriation for this purpose was $8,000,000,000, and for 1944, $9,000,000,000. No shipbuilding program is initiated in the 1946 estimates.

In this bill is contained a cash appropriation of $2,481,000,000 for aviation, plus $425,000,000 in new contract authority, representing another 12 percent of the total.

The bill makes provision for the matériel for the construction of additional public works, amounting to $1,274,000,000, of which approximately $1,000,000,000 is for off-shore installations, and $288,000,000 for continental construction, a total of 10 percent of the bill.

Eleven percent of the cash appropriations are for maintenance, Bureau of Ships, amounting to $2,790,000,000.

Another 12 percent, or $3,000,000,000, goes for ordnance and ordnance stores.

Nine percent is for subsistence of the Navy, transportation of personnel, freight charges, fuel, and the maintenance activities of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, including disbursing and accounting.

The remaining 5 percent of the bill is for miscellaneous items of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

SUMMARY OF AMENDED BILL

The amount of the bill as passed the House is $23,400,502,133.

This has been increased by the Senate by an additional $203,273,735.

Therefore, the amount of the bill as reported to the Senate is $23,603,775,868.

The total amount of the regular estimates for 1946 and of supplemental estimates for 1945, was $23,899,153,050.

Hence, the bill as reported to the Senate is under the estimates by $295,377,182.

The appropriations for the fiscal year 1946 are under the appropriations for the fiscal year 1945 by $5,110,063,433.

Mr. President, I should like in conclusion to make several concisely phrased observations.

It would, in my humble judgment, be an egregious blunder on the part of our Nation if after the conclusion of hostilities we did not retain the combatant force of the mighty Navy that will have accomplished so much, starting with so little, in bringing, under divine guidance, victory to American arms in the west and the east. I fervently hope that international arrangements that will insure the peace and tranquillity of the world will be agreed to and lived up to. But, Mr. President, if they are not, or if they fail of their sublime purpose, we shall have to rely in the future upon the

strength of our naval and air forces, as well as upon a mighty reserve force trained and equipped to spring to arms upon the sounding of the tocsin of war. To the consummation of this cardinal prerequisite to national safety we should embark upon a program of compulsory military service.

Mr. President, we shall have largely wrought, fought, and won in vain, if we do not retain under our own control and ownership the strategic islands in the Pacific and Southwest Pacific which we have captured from the Japanese Empire through the blood and sacrifice of thousands upon thousands of young Americans, and which are ours by the right of conquest and of occupancy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations, on page 3, in line 18.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 3, in line 24, after the words "in all", to strike out "$40,500,000" and insert "$41,750,000."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I intend to oppose one of the committee amendments. I could not hear very well whether the question was on agreeing by unanimous consent to all the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question was on agreeing to the first amendment of the committee. Without objection, it was agreed to.

The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated again.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, in line 24, after the words "in all", it is proposed to strike out "$40,500,000", and insert "$41,750,000."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I inquire what amendment is now before the Senate. I wish to comment on one of the amendments. I understand that the amendment on page 3 has been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct; the committee amendment on page 3, in lines 18 and 19, has been agreed to.

The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, in line 24, which has been stated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the other amendments reported by the committee.

The next amendment was on page 3, in line 25, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for compensation or expenses of persons who engage in the performance of conciliation or kindred services in situations growing out of employment in industries under the national defense program, for dealing with which situations personal services are available, pursuant to law, in or under the Department of Labor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to comment on this particular amendment. I am very happy to see in the report of the committee a memorandum of understanding between the Navy and Labor Departments regarding the performance of conciliation and kindred services in labor disputes, signed by the Acting Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Hensel, and the Secretary of Labor, Miss Perkins.

I think, in view of the memorandum of understanding, that the amendment starting in line 25 on page 3 of the bill, and extending through line 7 on page 4, is a proper one under the circumstances; but, of course, it does not solve the particular problem to which the amendment in the first instance sought to direct our attention. The problem involved in the amendment is an over-all one. It deals, of course, with the proper reorganization of the labor services of the Federal Government. I rise to comment briefly upon it at this time, only for the purpose of future reference.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. In view of the very few Members now present in the Chamber, and in view of the fact that this amendment, as well as others, may be contested, I believe that the argument against at least the pending amendment should be listened to by a majority of the Members of the Senate. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not yield for that purpose, for two reasons. First, I shall not object to the amendment, but shall vote for it. Second, I do not ask to have a quorum call in order that Senators may listen to my remarks.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. For the record, I wish to point out that I believe there is a very important principle involved in this amendment. I believe it illustrates the need for a reorganization of the labor services of the Federal Government. We no longer have a Department of Labor as such. We have departments of labor—many of them—in the Federal Government. Agency after agency has its own level of labor service, its group of conciliators, mediators, and administrators of the particular agency's so-called labor policy. The result is that we now have a great duplication of effort and a tremendous waste of funds in connection with the labor services of our Government. We also have something which adds to the cost of government, namely, jurisdictional suits among governmental agencies. When two governmental agencies engage in a jurisdictional suit they put trade-unions to shame, so far as controversies are concerned. So, in agreeing to this amendment I think we should keep in mind the problem which remains unsolved, namely, that of consolidating labor services and agencies of the Federal Government under one Department of Labor in order that we may have something which approaches a uniform policy, and also some degree of labor statesmanship on the part of the Federal Government in solving what will be, of course, one of the major domestic problems of the post-war era, that is to say, the relationship between labor and industry, and the solution of their difficulties by peaceful procedure with the assistance of the Government on a voluntary rather than a compulsory basis.

Mr. President, I think it is also important to keep in mind that the Senate should take cognizance of the fact that the great conciliation and mediation service of the Department of Labor has unquestionably been weakened during the war by the expansion of the conciliation and mediation services of other agencies of the Government. The Department of Labor has a great history and an excellent record. I look forward to the day, which I hope will not be in the far distant future, when both sides of this Chamber will cooperate in the reorganization of the Department of Labor so that once again there will be focused under it all the services, so far as conciliation, mediation, and labor relations under the Federal Government are concerned, instead of continuing the present hodgepodge system by which there now exists a whole series of small departments of labor under the so-called department "secretaries of labor."

So, Mr. President, I shall vote for the amendment, but I want the RECORD to show that I take note of the fact that by striking out this language, as proposed, we will not solve the problem which, apparently, the other House had in mind when it took judicial notice of the fact that, because many of the labor services have been removed from the direct jurisdiction and control of the Secretary of Labor, we now have a serious maladministration of the labor services of the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 3, line 25.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Navy Personnel—Training, education, and welfare, Navy," on page 6, line 15, after the word "discretion", to strike out "$156,269" and insert "$175,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 20, after "San Diego, California", to strike out "$2,170,000" and insert "$1,675,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 21, after "Newport, Rhode Island", to strike out "$1,036,800" and insert "$1,152,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 22, after "Great Lakes, Illinois", to

strike out "$5,700,000" and insert "$5,-300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 24, after "Lake Seneca, New York", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$4,-000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 25, after "Port Deposit, Md.", to strike out "$4,038,000" and insert "$3,-200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 10, after the word "for", to strike out "$2,877,196" and insert "$3,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 2, after the name "Navy", to strike out "$56,710,265" and insert "$58,234,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Ordnance—ordnance and ordnance stores, Navy", on page 14, after line 10, to insert:

For an additional amount for "Ordnance and ordnance stores, Navy", fiscal year 1945, including the objects and subject to the conditions applicable to the appropriations under this head in the Naval Appropriation Act, 1945, $180,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts", on page 14, line 17, after the word "Pay", to strike out "And Subsistence" and insert "Subsistence, and transportation", and in line 19, after the word "allowances", to strike out "an subsistence" and insert a comma and "subsistence, and transportation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 10, to strike out:

In all, for pay and subsistence of naval personnel, $6,736,227,000, and the money herein specifically appropriated for "Pay and subsistence, Navy," shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law and shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That hereafter additional commissioned, warranted, appointed, enlisted, and civilian personnel of the Medical Department of the Navy, required for the care of patients of the United States Veterans' Administration in naval hospitals, may be employed in addition to the numbers annually appropriated for: *Provided further*, That during the present emergency qualified enlisted men of the Navy, Naval Reserve, and Marine Corps may be appointed to the Naval Academy after 9 months of service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 19, line 1, to strike out the following subhead:

Transportation and recruiting naval personnel.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 20, after the word "transportation", to strike out "$242,385,000: *Provided*," and insert "$262,885,000; in all, for pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel, $6,999,112,000, and the money herein specifically appropriated for "Pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy," shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law and shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That hereafter additional commissioned, warranted, appointed, enlisted, and civilian personnel of the Medical Department of the Navy, required for the care of patients of the United States Veterans' Administration in naval hospitals, may be employed in addition to the numbers annually appropriated for: *Provided further*, That during the present emergency qualified enlisted men of the Navy, Naval Reserve, and Marine Corps may be appointed to the Naval Academy after 9 months of service."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—Medical Department," on page 24, line 25, after the word "patients" to insert "when entitled thereto by law, regulation, or contract."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 2, to insert:

The appropriation "Medical Department", for the fiscal year 1946 shall be available for the manufacture or production of products by patients in naval hospitals and other naval medical facilities incident to their convalescence and rehabilitation, and ownership thereof shall be vested in the patients manufacturing or producing such products, except that the ownership of such items manufactured or produced specifically for the use of a naval hospital or other naval medical facility shall be vested in the Government and such items shall be accounted for and disposed of accordingly.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Yards and Docks—Public Works, Bureau of Yards and Docks," on page 27, line 21 after "(Public Law 13)", to insert a comma and "$1,-500,000 for field house at United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., including acquisition of land and accessories."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I was not present at the hearing when this amendment was agreed to. What is meant by the words "field house"?

Mr. WALSH. In this instance, a gymnasium is meant. The resent gymnasium was constructed approximately 40 years ago when the student body comprised approximately only 800. Nearly every Board of Visitors at the Academy has recommended the construction of the field house. The student body at the present time consists of approximately 3,300. We concluded that a field house in the nature of a gymnasium could be used as an assembly hall, and make possible the elimination of an auditorium.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 27, line 21.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Increase and replacement of naval vessels," on page 36, after line 24, to insert:

Emergency construction: The unexpended balance on June 30, 1945, of appropriations under this heading shall be available until December 31, 1946, for expenditure only in liquidation of obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1945.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment, as I understand, is to carry over the current unexpended balance. Is that correct?

Mr. OVERTON. It was originally contemplated that this program would be completed earlier than it has been. It is necessary to carry over the balance until the end of the calendar year 1946. That is the sole purpose of the amendment. It does not increase the appropriation.

Mr. BRIDGES. It merely makes the balance available until December 31, 1946.

Mr. OVERTON. It makes it available until the program is completed.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Navy Department—General provisions," on page 48, after line 3, to strike out:

SEC. 105. No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salar. or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person or persons having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant; and no moneys herein appropriated for the Naval Establishment or made available therefor shall be used or expended under contracts hereafter made for the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, of any naval vessel, machinery, article, or articles that at the time of the proposed repair, purchase, or acquirement can be repaired, manufactured, or produced in each or any of the Government navy yards or arsenals of the United States, when time and facilities permit, and when, in the judgment of the Secretary, such repair, purchase, acquirement, or production would not involve an appreciable increase in cost to the Government, except when the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, would, in the opinion of the Secretary, be advantageous to the national defense.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I desire to discuss and to oppose the amendment which has just been stated.

Mr. WALSH. Does not the Senator think it is of such importance that there ought to be a quorum call?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was going to wait until the Senator from Louisiana moves the adoption of the amendment, and then we can speak on the motion.

Mr. OVERTON. It comes up without a motion, but I presume it is going to be quite controversial, and, if there is no objection on the part of the Senator from Washington, we can pass over this amendment until we finish the other

amendments. I think it is the only controversial amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is passed over.

The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 17, after the word "salaries", to insert a comma and "and to use such amount (not in excess of $4,000,000) of such appropriations as may be necessary for traveling expenses in connection with the recruitment and placement of civilian personnel in addition to the amount appropriated for such purposes under the Civil Service Commission" and in line 21, after the amendment above stated to strike out the colon and "*Provided*, That the average number of all civil personnel in the Navy Department at the seat of government, excluding the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard, shall not exceed seventeen thousand."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 24, after the word "personnel", to strike out "of such amount,", and in line 25, after the word "quarters", to strike out "as may exceed the rental charge for occupancy of such emergency housing facilities."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments renumbering the sections are agreed to.

That completes the amendments reported by the committee with the exception of the amendment passed over.

Mr. OVERTON. Now, Mr. President, we will revert to the amendment which was passed over and which appears on page 48, whereby section 105 is recommended to be stricken. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Bailey	Hayden	Reed
Bankhead	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Barkley	Hill	Robertson
Bilbo	Hoey	Russell
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Briggs	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Brooks	La Follette	Smith
Buck	Langer	Stewart
Burton	Lucas	Taft
Bushfield	McClellan	Taylor
Butler	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	Magnuson	Tunnell
Cordon	Millikin	Wagner
Donnell	Mitchell	Walsh
Downey	Moore	Wherry
Eliender	Morse	White
Ferguson	Murdock	Wiley
Fulbright	Myers	Wilson
George	O'Daniel	Young
Guffey	O'Mahoney	
Hart	Overton	

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in connection with the pending amendment I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a telegram which I have received from the president of the International Association of Machinists.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 14, 1945.*

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The Senate Appropriations Committee, in reporting out the pending Naval Appropriation bill, has stricken out section 105 thereof, which constitutes one of organized labor's cherished safeguards against workshop oppression. The anti-stop-watch part of this section has been incorporated annually since 1915 and the part of the section which requires that the Navy's work shall be performed in the Navy yards and arsenals when time and facilities are available and when the cost will not be appreciably more than when performed by contract, has been law for 20 years. Please remember that it took many years of effort by organized labor to secure the safeguards which the Appropriations Committee has seen fit to eliminate and that this legislation ranks high in importance among labor's magna carta of rights. Please do not permit this legislation to be scuttled. Vote to restore the legislation stricken out by the committee.

N. P. ALIFAS,
President, District No. 44,
International Association of Machinists.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I understand that the committee amendment is now before the Senate under a unanimous-consent agreement that it be considered. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment reported by the committee, found on page 48.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to the unanimous-consent request that this amendment be considered——

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. It was moved, and the motion was agreed to, that the bill be considered for amendment, committee amendments to be first considered. This is a committee amendment, and therefore it is in order to consider it now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is automatically before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. In view of the fact that the proponent of the amendment is the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], it seems to me the logical order would be for him to advance the arguments, if he has any, leading to this substantial change in what has been the law for 25 or more years. I notice the Senator from Minnesota is not in the Chamber at this time. I think we should hear from him the reasons why the change recommended by the committee is proposed, and then have the Senator from Washington and others discuss the amendment. The Senator from Minnesota may not desire to press the amendment, except to make an explanation of his position.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. In addition to asking for a quorum call, I have had one of the pages try to locate the Senator from Minnesota so that he may be here, advising him that his amendment is now before the Senate for consideration. I do not know where he is.

Mr. WALSH. Did the Senator from Minnesota respond to the last roll call? Is he in the city?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I cannot say. This seems to be the only controversial provision of the bill.

Mr. WALSH. It is my impression that if the Senator from Minnesota is given an opportunity to explain his position, perhaps the purpose the Senator has could be accomplished without much controversy. Does the record show that the Senator from Minnesota was present today?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota was present today.

Mr. WALSH. My suggestion is that if the Senator from Minnesota will make his statement, probably the matter may be cleared up. Is that the view of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. OVERTON. I think that is correct; but I do not know, and I cannot say, for I do not know with what vehemence the Senator from Minnesota is going to insist on his amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Since there seems to be a sort of deadlock over House bill 2907, I am about to move that the Senate return to the regular order, which would bring up the bill which we were first considering, House bill 3038. The junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is ready to proceed with House bill 3038. If Senators are not ready to go on with the other bill, we are ready to proceed with our bill.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado has been very courteous, and I hope he will continue to be. This appropriation bill could be disposed of in half an hour at the most. I am advised that the Senator who proposed the amendment expected to be on the floor, but he is not present. I want the bill disposed of today if possible. It is an important measure. We like to get the appropriation bills behind us. It is not being held up at all; we are ready for debate now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator from Washington yield further?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We can dispose of House bill 3038 in less than an hour, and if Senators are not ready to proceed with House bill 2907, it seems as if they would get out of the way and let those who are ready proceed.

Mr. OVERTON. We are ready; we want to go ahead with the appropriation bill.

Mr. HILL. I understand the Senator from Washington is prepared to discuss the amendment. Is he?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. My discussion will take only 2 or 3 minutes, since it seems to me the matter is so obvious. I was not prepared with facts, figures, or documents as to this amendment, but I am trying to look them up. A similar provision has been a part of every naval appropriation bill for 30 years. It was originally placed in naval appropriation bills at the instance of the very distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. It was placed in naval appropriation bills because navy yards, prior to 1916, indulged the practice of using vicious anti-labor speed-up methods, with stop watches checking on men here and there. That led to the institution in some industries of the so-called Taylor system. The purpose of this amendment, section 105, was to prohibit the Navy Department from using in its navy yards that vicious so-called speed-up system.

I do not know why it is now proposed to eliminate the provision. I for one would be the last to do anything or advocate anything which might result in decreasing naval production; but there is involved the age-old argument of how to get the greatest amount of work out of people. Wise industrialists and other intelligent Americans handling both labor and management have long since agreed that this is not the way to do it. This system has long been antiquated. Of course, striking out section 105 does not mean that the Navy is going to adopt such practices, but the section was designed to prevent the Navy, as well as other Government departments, for the provision is in other bills, from adopting and using such practices.

The committee report states, on page 8, in explanation of its action:

> This section is a prohibition on the Navy Department spending any of its appropriations on efficiency studies in navy yards. Certain members of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program on a recent trip to Norfolk were not tremendously impressed with the efficiency of that navy yard. It is believed that this section is a hindrance to the Navy Department in its efforts to improve the efficiency of Government navy yards.

I judge from that statement that the Navy has some intention of adopting this vicious antilabor system, which has long been considered as antiquated by all students of labor and management. It is the old Taylor speed-up method, and I should think that if it is proposed to strike out the prohibition because, as the report says, it is a "hindrance to the Navy Department in its efforts to improve the efficiency of Government navy yards," that may be some indication of an intention to adopt some such system.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I agree entirely with what the distinguished Senator from Washington has said. It is my understanding that the substance of section 105 was enacted into law at the instance of the late Senator Borah, at the time he was chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor. Hearings which lasted for many weeks were held before that committee. After the hearings were concluded the late Senator Borah prepared a detailed report consisting of about 13½ pages. In that report he considered the very items which are contained in the present section 105 which is proposed to be stricken from the pending bill. When Senator Borah presented the report to the Senate he succeeded in having the substance of section 105 passed by an almost unanimous vote of the Senate.

With the consent of the distinguished Senator from Washington, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the report prepared by the late Senator Borah, and which was made by the Committee on Education and Labor. I am satisfied that it will be a most convincing argument in favor of retaining section 105 in the bill.

There being no objection, the report (No. 930, 62d Cong., 2d sess.), was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(S. Rept. No. 930, 62d Cong., 2d sess.)

SYSTEMS OF SHOP MANAGEMENT

[July 17, 1912.—Ordered to be printed.]

Mr. Borah, from the Committee on Education and Labor, submitted the following report [to accompany S. 6172]:

The Commitee on Education and Labor, having had under consideration Senate bill 6172, report the same favorably with amendments and recommend its passage.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 1, in line 7, after the word "movements", insert the words "between the starting and completion of any job."

Page 1, in line 8, strike out the comma after the word "employee" and insert a period. Then strike out all after the word "employee" on page 1, line 8, down to and including the word "law", on page 1, line 12, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "No premium or bonus or cash reward shall be paid to any employee, except."

The terms of this bill (S. 6172) and the practices which it is intended to prohibit are directed against the excesses of certain systems of shop management which it is the intention of the War Department and the Navy Department to install in their manufacturing establishments and which we believe to be oppressive to workmen, as they have a tendency to reduce the employee to a mere machine, deprive him of his self-reliance, and in the long run would reduce Government employees to a condition of unresisting vassalage.

There are several systems of shop management now upon the market which have been invented by efficiency engineers. They are severally known as the Taylor system, the Stimpson system, the Emerson system, the Gantt system, etc., all of which have practically the same basic principles of operation but which differ somewhat as to details. When spoken of without reference to any one particular system, their authors prefer to have them be known by the generic term of "scientific management."

Many of those systems have much in them that is commendable and proper, since a large portion of their details consists of a compilation of business methods and shop practice which have proven successful and not harmful to the workman; such as the proper grouping of machines; standardizing tools and equipment and methods of doing work, elimination of waste, modern methods of issuing materials and cost keeping, etc. On the other hand, in the effort to get the utmost amount of work out of the employees, excesses are committed which should be curbed.

The Taylor system of shop management being the system decided upon by the War Department as the one to be used in their manufacturing establishments as well as the one originally intended for use by the Navy Department, and since this is the system against which objection has been raised by the employees, it would serve the purpose of outlining the principles of so-called scientific management to have an outline here given of the workings of this particular system of shop management.

The authority from which this outline is compiled is a treatise, Shop Management, by F. W. Taylor, being a paper read before the American Society of Mechanical Engineers; and the author, for the purpose of making the application of his system clear and specific, has taken the class of work done in a machine shop with which to illustrate.

Under the Taylor system the management of the shop is divided into two departments, known as the planning department and the executive department.

The duties of the planning department, which is supposed to do as much of the brain work of the establishment as it is possible to do there, are as follows:

"The following are the leading functions of the planning department:

"A. The complete analysis of all orders for machines or work taken by the company.

"B. Time study for all work done by hand throughout the works, including that done in setting the work in machines, and all bench work, vise work, and transportation, etc.

"C. Time study for all operations done by the various machines.

"D. The balance of all materials, raw materials, stores, and finished parts, and the balance of the work ahead for each class of machines and workmen.

"E. The analysis of all inquiries for new work received in the sales department and promises for time and delivery.

"F. The cost of all items manufactured, with complete expense analysis and complete monthly comparative cost and expense exhibits.

"G. The pay department.

"H. The mnemonic symbol system for identification of parts and for charges.

"I. Information bureau.

"J. Standards.

"K. Maintenance of system and plant and use of the tickler.

"L. Messenger system and post-office delivery.

"M. Employment bureau.

"N. The shop disciplinarian.

"O. A mutual accident-insurance association.

"P. Rush-order department.

"Q. Improvement of system or plant." (Par. 258, p. 1398.)

The duties of the executive department, which is managed by a large supervising force, consists of performing the work of the shop according to the directions of the planning department.

One of the leading features of the Taylor system is functional foremanship.

The employees each are under the direction of eight foremen, who have jurisdiction over different parts of their duties, and are as follows:

In the shop they have the gang boss, speed boss, inspector, and repair boss. Their duties

are sufficiently explained by their designation.

In the planning department there are four bosses who have jurisdiction over the men in the shop as to all questions touching their special duties. They are order of work or route clerk, instruction-card man, time and cost clerk, and shop disciplinarian.

All directions to the workmen as to what work to do, what machines to use, and the details as to methods and time allowed for doing work emanate from the planning department in the form of an instruction card covering these details. A sample instruction card is appended hereto.

Fred. W. Taylor.—Form D. 109

Transactions American Society of Mechanical Engineers. Vol. XXIV.
6733—1-24-'84.—3000.

OBSERVATIONS OF HANDWORK ON MACHINE TOOLS

Observer's name, ... Machine, ... Workman's name, ...
Date, ... Piece, ...

TABLE OF CUTS MADE AND CUTS THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN MADE WITH SODA WATER

Tool	1st		2d		3d		4th		5th		6th		7th		8th		9th		10th		11th		12th	
	Was	Should have been	Was	Should have been	Was	Should have been	Was	Should have been	Was	Should have been	Was	Should have been	Was	Should have been	Was	Should have been	Was	Should have been	Was	Should have been	Was	Should have been	Was	Should have been
Depth of cut																								
Feed—Number of teeth																								
Belt on cone teps																								
Length of cut																								
Inches cut in																								
Tool—Inches out of post																								
Number of cut																								
Rough edge																								
Time																								

Order.....
Weight.....
Times reset.....
Kind of metal.....
Heat number.....

Billet number.....
Carbon.....
Tensile strength.....
Percent of stretch.....
Hardness.....

TREATMENT.

Operations	Remarks	Time should have taken
GETTING JOB READY TO SET		
Learning what is to be done, when work is sketched, laid out		
Taking work, bogie, to machine, hoist, crane. Distance ..... Helpers		
Getting chain on and tightened. Helpers		
Shifting work on floor with, without, hoist. Helpers		
Lifting by hand, hoist, crane, to table, shears, circular ....., vertical ....., horizontal distance ..... Helpers		
Taking off chain. Helpers		
SETTING WORK	Actual time of getting job ready to set	Getting job ready to set should have taken
Considering how to clamp		
Getting out tools. Number		
Shifting table, toolholder, vertically ....., round ....., parallel to ....., at right angles to machine		
Shifting work, getting work on centers, setting work true, with, without hoist. Helpers		
Drawing down ..... bolts ..... set screws on ..... clamps and ..... wooden supports		
Drawing down ..... set screws on ..... stops		
Putting on ..... knee plate, steady rest, spider, universal chuck		
Putting on ..... parallel blocks		
Putting on ..... V blocks		
Putting on ..... piles ..... pieces, small packing		
Putting on ..... false table, face plate		
Putting on, taking off, horizontal side		
Laying out, trying with templet, rod		
Leveling		
Squaring with wooden, try, square, plumb bob		
Fixing soda water		
	Actual time of setting work	Setting work should have taken

Operations	Remarks	Time should have taken
SETTING TOOL		
Putting on tool post, drill rest, drill chuck, boring bar		
Adjusting feed		
Adjusting speed		
Adjusting crank, table stops		
Adjusting vertical slide, screw cutting gear		
Adjusting frame, poppet, crosshead		
Setting tool fastened by ..... bolts and ..... set screws		
EXTRA HAND WORK	Actual time of setting tool	Setting tool should have taken
Chipping ..... scale		
Chipping ..... center punching		
Hand turning		
Hand feed		
Filing		
Breaking off		
Stamping		
REMOVING WORK, ETC.	Actual time of extra handwork	Extra handwork should have taken
Taking off ..... bolts ..... set screws on ..... clamps and ..... wooden supports.		
Taking off ..... set crews on ..... stops.		
Taking off ..... knee plate, steady rest, spider, universal chuck.		
Taking off ..... parallel blocks		
Taking off ..... V blocks		
Taking off ..... piles ..... pieces small packing.		
Taking ..... false table, face plate		
Taking off tool post, drill rest, drill chuck, boring bar.		
Putting chain on. Helpers		
Moving work to floor with, without, hoist. Helpers		
Taking chain off. Helpers		
Taking out tool fastened by ..... bolts and ..... set screws		
Turning in tools. Number		
Cleaning necessary to job		
	Actual time of removing work, etc.	Removing work, etc., should have taken
Accidental delays		
Care of machine		

In the selection of a working force it is the purpose of this type of management to displace as rapidly as possible the high class of workmen ordinarily employed on such work with common laborers, who are cheaper and are glad to earn a little more than formerly, even though it is not so much as was earned by the mechanic whom they displace. This desired achievement is not always attainable, however, and depends upon the condition of the labor market.

This principle of the elimination of high-priced help also applies to the bosses.

It is also proposed to stimulate the activity of the employees by offering premiums and bonuses ranging from 30 percent to 100 percent more than was formerly earned by the employees in order to induce them to reach the daily task that is set. That is, if a machinist getting $3 per day is displaced by a laborer getting $1.50 per day, the laborer gets from 30 percent to 100 percent more per day than he formerly received if he succeeds in completing his task.

In setting tasks, the most capable workmen are used. When it is desired to ascertain how long it should take to do a given job, the time-study man takes observations of one of the fastest workmen who has been selected for the purpose, and notes the time it takes by means of a stop watch to do each of the elementary operations of the job. All of these elements or unit times are added, and the resulting time is supposed to be the standard time for that job.

Thus (par. 101 of Shop Management, p. 1358):

"His first step was to place an intelligent, college-educated man in charge of progress in this line. This man had not before handled this class of labor, although he understood managing workmen. He was not familiar with the methods pursued by the writer, but was soon taught the art of determining how much work a first-class man can do in a day. This was done by timing with a stop watch a first-class man while he was working fast. The best way to do this, in fact, almost the only way in which the timing can be done with certainty, is to divide the man's work into its elements and time each element separately. For example, in the case of a man loading pig iron onto a car, the elements should be: Picking up the pig iron from the ground or pile (time in hundredths of a minute). Walking with it on a level (time per foot walked). Walking with it up an incline to car (time per foot walked). Throwing the pig down (time in hundredths of a minute), or laying it on a pile (time in hundredths of a minute). Walking back empty to get a load (time per foot walked)."

The problem of inducing the employees to work at the pace required is solved first by offering a bonus or premium to those who succeed and if this does not get results other more drastic means are used.

It is the business of the shop disciplinarian to see that a system of discipline is in vogue and enforced that is adequate to induce everyone to make sure that his part of the work comes in on schedule time. The system of discipline advocated by Mr. Taylor consists of—

1. Lowering the man's wages.
2. Laying him off for a period of time.
3. Fining him all the way from 1 cent to $60.
4. Discharging him.

It is also regarded as a good plan to continually keep enough men on hand so as to be able to discharge a workman every now and then for failing to continue at the pace required, because of its moral effect on the rest of the workmen.

When the system is first installed the high speed cannot immediately be attained. It must be worked up to gradually, and therefore the kind of bonus system used is as drastic as the degree of perfection to which the system has attained will permit.

The gradual acceleration of the speed at which the workmen labor is accomplished by the premium and bonus above referred to, the system of discipline, and by the gradual elimination of the workmen who are unable to keep up to the rising standards of performance.

The system of bonuses now in vogue at the Watertown Arsenal, where the Taylor system has not yet reached an advanced stage, is as follows (see Annual Report of the Chief of Ordnance for fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, p. 17):

"For example, a workman has been doing a piece of work in 190 minutes. After painstaking study of the job and of all the means of saving time, the man is carefully instructed as to these means, and is told that for every minute saved, within, say, 120 minutes, he will be paid for half a minute at his regular rate, in addition to his regular daily pay; and that it is thought that he can do the work in 72 minutes, for which time the increase over his regular pay will amount to 33½ percent."

When the system has reached an advanced stage of perfection Mr. Taylor advocates the substitution of this kind of bonus plan for another one which is more drastic, wherever possible. This latter is known as the "differential rate," and is illustrated by the following:

If it is discovered that the maximum number of pieces of work which a first-class workman can do in a day is 10, he will receive 35 cents apiece provided he completes all 10 of them. If, however, he should fail to complete the 10 pieces, even if this task is missed by only 10 minutes, he would get only 25 cents apiece for all of them, thus making the workman's wage for the day only $2.50, instead of $3.50, for running behind 10 minutes on his schedule time. This arrangement furnishes him a powerful incentive to work at his utmost.

The Taylor system further insists upon dealing with the workmen individually, and dealing with labor organizations being regarded as inconsistent with the purpose and workings of the system.

To further increase efficiency, the movements of the workmen are closely studied and standardized so as to make every movement on the part of the workman count toward increased production.

In order to further elucidate the basic principles of these systems and to ascertain the motives which have suggested their provisions and the possible extent to which they could be carried out if unrestricted, we give below extracts from the Treatise on Shop Management, by F. W. Taylor, which it appears is regarded as a sort of textbook on the subject, and from which the outline above given was deducted. The substance of this publication, which was written prior to the investigation of these systems by a special committee of the House of Representatives last winter, was defended both in whole and in part by its author at the hearings, no part of it being repudiated. Hence, its aims and purposes shall still be regarded as the essence of "scientific management." Quotations are as follows:

UNIT TIME STUDY NECESSARY

"What the writer wishes particularly to emphasize is that this whole system rests upon an accurate and scientific study of 'unit times,' which is by far the most important element in modern management. With it greater and more permanent results can be attained, even under ordinary daywork or piecework, than can be reached under any of the more elaborate systems without it." (Par. 133, p. 1364.)

QUICKEST TIME IS STANDARD TIME

"For each job there is the quickest time in which it can be done by a first-class man. This time may be called the 'quickest time,' or the 'standard time' for the job.

"Under all the ordinary systems this 'quickest time' is more or less completely shrouded in mist. In most cases, however, the workman is nearer to it and sees it more clearly than the employer." (Par. 136–137, p. 1365.)

ORDINARY SYSTEMS NOT FAST ENOUGH

"The injustice of the very foundation of the system is thus forced upon the workman every day of his life, and no man, however kindly disposed he may be toward his employer, can fail to resent this and be seriously influenced by it in his work. These systems are, therefore, of necessity slow and irregular in their operation in reducing costs. They drift gradually toward an increased output, but under them the attainment of the maximum output of a first-class man is almost impossible." (Par. 90, p. 1355.)

STOP-WATCH TIME STUDY USED

"His first step was to place an intelligent, college-educated man in charge of progress in this line. This man had not before handled this class of labor, although he understood managing workmen. He was not familiar with the methods pursued by the writer, but was soon taught the art of determining how much work a first-class man can do in a day. This was done by timing with a stop watch a first-class man while he was working fast. The best way to do this, in fact almost the only way in which the timing can be done with certainty, is to divide the man's work into its elements and time each element separately. For example, in the case of a man loading pig iron onto a car, the elements should be: Picking up the pig iron from the ground or pile (time in hundredths of a minute). Walking with it on a level (time per foot walked). Walking with it up an incline to car (time per foot walked). Throwing the pig down (time in hundredths of a minute), or laying it on a pile (time in hundredths of a minute). Walking back empty to get a load (time per foot walked)." (Par. 101, p. 1358.)

ONLY ONE OUT OF FIVE CAN KEEP UP TO TASK

"When the writer left the steel works, the Bethlehem piece workers were the finest body of picked laborers that he has ever seen together. They were practically all first-class men because in each case the task which they were called upon to perform was such that only a first-class man could do it. The tasks were all purposely made so severe that not more than one out of five laborers (perhaps even a smaller percentage than this) could keep up." (Par. 125, p. 1361.)

ONLY TEMPERATE WORKMEN COULD STAND PACE

"A careful inquiry into the condition of these men when away from work developed the fact that out of the whole gang only two were said to be drinking men. This does not, of course, imply that many of them did not take an occasional drink. The fact is that a steady drinker would find it almost impossible to keep up with the pace which was set, so that they were practically all sober." (Par. 128, p. 1363.)

A LARGE DAILY TASK SET

"Each man in the establishment, high or low, should daily have a clearly defined task laid out before him. This task should not in the least degree be vague nor indefinite, but should be circumscribed carefully and completely, and should not be easy to accomplish." (Par. 149, p. 1368.)

"When an establishment has reached an advanced state of organization, in many cases a fifth element should be added, namely, the task should be made so difficult that it can only be accomplished by a first-class man." (Par. 153, p. 1368.)

LARGE TASK ENFORCED BY OBJECT LESSON OF LAYING OFF WORKMEN

"Where the labor market is large enough to secure, in a reasonable time, enough strictly first-class men, the piece-work rates should be fixed on such a basis that only a first-class man working at his best can earn the average amount called for. This figure should be, in the case of first-class men, as stated above, from 30 percent to 100 percent beyond the wages usually paid. The task idea is emphasized with this style of piece work by two things: The high wages and the laying off, after a reasonable trial, of incompetent men; and for the success of the system, the number of men employed on practically the same class of work should be large enough for the workmen quite often to have the object lesson of seeing men laid off for failing to earn high wages and others substituted in their places." (Par. 166, p. 1374.)

THE "DIFFERENTIAL-RATE PIECE WORK" IS MOST FORCEFUL, AND SHOULD BE USED WHERE POSSIBLE

"The differential-rate piece work" is rather simpler in its application and is the more forceful of the two. It should be used wherever it is practicable, but in no case until after all the accompanying conditions have been perfected and completely standardized and a thorough time study has been made of all of the elements of the work. This system is particularly useful where the same kind of work is repeated day after day, and also whenever the maximum possible output is desired, which is almost always the case in the operation of expensive machinery or of a plant occupying valuable ground or a large building. It is more forceful than 'task work with a bonus,' because it not only pulls the man up from the top but pushes him equally hard from the bottom." (Par. 170, p. 1375.)

IN ORDER TO MAINTAIN RAPID PACE WORKMEN SHOULD BE ABLE FREQUENTLY TO SEE IF THEY ARE FALLING BEHIND

"In fixing the times for the tasks and the piece-work rates in jobs of this class the job should be subdivided into a number of divisions, and a separate time and price assigned to each division rather than to assign a single time and price for the whole job. This for several reasons, the most important of which is that the average workman, in order to maintain a rapid pace, should be given the opportunity of measuring his performance against the task set him at frequent intervals. Many men are incapable of looking very far ahead, but if they see a definite opportunity of earning so many cents by working hard for so many minutes, they will avail themselves of it." (Par. 189, p. 1380.)

WORKMEN CAN DO TWO OR THREE TIMES AS MUCH WORK AS IN THE PAST

"Second. As a result of this change of feeling such an increase in their determination and physical activity, and such an improvement in the conditions under which the work is done, will result in many cases in their turning out from two to three times as much work as they have done in the past." (Par. 291, p. 1411.)

SOME MEN WILL BE UNABLE TO KEEP UP PACE UNDER SYSTEM; THESE MUST GO

"Second. After the men acquiesce in the new order of things and are willing to do their part toward cheapening production, it will take time for them to change from their old easy-going ways to a higher rate of speed and to learn to stay steadily at their work, think ahead, and make every minute count. A certain percentage of them, with the best of intentions, will fail in this and find that they have no place in the new organization, while still others, and among them some of the best workers, who are, however, either stupid or stubborn, can never be made to see that the new system is as good as the old; and these, too, must drop out." (Par. 293, p. 1412.)

SPEED GRADUALLY ACCELERATED—WORKMEN AT FIRST RESENT INTERFERENCE

"In reaching the final high rate of speed which shall be steadily maintained, the broad fact should be realized that the men must pass through several distinct phases, rising from one plane of efficiency to another until the final level is reached. First they must be taught to work under an improved system of day work. Each man must learn how to give up his own particular way of doing things, adapt his methods to the many new standards, and grow accustomed to receiving and obeying directions covering details large and small which in the past have been left to his individual judgment. At first the workmen can see nothing in all this but red tape and useless and impertinent interference, and time must be allowed them to recover from their irritation, not only at this but at every stage in their upward march." (Par. 295, p. 1413.)

WHAT IS MEANT BY HIGH WAGES

"By high wages he means wages which are high only with relation to the average of the class to which the man belongs and which are paid only to those who do much more or better work than the average of their class. He would not for an instant advocate the use of a high-priced tradesman to do the work which could be done by a trained laborer or a low-priced man." (Par. 37, p. 1347.)

USING HELPERS TO DO MECHANICS' WORK COMMENDED

"As a rule, the fewer the men employed by the contractor and the smaller the variety of the work the greater will be the success under the contract system, the reason for this being that the contractor, under the spur of financial necessity, makes personally so close a study of the quickest time in which the work can be done that soldiering on the part of his men becomes difficult and the best of them teach laborers or low-priced helpers to do the work formerly done by mechanics." (Par. 67, p. 1352.)

"The objections to the contract system are that the machine tools used by the contractor are apt to deteriorate rapidly, his chief interest being to get a large output, whether the tools are properly cared for or not, and that through the ignorance and inexperience of the contractor in handling men, his employees are frequently unjustly treated." (Par. 68, p. 1352.)

"These disadvantages are, however, more than counterbalanced by the comparative absence of soldiering on the part of the men." (Par. 69, p. 1352.)

FUNCTIONAL FOREMANSHIP RESULTS IN CHEAP WORKMEN, AND MEN DESIRED OF SMALL CALIBER AND ATTAINMENTS

"The full possibilities of functional foremanship, however, will not have been realized until almost all of the machines in the shop are run by men who are of smaller caliber and attainments and who are, therefore, cheaper than those required under the old system. The adoption of standard tools, appliances, and methods throughout the shop, the planning done in the planning room, and the detailed instructions sent them from this department, added to the direct help received from the four executive bosses, permit the use of comparatively cheap men even on complicated work. Of the men in the machine shop of the Bethlehem Steel Co. engaged in running the roughing machines, and who were working under the bonus system when the writer left them, about 95 percent were handy men trained up from laborers. And on the finishing machines working on bonus about 25 percent were handy men." (Par. 247, p. 1395.)

DISPLACING SKILLED LABOR WITH UNSKILLED

"It is true, for instance, that the planning room and functional foremanship render it possible for an intelligent laborer or helper in time to do much of the work now done by a machinist. Is not this a good thing for the laborer and helper? He is given a higher class of work, which tends to develop him and gives him better wages. In the sympathy for the machinist the case of the laborer is overlooked." (Par. 319, p. 1421.)

CHANGING FROM ONE BONUS SYSTEM TO ANOTHER AS SYSTEM DEVELOPS

"Mr. Gantt's system is especially useful during the difficult and delicate period of transition from the slow pace of ordinary day work to the high speed which is the leading characteristic of good management. During this period of transition in the past a time was always reached when a sudden long leap was taken from improved day work to some form of piece work, and in making this jump many good men inevitably fell and were lost from the procession. Mr. Gantt's system bridges over this difficult stretch and enables the workman to go smoothly and with gradually accelerated speed from the slower pace of improved day work to the high speed of the new system." (Par. 172, p. 1376.)

"No workman can be expected to do a piece of work the first time as fast as he will later. It should also be recognized that it takes a certain time for men who have worked at the ordinary slow rate of speed to change to high speed. Mr. Gantt's plan can be adapted to meet both of these conditions by allowing the workman to take a longer time to do the job at first and yet earn his bonus, and later compelling him to finish the job in the quickest time in order to get the premium." (Par. 174, p. 1377.)

ALL FOUR SYSTEMS OF PAYING FOR WORK CAN BE USED IN LARGE PLANTS

"It is clear, then, that in carrying out the task idea after the required knowledge has been obtained through a study of 'unit times,' each of the four systems, 'day work,' 'straight piece work,' 'task work with a bonus,' and 'differential piece work,' has its especial field of usefulness, and that in every large establishment doing a variety of work all four of these plans can and should be used at the same time. Three of these systems were in use at the Bethlehem Steel Co. when the writer left there, and the fourth would have soon been started if he had remained." (Par. 177, p. 1378.)

EXAMPLE OF HOW DIFFERENTIAL RATE SYSTEM WORKS

"The first case in which a differential rate was applied during the year 1884 furnishes a good illustration of what can be accomplished by it. A standard steel forging, many thousands of which are used each year, had for several years been turned at the rate of from four to five per day under the ordinary system of piecework, 50 cents per piece being the price paid for the work. After analyzing the job, and determining the shortest time required to do each of the elementary operations of which it was composed, and then summing up the total, the writer became convinced that it was possible to turn 10 pieces a day. To finish the forgings at this rate, however, the machinists were obliged to work at their maximum pace from morning to night, and the lathes were run as fast as the tools would allow, and under a heavy feed. (Ordinary tempered tools 1 inch by 1½ inch, made of carbon tool steel, were used for this work.)" (Par. 180, p. 1379.)

"It will be appreciated that this was a big day's work, both for men and machines, when it is understood that it involved removing with a single 16-inch lathe having two saddles an average of more than 800 pounds of steel chips in 10 hours. In place of the 50-cent rate that they had been paid before they were given 35 cents per piece when they turned them at the speed of 10 per day, and when they produced less than 10 they received only 25 cents per piece." (Par. 181, p. 1379.)

HOW HIGH TASKS SHOULD BE SET AT THE START

"As the writer has said several times, the difference between the best speed of a first-class man and the actual speed of the average man is very great. One of the most difficult pieces of work which must be faced by the man who is to set the daily tasks is to decide just how hard it is wise for him to make the task. Shall it be fixed for a first-class man; and if not, then at what point between the first class and the average?" (Par. 382, p. 1441.)

"One fact is clear, it should always be well above the performance of the average man, since men will invariably do better if a bonus is offered them than they have done without this incentive." (Par. 383, p. 1441.)

"The writer has in almost all cases solved this part of the problem by fixing a task which required a first-class man to do his best and then offering a good round premium. When this high standard is set, it takes longer to raise the men up to it. But it is surprising, after all, how rapidly they develop." (Par. 384, p. 1441.)

EACH SHOP EXISTS, FIRST, LAST, AND ALL THE TIME, TO PAY DIVIDENDS TO OWNERS

"On the other hand, this policy of promoting men and finding them new positions has its limits. No worse mistake can be made than that of allowing the establishment to be looked upon as a training school to be used mainly for the education of many of its employees. All employees should bear in mind that each shop exists, first, last, and all the time for the purpose of paying dividends to its owners. They should have patience and never lose sight of this fact. And no man should expect promotion until after he has trained his successor to take his place." (Par. 312, p. 1419.)

COLLOQUY BETWEEN MR. TAYLOR AND DISSATISFIED CUSTOMER

"Mr. TAYLOR. I think that Mr. Hawkins has also overlooked another important factor, and that is the question of time. If Mr. Hawkins expects large result in 6 months or a year in a very large works, he is looking for the impossible. If he expects to convert union men to a higher rate of production, coupled with high wages, in 6 months or a year, he is expecting next to an impossibility. But if he is patient enough to wait for 2 or 3 years he can go among almost any set of workmen in this country and not find the trouble which he did in Massachusetts.

"Mr HAWKINS. I have waited 6 years now.

"Mr. TAYLOR. Have you tried the incisive plan of centering on one man instead of going at the whole shooting match at once? I think failure is due to a lack of patient persistence on the part of the employers and then to a lack of centering right onto a single man. No workman can long resist the help and persuasion of five foremen over him. He will either do the work as he is told to or leave."

All of the principal systems of "scientific management" were extensively investigated by a special committee of the House of Representatives last winter. Both the efficiency engineers and the departments concerned were heard at such length as they desired. The Government employees who protested against the introduction of the Taylor system in navy yards and arsenals and workmen who had worked under the system in private employ were also heard at length, and their testimony was uniformly against the system.

Then the committee made its report to the House; its findings were against the features of the system, which were designed to stimulate the workmen to extraordinary exertions. This is shown by the following quotation from Report No. 403 of the committee's report to the House on March 9, 1912:

"In an effort to stimulate the workmen to increased activity various methods are used under different systems, such as discharge, fear of discharge, stop-watch time studies, and bonuses. The fear of discharge exists under any system, and no doubt will continue to exist and to act as a stimulus. The establishment of a premium or bonus presupposes the establishment of a task. The bonus system is based upon the establishment of a task large enough for an ordinary day's work and then giving additional compensation as an inducement to a workman to do more than he would ordinarily do.

"The proponents of the Taylor system assert that the workman will be protected against any injustice either in the amount of work required of him or the compensation for that work by a change in the mental attitude brought about by the introduction of the system. A mental attitude which produces a spirit of cooperation between the employer and the employee is much to be desired, but such a spirit is not the result of any particular system of management, but is due almost entirely to the personality of the management and employee and the spirit that prevails in their relations to each other. Your committee is of the opinion that the mere mental attitude of the employer is too variable and unsubstantial a basis upon which to rest the material welfare of the wage worker. Standardizing and systematizing of work can be introduced successfully without any change in mental attitude from that which exists in the ordinary shop, but when it comes to introducing stimulation, a change of mental attitude by which the workman is willing to give a greater amount of energy for the same amount of pay may be very desirable to the employer of labor, but it is not always so desirable to the employee.

"Here is the crux of the difficulty in the introduction of the Taylor or any other system of so-called scientific management. So far as the workmen are concerned, they have not made any serious objections before your committee to standarizing or systematizing of the work, but they have vigorously protested against stimulation on the grounds that it tends to injure their health through overwork, and that while their wages may be temporarily increased, the result is that they are ultimately required to expend the greater amount of energy without receiving any additional pay. In the judgment of your committee, the best and most effective stimulus that can be given to the work in the shop is to secure and hold a fine spirit of cooperation with the management on the part of the workmen. That cannot be secured through timing the operations of the workman with a stop watch when he considers such a procedure an indignity which recognizes him as being in the same class as a beast of burden or a machine, or when he considers such a time study inaccurate, and therefore unjust to him, or when he knows that it is to be used as a basis from which to compute the speed at which he must work and the wages he is to receive, when, in his judgment, the work, speed, and wage rates are being established in order to secure greater profits for the employer at the expense of the workmen."

The employees of the Government, who seem to be unanimous in their opposition to the system, are of the opinion that to carry out a program based upon the principles and methods of the Taylor system above outlined would mean relentless speeding up, destroy harmony among the employees, and would result in various other forms of oppression.

Workmen who have worked under the system in private shops, and who testified before the committee, stated under oath that the system is harsh and oppressive and altogether disagreeable under which to work.

Mr. Taylor does not think that his system is oppressive or relentless, and does not see why workmen should not thrive and be happier under it.

General Crozier, Chief of Ordnance, does not find anything objectionable in the paper, Shop Management, by F. W. Taylor, which has been extensively above quoted. Following is a quotation from a letter of General Crozier to the Secretary of War on the subject, written April 19, 1911, and incorporated in the hearings, page 1162:

"6. Concerning the general protest made by the committee to the effect that the Taylor system is fundamentally based upon overworking and enslaving employees, eliminating the skilled mechanic, and, in general, operating to the disadvantage of employees, I must say that I do not find these features in a persual of Mr. Taylor's paper. In the absence of experience with his method, as affecting workmen, my knowledge must come mainly from his own statements, and I have interrogated mechanics working under his system and have found them satisfied with it. I find nothing in his description leading to doubt of the statement which he makes in paragraph 21 of his paper: 'This paper is written mainly with the object of advocating high wages and low-labor cost as the foundation of the best management, * * *,' and I give him credit for sincerity in his belief that all employees are better satisfied under his system than under the general system which he wants to replace."

The question to determine is, What is harsh treatment? We submit that certain mehods of "scientific management" are harsh and should not be permitted in Government shops.

The War Department is at present working out the details of the Taylor system at the Watertown Arsenal, Watertown, Mass., so as to make them applicable to the manufacture of ordnance materials and the testimony at the hearings also shows that the preliminary features of the system are being installed at the Rock Island Arsenal in the machine shop where gun vehicles, limbers, caissons, etc., are manufactured, and that it is the intention of the Ordnance Department to introduce there the other features of the Taylor system as soon as their application has been perfected at the Watertown Arsenal.

Let us turn for a moment to certain recent testimony of the Chief of Ordnance as to the present efficiency of the plant at Rock Island, Ill., and thereby ascertain if the necessity exists for any drastic change of method, or speeding up. On January 13, 1912, General Crozier said before the special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the Taylor system, etc., as follows (see p. 1118 of hearings):

"We have recently manufactured gun carriages and are doing it still for 3-inch rifles; that is, field guns, at $2,510.60, the exact cost. We purchased those rifle carriages from experienced manufacturers, who had had preceding orders for the same thing, for $3,398.82, an increase of 35.4 percent over our own price. Our carriages were made at the Rock Island Arsenal.

"We have manufactured there, at the same arsenal, caissons, for $1,128.67, and we have purchased the same caissons from private manufacturers who had had previous orders for them, so that they had experience in the manufacture, for $1,744.10, which is 54.6 percent greater than our own price."

On page 1117 of the same hearings General Crozier stated as follows:

"At the Springfield Armory the principal manufacture is small-arms rifles. We make a few other things, but the manufacture is almost entirely of the small-arms rifle. We manufacture that rifle for about $15, and in doing so I take into account what I think should properly be taken into account in the cost; but the Springfield Armory, like the other arsenals, is maintained as an arsenal of storage and issue, as well as a manufacturing place; and, therefore, in computing these costs, I have subtracted from the total

expense of the Springfield Armory those portions which I consider result from its character as an arsenal of issue and storage. Unless somebody goes into the details quite closely, there may be a question as to whether I subtract quite as much as I ought to.

"Therefore, I, last year, for the purpose of satisfying some persons who might have some doubt, made up what I might call an exaggerated cost of the rifles at the Springfield Armory—that is, I took every cent of money that was sent up to the Springfield Armory and charged it to the rifle. Whether it was for the payment of the clerks that were used in the issue of stores, the payment of the storehouse force, whether it was for the payment of the watchmen—they are the guards and custodians of the valuable property we have up there—I charged all the pay of officers and all the pay of everybody concerned to the rifle, and by that means I arrived at a cost of the rifle of $17.64 instead of $15—that is, I found I had to add to the cost as I had reported it about 17 percent. Now, that then became a statement of an exaggerated cost which, whatever the rifle might cost properly, it could not possibly reach. It must have been below $17.65; and if it were possible to obtain the opinion of an expert, I would be glad to ask him if he thought the Springfield rifle could be produced by anybody else anywhere and purchased for $25. My own opinion is that you could not get it as low as $25 from any manufacturer."

The rifles are also made at the Rock Island Arsenal at practically the same figure.

On April 2, 1912, General Crozier stated as follows before a subcommittee of the Appropriation Committee of the House of Representatives relative to the cost of manufacture at the Rock Island Arsenal (see pp. 637–638 of hearings):

"The CHAIRMAN. Do your figures show the comparative cost of manufacture and purchase?

"General CROZIER. Yes.

"The CHAIRMAN. Put them in the record, please.

"General CROZIER. I will mention a few of them for the record. I think I can mention them more summarily, so they can be better comprehended in the record, than if I put in all of these details. I will take the limbers for the 3-inch rifles. The average of three contracts gave a price of $1,518 apiece for those limbers.

"Mr. CANNON. What is a limber?

"General CROZIER. A limber is the forward portion of the wagon which transports the gun, the forward portion of the gun carriage; and the average of five orders for manufacture at the Rock Island Arsenal was $684 apiece. The arsenal cost was less than half the purchase price.

* * * * *

"General CROZIER. Now, for the 3-inch caisson, the average of five contracts shows a price of $1,708, and the average of six manufacturing orders given to the Rock Island Arsenal is $1,081. The 3-inch gun carriage proper—that is, the vehicle on which the gun rests and from which it is fired—gives as the average price three contracts, $3,268, and the average cost under five manufacturing orders at the arsenal was $2,341.

"Mr. CANNON. Does that include overhead charges?

"General CROZIER. Yes, sir."

These figures, representing the cost of manufacture at the Rock Island Arsenal, include all overhead charges, such as pay of officers, interest on investment (which, for the Ordnance Department, is 3 percent), insurance (allowance set aside for fire losses), and depreciation of plant.

It will be observed that the very shop in which ordnance materials are manufactured at less than half of the cost of purchasing from private contractors is the place where it is proposed to install the Taylor system. We submit that the necessity does not exist for the installation of such a system of intensive production, with its accompanying disregard for the welfare of the employee, in a plant where efficiency has already reached an advanced stage.

What has been said of the comparative cost of production at the Rock Island Arsenal and the Springfield Armory is true to a large degree of many other manufacturing plants of the War Department.

The Ordnance Department is to be commented for its ability to manufacture economically, but this much-desired achievement should not be further augmented by the introduction of any system of shop management so apparently unjust to the employees.

If it should appear that other departments of the Government are unable to show as favorable a comparative cost of manufacture as is the case in the War Department, that condition must of necessity be due to other causes, since these plants of the War Department, at the time the costs above referred to were compiled, were operating under the system of management which had been evolved through years of practical experience in the production of ordnance materials, and which is not subject to the criticisms of the Taylor system.

The clerical force necessary for the maintenance of these elaborate systems makes the overhead charges exceedingly great, and it is a question whether the increased productivity of the workmen in the shop, upon whom the heavy burden falls, is sufficient to pay for all this nonproductive labor which has to be added.

On this point the investigating committee of the House says (see Rept. No. 403):

"The Taylor system undertakes to systematize the work first by the establishment of a planning department; second, by detail study of the shop and the elements of a particular piece of work; third, by a routing system; and out of these grow a multitude of other details, such as job cards, routing cards, time study, and many others. So much of this kind of detail work is needed under this system that it appears to your committee that constant care would have to be exercised in order to prevent the overhead charges thus created from using up all of the benefits which might be derived from the proper systematization of the work."

The machine shop of the Midvale Steel Co., at Philadelphia, Pa., where Mr. Taylor perfected his system, has since his advent there, abandoned most of it as an unprofitable method of management. Some of the features of the system which are obnoxious to workmen are still in vogue there, however. One of the strongest competitors of this concern for Government work is the Washington Navy Yard, where the system is not used.

That the navy yard is a strong competitor is shown in the testimony of Capt. E. H. C. Leutze, commandant of the Washington Navy Yard at Washington, D. C., before the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, February 28, 1906, in which he shows that the cost of manufacture at that yard is less in most cases than by contract.

The purpose of this bill (S. 6172) is to prevent the use of the stop watch and the premium and bonus system of compensation, which together form the basic elements that are responsible for the excesses committed; and their use is not necessary to any proper system of efficiency, which is demonstrated by the absence of these elements in other efficient manufacturing plants.

The employees of the Government agree with Mr. Taylor in regarding these two features of the Taylor system as the foundation of the rest. He says, in Shop Management, regarding his bonus system:

"* * * It is to compel the completion of the daily task, then, that two of the other principles are required, namely, 'high pay for success' and 'loss in case of failure.' The advantage of Mr. Gantt's system of 'task work with a bonus' and the writer's 'differential-rate piecework' over the other systems lies in the fact that with each of these the men automatically and daily receive either an extra reward in case of complete success, or a distinct loss in case they fall off even a little." (Par. 161, p. 1372.)

Regarding the importance of the stop-watch "time study," the author says:

"* * * And first among these comes the study of 'unit times.'

"324. This, as already explained, is the most important element of the system advocated by the writer. Without it the definite, clear-cut directions given to the foreman and the assigning of a full, yet just, daily task, with its premium for success, would be impossible; and the arch without the keystone would fall to the ground."

As long as the departments insist upon holding these features in the background, with the understanding that they are to be used as some future time, it will be impossible to secure the cooperation of the employees as to other changes which might be advantageous, due to the suspicion which now exists.

The passage of this bill will allay fear and suspicion, and for that reason will be for the good of the service.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator from Washington has stated that probably the Navy Department contemplates putting into effect a system—that is a system of appraising the efforts of labor—which would not be permitted to be put in effect in the event the amendment were not adopted. In order that the position of the Navy Department may be properly placed before the Senate in this connection, I wish to say that the Navy Department made no recommendation. The evidence upon that point is very short, and is to be found on page 17 of the hearings. I will read it:

Senator BALL. My attention has been called to section 105 of this bill, which is a prohibition on the Navy Department spending any of its appropriation on efficiency studies, in navy yards, for example. As you know, the Mead committee went down to Norfolk and we were not tremendously impressed with the efficiency down there. It occurred to me that that section, which I understand has been right there in the bill since 1916, has probably been no asset to the Navy in trying to improve the efficiency in the navy yard. Will you have any objection to striking it out of this bill?

Mr. FORRESTAL. None.

Senator BALL. Is there another statute?

Mr. FORRESTAL. I think that is the case. As far as the question of time studies is concerned, it would be useful if we were able to have them. They are not a cure-all, as you appreciate, but it is one instrument that is available in any normal industrial operation.

Senator BALL. Will you let me know about that?

Mr. FORRESTAL. Yes.

Senator GERRY. It was put in, Mr. Secretary, according to my recollection, in order to prevent this speed-up plan for labor that was being discussed at that time.

Mr. FORRESTAL. I was about to add that it might be objectionable to the labor interests.

Senator BALL. The Bedeaux speed-up plan?

Senator GERRY. It was a speed-up proposition.

Mr. FORRESTAL. In the hands of an unscrupulous man or a man with a grudge against labor it can be an unfair weapon, all right.

Senator BALL. It seems to me with the present administration's attitude toward labor, there isn't much danger in that now.

Mr. FORRESTAL. I would think labor need have no fear of that, particularly by the Navy. We are initiating a study of the whole navy-yard operation and out of that we hope to get, so to speak, a modernization and streamlining of our industrial operations, not merely navy yards, but other industrial plants. In a sense, we are operating, I think, in a slightly archaic system, a view which you hold, I think.

Senator BALL. Yes.

That is the sum and substance of the testimony. The elimination of the section was not recommended by the Navy Department. While the Secretary of the Navy said he had no objection to the elimination of the provision, he made the further statement that it might work a very severe hardship if it were in the hands of some unscrupulous man who was prejudiced against labor. So I do not think the amendment represents any recommendation by the Navy Department.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. I have not had the opportunity to read the hearings so as to know exactly the source and the origin of the committee amendment to strike out section 105. On the proposal the hearings are short, and, of course, give the opposite indication that possibly the Navy Department has no such intention. But for 30 long years we have tried to prevent labor speed-up of persons employed by the Government. If we now throw down the bars, then, as the Secretary of the Navy himself says in the hearings, there will be no prohibition against the use of the vicious so-called speed-up system; it could again be employed by unscrupulous persons, which would result in setting labor back where it was 30 long years ago.

As I stated previously, all intelligent students of labor, management, and capital have long since abandoned such systems in this country in their dealings with their working people.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think the Senator from Washington has already explained what I wanted to bring out by a question. I am and have been very close to the laboring people. I have found that attempts to keep a sharp watch or check on their work, and to speed up their work, or stretch them out, trying to get more work out of them, or attempts to find how many minutes laborers have to spare from actual work during the day, will bring about labor trouble.

I know it to be true that almost half of the strikes in South Carolina in our industrial plants have been brought about by the introduction of so-called stretch-out systems or efficiency systems which manufacturers have tried to put into effect in South Carolina. If such attempts result in labor troubles in industries in South Carolina, it will be found that the same result will be brought about if the Navy tries to inaugurate and put into effect similar practices in our Navy yards throughout the United States.

I simply throw out a word of warning. The retention in the bill of the section under consideration would prevent such a thing. I believe it is for the best interests of the United States that we do not enter into this kind of activity at this late hour.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] that the parliamentary situation is that the committee amendment beginning in line 4 on page 48 is before the Senate under a request for unanimous consent, and I have reserved the right to object.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. How does the committee amendment come before the Senate by unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment on page 48, beginning in line 4, is pending.

Mr. BALL. The Senator said something about unanimous consent, and reserved the right to object. I wanted to say something about the amendment. I should like to have a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment, however, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield for that purpose?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not yield for that purpose. I think Senators ought to understand the parliamentary situation. I do not want to give up the floor, because I intend to object to unanimous consent being given.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that no unanimous consent is being sought. The question before the Senate, under the unanimous-consent agreement that committee amendments be first considered, is on the only remaining committee amendment, which is pending.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then I shall be glad to yield so the Senator from Minnesota may suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Bailey	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hill	Overton
Barkley	Hoey	Reed
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Briggs	La Follette	Saltonstall
Burton	Lucas	Shipstead
Bushfield	McClellan	Smith
Butler	McKellar	Stewart
Capper	McMahon	Taft
Cordon	Magnuson	Taylor
Donnell	Millikin	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	Mitchell	Tunnell
Ellender	Moore	Walsh
Ferguson	Morse	Wherry
Fulbright	Murdock	White
George	Myers	Wiley
Guffey	O'Daniel	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 48, after line 3, striking out section 105.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement before the roll is called.

I sponsored this amendment in the Appropriations Committee. It strikes out section 105 of the bill. As I understand, that is a legislative rider which has been carried in the appropriation bill since 1915. The provision in which I am particularly interested reads as follows:

> SEC. 105. No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person or persons having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant;

The latter phrase, of course, precludes any chance of an incentive wage system, basing wages on the amount a man produces in any navy yard in the United States. The first part of the provision prevents the Navy from making any time study of any job performed in any navy yard, in the interest of increasing efficiency and eliminating useless movements on the job. It was written into the act back in 1915, when the so-called Bedeaux system was being pushed in the United States. That was a deliberate speed-up, stretch-out system, which organized labor fought. Today, in any modern industrial plant, time studies of specific jobs are made every day in the year, with management and labor cooperating in such studies, in the interest of increasing the efficiency of production. To deny this opportunity to improve efficiency in our navy yards seems to me very short-sighted on the part of Congress.

A couple of months ago a subcommittee of the War Investigating Committee made a visit to the Norfolk Navy Yard. The committee sent investigators to several other navy yards. It was the unanimous conviction of all Members of the Senate who went on those trips that our navy yards urgently needed a real study, and a program to increase their efficiency. This particular provision has prevented any thoroughgoing reform in those yards.

I assume, of course, that the Navy would follow the accepted practice of management, and invite representatives of the employees to observe any time studies made. That is done throughout industry. I believe the proper procedure in this instance would be for the Senate to strike out this provision. Then in conference, if the House objects, we can write a provision under which any such time study must be made with representatives of the employees participating. That is the way it is done in industry. Such a provision is found in literally hundreds of management-union

contracts today. They have specific provisions for such time studies in the interest of increasing production per man.

Mr. President, I think one of the most serious trends in this country, if we are going to maintain our place in this world as the most productive industrial nation on earth, is the tendency to insist on increasing wages, shortening hours, and limiting production per man. We have been able to achieve the production miracles which we have achieved in this war because our production per man per hour is higher than that of any other country in the world. To deliberately freeze the status quo as it relates to production per man seems to me to invite a degeneration in our productive capacity. I hope the Senate will support the amendment.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. REED. I wish to confirm what the Senator from Minnesota has said, because in the last 12 months I have discussed the efficiency situation with the personnel officers of the Navy Department, not with the Secretary of the Navy. Those personnel officers have told me that the presence of this restrictive measure in the law has been a serious handicap in the operation of all the Navy Yards. There was no talk about going back to the speed-up system. They talked with me about the advisability of eliminating this very binding restriction. They told me that the navy yards under this provision of the law are practically prohibited from making any kind of efficiency studies. At that time they suggested—it was not in an official conversation; I was discussing with Navy personnel officers the matter of efficiency in the navy yards—that it would be very helpful to them if they could get rid of this restriction.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas. Let me add that in the manpower bill which the Senate passed, but which died in conference, the Senate specifically provided that the Director of War Mobilization should make utilization studies in Army and Navy industrial establishments. That specific authority had to be contained in the bill, because otherwise, because of this provision, no such utilization studies could be made.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not like to disagree with the conclusions of my colleague, the Senator from Minnesota, but I must say that this provision does not prevent the making of efficiency studies by the United States Navy. The Navy has been making them for 30 years. Section 105 would merely prevent the Navy from making a stop-watch study of one man's work and using him as a guinea pig as regards other men. In every union contract of which I know there is a provision similar to the one contained in section 105.

In regard to the efficiency of the navy yards of the United States, the Senator from Minnesota himself said that we get more production per man per hour than is obtained by any other nation of the world. We do it because we treat labor as it should be treated, and we do not drive it.

The only purpose of section 105—and let me say that a similar provision has been contained in every appropriation bill for 30 years—is to prevent unscrupulous persons in the Navy Department or other departments from taking advantage of the vicious stop-watch system.

I may say for the information of the Senate—and the Senator from North Dakota previously stated it for the RECORD—that long hearings were conducted on this matter 30 years ago by the late Senator Borah. I mentioned the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who was responsible for having the Borah measure included in naval appropriation bills when those bills were handled by the Committee on Naval Affairs, and who has been responsible for having the same thing done since 1923, when the bills were placed under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The Senator said that the language proposed to be stricken would prohibit the making of stop-watch studies. The language relates to the making of any study of a job done by an employee. Obviously it is impossible to study a job without studying the person doing it. That is the heart of this matter. It would prevent the making of any time studies of work done by any employee in any navy yard. Obviously someone's work must be studied if such a study is to be made.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I may say that the officials of any navy yard know exactly how long it will take an employee to do a certain job—for instance, a shafting or a tube or a length of chain. The language of section 105 would prohibit them from having someone enter a plant and stand over a man, holding a stop watch, and trying to increase efficiency by playing one man against another man or by playing one shop against another shop. The Navy has made all sorts of efficiency studies.

I understand from the distinguished Senator from Louisiana—although I have not read all the hearings—that the Navy Department itself did not ask for this amendment. I do not know that there is any testimony before this body or before the Appropriations Committee to the effect that this provision would hinder the Navy in the making of its regular efficiency studies.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that the Navy would like to have every restriction and inhibition removed. Its attitude is that that would leave it freer to perform the work which it is charged to do. The Navy does not advocate this provision.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I think the hearings will show that I specifically asked the Secretary of the Navy, when he was before the subcommittee, whether he would have any objection to having the committee strike out section 105, and I told him why I thought it should be stricken out. He said he would have no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But he also said that the Navy is right now initiating a study of all the navy yard operations, and that it hopes to obtain a modernization and a streamlining of its industrial operations, not merely in the navy yards, but in other industrial plants as well.

Under the provisions of the bill with section 105 remaining in it the Navy will—and it has done so far years—conduct efficiency studies of the systems used.

As a matter of fact, the Senator from Massachusetts will tell the Senate that his committee is now in the process of conducting long hearings on the system now in operation by the Navy. I do not know how the committee members will vote on the amendment; but if I correctly sense their feelings about it, I imagine that they consider its adoption would probably hinder or restrict even more the present operation of the so-called Navy efficiency system.

I think this committee amendment would simply take us back 30 years. I hope it will not be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 48, beginning in line 4, where it is proposed to strike out section 105. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BRIDGES. In order to support the committee on the amendment sponsored by the Senator from Minnesota, a Senator should vote "yea"; is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct; in such case a Senator should vote "yea."

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. REVERCOMB's name was called). I announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from West Virgina [Mr. REVERCOMB]. He is at one of the Government departments on official business.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. Not knowing how he would vote I transfer that pair to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and let my vote stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator

from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are absent on public business.

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

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business as a delegate to the International Conference at San Francisco.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent on official business for the Interstate Commerce Committee.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, has been designated to visit the Philippine Islands, and, therefore, is necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business as a delegate to the International Conference at San Francisco. He has a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are absent by leave of and on official business of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate, and also because of an injury resulting from an accident.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is absent on official business by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senators from Iowa [Mr. WILSON and Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—21

Bailey	Capper	O'Daniel
Ball	Donnell	Overton
Bridges	Ferguson	Reed
Brooks	Hoey	Taft
Burton	McClellan	Wherry
Bushfield	Millikin	White
Butler	Moore	Wiley

NAYS—40

Bankhead	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Barkley	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Bilbo	La Follette	Saltonstall
Briggs	Langer	Shipstead
Buck	Lucas	Smith
Chavez	McKellar	Stewart
Cordon	McMahon	Taylor
Downey	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Mitchell	Tunnell
Fulbright	Morse	Wagner
George	Murdock	Walsh
Guffey	Murray	Young
Hayden	Myers	
Hill	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—35

Aiken	Gurney	Radcliffe
Andrews	Hart	Revercomb
Austin	Hatch	Scrugham
Brewster	Hawkes	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Thomas, Utah
Capehart	Johnson, Calif.	Tobey
Chandler	Kilgore	Tydings
Connally	McCarran	Vandenberg
Eastland	McFarland	Wheeler
Gerry	Maybank	Willis
Glass	Mead	Wilson
Green	Pepper	

So, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

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

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

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OVERTON. Is it in order at this time to make a motion to change the section numbers of the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The section numbers have been changed, the Chair is advised by the clerk.

Mr. OVERTON. Section 105 will remain in the bill, and therefore all sections after section 105 will have to be renumbered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that the section numbers will remain as they originally were.

The amendments having been ordered to be engrossed, and the bill having been read the third time, the question is, shall the bill pass.

The bill (H. R. 2907) was passed.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. OVERTON, Mr. GLASS, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. GREEN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. WHITE conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF PERIOD OF OPERATIONS UNDER SECTION 409 OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3038) to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] whether he desires to make a preliminary statement with regard to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I do not desire to be heard at this time.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this bill represents a phase of transportation legislation which has received more or less attention from the Congress, beginning with the passage of what is known as the Transportation Act of 1940. In that act there was provision for an extensive overhauling of various phases of transportation. It was the first overhauling since 1920, when the Transportation Act of 1920 was enacted into law.

Mr. President, the one phase of transportation which was not adequately dealt with in the Transportation Act of 1940 was the handling of less-than-carload freight. For a long period of time that has been a definite inadequacy in our transportation system. The railroads of the country are the most efficient transportation agency for handling heavy traffic long distances known to the world, but when it somes to the handling of package freight as freight—not to be confused with express or parcel post—the railroads labor under a great disadvantage. Because of that fact there has come into existence a transportation agency known as freight forwarders. Their function is to collect from a large number of shippers, as large a number as they can find, packages and consolidate them into carloads lots, thereby obtaining to the extent which such freight can move by carload a very much lower rate than if it moves by individual package. Furthermore, they furnish a very much better and more expeditious service. As to those facts, as I have stated them, there is no controversy.

Now let me say, Mr. President, that the freight forwarders are not the only agency that consolidates package freight into carloads. They are the largest, but the country over there are cooperate organizations engaged in the same work. A few merchants or manufacturers or people engaged in the same kind of business form themselves into a nonprofit organization, consolidate their goods, and put them into carload lots. It is important to keep in mind both those facts, for there is an active controversy as to whether or not the freight forwarders, particularly the gigantic freight forwarders, can close out and put out of business other consolidators.

Mr. President, when the transportation act of 1940 was considered on the floor of the Senate there was an attempt made to deal, although inadequately, with less-than-carload freight. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], whom I was assisting in handling the bill later took up the question, a special study was made, and a bill which I prepared was introduced for the Senator from Montana and myself, which undertook to regulate freight forwarders and others in the handling of package business.

By that time the business had grown to a volume of about $200,000,000 a year in revenue. The freight forwarders were operating entirely without any regulation of any kind. The Interstate Commerce Commission conducted an investigation which was described in Interstate Commerce Commission Docket 27365. The Interstate Commerce Commission spent 2 years on the investigation and made a report in 1938.

In 1935 there was passed the Motor Carrier Act which brought motor carriers under regulation. In the investigation by the Interstate Commerce Commission to which I have referred it was discovered that the freight forwarders, who were held to be shippers not carriers, had been making joint rates with motor common carriers and motor contract

carriers. A shipper obviously cannot make a joint rate with a carrier, and the Interstate Commerce Commission found tariffs filed by the freight forwarders in conjunction with the contract and common motor carriers to be unlawful and ordered such tariffs to be stricken from its files.

Mr. President, that finding was made in 1938. In 1940 the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed the finding of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Senate bill 210, which was the result of our efforts to regulate the freight forwarders, passed the Senate in March 1941; it went to the House of Representatives, was amended there, came back to the Senate, and was finally passed by Congress and signed by the President on May 16, 1942.

That act made an important change in the practice of filing rates. The bill passed by the Congress recognized that fact, and allowed a period of 18 months for adjustment. Mr. President, please keep in mind that these tariffs had been found to be unlawful in 1938, and in 1940 the Supreme Court affirmed that finding. In 1942 Congress passed a law which undertook to regulate freight forwarders, but, in recognition of the disturbance that would be caused by the change from the practice of some years, we allowed in that act a period of 18 months in which the freight forwarders who were carrying on these unlawful operations could adjust their practices to the new law.

Mr. President, I handled that bill in the Senate; I was one of the conferees, and I thought at that time that the adjustment could easily be made in 6 months; that no one could reasonably ask for more than a year; but, as a compromise, the bill allowed 18 months. That 18 months expired in 1943, and the freight forwarders not only made no progress but made no effort to file lawful tariffs. They came forward and asked for another extension. Again there was a difference of opinion as to how much of an extension was necessary. Again the bulk of the testimony showed that 6 months would be ample. Yet we gave them an additional 18 months. That brings us up to this time.

Mr. President, I filed a minority report in 1943, as I am filing one in this case, and in that minority report of 1943 I wrote:

> They have made no effort and in all human probability they will not make an effort.

As we approach May 16, 1945, which is tomorrow—

> the Congress will probably be confronted with the present situation unless the statute is changed to meet the views of the freight forwarders. They have no intention of undertaking to comply with the present statute.

The reason why they will not do that is that $200,000,000 of revenue is collected by approximately 100 freight forwarders. Seventy percent of it is collected by three companies. They are big institutions. They have never made any effort to comply with this law. They have no intention of making an effort, as long as they can persuade the Congress to postpone the effective date.

The reason is that they want to put out of business the carload consolidators, operating on a nonprofit basis, or operating as part of a cooperative effort between shippers. This is a contest principally between the three great forwarding companies getting 70 percent of the $200,000,000 of revenue collected annually by the freight forwarders, and merchants or producers or manufacturers who get together and, in cooperation, make a carload out of their several shipments. There are a great many associations—I do not know how many—of these consolidators in this country operating on a nonprofit basis. The freight forwarders operate for profit.

Mr. President, if the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission had been untied, the Commission, I think would have cured this situation before this, and I shall have some criticism to make of the Commission later.

We froze this thing. We took all power out of the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission to correct the situation. We first said the freight forwarders should have 18 months in which to change their practice under the tariffs which had been declared unlawful in 1938. Then we extended that, by statue, and gave them 18 months more. Today, Mr. President, it has been 9 years since these unlawful rates were first filed. It has been 7 years since they were found by the Interstate Commerce Commission to be unlawful. It has been 5 years since the Supreme Court affirmed the findings of the Interstate Commerce Commission; but those unlawful practices are being followed today. The tariffs are still on file, protected by action of the Congress, although the freight forwarders have been given at least 7 years from the date of the Interstate Commerce Commission's finding, at least 5 years from the date of the Supreme Court decision affirming the findings of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to correct their unlawful practices; and 3 years from the date of the final passage of the bill.

Mr. President, I do not believe it will be possible to match that record of contined and condoned unlawfulness anywhere in our history.

When this matter came up 18 months ago I protested in the committee very much as I am protesting now on the floor of the Senate, and I made a minority report then, as I am making one now. We had a clear understanding in the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate—at least I though we did; the chairman agreed in the committee that there was such an understanding—that there would be no further extension granted, that the freight forwarders had had more than sufficient time to adjust their practice. So I am protesting in the interest of reasonable integrity in legislation, of reasonable conformance with the law, of reasonable regard for fair practice by these people who are subject to public regulation.

It is a little difficult to describe a more shameful situation. No legislative body that has permitted this, or would permit it, is entitled to take much credit to itself for careful and adequate legislation.

We granted permission to the Interstate Commerce Commission, in the first bill, to reduce the 18 months to a shorter period, if in its judgment the full 18 months were not necessary. We went into the war, and things were upset. It may be urged we are still in the war. While they disapprove of what the freight forwarders are doing, the War Department and the Office of Defense Transportation both are reluctant to have war conditions disturbed. I think their reasons are insufficient to justify the Congress in extending any further a period in which unlawful practices are carried on. I think there has been too much tolerance, too much patience shown, and I am quite sure that until they are required to do so, the freight forwarders have no intention of complying with the law as it now stands.

Mr. President, I wish to advert for a moment to another matter. I can say this with some confidence, because I supervised the writing of the bill which was passed regulating the freight forwarders. There was inserted a special provision for what is known as assembling merchandise and commodities from points beyond the break bulk point for distribution and beyond the assembling point for assembly. But we made those rates applicable to others than freight forwarders, and I want this language noted:

> These rates will be applicable to freight forwarders and others who employ or utilize the instrumentalities or services of such common carriers under like conditions.

Mr. President, that is a fundamental rule of public regulation of transportation agencies. A transportation agency has but one thing to sell, and that is transportation service. Obviously any system of fair regulation must require that anyone who buys transportation service shall receive such service at the same price at which anyone else can get it under the same conditions.

Eighteen months ago I wrote into my minority report that the freight forwarders were in the wrong forum. Instead of coming back to Congress and asking for a further extension when they had had adequate time, I said—and this appears on page 9 of the committee report, which also carries the minority views which I expressed:

> The proper place for the freight forwarders to test the application of the present statute is before the Interstate Commerce Commission. They have such a proceeding now under way in I. and S. Docket No. M-2180.

Since that time, Mr. President, that case has been decided. I called attention to it in my statement made in 1943. The case has now been decided. Please consider that, after all, the heart of this controversy lies between the huge freight forwarders and the car consolidators who load their own goods under cooperative effort on a nonprofit basis.

In the case to which I have just referred, decided last June, the Interstate Commerce Commission made the following finding touching this concrete point:

> The shippers and shippers' associations as described herein employ or utilize the instrumentalities or services of Transamerican—

That was the name of the motor carrier on whose tariffs this case was made—

or services of Transamerican in assembling operations under conditions like those under which forwarders employ or utilize the instrumentalities or services of the same carrier in their assembling operations.

The case was settled by the only tribunal in the United States which can make a finding and which can settle that point. That is the finding of the Interstate Commerce Commission made last June touching this point. That is the heart of the controversy.

I desire to read some excerpts from the letter sent by the Interstate Commerce Commission to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, dated April 16, in which the Commission discussed some of these statements to some extent. I shall not take time to read more than those touching the points I am discussing. Here is a controversy the heart of which is between huge freight forwarders and the smaller cooperative nonprofit car consolidators, both of which the Interstate Commerce Commission has found are operating under the same conditions and the same circumstances. On page 20 of the letter from the Interstate Commerce Commission to the Senator from Montana the Commission made this extraordinary reference:

The forwarder in its relation to a railroad apparently is a shipper, but a shipper of a particular kind.

The main reason for enacting the interstate commerce law back in 1887 was because we had too many particular kinds of big shippers. They were giving rebates and favors, and rates to some which were different from those to others. That was the primary reason why Congress passed the Interstate Commerce Act in the first place. If any Senators have any doubt on that point let me read further from the language of the letter from the Interstate Commerce Commission to the Senator from Montana. It proceeds on page 4 further to state:

It was to get away from the undue influence of large shippers in rate making that the act to regulate commerce was originally enacted, and it seems to us—

That is to the Commission—

that the underlying purpose of this bill—

They were discussing then Senate bill 797 introduced by the Senator from Montana, which is not here in issue, but which is related to this question—

that the underlying purpose of this bill would be contrary to the dominant scheme of the Interstate Commerce Act. We are convinced that the only way to eliminate undue preference of the large forwarder is to forbid all joint rates or agreements in whatever form as between forwarders and common carriers subject to the act.

Mr. President, I wish the Commission could always consistently hold to that view. If it would do so it would make the situation much easier. Those of us who have tried to maintain respect for the Commission during many years of contact, as I have, will continue to have such respect, and I will have much higher respect for the Commission than I have now.

Mr. President, I do not like to say this, but there is no Senator on this floor who has had more intimate contact with the Interstate Commerce Commission than I have had for 25 years. I have practiced before the Commission. But I must deplore the decay from that fine strong intelligence which the Commission used to exercise, and which appeared in all its early history. Unfortunately, to my regret, that condition does not apply now.

Mr. President, I think that is a clear summary of the case. I very much regret that the committee saw fit to extend this period. I repeat, it has been 7 years since the first finding of unlawfulness was made respecting this class of rates. It has been 5 years since the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed that finding made by the Interstate Commerce Commission. It has been 3 years—March 1942—since we passed the bill. We have never been able to get rid of these unlawful rates and unlawful practices to this day. The freight forwarders have the effrontery to come back to the Congress and ask for a further 9-months' extension. I do not think the extension ought to be granted. That is all that is contained in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I agree with the statement made by the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] with respect to the bill, that is I agree with his arguments and agree with his statements of fact, but I cannot agree with his conclusions. In stating the facts surrounding the necessity for this extension it seems to me the Senator has not given sufficient weight to the present war in which we are engaged and to the present condition of our transportation, and especially our railroad transportation. There can be no doubt in the mind of any student of transportation that during the next months our railroads face the greatest test of all time. The change that has occurred in the war, making necessary the accelerated movement of freight in the United States from the east to the west, has placed an all-time burden upon the railroads.

Col. J. Monroe Johnson, director of the Office of Defense Transportation, recently issued a statement as follows:

The next 12 to 15 months will be the most critical period in the history of American transportation.

* * * * *

All forms of transportation have for the past 3 years carried the heaviest freight and passenger burden in the country's history. They have been strained to the utmost.

That, of course, is no exaggeration. It is an understatement, if anything.

The Senate now has before it a bill to extend a method which has grown up in this country for handling certain kinds of freight. The Senator from Kansas has opposed granting to forwarders an extension of time in which to put their House in order. He opposed it when we granted the extension 18 months ago, and he is consistently opposing it now. He has stated his reason. As I have said, I agree with his arguments and his logic; but we are still in the war.

The bill now before the Senate would extend the status quo for a period of 9 months, which seems to me to be entirely reasonable. The Office of Defense Transportation has pointed out that unless this bill is enacted, a greater burden will be placed upon railroad transportation. Today railroad transportation has a burden almost beyond its ability to meet. So, of course, it would not be in the interest of the war effort to make a change at the present time, and place any greater burden upon the railroad transportation systems, which are so vital to the war effort.

I believe that the War Department, in one paragraph, summed up all the arguments that can be made for and against this bill. I wish to read that paragraph. This is from a statement by Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, dated May 5, 1945, and addressed to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. The particular paragraph to which I refer reads as follows:

The War Department is opposed to the continuance of a system of joint rates between freight forwarders and motor carriers.

In that statement the War Department is in complete accord with the statement of the Senator from Kansas, and, I might add, with the views of the Senator from Colorado. "The War Department is opposed to the continuance of a system of joint rates between freight forwarders and motor carriers." That is the argument which the Senator from Kansas has made. But the War Department statement continues, and the remainder of the paragraph supports my argument:

However, due to the large volume of traffic resulting from the prosecution of the war, the War Department is also opposed to any action which would interfere with or disrupt the operation of transportation facilities or agencies during the present emergency. Termination of joint rates between forwarders and motor carriers, at this time, in view of the limited publication of assembling and distribution rates by motor carriers, would, in all probability, interfere with the operations of freight forwarders to the detriment of the war effort.

That is my whole argument. There is nothing that I can add to the statement of Secretary of War Stimson on this subject.

I invite the attention of the Senate to this fact: The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] and Representative LEA introduced legislation to correct the unlawful aspects to which the Senator from Kansas has referred. The bill which the Senator from Montana introduced was referred to the Interstate Commerce Commission for its comment. When the report came back it was a divided report. Some of the Commissioners were opposed to Senate bill 797, and a minority favored the enactment of the bill. So it became apparent to the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee that hearings would have to be held on Senate bill 797. For that reason, as I understand, the Senator from Montana favors the extension of 9 months to give the Congress an opportunity to hold hearings on the whole question and decide upon a policy to cover the difficult question of

joint rates between rail and motor carriers.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MITCHELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. REED. I am sure the Senator from Colorado did not mean to say that the question of joint rates between rail and motor carriers was involved in this case. It is the question of joint rates between freight forwarders and motor carriers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. I misstated it to that extent. I should have said that the question related to joint rates between freight forwarders and motor carriers, rather than between rail and motor carriers. However, there is a dual handling of freight by the railroads and by the motor carriers. Unless Congress acts now and extends this time, in my opinion the result will be far more serious than the Senator from Kansas realizes. It will be disastrous. Because of the war, for the time being the bad practice which he points out should be continued until Congress has an opportunity to act.

I sincerely hope that the bill will be enacted into law and that 9 months will be given to adjust the difficult situation which the Senator from Kansas has pointed out.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, this question was discussed at great length before the Committee on Interstate Commerce. The Senator from Kansas insists on calling this an illegal rate. The difficulty is that it is not illegal, and that is his objection. The law which it is sought to continue makes the rate legal. If the pending bill were not enacted into law, tomorrow—if that is the day when the law expires—the rate would be illegal.

The question was discussed and argued, and the Senator from Kansas addressed the Committee on Interstate Commerce, making the same arguments which he has made here today. After that discussion the committee, which had a large attendance, voted, with one exception, unanimously in favor of the extension of time.

The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], stated that there would be a discussion of this matter, and that the whole question would be threshed out in the Committee on Interstate Commerce during the 9 months. The Senator from Kansas reminded the chairman that there had been some kind of agreement heretofore that there would be no extension after tomorrow, or whatever the date is when the law expires. The chairman admitted that there had been such a statement by him; but he said that such a condition had arisen that there must be an extension, or that great confusion in rates would result.

As I understand the situation, the freight forwarder, no matter what criticism there may be as to the legality of his position, has done a great deal of good. There is a demand on the part of thousands of people for the continuance of his work.

The Senator from Kansas insists that there are others who should be in a position equally as good, but who have not been recognized as having the same rights as the forwarders, and that that is one of the things which should be threshed out and should be covered by legislation. As the Senator from Colorado has said, I hope this extension may be granted, and I have full faith that the Interstate Commerce Committee will thresh out the matter before the time of the extension expires.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I would not want this discussion or debate to close on the statement made by the Senator from Delaware. The Senator from Delaware is not very familiar with the legal terms used in connection with rates for transportation. I did not say at any time that these rates were illegal. I said they were unlawful. There is quite a difference. These rates were found to be unlawful in 1938. In 1940 the Supreme Court confirmed that finding of the Interstate Commerce Commission. They are legal rates. They are the only rates that can be collected so long as the Congress freezes this situation. But they are unlawful. At no place is there to be found any authority, judicial or quasi judicial, to support the position of the Senator from Delaware, as I understand it.

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

Mr. REED. In just a moment I will yield the floor.

Mr. President, I struggled with this question for a long time. Those of us who have seen this thing go ahead and who have seen it permitted to go ahead with complacency on the part of the Congress have become rather discouraged about it. The situation is unlawful. It is not a credit to anyone. It is a discredit to everyone who has anything to do with it.

There was an understanding, which I had 18 months ago, that there would be no further extension. Always heretofore, the protesting parties have been granted a hearing. I discussed that matter with the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee. I urged him to give them a hearing. Numbers of them had complained to me and to him, and I transmitted to him the complaints I received, and I urged him that they should have a hearing. But a hearing was not had.

I wish to say to the Senator from Colorado that I do not think the transportation situation would be seriously affected by whatever may be done in this case. I do not share Colonel Johnson's fears that the railroads would be overburdened or that there would be any great confusion if these rates were stopped now and if no further extension were granted.

What I think would happen, although I cannot be certain about it, is that the freight forwarders would cancel the present tariffs, and then the motor carriers would publish these assembling and distributing rates, once they definitely understood that the Congress was not going to tolerate this situation any longer.

That is what I wish to say to the Senator from Colorado. If a hearing had been granted, an effort would have been made to develop some of the facts and circumstances upon which one could form a judgment. There being no hearing, there has been no possibility to develop such facts and circumstances.

I will now yield the floor; or, if the Senator from Delaware wishes to ask me a question, I will yield to him, if he desires to have that done.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. The Senator from Kansas has said that I am not familiar with some of these terms. I think I shall plead guilty to that, and I hope I shall never be quite so familiar with them that I will attempt to draw the distinction which he has drawn. According to what the Senator from Kansas has said, certain rates which are being charged are legal, but unlawful. There are dictionaries, and I think we can find several authors who consider those terms synonymous in many instances, and I think they are in this case, notwithstanding what the Senator from Kansas has said.

I notice that there was the same disagreement in the Committee on Interstate Commerce between the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Montana. I do not think the Senator from Kansas has said that the chairman of the committee was unfamiliar either with the railroad rates or railroad language or railroad practice. At any rate, he did not say so, although they themselves disagreed fully. The Senator from Montana finally told the Senator from Kansas that he—the Senator from Kansas—had an idea that he knew more about these rates than anyone else did. I think probably that is a part of the difficulty at this time.

At any rate, the Senator from Kansas was unable to convince any of the large number of members of the committee who were present—both Republicans and Democrats—that he was correct; and when the vote was taken, there was only one vote in the negative, and it came from the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the ignorance of the Senator from Delaware is more profound than I thought it was. If he will inquire of any authority on the subject, from the Interstate Commerce Commission to the Supreme Court, or if he will refer to any textbook, he will find that there is a very clear distinction—and this is a primary lesson in transportation law—between an illegal rate and an unlawful rate. The carrier cannot collect and the shipper cannot pay any rate except the rate which is published in the tariff, which is the legal rate, but that same rate may have been, and has been found hundreds and thousands of times to be, unlawful.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, the great difference between the Senator from Kansas and myself is that he thinks he knows, but I do not think he does. That is a very clear distinction. I find that all the other opinions agree with my opinion. So I am satisfied to leave the matter on the basis of the vote which was had in the committee—in other words, approximately 10 or 12 to 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the

question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 3038) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President pro tempore be authorized to sign the bill just passed, while the Senate is in recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Subsequently,

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 3038) to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

SALARIES AND WAGES OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, earlier in the day the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] requested that Senate bill 807 be made the unfinished business for Thursday. That was not done at that time, because of pending matters which now have been disposed of.

With the understanding that the Senate will take a recess until Thursday, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 807 be made the unfinished business.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, in order that the bill may be identified for the benefit of the Members of the Senate, some of whom are now present and some of whom are not present at this time, will the Senator indicate what the bill is?

Mr. BARKLEY. The title of the bill is to improve salary and wage administration in the Federal service; to provide pay for overtime and for night and holiday work; to amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHITE. It is the bill which has been reported by the Committee on Civil Service, is it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; the bill has been reported by the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 807, which is Calendar No. 262. By a misprint of the calendar the bill is shown to be Senate bill 909, but its correct number is 807. It is not my purpose to discuss the bill today, but to ask the Senate to recess until Thursday, at which time we will take it up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Civil Service with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I—COMPENSATION FOR OVERTIME, NIGHT, AND HOLIDAY WORK

COVERAGE

SEC. 101. The provisions of this title shall, except as provided in section 401, apply to (a) all civilian officers and employees in or under the executive branch of the United States Government, including Government owned or controlled corporations; (b) all civilian employees of the Library of Congress, the Botanic Garden, or the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, except those covered by section 202 (c); and (c) those employees of the District of Columbia municipal government who occupy positions subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

OVERTIME PAY

SEC. 102. Officers and employees to whom this title applies shall be compensated for all hours of employment, officially ordered or approved, in excess of 40 hours in any administrative workweek, at one and one-half times their basic rate of compensation: *Provided*, That in determining the overtime compensation of per annum officers and employees the pay for 1 hour shall be considered to be one two-thousand-eight-hundred-and-eightieth of their respective per annum salaries: *And provided further*, That such overtime shall be paid only on such portion of an officer's or employee's basic rate of compensation as is not in excess of a rate of $2,900 per annum.

COMPENSATORY TIME OFF FOR IRREGULAR OR OCCASIONAL OVERTIME WORK

SEC. 103. (a) The heads of departments, establishments, and agencies may by regulation provide for the granting of compensatory time off from duty in lieu of overtime compensation for irregular or occasional duty in excess of 48 hours in any regularly scheduled administrative workweek to those per annum employees requesting such compensatory time off from duty.

(b) The Architect of the Capitol may, in his discretion, grant per annum employees compensatory time off from duty in lieu of overtime compensation for any work in excess of 40 hours in any regularly scheduled administrative workweek.

NIGHT PAY DIFFERENTIAL

SEC. 104. Any officer or employee to whom this title applies who is assigned to a regularly scheduled tour of duty, any part of which falls between the hours of 6 o'clock postmeridian and 6 o'clock antemeridian, shall, for duty between such hours, excluding periods when he is in a leave status, be paid compensation at a rate 10 percent in excess of his basic rate of compensation for duty between other hours: *Provided*, That such differential for night duty shall not be included in computing any overtime compensation to which the officer or employee may be entitled: *And provided further*, That this section shall not operate to modify the provisions of the act of July 1, 1944 (Public Law No. 394, 78th Cong.), or any other law authorizing additional compensation for night work.

PAY FOR HOLIDAY WORK

SEC. 105. Officers and employees to whom this title applies who are assigned to duty on a holiday established by Federal statute or Executive order shall be compensated for such duty, excluding periods when they are in leave status, in lieu of their regular pay for that day, at the rate of one and one-half times the regular basic rate of compensation: *Provided*, That extra holiday compensation paid under this section shall not serve to reduce the amount of overtime compensation to which the employee may be entitled under this or any other act during the administrative work-week in which the holiday occurs, but such extra holiday compensation shall not be considered to be a part of the basic compensation for the purpose of computing such overtime compensation: *And provided further*, That this section shall take effect upon the termination of the present war or such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate.

TITLE II—EMPLOYEES OF LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES OF THE GOVERNMENT

COVERAGE

SEC. 201. The provisions of this title shall, except as provided in section 401, apply to officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose compensation is not fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to those employees in or under the legislative branch of the Government not provided for under the provisions of title I, and to the official reporters of proceedings and debates of the Senate and their employees.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION

SEC. 202. (a) During the period beginning on July 1, 1945, and ending on June 30, 1947, officers and employees to whom this title applies shall, except as provided in subsections (b), (c), and (d), be paid additional compensation at the rate of (1) $360 per annum if their earned basic compensation is at a rate of not more than $1,565 per annum, or (2) 23 percent of so much of their earned basic compensation as does not exceed a rate of $2,900 per annum, if their earned basis compensation is at a rate in excess of $1,565 per annum.

(b) Officers and employees to whom this title applies and whose hours of duty are less than full time, or whose compensation is based upon other than a time-period basis shall be paid, in lieu of additional compensation under subsection (a), additional compensation at a rate of 23 percent of so much of their earned basic compensation as does not exceed a rate of $2,900 per annum.

(c) In lieu of overtime pay under title I, per annum employees under the Office of the Architect of the Capitol who are not compensated in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and intermittent elevator operators under such Office who are paid at hourly rates, shall be paid additional compensation in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(d) In no case shall any officer or employee be paid additional compensation under this section for any pay period amounting to more than 25 percent (or, in the case of employees of the Senate restaurant whose hours of duty are less than full time, more than 15 percent) of his earned basic compensation for such pay period.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1923, AS AMENDED

COVERAGE

SEC. 301. The provisions of this title shall apply to all officers and employees in or under the United States Government, including Government-owned or controlled corporations, or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, who occupy positions subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

ESTABLISHMENT OF RATES FOR CLASSES OF POSITIONS WITHIN GRADES

SEC. 302. Section 3 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is further amended by inserting at the end of such section a paragraph reading as follows:

"In subdividing any grade into classes of positions, as provided in the foregoing paragraph, the Civil Service Commission, whenever it deems such action warranted by the nature of the duties and responsibilities of a class of positions in comparison with other classes in the same grade, and in the interests of good administration, is authorized to establish for any such subdivision or class a minimum rate, which shall be one of the pay rates, but not in excess of the middle rate, of that grade as set forth in section 13 of this act, as amended. Whenever the Commission shall find that within the same Government organization and at the same location gross inequities exist between basic per annum rates of pay fixed for any class

of positions under this act and the compensation of employees whose basic rates of pay are fixed by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose, the Commission is hereby empowered, in order to correct or reduce such inequities, to establish as the minimum rate of pay for such class of positions any rate not in excess of the middle rate within the range of pay fixed by this act for the grade to which such class of positions is allocated. For the purposes of this section the fourth rate of a six-rate grade shall be considered to be the middle rate of that grade. Minimum rates established under this section shall be duly published by regulation and may be revised from time to time by the Commission. The Commission shall make a report of such actions or revisions with the reasons therefor to Congress at the end of each fiscal year."

PERIODIC WITHIN-GRADE SALARY ADVANCEMENTS

SEC. 303 Subsection (b) of section 7 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is hereby further amended by substituting "twelve" for "eighteen", "eighteen" for "thirty", and "month" for "quarter"; by substituting "less than $200" for "$60 or $100", and "$200 or more" for "$200 or $250"; by striking out paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) That an employee shall not be advanced unless his current efficiency is good or better than good.";

and by renumbering paragraph (4) as paragraph "(3)".

REWARDS FOR SUPERIOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS; AUTHORIZATION AND LIMITATIONS

SEC. 304. Subsection (f) of section 7 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(f) Within the limit of available appropriations, as a reward for superior accomplishment, under standards to be promulgated by the Civil Service Commission, and subject to prior approval by the Civil Service Commission, or delegation of authority as provided in subsection (g), the head of any department or agency is authorized to make additional within-grade compensation advancements, but any such additional advancements shall not exceed one step and no employee shall be eligible for more than one additional advancement hereunder within each of the time periods specified in subsection (b). All actions under this subsection and the reasons therefor, shall be reported to the Civil Service Commission. The Commission shall present an annual consolidated report to the Congress covering the numbers and types of actions taken under this subsection."

REWARDS FOR SUPERIOR ACCOMPLISHMENT; RESPONSIBILITY OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

SEC. 305. Subsection (g) of section 7 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(g) The Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized to issue such regulations as may be necessary for the administration of this section. In such regulations the Commission is hereby empowered, in its discretion, to delegate to the head of any department or agency, or his designated representative, the authority to approve additional within-grade compensation advancements provided for in subsection (f), without prior approval in individual cases by the Commission, and to withdraw or suspend such authority from time to time, whenever post-audit of such actions by the Commission indicates that standards promulgated by the Commission have not been observed."

INCREASE IN BASIC RATES OF COMPENSATION

SEC. 306. (a) Each of the existing rates of basic compensation set forth in section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except those affected by subsection (b) of this section, is hereby increased by 20 percent of that part thereof which is not in excess of $1,200 per annum, plus 10 percent of that part thereof which is in excess of $1,200 per annum but not in excess of $4,600 per annum, plus 5 percent of that part thereof which is in excess of $4,600 per annum. Such augmented rates shall be considered to be the regular basic rates of compensation provided by such section.

(b) (1) The proviso to the fifth paragraph under the heading "Crafts, protective, and custodial service" in section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That charwomen working part time be paid at the rate of 78 cents an hour, and head charwomen at the rate of 83 cents an hour."

(2) Such section is amended so as to provide the following rates of compensation for positions in the clerical-mechanical service:

Grade 1, 78 to 85 cents an hour.
Grade 2, 91 to 98 cents an hour.
Grade 3, $1.05 to $1.11 an hour.
Grade 4, $1.18 to $1.31 an hour.

(c) The increase in existing rates of basic compensation provided by this section shall not be construed to be an "equivalent increase" in compensation within the meaning of section 7 (b) (1) of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

GENERAL EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 401. (a) The provisions of this act shall not apply to elected officials, judges, or heads of departments, independent establishments, and agencies. As used in this subsection the term "elected officials" shall not include officers elected by the Senate or House of Representatives who are not members of either body.

(b) The provisions of this act, except the provisions of section 406, shall not apply to (1) officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; (2) employees whose basic compensation is fixed and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose; (3) employees outside the continental limits of the United States, including Alaska, who are paid in accordance with local native prevailing wage rates for the area in which employed; (4) officers and employees of the Inland Waterways Corporation; (5) individuals to whom the provisions of section 1 (a) of the act of March 24, 1943 (Public Law No. 17, 78th Cong.), are applicable; and (6) employees of the Transportation Corps of the Army of the United States on vessels operated by the United States, and vessel employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and such employees may be compensated in accordance with the wage practices of the maritime industry.

EFFECT ON EXISTING LAWS AFFECTING CERTAIN INSPECTIONAL GROUPS

SEC. 402. The provisions of this act shall not operate to prevent payment for overtime services or extra pay for Sunday or holiday work in accordance with any of the following statutes: Act of February 13, 1911, as amended (U. S. C., title 19, secs. 261 and 267); act of July 24, 1919 (U. S. C., title 7, sec. 394); act of June 17, 1930, as amended (U. S. C., title 19, secs. 1450, 1451, and 1452); act of March 2, 1931 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 109a and 109b); act of May 27, 1936, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 382b); act of March 23, 1941 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 47, sec. 154 (f) (2)); act of June 3, 1944 (Public Law No. 328, 78th Cong.): *Provided*, That the overtime, Sunday, or holiday services covered by such payment shall not also form a basis for overtime or extra pay under title I of this act.

INCREASE IN BASIC RATES FOR CUSTOMS EMPLOYEES

SEC. 403. The existing basic rates of pay set forth in the act entitled "An act to adjust the compensation of certain employees in the Customs Service," approved May 29, 1928, as amended, and those set forth in the second paragraph of section 24 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, are hereby increased in the same amount as corresponding rates for positions subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, would be increased under the provisions of section 306 of this act; and each such augmented rate shall be considered to be the regular basic rate of compensation.

ESTABLISHMENT OF BASIC WORKWEEK

SEC. 404. It shall be the duty of the heads of the several executive departments, independent establishments, and agencies, including Government-owned or Government-controlled corporations, and the municipal government of the District of Columbia, to establish for all full-time employees in their respective organizations, in the departmental and the field services, a basic administrative workweek of 40 hours, and to require that the hours of work in such workweek be performed within a period of not more than 6 of any 7 consecutive days. The provisions of the Saturday half-holiday law of March 3, 1931 (46 Stat. 1482; U. S. C., title 5, sec. 26 (a)) shall not be applicable to employees in such organizations. The provisions of so much of section 5 of the act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes, as amended (30 Stat. 316; U. S. C., title 5, sec. 29), as precedes the second proviso in such section is hereby repealed.

REGULATIONS

SEC 405. The Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized to issue such regulations as may be necessary for the administration of the foregoing provisions of this act, subject to the approval of the President, insofar as this act affects employees in or under the executive branch of the Government.

PERSONNEL CEILINGS

SEC. 406 (a) It is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that in the interest of economy and efficiency the heads of departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government shall terminate the employment of such of the employees thereof as are not required for the proper and efficient performance of the functions of their respective departments and agencies.

(b) The heads of departments and agencies in the executive branch shall present to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget such information as the Director shall from time to time, but at least quarterly, require for the purpose of determining the numbers of full-time civilian employees and the man-months of part-time civilian employment (other than full-time employees of, and part-time employment by, the War and Navy Departments in the Territories and possesseions) required within the United States for the proper and efficient performance of the authorized functions of their respective departments and agencies. The Director shall, within 60 days after the date of enactment of this act and from time to time, but at least quarterly, thereafter, determine the numbers of employees and man-months of employment so required, and any personnel or employment in such department or agency in excess thereof shall be released or terminated at such times as the Director shall order. Such determinations, and any numbers of employees or man-months of employment paid in violation of the orders of the Director, shall be reported quarterly to the Congress. Each such report shall include a statement showing for each department and agency the net increase or decrease in such employees and employment as compared with the corresponding data contained in the next preceding report, together with any suggestions the Director may have for legislation which would

bring about economy and efficiency in the use of Government personnel.

(c) Determinations by the Director of numbers of employees and man-months of employment required shall be by such appropriation units or organization units as he may deem appropriate.

(d) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall maintain a continuous study of all appropriations and contract authorizations in relation to personnel employed and shall, under such policies as the President may prescribe, reserve from expenditure any savings in salaries, wages, or other categories of expense which he determines to be possible as a result of reduced personnel requirements. Such reserves may be released by the Director for expenditure only upon a satisfactory showing of necessity.

(e) As used in this section—

(1) the term "United States" shall include the Territories and possessions;

(2) the term "full-time civilian employees" shall include full-time intermittent (when actually employed), $1 per year, without compensation, and casual workers, as defined by the Civil Service Commission; and

(3) the term "part-time civilian employment" shall include part-time employment by intermittent (when actually employed), $1 per year, without compensation, and casual workers, as defined by the Civil Service Commission.

APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZED

SEC. 407. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 408. Amounts payable under the provisions of this act, other than as an increase in the basic rates under title III or under section 403, shall not be considered in determining the amount of a person's annual income or annual rate of compensation for the purposes of paragraph II (a) of part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, or section 212 of title II of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1932, as amended.

REPEAL OF CONFLICTING PROVISIONS OF EXISTING LAW

SEC. 409. All laws or parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 410. This act shall take effect on July 1, 1945.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Vice Admiral Richmond K. Turner, United States Navy, to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Maury Maverick, of Texas, to be a member of the Smaller War Plants Corporation;

Patrick W. McDonough, of California, to be a member of the Smaller War Plants Corporation;

James T. Howington, of Kentucky, to be a member of the Smaller War Plants Corporation;

Lawrence F. Arnold, of Illinois, to be a member of the Smaller War Plants Corporation; and

C. Edward Rowe, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

David E. Lilienthal, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the term expiring 9 years after May 18, 1945 (reappointment).

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

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Several officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States; and

Sundry cadets of the United States Military Academy, for appointment as second lieutenants in the Regular Army of the United States.

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

Harold H. Young, of Texas, to be Solicitor of the Department of Commerce.

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

POSTMASTER AT HOPKINS, MINN.—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas J. Kosanda, to be postmaster at Hopkins, Minn.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is not present in the Chamber. I have endeavored to reach him by telephone at his office. I ask that the nomination be temporarily passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be temporarily passed over.

The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph J. Lawler to be Third Assistant Postmaster General.

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

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Donnell Gilliam to be United States district judge for the eastern district of North Carolina.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Tobias E. Diamond to be United States attorney for the northern district of Iowa.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jones Floyd to be United States marshal for the western district of Arkansas.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

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

With the exception of the nomination passed over, that completes the calendar.

POSTMASTER AT HOPKINS, MINN.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask to recur to the nomination passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination passed over.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas J. Kosanda, to be postmaster at Hopkins, Minn.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I discussed this subject in the Senate a week ago Monday, and I shall merely review very briefly what I stated at that time.

The Post Office Department has submitted the name of Thomas J. Kosanda to be postmaster at Hopkins, Minn. It did so after certification by the Civil Service Commission that Kosanda was entitled to veteran's preference. As a result of the civil-service examination held for the post, three persons were certified, namely, Roy M. Kelly, with a grade of 91.8; Einar Jorgenson, with a grade of 84.6; and Thomas J. Kosanda, whose name is before the Senate, with a grade of 75.8. Five percent was added to the score of each of these men for veteran's preference.

Kosanda is acting postmaster at the present time, and has been for approximately a year. Kelly has been employed in the post office at Hopkins for 18 years, and for the past several years he has been assistant postmaster.

As Senators know, there is a requirement that no eligible veteran may be passed over and a nonveteran appointed without giving the reasons in writing for so doing. Therefore, Kosanda could not have been appointed in this case except with the certification of the Civil Service Commission that he was entitled to veteran's preference.

The facts are that Kelly spent 13 months overseas in the First World War, that Kosanda reported for induction on November 11, 1918, and, according to the information which has been given to me, was discharged on December 10, 1918, without ever having been sworn into the Army.

The Senator from California informed me today that he had asked for a report in this case, both from the Army and from the Civil Service Commission. The Army informed him that they had paid Kosanda $1, that he had been discharged on the same day as that on which he reported for induction, and was never actually sworn into the armed forces of the United States. Therefore, in the opinion of the Army he was not entitled to veterans' preference. On checking that information with the Civil Service Commission, after investigation they stated that they had informally informed the Senator from California that they were withdrawing the certification of Kosanda as being entitled to veterans' preference.

I believe it is the clear intent of Congress that only veterans who have served on active duty in the armed forces of the United States during a war are entitled to veterans' preference. I think the certification of Kosanda as being entitled to veterans' preference was clearly a mistake, and a violation of the clear intent of Congress.

In view of the statement made to me this morning by the Senator from California that the Civil Service Commission was withdrawing its certification of Kosanda, I suggest to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads [Mr. McKELLAR] that the nomination of Kosanda be recommitted to the committee for a thorough check-up on the facts.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this nomination was made by the Post Office Department following a report of the Civil Service Commission that both of the gentlemen involved are veterans. It seems that Mr. Kosanda has been acting as postmaster at Hopkins, Minn., for a long time. I believe Mr. Kelly was employed in the office, also, but Mr. Kosanda has been employed there longer than has Mr. Kelly.

The Democratic authorities in that State recommended the appointment of Mr. Kosanda. They wanted him to be appointed. The Post Office Department wanted him appointed. There is nothing against his character, ability, standing, or efficiency in any respect whatsoever.

The other man, Mr. Kelly, is not before the Senate so far as a nomination is concerned. His name was placed on the eligible list, but there is no reason in the world why the Senate should not confirm the nomination of Mr. Kosanda. Both men were certified by the Civil Service Commission as being war veterans.

This subject was all threshed out in the committee, and I see no reason for further holding up the confirmation of the nomination. I assume that the controversy is merely a political one. I do not know what the politics of these men may be; but I understand that those who are in position to be correctly informed have stated that Mr. Kosanda has the backing of the Democratic organization in the locality in which the post office is located. For that reason I do not see why the nomination should not be confirmed.

I served on the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads when the Republicans were in charge, and I do not recall ever having suggested that a Democrat be appointed when a Republican had been nominated. I may have done so, but I doubt it.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I may say that I do not know either of these individuals. Mr. Kelly or Mr. Kosanda. My attention was called to this case by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, who protested very vigorously against what they regarded as a gross disregard of the veterans' preference law, and on investigation I was convinced that it was a gross violation of the intent of Congress that veterans who served on active duty should be given preference, and that an individual who reported for induction on November 11, 1918, and discharged on December 11, 1918, and was never sworn into the armed forces certainly was not entitled to that preference. On that basis, I believe the committee should go into this situation, because a hundred thousand veterans a month, most of whom have seen actual combat duty, are being discharged from the armed forces, and if the law passed by Congress saying that they are entitled to preference is not to mean anything, I think we should find it out right now.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator permit me to ask a question?

Mr. BALL. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am wondering to what extent the Senate would feel justified in going beyond the records of the Civil Service Commission and the War Department in determining whether a man is a veteran. Under the law there is no distinction made between a veteran who saw active service and one who did not.

Mr. BALL. Oh, yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I mean, there is no distinction between overseas veterans, except there may be one of percentage in the grading of the papers. If they are certified as veterans, under the law which has been in force for a long time, such certification is taken from the records of the War Department. I do not know where else it would be gotten. That raises a question. A nomination comes to the Senate. Ordinarily, unless there is something against the nominee by way of character disqualification or other disqualification, the qualifications of other possible nominees whose names might have been sent in are not usually regarded as a reason for denying confirmation to the man nominated. I myself am somewhat bothered about how far behind the War Department records we should go in determining whether a man is actually a veteran, and whether he has been properly certified to the Commission, and by the Commission to the Senate, as having been a veteran of some war.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee will yield, the law passed in the Seventy-eighth Congress, Public Law 359, very clearly states that only those ex-service men and women who have served on active duty in any branch of the armed forces are entitled to preference. As I understand, the Army record shows that this man was never sworn into the armed forces. That was the basis of the protest I received.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this is a matter which I know has been back to the committee once, and perhaps twice. I am sure it has been back once. Will the Senator say whether or not it has been back twice?

Mr. BALL. This is the first time it has been before the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was before the Senate on a previous occasion, and the Senator asked that it be held up, and we have had it before the committee time and time again. After a very careful consideration the last time, the report the Senator has heard of did not materialize. It was found that the Civil Service Commission had certified this man after the War Department had certified him to the Civil Service Commission. I have no objection to the nomination going back to the committee for further examination. Hopkins must be an extremely important town. I did not know it was so important; but we have spent not only hours but days trying to determine whether Mr. Kelly or Mr. Kosanda should be postmaster. I am perfectly willing to spend more time on it. I am merely wondering whether the Senator could ascertain why this matter is so exceedingly important that it should take so much of the time of the committee and of the Senate. It has come up a dozen times and gone over for purposes of examination. I am perfectly willing it should go back to the committee, if the Senator so desires.

Mr. BALL. The committee never had a meeting on this nomination. I held it up in committee, and then I agreed with the chairman that at his request, we would let it go to the Senate, and I would present my case here. There was never a meeting of the committee on this nomination, as I understand.

Mr. McKELLAR. How long has it been before the Senate? It has been before the Senate quite a number of times.

Mr. BALL. It came up a week ago Monday. It was put over at the request of the Senator from California, and not on the request of the Senator from Minnesota. I have no objection to its being acted on at this moment. I move that the nomination be recommitted to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. If the chairman wants to take the nomination back to the committee, I should like to have the facts from the Army and the Civil Service Commission, particularly in view of the statement of the Senator from California to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator let us settle it once and for all, within a reasonable time, and not hold up the Senate and the committee? I am perfectly willing to take it back to the committee; I have no objection in the world to doing so; but I hope the Senator will ascertain whether the Civil Service Commission is falsely certifying a nomination to us, or whether the Army is doing it. If either one is doing it, I hope the Senator will find it out and make his proof, and we shall be glad to consider it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is recommitted to the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to be transacted, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, May 17, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 15 (legislative day of April 16), 1945:

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY

Vice Admiral Richmond K. Turner, United States Navy, to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 15 (legislative day of April 16), 1945:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Joseph J. Lawler, to be Third Assistant Postmaster General.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Donnell Gilliam, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of North Carolina.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Tobias E. Diamond, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Iowa.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Jones Floyd, to be United States marshal for the western district of Arkansas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 15, 1945

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

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, in this moment of worship we would reverently lift our hearts in gratitude and gladness for Thy gift of life, Thy protection, Thy guiding hand, and the many tokens of Thy love.

Thou hast revealed Thyself as the Way, but we humbly confess that we have turned aside from those paths which Thou hast marked out for us. May we be more eager to hear and heed Thy voice, saying, "This is the way, walk ye therein," for Thy ways are ways of pleasantness and Thy paths are paths of peace.

Thou art the Truth, but we penitently acknowledge that we have taken counsel with our own wisdom and have become confused and confounded. We pray that we may now be inspired with such a love to seek Thy truth that we shall come to know the truth of Thy love.

Grant that in all the duties and tasks of this new day we may have the assurance of Thy presence, the fullness of Thy power, and the benediction of Thy peace.

We offer our prayer through the merits and mediation of the Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2992. An act to extend the provisions of the act of July 11, 1941 (Public Law 163, 77th Cong.).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 89. An act to provide for the planning of rural electrification projects, to reestablish the Rural Electrification Administration as an independent agency of the Government, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committe on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Commerce.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Department of the Treasury.
4. Department of War.
5. Administrative Office of United States Courts.
6. Office of Scientific Research and Development.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2603) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary, and the Federal Loan Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 40 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of War.
4. Office of Defense Transportation.
5. Office of Price Administration.
6. War Manpower Commission.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] may have permission to address the House for 1 hour today before disposition of the legislative business on the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

TRANSPORTATION HOME OF PERSONS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the House Committee on Military Affairs on House Resolution 249.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are directed to transmit to the House of Representatives within 2 days after the adoption of this resolution copies of all plans of the Department of War and of the Department of the Navy, respectively, for providing transportation home to persons in the armed forces returning to the United States on furlough after victory in Europe.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Kentucky withhold his motion pending the parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, a resolution of this type has to come before the House within 7 legislative days either with a motion to lay it on the table or with a favorable report. May I ask the gentleman from Kentucky if he can throw a little light on the information which I asked for?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the information sought by the resolution has been made public by the War and Navy Departments. It has likewise been printed in special reports by the House Committee on Military Affairs, and is available to all Members of the House. We anticipate printing a large number of those reports setting forth what is known as the plan for discharging personnel from the Army, known as the point system. That is in print now and will be available to the House generally.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I shall not ask for a vote on this motion. If I thought I had the votes to put it through, I would ask for it, however. But I fear, in view of the forces of reaction obviously alined against me, I would be entering into a David and Goliath battle. May I ask the gentleman from Kentucky if there is any specific place in the report which deals with furlough transportation as covered by the question in the resolution?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAY. I decline to yield further, Mr. Speaker, for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That, I presume, is reserved for the Chair to decide. I will say this, if I may, Mr. Speaker, before the motion is finally put to a voice vote. I believe that there should be more publicity given this particular resolution and more opportunity to debate it. The Committee on Military Affairs is dodging the issue by not allowing it to come out and having a free discussion on it. Of course, nothing I can say will change the obstinacy of those who persist to ignore the importance of giving our soldiers a break. But I warn the House there will be a day of reckoning. I have already plenty of evidence from returning servicemen that Congress is being blamed rightly or wrongly for not doing right by our boys. This resolution will at least show the Army that our hearts are friendly toward our fighting men.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, may I say that on the question of publicity on the matter, the gentleman from New York has during the past 2 years given a great deal of publicity to it. He has spoken on the subject on many occasions and yet he seems wanting information.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Three years.

Mr. MAY. We have already made a report to the House on it. In addition to that we have printed all the facts, including the operation of the system. I insist upon my motion, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] is recognized for 1 hour.

GERMAN ATROCITIES

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, the committee appointed by you to serve with a like committee from the Senate to investigate the war atrocity camps in Germany herewith submits its report. The report is unanimous and signed by all members of the joint committee. Our special mission was to ascertain the facts and the report is therefore confined to that field. Later in the day, or within the next day or two, when the members of the committee can obtain the floor we will make other observations regarding our interesting trip and also yield for questions. I know there are many things about which you feel deep concern. You will want to know about the attitude of the German people, the treatment accorded American prisoners, the punishment of war criminals and the procedure to be employed. We were in Europe at an exciting and historic time. We visited France, Germany, Belgium, and England. We were there when the Germans surrendered, although the official proclamation was not issued until the night we left Paris for home. We visited General Eisenhower and also most of our high commanders at their respective headquarters at or near the front. We talked with hundreds of G. I.'s, saw many of our boys who had been prisoners and visited our sick and wounded in several hospitals. We were proud of all our men and women in the armed forces, and rejoiced that we are American citizens. Many of the details of our trip we hope to give you at an early date. I request, however, that I not be asked to yield during the reading of the report.

REPORT TO THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE REPRESENTING THE TWO HOUSES NAMED TO INVESTIGATE ATROCITIES AND OTHER CONDITIONS IN CONCENTRATION CAMPS IN GERMANY, AS REQUESTED BY GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER THROUGH THE CHIEF OF STAFF, GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

Before relating the conditions found by the joint committee which recently visited Germany to investigate atrocities in concentration camps in that country, the committee desires to inform the Senate and House of Representatives the basis upon which the investigation was undertaken and the procedure by which members representing the two Houses were designated.

The trip to Europe was wholly unexpected on the part of all those who made it. It was a mission undertaken with a view to the possible performance of a service to the Congress, to the American people, and to the cause of peace.

On April 20, at about noon, two representatives from the Office of the Chief of Staff called upon the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the Senate, and laid before them a cablegram received by Gen. George C. Marshall from Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Commander in Chief of the Allied forces in the European theater of the war, which cablegram was as follows:

From: General Eisenhower.
To: General Marshall.

We are constantly finding German camps in which they have placed political prisoners where unspeakable conditions exist. From my own personal observation I can state unequivocally that all written statements up to now do not paint the full horrors.

In view of these facts you may think it advisable to invite about 12 congressional leaders and 12 leading editors to see these camps. If so I shall be glad to take these groups to one of these camps. Such a visit will show them without any trace of doubt the full evidence of the cruelty practiced by the Nazis in such places as normal procedure.

A similar invitation is being sent to similar representative British groups.

General Marshall requested these representatives to contact both Houses, in the manner above mentioned, for the purpose of arranging the designation of their respective Members to make this investigation with all the promptness possible.

In order that they might arrive at the scene of the atrocities, which General Eisenhower desired the committee to view in person as soon as possible, it was stated that the group would be expected to leave Washington on Sunday morning, April 22.

These concentration camps had been uncovered by the advancing Allied armies and the conditions were such as to make it compulsory that they be cleaned up as rapidly as possible, and, therefore, such committee as might be designated would of necessity have to arrive on the scene and make such personal investigation as they might think proper while the conditions were as fresh and unchanged as possible following the occupation of these areas by our armed forces.

As will be seen from the cablegram, General Eisenhower also suggested the appointment of a similar committee from among the newspapers and other publishers of the country, in order that they might have a similar opportunity to investigate these conditions which prompted General Eisenhower's request. During our interview with him at his headquarters in Europe, he advised us that when he visited one of these concentration camps, which will be referred to later, he was so horrified at what he found that he felt it incumbent upon him to request that the committee mentioned should come at once and see conditions as they were.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the Senate at once set about to consult with the minority leaders of the two respective Houses, with a view of designating a representative committee to respond to General Eisenhower's request with all promptitude. The minority leaders of the House and Senate, respectively, were immediately conferred with, with a view to their cooperation in the selection of such a joint committee.

It was agreed that six Members from each House would be designated, to be equally divided between the majority and minority parties in both Houses. While the Senate was in session for a short period on Friday the 20th, the matter had been brought to the attention of the two Houses so unexpectedly that it was impossible to do more on that day than discuss the matter informally because of the contemplated week end recess of both Houses, and because, if the committee were to depart on Sunday the 22d as desired, it would be impossible to wait until the following week, either for the purpose of taking formal action in the two Houses of Congress, or to consult more leisurely with respect to the personnel of the joint committee.

Under these circumstances, it was agreed that the membership representing both Houses should be immediately named, in order that the mission might go forward without delay. In appointing the Members of the House of Representatives, the Speaker indicated his desire to have representation from three of the House committees, namely, Foreign Affairs, Military Affairs, and Naval Affairs. But this suggestion was informal, and there was no definite agreement as between the two groups as to what committees should be represented. On the whole, however, this arrangement was followed.

During the afternoon and evening of Friday the 20th, and Saturday morning the 21st, the majority and minority leaders of the Senate frequently conferred as

to the personnel of the Senate portion of the joint committee. During the morning of the 21st, the minority leader of the Senate, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] advised the majority leader he was ready to recommend, on the part of the minority, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The majority leader of the Senate asked the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, to become members of the Senate group; and he sought to have the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, included as the third member of the group to represent the Senate majority. The Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Utah indicated their willingness to accept this assignment, but the Senator from Massachusetts had left the city for his home in Massachusetts and was not expected to return until the following Monday. It was, therefore, impossible to confer with him about his possible appointment as a member of the committee. He has since indicated that it would have been impossible for him to have become a member of the committee if he had been in Washington. After the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the minority leader of the Senate advised the majority leader of the Senate on Saturday morning the names of the members designated by them, respectively, a conference was called of the entire group at 1 o'clock on Saturday afternoon to receive the information necessary from the War Department concerning the hour of departure and the requirements and needs of the various members of the group upon their arrival in Europe. During this conference the members of the group urged the majority leader of the Senate to become a member of the committee and make the trip, which he decided to do, and, therefore, he became a member of the group in lieu of the Senator from Massachusetts, chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. This, in brief, is the basis for the appointment of the various Members and the basis for the trip itself. The committee, thus appointed, consisted of the following members:

The Senator from Kentucky, Mr. ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

The Senator from Georgia, Mr. WALTER F. GEORGE.

The Senator from Utah, Mr. ELBERT D. THOMAS.

The Senator from Illinois, Mr. C. WAYLAND BROOKS.

The Senator from Nebraska, Mr. KENNETH S. WHERRY.

The Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

Representative R. EWING THOMASON from Texas.

Representative JAMES P. RICHARDS from South Carolina.

Representative ED. V. IZAC from California.

Representative JOHN M. VORYS from Ohio.

Representative JAMES W. MOTT from Oregon.

Representative DEWEY SHORT from Missouri.

It ought to be stated that nobody in the War Department made any suggestions, directly or indirectly, as to who should be appointed on this joint committee. When the members of the committee were appointed, in the way which has been indicated, the War Department was advised of the personnel and was represented at the conference held on Saturday afternoon to make arrangements for the trip.

The entire group departed at noon on Sunday, the 22d, by air transportation arranged by the War Department, accompanied by representatives of that Department, and arrived in Paris in the late afternoon of Monday, April 23.

Before setting forth the conditions which the committee found at the three camps which it visited, all of which will be described later, the committee feels that it is advisable to state the general character and purpose of the camps, as well as the character of the evidence which it obtained, and upon which this report is based.

There are more than 100 concentration camps for slave laborers and political prisoners in Germany. No attempt was made to conceal them and all were built in thickly populated areas and many of them along main highways. Your committee visited three of these camps located in widely separated parts of Germany, namely, Buchenwald in Thüringen Province, Nordhausen in Saxony, and Dachau in Bavaria. These three camps are typical of all the concentration camps in the Reich and their physical characteristics, functions, management, and operation furnish an accurate cross section of the entire German political prisoner camp system and policy.

Before proceeding with detailed statements concerning the several camps visited, we believe a preliminary word as to just what these camps are and, just what they are used for would be of value. In the first place, the concentration camps for political prisoners must not be confused with the prisoner-of-war camps. No prisoners of war are confined in any of these political-prisoner camps, and there is no relationship whatever between a concentration camp for political prisoners and a camp for prisoners of war.

The concentration camps for political prisoners are precisely what the name implies. They are places of incarceration, punishment, and liquidation of civilians who were opposed to or who were suspected of being opposed to the Hitler regime. A number of them were established at the beginning of that regime. At first these camps contained only German political prisoners. When the Germans overran and occupied the adjacent lands of Poland, Russia, France, Holland, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, and other countries, the camps were expanded both in size and number to accommodate the hundreds of thousands of additional political prisoners brought in from those countries.

During the past month all of these camps have been uncovered by the rapid advance of the Allied armies. At the time of our visit the surviving prisoners were still in the camps and were being cared for by the American military forces. These liberated prisoners will be sent to their home countries when facilities for that purpose are available, and some, in fact, have already been sent home. When we saw the camps, however, they were filled practically to capacity with prisoners. This was especially the case at Dachau, which camp we inspected only 48 hours after the S. S. garrison in charge of it had been driven out by the American troops.

THE THREE CLASSES OF EVIDENCE UPON WHICH THIS REPORT IS BASED

We think it is important, also, to make a statement at this point regarding the character of evidence gathered on our visits to these camps, so that the basis for the detailed recital which follows may be clear and unambiguous.

Three classes or kinds of evidence were presented to us. The first was the visual inspection of the camps themselves, freshly freed by the American troops of S. S. supervision. We saw the barracks, the work places, the physical facilities for torture, degradation, and execution. We saw the victims, both dead and alive, of the atrocities practiced at these camps. We saw the process of liquidation by starvation while it was still going on. We saw the indescribable filth and smelled the nauseating stench before it was cleaned up, and we saw a number of victims of this liquidation process actually die.

The second kind of evidence we obtained was the testimony of eyewitnesses among the prisoners themselves to these atrocities. Many of the prisoners had been in the camps we visited as long as 3 and 4 years. Many others had spent long terms as prisoners in several other similar camps. While these prisoners included men from nearly all the countries of central Europe, whose speech, whose station in life and whose education and previous environment differed widely from one another, yet the testimony of all these witnesses was substantially the same. Directly and through interpreters we talked to prisoners who had seen the hangings and the beatings and who had themselves experienced the systematic process of starvation, corporal punishment, and human degradation.

The third kind of evidence was what may be called the common knowledge of the camp, that is to say, evidence of things done in the camp which were not done publicly but which, nevertheless, all prisoners were aware of. This is similar to certain knowledge possessed by prisoners generally in legitimate institutions like State penitentiaries. These prisoners, from custom and experience, from their conversation with the guards and among themselves, and from a very plain and almost mathematical kind of circumstantial evidence, have accurate knowledge of certain things which they have not actually seen with their own eyes. The prisoners at the camps speak about these things as though they had actually seen them. It was the unanimous opinion of our committee after

talking to hundreds of prisoners that this third kind of evidence was often as accurate and reliable as the two kinds of direct evidence above referred to. An example of this kind of evidence will be found in that part of our report dealing with the torture chamber at Buchenwald, where no one actually saw the strangulations perpetrated in this chamber, but where the circumstantial evidence of it was so complete and clear as to leave no doubt in the mind of anyone.

The three kinds of evidence here referred to constitute the only evidence accepted by this committee in making its report. Rumor, hearsay, and every other form of information or testimony has been carefully excluded so that those reading the report may be assured that everything therein described was either actually seen by us or reported to us by competent and reliable eyewitnesses or that it is based on circumstantial evidence which we have considered to be trustworthy.

One further preliminary observation may not be out of place here, and that is that all of the facts here recited are corroborated by the records of the investigation of the military authorities who have made a most minute, careful, and exhaustive examination of all of the prison camps. These authorities, who are specialists in their line, have taken the testimony of hundreds of eyewitnesses and have carefully authenticated and documented the same. The committee has examined some of this documented evidence but it has not used any of it in making this report. The report is based exclusively upon our own personal investigation of these camps.

PART 2. GEOGRAPHY AND STATISTICS, BUCHENWALD

On the morning of April 24, following its arrival in Paris on the afternoon of Monday, the 23d, the committee, accompanied by Brig. Gen. John M. Weir, Col. Robert H. Thompson, Col. John A. Hall, and photographers, left Paris by airplane for Weimar, which is located in the province of Thüringen, Kriese, county of Weimar, about 120 miles southwest of Berlin, and proceeded from Weimar by automobile to the outskirts of the city, where was located the German political concentration camp of Buchenwald.

This camp was founded when the Nazi Party first came into power in 1933 and has been in continuous operation since that time, although its largest population dates from the beginning of the present war. The camp was overrun by the American Army on April 12, 1945. The first appearance of the Americans at Buchenwald was made by a tank spearhead, which briefly engaged the enemy and withdrew. The garrison of SS troops at Buchenwald became so alarmed at the rapid approach of United States troops that they fled precipitately, abandoning the camp completely. On Friday, the 13th, the main body of advancing United States troops arrived with supplies and medicine and took over the camp.

The surviving population of the camp, as recorded on April 16, 1945, was about 20,000, divided into nationalities, as follows:

French	2,900
Polish	3,800
Hungarians	1,240
Yugoslavs	570
Russians	4,380
Dutch	324
Belgians	622
Austrians	550
Italians	242
Czechs	2,105
Germans	1,800
Dutch	260
Anti-Franco Spanish and miscellaneous	1,207
	20,000

The character of the surviving population was all male and included a thousand boys under 14 years of age. The prisoners at this camp included the intelligentsia and leadership groups from continental Europe, as well as democratic or anti-Nazi Germans and their relatives. Among the 20,000 survivors were about 4,000 Jews.

The mission of this camp was an extermination factory and the means of extermination were starvation, beatings, tortures, incredibly crowded sleeping conditions, and sickness. The effectiveness of these measures was enhanced by the requirement that the prisoners work in an adjacent armament factory for the manufacture of machine guns, small arms, ammunition, and other matériel for the German Army. The factory operated 24 hours a day, using two 12-hour shifts of prisoners. At the time your committee visited the camp the factories were no longer in operation, having been totally destroyed by remarkably effective precision bombing. The factory area was completely demolished, but not one bomb fell within the camp area, which was immediately adjacent to the factory area and separated from it only by a barbed-wire fence. In addition to those inmates performing slave labor at the munitions factory, other inmates were organized into labor parties to perform various kinds of work on farms in the vicinity of Weimar.

The main elements of Buchenwald included the "Little Camp," the "regular barracks" and the "hospital," the medical experimentation building, the body-disposal plant, and the ammunition factory.

THE "LITTLE CAMP"

The prisoners in this camp slept on triple-decked shelves, the clearance height between the shelves being little more than 2 feet. They were so crowded into these shelves that the cubic content figured out to about 35 cubic feet per man, as against the minimum for health of 600 cubic feet prescribed by United States Army regulations. We were informed that after arriving, new prisoners were initiated by spending at least six weeks here before being "graduated" to the "regular barracks." During this initiation prisoners were expected to lose about 40 percent in weight. Jews, however, seldom if ever graduated to the regular barracks. Camp disciplinary measures included transferring recalcitrant prisoners back to the "Little Camp." As persons became too feeble to work, they were also sent back to the "Little Camp" or to the "hospital." Rations were less than at the regular barracks, and the death rate in the "Little Camp" was very high, recently about 50 per day.

REGULAR BARRACKS

The dormitory room here was approximately 42 by 23 feet and about 10 feet high, having a content of about 9,500 cubic feet. In each such room there were installed, triple-decked, 38 stacks of 3 bunks each, or a total of 114 bunks, each bunk 30 inches by 72 inches, outside measurement. Most of these bunks were double; that is, 2 parallel bunks occupying the space of 60 inches by 72 inches. The aisles were narrow, being less than 24 inches wide and permitted movement through them only with the body being kept edgewise. One hundred and fourteen bunks placed in 9,500 cubic feet make less than 85 cubic feet per person. Since the beginning of the war, 250 persons have been made to sleep in each such room, or less than 40 cubic feet per person. There was less than 1 blanket per prisoner. Blankets were thin, shoddy, and undersized. There was substantially no heat in these dormitories.

THE HOSPITAL

This was a building where moribund persons were sent to die. No medicines were available and, hence, no therapy was possible. Typhus and tuberculosis were rampant in the camp. About half of the wards of the hospital were about 15 feet deep and 5½ feet wide, with one window on the outside end. From six to nine "patients" occupied each ward, lying crosswise on the floor, shoulder to shoulder. The room was too narrow for most of them to extend their legs. The death rate in the "hospital" was from 5 to 20 persons per day.

MEDICAL EXPERIMENT BUILDING

Block No. 41 in the camp was used for medical experiments and vivisections with prisoners as guinea pigs. Medical scientists came from Berlin periodically to reinforce the experimental staff. In particular new toxins and antitoxins were tried out on prisoners. Few prisoners who entered this experimental building ever emerged alive. Prisoners were induced to volunteer for experimentation on the representation that living quarters provided there were far superior to those in the barracks and that their rations were far superior to those received by ordinary prisoners.

THE BODY DISPOSAL PLANT OR CREMATORY

The design of this installation was a striking example of German industrial efficiency. It had a maximum disposal capacity of about 400 bodies per 10-hour day, which is about 2 percent of the camp population at the time of liberation. We were informed that when the death rate exceeded the capacity of the crematory, the bodies were taken out and buried in pits without any means for identification. Teeth having gold fillings were extracted prior to cremating the bodies. We have been advised that on the day following our visit to Buchenwald, a large cache of gold fillings and gold jewelry was discovered in a quarry near the camp. Included were literally thousands of wedding rings alone.

The crematory was entirely enclosed within a high board fence. No one, except a small operating force of S. S. personnel were allowed even to look inside this fence. No prisoner who passed within it—as a member of a labor party or for any other person—came out alive. Inside this fence was the incinerator building, centrally located between two yards. This building was of substantial brick construction with cement floors, 1 story high, with full-size 12-feet-high basement beneath. The main floor contained an administration office at the front end, a locker and washroom for S. S. personnel at the far end, and the incinerator room in the center. The latter contained, in line, 2 batteries of 3 firebrick incinerators each; 15 to 20 minutes were required for the incineration of a total of 18 bodies, each incinerator having a capacity of 3 bodies, or a total charge of 18 bodies; 15 to 20 minutes were required for the incineration of a charge.

The floor of each incinerator consisted of a coarse grate, through which the day's accumulation of bone ash was extracted at the end of operation. The fire came from a furnace room occupying the rear two-thirds of the basement, the flames being deflected downward onto the bodies by baffle plates in the roofs of the furnace. Fuel used in this plant was coal. The front of the basement was occupied by the strangling room.

The method of collecting bodies was as follows: Roll call was held every evening outdoors outside the dormitory buildings. Internees were required to strip and bring to roll call the naked bodies of all comrades who had died during the previous 24 hours. After roll call a motortruck drove around the camp, picked up the bodies, and was driven to the front yard of the incinerator plant to await the next day's operation. But this was not the only source of bodies. Emaciated prisoners who had been around too long, or who had committed infractions of discipline, or who knew too much, or who had refused to be broken in mind, were arbitrarily condemned to death. For instance, in the "Little Camp," where prisoners slept 16 to a shelf, an infraction of discipline—particularly an attempt to escape—not infrequently resulted in all 16 being condemned. Such persons were immediately marched on foot to a small door in the fence of the back yard at a point immediately adjacent to the incinerator building. This door opened inward until it hit a doorstop which held it in a position parallel to the building's wall, thus creating a corridor 4 feet wide and 3 feet deep. At the far end was an opening about 4 feet by 4 feet, flush with the ground, the head of a concrete shaft, about 13 feet deep, the bottom floor of which was a continuation of the concrete floor of the room at the front end of the basement. The condemned prisoners, on being hurried and pushed through the door in the fence, inevitably fell into this shaft and crashed 13 feet down to the cement cellar floor. This room, on the floor at one end of which they now found themselves, was the strangling room. As they hit the floor they were garrotted with a short, double-end noose by S. S. guards and hung on hooks along the side walls, about 6½ feet above the floor, the row of hooks being 45 or 50 in number. At the time of our visit all of the hooks except 5 had been removed, but we could observe the holes where the other hooks had previously been. When a consignment had been hung up, any who were still struggling were stunned by a wooden mallet, which was exhibited to us in the chamber still bearing stains of blood. The bodies were left on the hooks until called for by the incinerator crew. An electric elevator, with an estimated capacity of 18 bodies, ran up to the incinerator room, which was on the floor above the strangling room. The day's quota of approximately 200 bodies was made up of from 120 to 140 prisoners who had died—mostly in the hospital, the medical experimental building, or the little camp—and from 60 to 80 were supplied by the strangulation room.

For a period of about 10 days in March, the coal supply for the incinerator ran out. The incinerator furnace grates had not been cleared of entirely unconsumed bodies as we observed portions thereof. Awaiting the arrival of a new supply of coal, bodies, to the number of about 1,800, were allowed to collect in the front yard, stacked up like cordwood. The sudden arrival of American armor prevented the S. S. garrison from disposing of the bodies which had accumulated due to the lack of fuel for the incineration plant. At the time of our visit to the camp we saw a truckload of bodies within the area of the incinerator. It is estimated that there were about 60 bodies in this truck. Near the truck, on the ground, were piled about 20 or 25 additional bodies. We were advised that the death rate, prior to the liberation, was approximately 200 per day. At the time of our visit the American medical authorities had been able to reduce the death rate to about 20 per day. Upon liberation of the camp the American authorities provided decent interment for the unburied dead and for those who died thereafter.

The American surgeon stated that the adult corpses weighed from about 60 to 80 pounds each.

MISCELLANEOUS

Rations: We were advised that the ration allowance for the regular camp was between 600 to 700 calories per day and consisted generally of a very weak soup made from cabbage and other vegetables, and a small piece of bread about 3 inches square. This meal was provided only once a day—in the morning and in the evening another small piece of bread was furnished. The diet was heavily deficient in animal fats and vitamins and contained no meats. In the "little camp" the ration allowance was about 500 calories. About 3,000 to 3,600 calories per day is required for adult health. Red Cross packages were almost entirely appropriated by the S. S. camp commander and distributed to suit himself to S. S. personnel and to citizens of Weimar and even to Nordic German camp prisoners. Meals were prepared and served by prisoner personnel under S. S. supervision.

The committee was informed that the S. S. troops had received orders to destroy all of the occupants of the camp prior to their departure, but in their haste to flee before the advancing American troops they had been unable to undertake such a large scale operation.

The administration of the camp and the maintenance of records were carried on by prisoners under the supervision of S. S. troops. The available records at the time of liberation had been examined by the prisoners engaged in the administration of the camp and the records revealed that 51,000 persons had died in the camp. At the time of our arrival the prisoners, in a pathetic gesture, had erected of flimsy materials, a memorial to the dead of Buchenwald. Pictures and descriptions of the conditions at this camp cannot adequately portray what we saw there, and it is only when the stench of the camp is smelled that anyone can have complete appreciation of the depths of degradation to which the German Nazi Government and those responsible for it and its agencies, organizations and practices had dropped in their treatment of those who had failed to embrace the doctrines of the "master race".

CAMP DORA AT NORDHAUSEN

The group visited the concentration camp at Nordhausen, which is located in the province of Saxony, about 125 miles southwest of Berlin, on May 1, 1945. This was a political concentration camp and was known as the Dora Camp. It is located on the outskirts of Nordhausen, adjacent to a large underground manufacturing plant which produced V-1 bombs, the V-2's, airplane engines and parts and other munitions of war. At the time of our visit to Nordhausen the camp had been in American hands about 3 weeks, and, of course, did not portray the filth and operating conditions which existed at the time of its liberation. The prisoners at this camp had been used as slave labor in the underground factory and for work parties on adjacent farms and in smaller munitions factories. The magnitude of the operation at Nordhausen is demonstrated by the fact that there were 31 miles of railroad track in the underground factory. The factory itself contained well organized production lines and enormous quantities of fine machine tools, many of which were new and all in fine operating condition. The underground factory had also been used as barracks for prisoners until the death rate exceeded that apparently desired and began to affect the efficiency of production. We observed a crematory similar to the one that we saw at Buchenwald. We observed a large cement apron on which we were told by a reliable inmate that 135 prisoners had been executed by hanging at the rate of 4 at a time a few days before the camp was overrun by the American forces. This inmate stated that all of the prisoners who were physically able were required to witness the executions. He also told us that the executions had been for violations of camp disciplinary regulations and for alleged sabotage in the underground factory. He further stated that the individuals executed on this occasion were all Russians. At the time of our visit to the camp it was being additionally used by

the American authorities as a rendezvous for displaced persons who had been wandering about in the area.

The prisoners had been segregated by our forces after liberation as far as possible by nationalities and every effort was made to alleviate their physical condition by food and medicine. On the whole, we found this camp to have been operated and administered much in the same manner as Buchenwald had been operated and managed. When the efficiency of the workers decreased as a result of the conditions under which they were required to live, their rations were decreased as punishment. This brought about a vicious circle in which the weak became weaker and were ultimately exterminated.

DACHAU

The committee next visited the infamous concentration camp at Dachau, in two groups, on May 2, 1945. Dachau is located in the province of Bavaria, about 325 miles south of Berlin. The groups visited Dachau within 48 hours after its liberation by American forces.

In the drive of General Patch's Seventh Army toward Munich, the Forty-fifth United States Division fought into Dachau 7 miles to the north and surprised and surrounded the concentration camp on the outskirts of the town. The camp was in charge of about 200 Storm Troopers who resisted as the American Army approached. The camp was occupied after many of the German guards were killed and the remainder captured.

Because of the surprise due to the speed of the American advance, this camp was captured practically intact. By orders of General Patch, the evidences of German brutality were left untouched awaiting our inspection. Two days later we arrived. We found a large rectangular-shaped camp filled with numerous barracks or sheds, in which were perhaps 30,000 political prisoners. Two high parallel barbed-wire fences surrounded the camp, the inner one 15 feet from the outside one which was electrically charged. At intervals of about 50 yards, 20-foot towers rose above the outer wire and from these towers armed guards looked down on the interior of the camp. At one end of the large enclosure was an open space for assembling the prisoners and at the extreme end was a large administration building.

When we arrived there were many prisoners lying dead between the inner and the outer barbed-wire fences—apparently shot by the guards. The living, Russians, Poles, Dutch, and in fact many nationalities, were being cared for by our Army. We found women segregated in another enclosure behind the administration building. An inspection of one of the better barracks for men disclosed 390 jammed into a room built to accommodate 50. Most were suffering from typhus or tuberculosis, and all were living skeletons due to lack of food. The stench was sickening.

Outside, lying in rows, were about 300 bodies of those who had died and had been collected that morning from the various barracks. They were yet to be disposed of, as were those lying between the fences, and others, including the bodies of some of the German guards, which were strewn along the approaches to the entrance.

This camp was apparently built in 1933 or 1934, and we were told the original occupants were those who dared to oppose the Hitler regime. After their liquidation fresh prisoners in ever-increasing numbers were furnished by the countries overrun by the German armies. The complete break-down by nationalities of the prisoners in the camp at Dachau was being undertaken by the American Army authorities while we were there, but the record has not yet been received in Washington.

Across a canal or moat filled with water which ran between this wire-enclosed camp and the highway there was what appeared to be an old German Army caserne, the buildings of which were scattered throughout an area of considerable size, all completely surrounded by a stone wall. Trees lined the driveways in this secluded area in the center of which was a modern brick building, where the executions of the prisoners from the camp across the street took place.

As we visited Dachau we saw on a railroad sidetrack paralleling the main highway, and close to the gates of the prison camp, a train of cars which had been used to bring additional civilian prisoners to this camp. These cars were an assortment of odd boxcars, some of which could be locked, and some were the coal-car type. In each of them the floor of the cars was covered with dead, emaciated bodies. In some of the cars there were more than enough to cover the floors. In size these cars were of the small European type, which, when used for the movement of troops, would never accommodate more than 40 men. Nevertheless the army officials in charge of this camp advised us that there were 50 of these cars in this one train, and that at least 100 of these civilian prisoners had been jammed into each car—locked in—and they had been on the road for several days without food or water, and that approximately 3,000 of them were dead upon arrival and most of the others were in a dying condition.

We saw many dead bodies on the ground. These prisoners had apparently crawled out of the cars and had died on the ground. Our officials advised us that many of the others who had survived the trip in the cars, had died since in the camp and many more, although still alive, were starved beyond redemption.

Directly across the road from the cars—near the entrance of this Dachau Camp—we saw three dead members of the Nazi S. S. troops. Two had been shot and the skull of one had been crushed. We were advised that these three were members of the S. S. guards at the prison who were captured and killed by Russian inmates of the prison when the camp was liberated by the advancing American Army.

EXECUTIONS AT DACHAU

A distinguishing feature of the Dachau camp was the gas chamber for the execution of prisoners and the somewhat elaborate facilities for execution by shooting.

The gas chamber was located in the center of a large room in the crematory building. It was built of concrete. Its dimensions were about 20 by 20 feet and the ceiling was some 10 feet in height. In two opposite walls of the chamber were airtight doors through which condemned prisoners could be taken into the chamber for execution and removed after execution. The supply of gas into the chamber was controlled by means of two valves on one of the outer walls, and beneath the valves was a small glass covered peephole through which the operator could watch the victims die. The gas was let into the chamber through pipes terminating in perforated brass fixtures set into the ceiling. The chamber was of size sufficient to execute probably a hundred men at one time.

The room in which the gas chamber stood was flanked on both ends by warerooms in which the bodies were placed after execution to await cremation. The size of each room was approximately 30 by 50 feet. At the time we visited the camp these warerooms were piled high with dead bodies. In one of the rooms the bodies were thrown in an irregular heap. In the other room they were neatly stacked like cordwood. The irregular pile of bodies was perhaps 10 feet high, covering most of the floor space. All of them were naked.

It was quite evident that the daily death rate at Dachau, by execution and otherwise, far exceeded the daily capacity of the crematory to dispose of the bodies. The stench indicated that some of them had been there for several days.

In the rear of the crematory building was an enclosure where the executions by shooting were carried out. There were three separate places for execution in this yard. One, we were informed, was for common political prisoners, one was for women, and one was for prisoners of distinction, including those who at some time had had military records. The latter were not prisoners of war. As has been stated, no prisoners of war were kept in any of the concentration camps, but all of the camps had political prisoners who had served in the armies of their countries prior to the beginning of the present war, and, particularly, during the First World War.

These three places of execution, which were separated from each other by tight board fences, consisted of banks of earth some 20 feet in length and 3 feet high. The condemned prisoners knelt down facing the bank and were shot through the back of the head. The only difference between these separate places of execution was that in front of the bank of earth where the distinguished prisoners were shot there was a small boardwalk upon which the prisoners knelt, while the common prisoners and the women knelt on the bare ground. A considerable amount of blood still remained on the ground at two of these execution places.

In the enclosure was a pile of rough wooden coffins. Since we had seen no coffins at the other camps visited, we inquired why coffins were used at Dachau and were informed that these coffins were reserved for prisoners of distinc-

tion. The bodies of ordinary prisoners, if not cremated, were buried without coffins and usually without clothing.

PART 3. CONCLUSION

While the above three camps which were visited by the joint committee differed in some details, they were all of the same general pattern and design and administered for the same purpose.

At each of these camps we found four general classifications of prisoners: First, political prisoners; second, habitual criminals; third, conscientious or religious objectors; fourth, persons who were imprisoned for failure to work.

Although differing in size, they all carried into effect the same pattern of death by hard labor, starvation, hanging, strangulation, disease, brutality, gas chambers, gallows, and filthy and insanitary conditions, which meant inevitable death eventually to every imprisoned person.

We found, in each case, that the supervision of the camps was carried out by the criminal tactics of S. S. troops, who, in addition to their own brutality, assigned some of their punitive duties to the prisoners, especially the habitual criminals who had charge of the barracks in which all types of prisoners were subject to their vicious and inhuman methods.

We found that this entire program constituted a systematic form of torture and death administered to intellectuals, political leaders, and all others who would not embrace and support the Nazi philosophy and program. We found the extent, devices, methods, and conditions of torture almost beyond the power of words to describe.

We found, from all the evidence available, that in these camps the Jews and Russians and Poles were treated with a greater degree of severity than other nationalities. We found that a colossal scheme of extermination was planned and put into effect against all those in occupied countries who refused to accept the principles of nazism, or who opposed the saddling of the Nazi yoke on their countries. The Nazi leadership in the pursuit of this policy found especially expedient the use of various forms of terrorism calculated to reduce the opposition and to render futile all efforts to throw off the yoke.

The over-all pattern of the scheme varied but little. First, vast numbers of nationals of overrun countries were abducted and brought into Germany—sometimes whole families, sometimes just the men. The number of these persons is variously estimated at between 12 and 20 million people. These people were forced to labor long hours by their Nazi masters and for slight infractions they were placed in concentration camps.

Likewise, the intelligentsia, college professors, former Army generals, business leaders, and professional men of the occupied countries were taken captive and placed in these camps, unless they agreed to spread the doctrines advocated by the Nazis.

The treatment accorded to these prisoners in the concentration camps was generally as follows: They were herded together in some wooden barracks not large enough for one-tenth of their number. They were forced to sleep on wooden frames covered with wooden boards in tiers of two, three, and even four, sometimes with no covering, sometimes with a bundle of dirty rags serving both as pallet and coverlet.

Their food consisted generally of about one-half a pound of black bread per day and a bowl of watery soup for noon and night, and not always that. Owing to the great numbers crowded into a small space and to the lack of adequate sustenance, lice and vermin multiplied, disease became rampant, and those who did not soon die of disease or torture began the long, slow process of starvation. Notwithstanding the deliberate starvation program inflicted upon these prisoners by lack of adequate food, we found no evidence that the people of Germany as a whole were suffering from any lack of sufficient food or clothing. The contrast was so striking that the only conclusion which we could reach was that the starvation of the inmates of these camps was deliberate.

Upon entrance into these camps, newcomers were forced to work either at an adjoining war factory, or were placed "in commando" on various jobs in the vicinity, being returned each night to their stall in the barracks. Generally a German criminal was placed in charge of each "block" or shed in which the prisoners slept. Periodically he would choose the one prisoner of his block who seemed the most alert or intelligent, or showed the most leadership qualities. These would report to the guards' room and would never be heard from again. The generally accepted belief of the prisoners was that these were shot or gassed or hanged, and then cremated. A refusal to work, or an infraction of the rules, usually meant flogging and other types of torture, such as having the finger nails pulled out, and in each case usually ended in death after extensive suffering. The policies herein described constituted a calculated and diabolical program of planned torture and extermination on the part of those who were in control of the German Government. These camps, on the whole, were conducted and controlled by the S. S. troops and the Gestapo, who acted under orders from their superiors, or who were given wide discretion in the methods which they were to adopt in perpetrating these hideous and inhuman sufferings.

It is the opinion of your committee that these practices constituted no less than organized crime against civilization and humanity, and that those who were responsible for them should have meted out to them swift, certain, and adequate punishment.

We found that the propagation of the Nazi theories and the practices which were carried forward under those theories created within Germany a disregard for human rights, and for the dignity of the individual human being, which not only degraded the life of the people within the German Reich, but which was inevitably calculated to bring about war between Germany and her neighbors and was calculated also to subject the conquered nations to the brutalities and indignities which struck fear and terror into the hearts of those who might otherwise oppose these policies, which we have attempted to describe.

With reference to the punishment of those guilty of war crimes, which an indignant world will expect and demand, we desire to report that at the present time various agencies are actively and comprehensively engaged in the gathering of evidence throughout the regions where these atrocities were committed. The officers of our Armies, and of the Allied armies, have been alert for many months to the conditions which prevailed in all Nazi occupied territories and a very competent corps of investigators in each military area, under the control of our armed forces and those of our allies, has been for months engaged in gathering and documenting testimony which will be available for use when those guilty of these atrocities are brought to trial. The Army of the United States alone has already gathered testimony and sworn statements that will fill many volumes.

In Paris the French Provisional Government has set up a Commission for the investigation of war crimes. The Allied Nations have set up a War Crimes Commission, with its headquarters in London, made up of competent men representing 16 of the Allied Nations, and already specific charges are being made against many of the outstanding leaders of this criminal program.

It was the high privilege of the members of your committee to confer with our military authorities in Europe, with the French Commission in Paris and the Allied Commission in London, concerning their methods and procedures and the results intended to be obtained by their activities, and the members of this committee were gratified at the thorough way in which this work is being undertaken. It has already been announced by the President that Justice Robert H. Jackson of the Supreme Court of the United States has been designated to represent this country in the preparation and representation of the evidence which will be brought before such tribunals as may be in existence, or may be established, for the trial of major war criminals.

In view of all these activities, the committee does not feel at liberty at this time to recommend the creation of an additional agency for the investigation of these war crimes or for their ultimate disposition, but feel that the agencies now dealing with the problem are approaching the subject from the standpoint of practical justice in every area and in all categories of crimes that may be involved.

The committee is happy to report that each and every member approached the performance of this task with solemnity and with a sense of responsibility which deserves the commendation of our people. It was approached without regard to differences of political affiliation or geographical location. The committee feels that out of it all justice will emerge, and that through the sickening spectacle which we have witnessed of the degradation to which human beings have been

subjected, will come ultimately a firmer realization that men of all nations and all tongues must resist encroachments of every theory and every ideology that debases mankind, and that a more just and enduring peace may arise upon the ruins and from the sacrifices which the human race has endured through one of the most crucial periods of its history.

ALBEN W. BARKLEY.
WALTER F. GEORGE.
ELBERT D. THOMAS.
WAYLAND BROOKS.
KENNETH S. WHERRY.
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.
R. EWING THOMASON.
DEWEY SHORT.
JAMES W. MOTT.
JAS. P. RICHARDS.
JOHN M. VORYS.
ED. V. IZAC.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a report of the War Production Board covering operations under the Property Requisitioning Act of October 16, 1941, as amended, for the period from October 16, 1944, through April 15, 1945.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 15, 1945.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Hon. Lindsay Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, before the Joint Committee on Organization of the Congress today.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an address delivered yesterday by Archbishop Cushing before the Jewish War Veterans' Auxiliary in Boston, and in the other a resolution adopted recently by the Jewish War Veterans of the Department of Massachusetts.

Mr. SHEPPARD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include Assembly Joint Resolution No. 42 passed by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and to include in each a statement made before the Committee on Ways and Means by a witness.

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MASON, Mr. GAVIN and Mr. O'KONSKI asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and to include in one a letter and in the other a newspaper article.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. JONKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and to include in one an editorial and in the other a letter.

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Peter Edson appearing in the Washington News.

RECLASSIFYING SALARIES IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 246 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3035) to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3035) to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes. It seems to me much needed and very desirable legislation. Personally, I hope the rule can be adopted and the bill be passed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

As the gentleman from Kentucky has stated, this is a rule providing for 2 hours of general debate. The bill was prepared by the Post Office Department, especially the currency department of the Post Office Department. The Department favors the bill. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. It gives the post-office employees an average of approximately $395 a year over the old basic pay, which was provided for about 20 years ago. It also gives certain justified liberalizations of sick leave.

The additional cost to the Government will be between forty-five and fifty-three millions of dollars.

By reason that I have an important departmental conference this afternoon meaning a great deal to many of my constituents, it is probable that I will not be present on the final roll-call passage of this justifiable legislation. Anyway, it will pass by over 50 to 1. In fact, it should be passed unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order H. R. 3035 under which 2 hours of general debate is permitted. I know of no serious opposition to this bill. Therefore, most of this time will be taken up in sort of a testimonial meeting on the part of the members pointing out the necessity, the equity, and the advisability of the changes in the existing law. The best short analysis of the bill that I have seen was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. Mr. MASON said:

First. The bill provides a $400 per year increase over present base pay to practically every person in the Postal Service, in lieu of the $300 per year temporary bonus which expires June 30, 1945.

Second It introduces the principle of longevity pay in many of the branches of the Postal Service.

Third. It removes many of the inequalities and injustices that have existed for a long time between various branches of the Postal Service.

Fourth. It provides for time and one-half pay for overtime work.

Fifth. It provides 10 percent extra over the hourly day rate for postal workers, with some exceptions, who are required to work nights.

Sixth. It grants to all postal employees 15 days' leave of absence each year with pay, and 10 days of sick leave with pay each year.

I can add nothing further other than to say that I am in hearty accord with this rule and predict that the bill will pass by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this rule and will support the bill which provides for an equitable adjustment of the pay rates of the postal employees of the Government. This wage adjustment has been long overdue because in all probability the postal employees have been the most poorly paid of all those in the Federal service. Recently, I believe 2 years ago, we passed a measure in this House which would, in a way, have adjusted at least a portion of the postal salaries. But that bill failed to become a law. I believe this measure, which is now before us, is a better one because it takes into consideration the wages and salaries of all the various employees of the Post Office Department and adjusts them on a very fair basis, in relationship to the increases which have come in all other lines of occupation as well as in the cost of living. Therefore, I expect to support both this rule and the bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, this bill will not only give postal workers a pay increase long overdue, as stated by the gentleman from Ohio, it will guarantee the maintenance of high efficiency in the Postal Service.

Post Office Department authorities are already finding it difficult to live up to the motto, "The mails must go through"; because of inadequate pay thousands of experienced postal workers have gone into other fields of employment in recent years. Other thousands will follow them if Congress fails to pass this bill today.

A study of the current and anticipated American standards of living, and in consideration of the qualifications required of postal employees, it is difficult to conceive that a personnel conducive to the required efficiency of the Postal Service can be induced to stay under present salary rates. And at the same time it is difficult to conceive how new capable men can be induced to enter the service.

President William C. Doherty, of the National Association of Letter Carriers, recently testified that manpower shortages within the Postal Service are acute. He said that management is finding it practically impossible to recruit needed personnel on the present outmoded pay schedules:

Existing critical conditions—

He said—

are no longer affecting letter carriers and postal workers alone. * * * Let it be said that the very future of he Postal Service and the fate of its personnel rests with the Seventy-ninth Congress.

I am told reliably that each day witnesses the registration of more and still more complaints of poor service. I firmly believe that if this legislation is not enacted into law there will be such a break-down in morale of those who have been loyal, that poor mail service will be commonplace rather than the exception.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BATES] in order to very briefly stress the importance of immediate adoption of this resolution from the Rules Committee that merely makes in order the consideration of H. R. 3035, which is a bill primarily designed to rectify innumerable injustices which have been done over the years to the loyal, competent, and faithful employees of the Postal Service. I do not propose to usurp the thoughts of most of us who will gladly appreciate and take advantage of the opportunity of voting favorably on this rule and on the bill itself. I feel confident that this worthy and long-needed legislation will shortly receive the unanimous approval of each and every Member of this body.

Every citizen and taxpayer is familiar with the economic plight of the postal workers over these many years. The bill H. R. 3035, if I may say so, is merely an initial step in the direction of remedying a situation which for 20 years has been the bane in the existence of every efficient, faithful postal employee in the country. It seeks to correct a number of inequalities and injustices that have continued for quite some years between various branches of the Postal Service. It grants a permanent increase of $400 per annum in the basic pay of practically all employees of the Department. It provides for time and one-half pay for overtime work; allows 10 percent extra compensation, with some limitations, for night work. It also grants 15 days' leave of absence with pay and 10 days' sick leave with pay each year to all our deserving postal employees.

At last we are attempting to install this most worthy group of public servants upon a basis which is somewhat in line with and comparable to that of employees engaged in private industries. I am one of those who believe that since the cost of bare living has so greatly increased, this Congress must take immediate steps to equitably increase all wage scales in a proportionate amount. The industrial workers of this Nation should have a fair raise in their basic pay and appropriate adjustments should promptly be made for all Government and white-collar workers.

To return to the immediate problem, that of the post-office workers, I respectfully urge you to promptly adopt this rule so that we may as soon as possible consider and pass this extremely meritorious and long overdue legislation to which these competent, faithful men and women of the Postal Service are so justly entitled.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3035) to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3035, with Mr. IZAC in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 3035 comes before the House with the unanimous approval of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee. This is a bill designed to reclassify and make equitable readjustment in the salaries of all officers and employees now in the field service of the Postal Department.

It will remove inequalities and inequities among employees performing like work. It will establish a fair wage scale. It will improve the working and wage conditions of regular and substitute employees and employees in third-class post offices and special-delivery messengers. It is also designed to make the Postal Service a satisfactory and attractive career for young men and women. The bill will provide in part for the greatly increased living costs for which temporary legislation was enacted.

This reclassification of salaries is not war legislation but is a long-range program which primarily will improve our Postal Service and the condition of the faithful people who carry it on.

The Postal Department is a Government-owned public-service organization which reaches every family, every man and woman, and every business in the United States. Its primary purpose is the transmission of social and business correspondence and the dissemination of information. It binds all the people together more than any other institution. Every citizen is a patron and a stockholder.

The magnitude of postal operations may be visualized when we picture some 43,000 post offices scattered throughout every State and Territory employing some 375,000 regular, substitute, and contractual employees. They handle some 35,000,000,000 pieces of mail annually.

It carries on financial operations amounting to $17,000,000,000 anually, including a Postal Savings bank with $2,500,000,000 on deposit with some 3,750,000 depositors; it provides other special services such as registered, special delivery, parcel post, directory, insured mail, money order, postal note, and C. O. D. services. It operates over 9,300 motor vehicles, said to be the largest fleet in the country. It maintains and operates some 3,200 public buildings. Its transportation services of air, rail, motor, wagon, horse, and boat interlace the earth, water, and sky.

It performs a vast amount of work for other Government departments and agencies, such as the sale of War Savings bonds and stamps, migratory bird hunting stamps, internal revenue and motor-vehicle tax stamps. It takes a census of certain kinds of livestock. It aids in censorship activities and assists in the apprehension of criminals. It provides local secretaries for the Civil Service Commission.

These and many other activities make the Postal Service close to the people and necessary to their well-being. It is one of the largest employers of men and women in the country, and in peacetime is the largest, by far, in the Government.

The work of the Postal Service requires a high type of loyal, intelligent, able, and industrious men and women. The science of mail distribution and the transportation, accounting for, and safeguarding the vast amount of mail and money involved requires men and women above the average in ability. The care of the people's confidential papers and messages requires persons of strict fidelity, high reputation and devotion to the public interest.

The last comprehensive postal legislation was enacted in 1925, 20 years ago. Since that time there has been legislation affecting various groups of postal

employees, mainly for the purpose of improving conditions, but many inequalities have crept into the postal salary structure. The basic salaries have not been increased and are wholly inadequate. We cannot hope to continue a good service under such a condition.

One purpose of this legislation is to wipe out inequalities and to bring up to a satisfactory point the pay of thousands of employees in the lower wage brackets commensurate with the importance of their work and the costs of living, which on the whole have steadily increased since the last wage readjustment in 1925.

Public Law 25, which became effective May 1, 1943, did give to postal employees an increase of $300, or in certain cases a 15-percent increase. That, however, is temporary legislation and expires on June 30, 1945.

The expressions of numerous Members of Congress; editorial comment in the press throughout the country; and manifestations of interest from the general public, have convinced the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads that there is almost unanimous agreement that this legislation is long overdue.

I shall outline briefly some details of what this legislation is intended to do. First of all, it provides that practically all postal field employees now in the Service shall receive an increase over their present wages, and that no employee shall be reduced in pay as a result of this act.

Approximately 85 percent of all postal employees are in automatic grades, the greater number of them, the clerks and carriers, entering the Service at $1,700 and being increased $100 annually until they reach $2,100. Salaries in the Railway Mail Service begin at $1,900 and increase annually, as a rule, to $2,450.

Smaller groups not in the automatic grades, but which this legislation provides be placed therein, such as laborers, mail handlers, charwomen, and others in like employment, receive salaries of from $1,100 to $1,600 a year.

It is proposed that all employees in automatic grades now in the Service be given increases, but that new employees entering the Service shall start at the same grades as at present and be promoted annually $100 until they reach their respective maximum grade.

In the larger offices, and in the Rural Service, and the Railway Mail Service, it is proposed that three additional promotions of $100 each be made at the completion of 3, 5, and 7 years, respectively.

Present employees will receive immediate benefits. Newly appointed employees will start at the same salaries as at present, but if they stay in the Service and develop, they will be able, through annual promotions of $100 each, to attain salaries commensurate with their work and responsibilities.

The proposed legislation, while providing for the lower-paid employees, also provides for the supervisory group, whose compensation has long been inadequate considering their heavy responsibilities.

Difficulty is now found in obtaining suitable persons to accept supervisory positions because the first supervisory step is not sufficiently high to make it worth while. This is because clerical and carrier employees are paid for overtime work and through this oftentimes can earn more than supervisors in their offices. Another inconsistency is the fact that under present legislation, postmasters of the first class receive salaries of from $3,200 to $12,000 a year while their assistants receive salaries of but from $2,600 to $4,900. This inequitable condition exists throughout the entire postal supervisory service and should be corrected.

The bill also provides for uniform procedures for computing base compensation, overtime, night differential, annual and sick leave and hours of duties. These vary in the several branches of the service.

The proposed legislation will place clerks in third-class post offices on a salary basis rather than on allowances given to the postmaster to be distributed as he sees fit. It was found that these clerks now receive an average of 26 cents an hour, some as low as 14 cents, and postmasters of the third class have had to pay from their own pockets additional sums in order to retain suitable employees. It is obvious that this condition should be remedied.

The Special Delivery Service is unsatisfactory because it is difficult to obtain employees to deliver special-delivery articles at 9 cents each unless they are given such a large number as will make it worth while. When this is done, it is impossible to deliver all such mail promptly. The bill provides salaries for this group beginning at $1,600 and increasing $100 annually to $2,400 for employees engaged on a full time basis. It also provides that postmasters may utilize any office employee who is available for Special Delivery Service at his regular rate of pay.

The proposed legislation brings about a rearrangement of the salaries of rural carriers, and while the entrance salary is not quite as high as at present, automatic increases are provided for over a period of years. The plan devised is satisfactory to postal officials and to the rural carriers, and brings about an equalization of salary payments comparable with other branches of the service.

The employment of substitutes in the Postal Service and their compensation has always been a difficult problem. While at the present time there are but approximately 4,600 classified substitutes employed, this is due to war conditions, and after the war the authorized number of substitutes employed will be approximately 25,000. From time to time Congress has enacted legislation endeavoring to better the lot of these employees. In addition to bringing their salaries, which are on an hourly basis, up to those of regular employees, it is proposed that when substitutes are called for duty they shall be given at least 2 hours' employment. At the present time substitutes may be called and required to appear at the post office, and if for any reason there is not sufficient work for them, they are not paid anything.

While it is true that this bill does not meet all of the demands made by postal workers, it does meet with their general approval. It is found that in order to have a well-coordinated reclassification of salaries, it is impossible to meet some demands that may appear just. The bill brings about the greatest good to the greatest number, and it is agreed that to make changes in one part will bring about greater inequalities in other parts of the bill.

As I have said, the proposed legislation is not wartime legislation. Increased salaries are due postal employees because of two principal reasons. First, the standards of living have greatly improved since 1925, when the last basic postal salary readjustment was made. During the intervening years postal salaries have not kept in step with such improvements.

Secondly, it should be understood that the work in the Postal Service is much more intricate and difficult than it was in 1925. The science of mail distribution and its transportation and delivery has become more complex. The great advances in air, rail, and motor vehicle transportation, and the necessity for improved financial and accounting procedures because of new operations and increased business require a wider knowledge on the part of postal clerks to bring about efficient service. In addition, increases in personnel have not kept pace with increased work. In many instances fewer people are doing more work. It is clear postal salaries have not kept in step with the additional duties and added responsibilities of postal employees.

In 1925 we had 50,957 postmasters; now we have but 42,216, a decrease of 17 percent.

In 1925 we had 45,189 rural delivery carriers; now through extensions and consolidations, we have but 32,112 carriers. While the rural force decreased 29 percent, the mileage increased 16 percent.

Where we handled 23,000,000,000 pieces of mail in 1925, we now handle 35,000,000,000 pieces, an increase of about 60 percent.

Postal receipts have in this period increased 85.61 percent; in 1925 they were $599,600,000, in 1944 they were $1,112,800,000.

In 1926 salaries of personnel were $502,297,466. In 1944, $740,217,542, an increase of approximately 40 percent.

Our money-order business has increased 54 percent in items and 196 percent in value.

Annual postal-savings deposits have increased over 1,419 percent, with two and one-half billion dollars on deposit. The increase in depositors is 768 percent.

In our domestic air mail, where we flew approximately 4,834,000,000 pound-miles in 1933, in 1944 we flew 85,802,000,000 pound-miles.

In 1935 our postmasters handled $194,000,000 worth of Savings bonds; in 1944 they handled $1,671,000,000 worth.

This great increase in business seems stupendous, but it has been handled well. While you have the figures of this vast increase in business in mind, I wish to call your particular attention to the fact there has been an increase of only 5½ percent in full-time personnel.

Postmaster General Walker has well said in one of his annual reports that the work of the Postal Service requires skill, expertness, fidelity, and constant study,

and that the science of mail distribution and transportation and the accounting for and safeguarding and transmission of $17,000,000,000 annually calls for a personnel far above the average in ability. He has given the rank and file credit for the good work they have performed. That this work has been performed well is indicated by the fact that without taking credit for some 122 million dollars worth of free services provided by the Post Office Department, there was a surplus in 1943 of $1,334,555. This good record has been kept up in 1944 and a surplus of $37,768,000 has been reported, the first two such surpluses in 25 years. I understand that for the current fiscal year an even better record is being maintained.

The increase to regular and substitute employees will total $49,000,000, but note that this sum includes the cost of authorizing salaries to clerks in third-class offices amounting to over $10,000,000 in excess of the lump sum allowances heretofore granted to postmasters for clerical assistance.

It is thus apparent that the sum of approximately $39,000,000 is the net increase of salary payments, exclusive of overtime, night differential, and so forth made under present laws.

In the estimated cost of this bill there is included $1,345,000 for an increase from $3 to $4 per day in the travel allowances for railway mail clerks.

An increase in rent allowances for fourth-class postmasters is included, amounting to $505,000. This allowance is fixed by existing law at 15 percent of the postmaster's salary. It is not proposed to change this rate.

An increase in night differential pay is also included, amounting to $6,084,000. This increase results from the application of the existing 10-percent rate to the true hourly rates of pay as established by the bill.

The cost of the provision allowing postmasters and supervisors, for the purpose of fixing salaries, 100-percent credit for postal receipts, as compared with 85- and 90-percent credit under present laws, is $8,000,000, which is also included in the total over-all cost of conversion.

The conversion cost of this bill is its greatest cost, inasmuch as continuing the present entrance salaries for new employees and the same automatic grades for the first 5 years of service will offset the higher salaries provided for by additional automatic grades.

Briefly, the purpose of this bill is to do justice to the postal employees, the Post Office Department, and the people they serve.

A large part of the cost is for the purpose of removing inequalities, classifying employees who are not now on a regular salary and who are given allowances which bring about substandard wages, and to provide for additional positions and classifications brought about through the greatly increased volume of business and new services.

The part of the legislation which is designed to compensate employees adequately to meet the higher standards of living which have greatly improved since 1925 is thought to be well within a 15 percent increase.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads has made a very clear statement outlining the provisions of this bill. The Members on this side of the aisle want to see this bill passed as soon as possible. We have no requests for time. I simply wish to make this announcement: I propose to ask unanimous consent when we get back in the House that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at the point of general debate in the RECORD.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STARKEY].

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I propose to utilize the time allotted me, to analyze and approach H. R. 3035, in the same manner as if it covered employees of private industry, and was subject to the wage stabilization division of the National War Labor Board. I am thoroughly convinced that the wage increases, reclassifications, and equalization of salaries in this bill come well within the Little Steel formula, intraplant inequalities, new positions, and rare and unusual cases, which are the formulas used by the War Labor Board.

I make this statement based on my past experience in dealing with labor-management problems. Permit me to say, not in a boastful manner, but merely to lay the foundation for some authority to speak on this subject, that for more than 25 years I have represented labor unions, either directly or indirectly, and only once during that period of time was there any stoppage of work on the part of a union I represented, and then for only 1 day.

Let me state further that from the very inception of the War Labor Board it has been my duty to fill out the required forms and submit supporting evidence to the Board for approval. In only one case did the Board refuse approval of wage rates submitted by organizations which I represented.

Based on this experience, let me say it is my opinion that not only would the War Labor Board approve the rates and changes embodied in this bill, but I am convinced this bill does not exhaust all of the limitations of the Board's orders, directives, and rules. I am further of the opinion that if an agency of the Government directs and compels private employers to grant increases, then the responsible agencies of government should apply the same formula in dealing with Government employees.

In considering H. R. 3035, there are four definite directives and orders of the War Labor Board which are applicable to this case.

First. The Little Steel formula, which means 15 percent increase over the total pay roll of January 1, 1941.

Second. Equalization of pay in wage ranges already established.

Third. Intraplant inequities.

Fourth. Equal pay for equal work.

On November 25, 1944, December 7, 1944, and February 20, 1945, the War Labor Board ordered, in cases involving three of the country's largest employers of labor, namely, basic steel, textiles, and meat packing, and used substantially the same language in each case. I quote:

> The company and the union shall negotiate the elimination of existing intraplant wage-rate inequalities. The following guide posts are established for collective bargaining.
>
> 1. The extent of wage adjustments required to eliminate intraplant wage-rate inequities will vary between the companies. From the record, it appears that little or no increase to eliminate intraplant wage-rate inequities will be needed in some plants where wage rates are now in a sound relationship. The largest increases in pay-roll costs may be expected where little or nothing has been done in the past to correct wage-rate inequities.

Permit me to interject at this point that certainly in the Postal Service, little or nothing has been done for the past 20 years to correct wage-rate inequalities.

Further, quoting from the Board's orders:

> 2. The maximum increases for any one company shall not exceed an amount equivalent to an average of 5 cents per hour for all its employees covered by this directive order.

The Postal Service can properly be considered one company and this directive, applied to the Post Office Department, would permit an increase equivalent to 5 cents an hour for all its employees, in addition to the 15 percent.

Applying these directives to the increases and adjustments of postal workers embodied in this bill, after granting the 15-percent increase to the total pay roll of regular employees, and treating wages of employees who are within an established rate range but not receiving the top range to which they are entitled, as intraplant inequities, it requires $4\frac{3}{100}$ cents per hour to make the adjustment, and replace the bonus presently being paid.

Therefore, it is evident that we are within the directives and orders of the War Labor Board in adjusting the salaries of regular employees.

There is another group within the Postal Service referred to as substitutes who receive less than the hourly rate of regular employees for whom they substitute. It is the universal practice in private industry to evaluate the job and set an hourly rate for the job, regardless of who performs the work. It will require $38,139,666 to replace the bonus and equalize substitutes' pay.

On June 5, 1943, the National War Labor Board handed down a decision involving male employees in which it is stated:

> This wage increase is made without regard to the Little Steel formula, but with regard simply for the democratic formula of equal pay for equal work in quantities and qualities in the same classification.

Again in their order of equal pay for equal work, which in the main involved women who were performing duties formerly performed by men, they made it crystal clear that where the quantity and the quality of the work was the same that the wages should be the same, regardless of sex.

The fact that these substitutes do not have regular hours of employment—at least, not in normal times—the Board has gone even further when on August 16, 1944, the National Board upheld the tenth region in its findings, and I quote:

All employees working less than 5 full consecutive days in any calendar week shall be paid 10 cents per hour above the scale in the classification in which they work.

Therefore, it is very obvious that placing substitutes on the same hourly rate as the regular employees does not militate against nor should it be considered in determining the 15 percent general increase and the 4 3/100 cents per hour to correct inequities among regular employees.

There is also included in this figure an amount for placing clerks in third-class post offices on a regular salary basis. At the present time postmasters in these offices are given an allowance for clerk hire, based on receipts of the office; and they may employ clerks on any basis they desire. The difference in the amount now allowed and the salary to be paid is $2,060,800.

Deducting the above amounts from the original total increase of $143,051,990, we arrive at a figure of $102,851,534, which is the amount required to replace the bonus, correct inequities, and grant increases.

Applying the Little Steel formula permits an increase of $80,172,846. There are 271,113 regular employees who work 2,024 hours per year or a total of 548,732,712 hours, collectively. Applying the 4 3/100 cents to the total hours gives us $22,138,678 or a total equal to the increase provided for regular employees under this bill.

Now just a word to explain some of the inequalities existing within the Postal Service among regular employees.

The salary range of first-class postmasters is from $3,200 to $12,000 per annum, and for assistant postmasters from $2,600 to $4,900, depending upon the receipts of the office. This bill does not increase the salary of postmasters receiving $6,000 per year and up. An assistant to a $6,000 postmaster receives $3,700 or only 61.6 percent of the postmaster's salary. The percentage continues to shrink gradually and when we reach the $12,000 postmaster his assistant receives a salary which is only 40.8 percent of that of the postmaster.

This same condition exists among employees who are now performing the functions, but not carrying the title or receiving a salary commensurate with the responsibilities of general superintendent of finance, general superintendent of mail, and superintendent of incoming and outgoing mail, and their assistants, and other supervisors.

The Post Office Department has three grades of clerks doing precisely the same work with maximum salaries under the old law of $2,450, $2,300, and $2,100 per year, respectively. It is common practice throughout the Post Office System that these three grades of clerks work side by side in many instances, or in different locations within the system, doing exactly the same work.

In figuring the amount involved to correct these inequalities we have not taken the highest figures of $2,450 per year, but the middle grade of $2,300 per year. There are at the present time 47,755 post-office clerks who have the required length of service and efficiency rating to permit them to be raised to the $2,300 grade. The present law permits this increase but the appropriation does not. Therefore, very definitely under the rules that govern increase, and the fact that they do precisely the same work as the higher paid employees, there is an intraplant inequality and this bill corrects the situation by placing all clerks on the same salary schedule.

City delivery carriers take the identical examination as clerks and are required to have the same educational and other requisites to qualify for the examination. They are interchangeable, sometimes being assigned as clerks and clerks assigned as carriers. Here again, there is a definite inequality, and this bill makes the adjustment.

There are also inequalities existing among drivers of motor vehicles. Drivers of half-ton trucks now receive a top salary of $2,300, while many drivers of 5-ton trucks are limited to only $2,100 per year.

None of these conditions would be tolerated in private industry.

Permit me to add that both the Department of Labor and the Federal Reserve bank made surveys as to the increased rates of pay in private industry. The Labor Department studied wages in mining, manufacturing, and railroads and reached the conclusion that there has been a 20 percent increase in wages from 1925 to 1941. The Federal Reserve bank's study included all private employees and school teachers, but excluded other Government employees and reached the conclusion that the increase was 18 percent during the same period, while the salaries of the postal employees remained the same in 1941 as they were in 1925.

All of these facts most certainly, in my opinion, justify passage of this bill.

We have many charts and a large amount of figures and data indicating the tremendous increase in the volume of business and functions of the postal service which substantiate our contention of increase in responsibilities and duties, and justifies the conclusion reached by your committee. This data is much too voluminous to comment on here.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this bill. For many years the postal employees have been rendering meritorious service in all kinds of weather without just compensation. Simple justice demands that their services be recognized by the speedy passage of this bill.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, the legislation that is being considered by the House this afternoon to bring about a more equitable pay for deserving postal employees, not only of the Government, but of the people of this Nation, is most desirable.

I call attention to several unusual circumstances in connection with mail deliveries:

Several Florida cities have weathered hurricanes without disruption of the mail service. During the severe blows of 1926 and 1928 carriers made collections of letters from street boxes while nearly everybody else in town had sought refuge from the storm.

In the Northwest the rural and star-route carriers have their troubles in winter. One man in northern Wisconsin regularly makes his deliveries on skis. Another carries his mail in an ice boat occasionally. Snowshoes and ice skates have been important factors in making deliveries. Many of the carriers in the Northwest use sleighs.

One rural carrier, Walter R. Blanchard, of Hilbert, Wis., was hopelessly snow-bound one day, but a farmer helped him shovel his sleigh out. He continued on his route, cut through fields, dug his way through snowdrifts, and finally delivered all his mail. When he finished he was so nearly frozen that he was unable to unhitch his team.

Another old-timer, Thomas Connell, has served his patrons by buggy, by cart, with sleighs, afoot, and on horseback, by two- and four-horse teams, and on skis. A carrier in Mississippi who has a long route over very bad roads generally keeps two automobiles, has been known to wear out two cars in 1 year. He has to ford streams, go through sand beds, put on chains to climb a slippery clay hill, drive on muddy roads, and sometimes has to be pulled out of a bog.

One of the most unusual rural routes in the postal service is 300 miles long and extends from Point Barrow along the coast of Alaska to Kotzbue. It is carried by an Eskimo with a sled and dog team and sometimes 2 months are required for a round trip.

The first emergency that confronted Postmaster Hogan, of Chicago, more than a hundred years ago was solved in a unique manner. He made his headquarters in a log cabin and along the wall he nailed a row of boots, each of which became a receptacle for the mail of some regular patron. This was the first delivery system of its kind on record. The balance of the mail he stuck in his tall hat and delivered on foot.

Pioneers in the West were confronted with problems much worse. Letters to people whose whereabouts were not known were simply addressed "In the Boone's Lick Country," or "Out West." Strangely, many of these letters were delivered. A packet of letters so addressed would be passed from one settlement to another, from cabin to cabin, and any deliverable mail extracted. When the letters had gone the rounds of all known settlers they were then tacked onto the walls of the last cabin, where anyone who entered might see them. Many of them were claimed eventually, and those that were not claimed after 6 months were opened and read by the community, all of whom were anxious for news of any sort.

A permanent requisite of postal employees is patience. One day in a small Kansas town a lady presented a money order at the post office window. She was

asked to endorse it and, taking the pen, she wrote on the back of it: "I heartily endorse this money order." When she was told to sign it as she ordinarily would sign a letter, she wrote: "Your loving wife, Mary K. J."

Some of the most illustrious names in American history are linked with the postal service. Benjamin Franklin was the first Postmaster General. Franklin, incidentally, inaugurated the patronage system by appointing his son-in-law Comptroller of the Post Office. Under the crown Franklin had been permitted to frank mail thus: "Free. B. Franklin." When the colonies declared their independence, Franklin changed his frank to this: "B. Free Franklin."

I believe that H. R. 3035 will pass with almost unanimous approval, and I hope the Senate will act promptly on the measure that justice may be done these loyal and efficient workers.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS].

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, exclusive of our fighting men and women, no group has done a better job during this war than the post-office employees. Yet the postal employees are truly the forgotten men of America. Not a single individual in this country can explain our failure to give them proper recognition. Every major newspaper in the Nation has advocated a pay raise and a reclassification bill for the postal employee. Every major public-opinion poll likewise favors a raise in the present basic pay of the postal worker, which has remained unchanged since the Coolidge administration in 1925.

Then who is to blame for this inaction? The Congress of the United States, and only the Congress. It is time we act. It is time we practice the principles we preach. We Congressmen have complained that our salaries are inadequate to make ends meet during this high-cost-of-living era. Well, how about the postal employee, with his family usually larger than ours. How can he make ends meet on his present salary? His working responsibilities have definitely increased. Today the Postal Service is moving an unprecedented volume of mail. It has sold bonds and stamps, helped register aliens, delivered millions of ration books, and assisted with other special wartime services. And on top of all this has been piled the movement of millions upon millions of service letters and packages to and from the far ends of the earth.

The Postal Service has not been exempted from the draft. A very large percentage of clerks, mail carriers, and other postal workers are at the front. It has been difficult and at times impossible to replace them. Therefore, the gigantic job increased by war has been done by a short-handed staff.

Yet, there has not been any postal strike, nor disturbance, nor any high-pressure action to force better pay. It is universally admitted that if any private employer had treated his workers as Uncle Sam has treated the postal employees, there would be 15 alphabetical agencies on his neck with a prompt order for retroactive pay increases—in addition to a fine and penalty—for freezing wage rates at arbitrary levels below the cost of living. As one Member of Congress, I will insist that Uncle Sam no longer remain immune. Where is the equity and justice in allowing Uncle Sam to crack the whip on a private employer in order to force him to maintain a decent standard of living for his employees, yet let Uncle Sam be blinded and ignore his own employees? The faith and loyalty of the postal worker has never been challenged. Let the Congress recognize this faith and loyalty by promptly enacting into law the Burch reclassification bill, now known as H. R. 3035.

Extensive public hearings were held on the original Burch reclassification bill, known as H. R. 2071. Instead of reporting out H. R. 2071 with amendments, it was considered better to introduce H. R. 3035 in order to simplify procedure. All of the postal organizations were represented at the hearings before the committee and strongly urged a favorable report on the bill. Approximately 200 Members of Congress informed the committee, either in person or by written statements, that they considered this proposed legislation extremely meritorious and long overdue. During the hearings, emphasis was placed on rising living costs throughout the Nation within the past few years, and it was shown that postal employees are having a difficult time meeting their essential living expenses on the basis of their present compensation. The committee is thoroughly convinced that postal wages should be increased so that they will be in line with wages and salaries in private industry and the Postal Service will be able to retain competent employees.

The purpose of the bill is to reclassify salaries in the several branches of the field service of the Post Office Department commensurate with the importance and complexity of postal work; to arrange for uniformity in computing compensation and making salary payments; to provide improved working and wage conditions for classified substitute employees and nonclassified clerks in third-class post offices and special-delivery messengers, and, in general, provide such conditions that will attract to the Postal Service men and women of character, loyalty, ability, and industry, and thus bring about improved service to the public. The bill, so far as basic salaries are concerned, is proposed as permanent legislation and not as one to meet wartime conditions. Such conditions are provided for in section 20 of the bill which provides that during the emergency and for 6 months thereafter employees shall be paid overtime for services required on Saturdays. The bill proposes to bring about uniformity in the entire postal salary structure and give each class of work its due relative importance. It is designed to remove inequities and inequalities in the salaries of employees performing like work, and in the bases of their compensation. The necessity for the reclassification and standardization of postal salaries is of long standing. The present basic salary structure was enacted in 1925. While a large number of beneficial laws affecting separate groups of employees have been enacted since, these have been enacted without at all times considering the services as a whole, and the basic salaries have remained the same. It seems recognized generally that basic maximum salaries are too low. Remedial legislation through Public Law 25, effective May 1, 1943, to correct this condition, provided for increases of $300, or 15 percent. This law, however, becomes inoperative July 1, 1945, which points to the need for legislation before that date.

Let us make a career in the Postal Service worth while. For years Government subsidies were necessary to maintain a standard of service to the American people. Today, however, the Postal Department has been operating at a profit—exceeding the sum of $150,000,000 this past year. This profit should and must be shared with the postal employee.

I am happy that Chairman BURCH incorporated into his bill the provisions of my bill for time and one-half for overtime. Time and one-half is enjoyed by all American labor—so why exempt the postal employees?

The provisions of the Burch bill are reasonable and just and this recognition for the postal employee is long overdue. Everyone agrees that today they are decidedly underpaid. The Burch bill corrects this injustice.

I appeal to the Seventy-ninth Congress today to rise to its stature of statesmanship and responsibility by promptly passing this most meritorious measure, H. R. 3035, to reward our faithful postal employees.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is gratifying to see this bill, H. R. 3035, brought out on the floor of the House for consideration. Its objective is to bring about a much-needed salary increase for the loyal employees of our postal system. It provides them their first pay increase since the year 1925, with the exception of the temporary bonus of $300 which they are now receiving and which will expire on June 30.

H. R. 3035 is a worth-while measure and constitutes a basis for further upgrading of postal salaries. The postal workers, one of the most deserving groups in our Government system, have long been due a reward for their tireless public service. In this war, their contribution has been inestimable. An over-all adjustment of postal salaries has been drastically needed for years and has been earnestly advocated by all those interested in postal reform. H. R. 3035 is indeed a step in the right direction, and I hope the House will act favorably on it this afternoon.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. TRAYNOR].

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Chairman, the individual that coined the phrase "the forgotten man" surely had in his mind the postal employees.

For 20 years the employees have maintained a dignified silence as to pay increase and have proven their loyalty to

the Government when other employees of the Government have received substantial increases.

During the Seventy-eighth Congress an increase of $300 was granted until June 30, 1945.

The Post Office Department is one of the most important departments of the Government. In fact, it is the only self-sustaining Department with employees numbering 277,477 regular employees, 57,771 classified substitutes, making a total of 368,504 employees of the Postal Service. The Postal Service is a Nationwide institution and it is in some respects one of the largest business undertakings in the United States.

In the fiscal year of 1944 its operating revenues were approximately $1,110,714,000, and its expenditures under appropriation items approximately $1,088,175,000, leaving a gain of $22,539,000. This year the Department expects to have a surplus of $117,000,000.

No corporate business of this size could for long operate efficiently and expect to remain solvent without a rather complete knowledge of the facts regarding each branch of its activities and in no respect is this need absent in the Postal Service, even though deficits, when they occur, are met readily from the United States Treasury, to give to its owners, the people of the United States, efficient service at minimum costs consistent with high quality, with the burden equitably distributed among users.

I believe the postal workers are the poorest-paid employees of the Federal Government.

The bill H. R. 3035 drawn and recommended by the Postal Department will be, I believe, after being heard and acted upon by the Committees on Post Offices and Post Roads of both Houses of Congress, a good start in correcting most of the discrepancies which are present in the pay envelope of the loyal employees of the Post Office Department. I feel that better times are in sight for the postal employees.

The Government has begun to recognize the value of the postal employees and the contribution made by them to the Nation during the present conflict. I am confident, with the passage of this bill, the Government will, in a small way, compensate them for the splendid work they have been doing.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads for reporting House bill 3035 favorably. This committee has performed a most constructive service in reporting this bill to the House. They have been very diligent and painstaking in their hearings. I know this because I appeared before this committee on two occasions supporting and asking that this legislation for our postal employees be made a law. On both occasions they accorded me most courteous and kind consideration as well as the others who appeared before them in support of the measure.

This bill should receive the support of every Member of the House whether he be a Republican or a Democrat as this is not a partisan bill but it might be called a humanitarian piece of legislation and a measure to bring "economic justice" to a group of our most loyal and hard-working Government employees—postal workers. In season and out, in bad weather and in good, in snow, rain, storm, the letter carriers deliver the mail regularly and without interruption. Congressmen can feel close to the postal employees for they handle the many pamphlets and books and other literature during a campaign and they do the job efficiently, quickly, and without complaint.

Certainly it is our postal employees that have been the "forgotten" people in this period of increased prices and increased living costs. While we looked upon them for efficient and essential service during all these days, we have forgotten them on pay day. When we realize that for 20 long years these hard-working patriotic employees have not had a raise in salary, we bow our heads in shame for the treatment accorded this fine group of our citizens.

Members of Congress, let us do the honest, right, and just thing by passing this law and granting to the postal employees this additional compensation.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I voted against the postal employees permanent pay raise because I do not think this is the time to permanently raise Federal employees' wages. I voted for a temporary raise in the salaries of postal employees as a war measure and would have voted to extend this for the duration. Furthermore, it was the understanding when this temporary pay raise was voted, that no permanent wage increase would be requested until after the conclusion of the war.

Also, it is my understanding that a study is being made of the entire Federal wage schedule with the view of making salary adjustments. I feel that it would be better to have a thorough picture of the over-all situation before attempting to make any change in the wage rates.

Wages and farm prices are fixed by the Government and are not permitted to be raised and they have no assurance these will even be maintained at the present level after the war. I believe we should treat all groups alike.

I voted against increasing my own salary $2,500 just a few days ago. I feel certain that my constituents want me to do everything possible, not only to hold the line against inflation, but to be as fair as I possibly can to all groups.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in accord with the objectives of H. R. 3035 and regret exceedingly that the bill did not become a law during the last Congress. This is a new bill to take the place of H. R. 2071, and includes the committee amendments. I had the opportunity to appear before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads in support of this bill and want to congratulate the committee on their early consideration of this measure and favorably reporting it out unanimously, as I understand.

The purpose of the bill is to reclassify salaries in the several branches of the field service of the Post Office Department commensurate with the importance and complexity of postal work; to arrange for uniformity in computing compensation and making salary payments; to provide improved working and wage conditions for classified substitute employees and nonclassified clerks in third-class post offices and special delivery messengers, and, in general, provide such conditions that will attract to the Postal Service men and women of character, loyalty, ability, and industry, and thus bring about improved service to the public. The bill, so far as basic salaries are concerned, is proposed as permanent legislation and not as one to meet wartime conditions. Such conditions are provided for in section 20 of the bill, which provides that during the emergency and for 6 months thereafter employees shall be paid overtime for services required on Saturdays. The bill proposes to bring about uniformity in the entire postal salary structure and give each class of work its due relative importance. It is designed to remove inequities and inequalities in the salaries of employees performing like work, and in the bases of their compensation. The necessity for the reclassification and standardization of postal salaries is of long standing. The present basic salary structure was enacted in 1925. While a large number of beneficial laws affecting separate groups of employees have been enacted since, these have been enacted without at all times considering the service as a whole, and the basic salaries have remained the same. It seems recognized generally that basic maximum salaries are too low. Remedial legislation through Public Law 25, effective May 1, 1943, to correct this condition, provided for increases of $300 or 15 percent. This law, however, becomes inoperative July 1, 1945, which points to the need for legislation before that date.

We all know that these faithful Federal employees have not had raises in salary for 20 years with the exception of the wartime emergency increases which we authorized heretofore and which expires on June 30. Under this bill mail-carriers' pay will range from $1,700 to $2,700. It also provides for an 8-hour day and compensatory time for work on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays, and overtime in emergencies requiring more than an 8-hour day. It also has a 10-percent differential for night work and a 15-day vacation with pay.

The bill generally provides for increase in salaries of postmasters, clerks, and other postal employees, but the faithful letter carriers are also included, who certainly are entitled to consideration. They have been the forgotten men of the Federal employees' family.

The bill provides 11 grades for city-delivery carriers, clerks, and employees of the Postal Service whose work is comparable to that of clerks and carriers, beginning with grade 1 at $1,700 per annum, with annual promotions to the eleventh grade at $2,700. Existing law provides for 5 grades and the first 5 grades in the proposed bill are the same as at present. For employees at first-class offices, in the Railway Mail Service, and in the Inspection Service 3 addi-

tional grades are provided for those who perform faithful and meritorious service, viz: grade 12 at $2,800 per annum after 3 years; grade 13 at $2,900 per annum after 5 years, and grade 14 at $3,000 per annum after 7 years. This feature provides regular promotions for employees commencing with their first year of work and ending with the twenty-fifth year. Ten of the promotions may be attained within 10 years. During this period an employee is required to progress from comparatively simple duties to work involving considerable special and technical knowledge and skill, combined in many instances with financial responsibility.

I hope that the bill will receive the unanimous approval of the House so that it may go over to the other legislative body and receive early action and be enacted into law without further delay.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this legislation to grant a permanent increase in pay for postal carriers and clerks is long overdue. No upward adjustment in the basic pay rates of these fine public servants has been made since 1925. There is no harder working branch of the Federal service than our Post Office employees, and this bill merely provides tardy recognition for the fine, efficient service rendered by these faithful workers. It would be unfair for us to fail to award this measuse of justice, and as a practical matter, it should be done in order to retain many of these experienced men in the Post Office service and maintain a high level of efficiency.

I sincerely hope this legislation will again pass the House, as it did last December, and that at this session it will finally be enacted into law.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 3035, is probably the most comprehensive salary-increase bill ever to be reported by the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, which represents months of arduous study by our committee, and has been reported with unanimous approval.

In addition to the general salary increase, it provides a basis for the overtime and night differential that will be more equitable among the various branches of the Postal Service and in addition will simplify pay-roll procedures.

Critics of the bill may argue that the additional cost of the $150,000,000-a-year increase is too high. It should be pointed out, however, that over eighty-four million of this amount will be represented by the time-and-a-half-overtime feature alone. Most of this will be eliminated when the manpower situation becomes normal again.

No group in America is more entitled to the consideration of this Congress than our postal employees. This is the first increase to their base pay since 1925. While living costs have increased, their base pay has remained stationary for over 20 years, the only change being the 15-percent reduction which they were given under the Economy Act.

The Post Office Department is a service department that our Government affords its people. Its expansion is interwoven with the history of our great Republic. In many particulars it has been responsible for our expansion westward. It has attracted to itself men and women of high caliber, who have rendered efficient service to the American people.

That this high quality of service is appreciated by the American people is best proved by the widespread and wholehearted approval that has been expressed in favor of this legislation by citizens throughout the land.

This bill, H. R. 3035, which will bring long-delayed justice to these faithful employees of the Post Office Department, has been carefully prepared by our committee, and I sincerely hope that it will be passed without amendment.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am for this bill. I believe its passage is overdue. The post office workers of this Nation represent governmental service to the people at its best. They are a credit to our democracy and its institutions. A bill similar to this one passed the House last year with, I believe, but one dissenting vote. This time, I hope it will be unanimous.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I heartily favor this bill, H. R. 3035, which reclassifies salaries in the Postal Service. The unanimity of the support which this bill is receiving from Members of Congress is a great tribute to the Postal Service and its many thousands of employees all over the Nation. Every citizen of this country is in almost daily contact with our postal employees. He sees them in their daily work; he knows them as neighbors and fellow townsmen; and he forms his impression of Government employees and of the efficiency of Government itself from these contacts. The fact that this bill has received such strong support, not only in Congress, but throughout the country, indicates that people generally are pleased with the kind of service which they have been getting through the Post Office Department. It indicates the high regard which they have for postal employees and their appreciation of the splendid service which they render day in and day out through the years.

It has been 20 years since we have had general legislation affecting the Postal Service. During that time the service has expanded and grown tremendously. The character of the service has changed in many instances. New duties have been given postal employees. It is true there have been pay adjustments in certain cases, but the time has now arrived when Congress should pass comprehensive legislation covering the entire field of postal employees.

I do not suppose that anyone would contend that this is a perfect bill. There are no doubt some groups of postal employees who feel that their particular situation has not been fully taken into account. It may be necessary later to make some adjustments. The committee had the job of reconciling many conflicting viewpoints. I think it has done an excellent job. This bill is intended to, and will, benefit every postal employee. I am happy to give it my support.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration is to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service, and to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation.

This bill has the unqualified endorsement of all postal organizations. It should have the unanimous approval of the membership of this House.

This legislation is highly meritorious. It seeks to correct a condition that has existed too long. The postal employees are the "forgotten men" of the Government service when considered from the standpoint of long-delayed salary adjustments to meet the ever-rising cost of living. Justice to these faithful employees requires that the matter shall no longer be delayed.

During the last few years it has been difficult for postal employees to meet the increased cost of living upon salaries fixed in 1925. Through the years our postal employees have worked faithfully and conscientiously. In recent years they would have been far better off, from a financial standpoint, if they had taken positions in war industries or other private industries that were paying much higher wages. But they have remained at their post of duty in expectation that the justice of their claim would be recogized. This recognition should have come long ago. However, the opportunity is now at hand, and it is the duty of this House to pass the pending legislation and thereby rectify the wrong and unjustice that has prevailed for so many years.

I consider it not only my duty but a privilege to cast my vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, during this brief time allotted to me, I wish to state at the very outset that I intend to support the pending measure, H. R. 3035, which will give to the postal employees simple justice in the readjustment of their wages and salaries. Throughout the length and breadth of this country the people realize that the postal employees have been long denied an increase in their compensation, and I am happy that this measure is now before the House so this question can be debated, voted upon, and finally decided.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that many years ago the postal employees were granted a slight raise in their pay. Since that time the cost of living has increased, the standard of living has been enhanced, but the postal employees have had to go forward from year to year with the same wage and salary. Yet their duties have continued, and in many post offices those duties have been more than doubled during the past few years. During the period of this war I am convinced the duties of our postal employees have increased tremendously, yet those faithful employees have carried on—they have faithfully performed their duties in fair and foul weather; they have done a wonderful job for the people of this great Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the report filed with the pending measure indicates that the last readjustment of salaries of postal employees was in the year 1925. That being the case, these people are entitled to an adjustment now. In the face of the increase of salaries and wages of

practically every other class of Government employees—many of those having desk jobs, and in the performance of their work they are not exposed to the inclement weather that many of the postal employees encounter—this is certainly the time and here is the place where this class of our Government employees may be given the slight increase embraced in this bill, and to which I am constrained to believe they are justly entitled.

Mr. Chairman, I will fully support this bill. It is my best judgment that this increase is entirely merited, and it will grant equity where equity is due.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, throughout my entire membership in the House of Representatives I have supported legislation to improve both the working conditions and the salaries paid to our conscientious and hard-working postal employees. I have always felt these employees of our Government were underpaid and were justified in their efforts to secure just compensation and better working conditions.

I sincerely hope this just bill, H. R. 3035, will pass the House by a unanimous vote and will speedily be enacted into law, thereby bringing a long-delayed relief to our faithful and deserving postal employees.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of H. R. 3035, a bill to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes.

The purpose of this bill is to reclassify salaries in the several branches of the field service of the Post Office Department commensurate with the importance and complexity of postal work; to arrange for uniformity in computing compensation and making salary payments; to provide improved working and wage conditions for classified substitute employees and nonclassified clerks in third-class post offices and special-delivery messengers, and, in general, provide such conditions that will attract to the Postal Service men and women of character, loyalty, ability, and industry, and thus bring about improved service to the public.

I think everybody will concede that our postal employees, before the war and especially during the war, have had an unusually arduous job to perform and that they have performed their duties with an unusual degree of ability and loyalty.

All of the postal organizations were represented at the hearings before the Post Office and Post Roads Committee and strongly urged a favorable report on this bill.

The general purposes accomplished by this bill may be defined as follows:

First. The bill provides a $400 per year increase over present base pay to practically every person in the Postal Service, in lieu of the $300 per year temporary bonus which expires June 30, 1945.

Second. It introduces the principle of longevity pay in many of the branches of the Postal Service.

Third. It removes many of the inequalities and injustices that have existed for a long time between various branches of the Postal Service.

Fourth. It provides for time and one-half pay for overtime work.

Fifth. It provides 10 percent extra over the hourly day rate for postal workers, with some exceptions, who are required to work nights.

Sixth. It grants to all postal employees 15 days leave of absence each year with pay, and 10 days of sick leave with pay each year.

This bill will grant to a great body of worthy postal employees additional advantages over their present situation. Our Postal Service has long been the admiration of our country and I am heartily in favor of this bill for the reasons set forth and for the additional reason that it will bring a ray of hope to those employees of our Postal Service who, by their efficiency and competency, have raised the Post Office Department to its high level of public efficiency.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to state that I heartily endorse H. R. 3035 and sincerely trust that it will be speedily approved in the House.

I have been interested in the affairs of the postal workers for the past several years and I do not know of any group in the Federal service who are more faithful, loyal, and dependable workers than those in the Postal Service.

Certainly the people of the Nation recognize the excellence of their performance over the years, day in and day out, and they deserve any increases that may be granted to them.

It has been generally recognized increases for this branch of the Federal Government have been neglected for a considerable length of time and I am surprised that more of their number have not sought other occupations.

The people are indeed fortunate that they have been faithful to their work and stayed on despite the fact that this increase should have been granted sometime ago.

They have faith in their job and they have faith in the Post Office Department and I hope this faith will be justified in the action of the Congress today in the rapid approval of this legislation.

Their work has been outstanding and everywhere throughout my district I hear hearty commendations of their performance—a performance that might well be emulated by other branches of the Federal Government.

This legislation is timely and I know this will renew their faith that Congress wants to do the right thing and that the people of the Nation do appreciate the splendid work of the Post Office Department and its thousands of employees.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I have, of course, repeatedly stated my position with respect to salary adjustments for postal employees. These employees have not had a raise since 1925. They work for the Government of the richest country on earth. Let us not neglect them any further. These employees stuck to their jobs during this war, and saw that the mail got out, while others were seeking war jobs with higher pay. If any employee in the Government service deserves recognition, the postal worker does.

I hope this bill is overwhelmingly passed.

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of H. R. 3035 because the vast majority of the postal employees have remained with the Department through the war when it would have been possible for them to have gone into defense work and doubled their salary. These loyal and efficient employees have not had a raise in pay in over 20 years. It is true that they are now receiving a wartime bonus but this will soon be stopped unless this bill becomes a law.

This bill does more than merely make the wartime bonus permanent. It revises the entire pay schedule and allows a more equitable system of pay increases, thus giving some incentive to the postal employees to stay with the Department and render loyal, efficient service.

In my estimation, this measure is nothing more than a just reward for a group of our citizens who are now, and who have been over many years, rendering an outstanding service to our country.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that Congress is taking steps to bring about necessary readjustment in the pay of those engaged in the Nation's Postal Service. This legislation has been delayed too long. Twenty years have elapsed since any upward revision was made in the basic salary rates of these loyal and efficient workers upon whose shoulders rest much responsibility and whose duties involve exacting labor. Their work, as we all know, is vital to the successful functioning of Government, to the operation of private enterprise, and to the economic and social welfare of all our people. Yet their salaries have remained below those of large numbers of persons engaged in less essential employment, private and public. This situation should be remedied promptly and I am sure Congress intends to see that this is done.

H. R. 3035, which is now being considered, replaces the original measure, H. R. 2071. The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, which considered this legislation most carefully and conducted numerous hearings, had at first intended to report out H. R. 2071, with amendments. In order to simplify the procedure, however, it was decided to introduce H. R. 3035, which includes some changes in provisions of the former bill. These changes are based to a considerable extent upon views expressed by representatives of the various postal branches who appeared before the committee.

H. R. 3035, so far as basic salaries are concerned, is designated as permanent legislation and not as a measure to meet wartime conditions. Such conditions are provided for in a section which states that during the emergency and 6 months thereafter, employees shall be paid overtime for services required on Saturdays.

The bill is intended to bring about uniformity in the entire postal salary structure and give each class of work its due relative importance, to remove inequities and inequalities in the salaries

of employees performing similar work, and in the bases of their compensation.

In the matter of general salary increase, this legislation stipulates that regular employees in automatic grades shall be assigned to the salary of their respective position on the basis of their base salary plus 20 percent, or $400, whichever is the lesser amount, but not less than $300. It provides that nothing in this proposed law shall operate to decrease the pay of any present regular employee to an amount less than annual base pay plus $300.

Under this reclassification program, the salaries of postmasters and supervisors, now based on 85 percent of gross receipts in nondelivery offices and 90 percent at delivery offices, would be changed to a basis of 100 percent of gross receipts. All postmasters of the first-class offices, except those now receiving $6,000 and more, would receive increases of from $300 to $400 over their present base pay. Those of the second-class offices would receive increases of $400 to $600 over their base pay and additional benefits through the 100-percent clause. Postmasters at the third-class offices would be benefited by reason of the 100-percent provision and increases of $300 over their base pay, while those at the fourth-class offices are giving increases of 20 percent in this bill, and they will also benefit through the 100-percent arrangement.

These benefits are gratifying, but in my opinion the increases the postmasters would receive under this bill are not sufficiently large enough in proportion to those granted others connected with the Postal Service, considering the postmasters' duties and responsibilities.

The measure places clerks in third-class offices, employed not less than 40 hours per week, in automatic salary grades of from $1,200 to $1,700, instead of being paid from allowances given the postmasters, a practice which has resulted in inadequate allowances for these clerks and has made it necessary for the postmasters to pay additional compensation out of their own pockets in order to retain satisfactory employees.

Eleven grades are designated for city-delivery carriers, clerks, and employees whose work is comparable to that of clerks and carriers. Grade 1 is put at $1,700 per annum, with annual promotions leading to grade 11 at $2,700. For employees at first-class offices, in the Railway Mail Service, and in the Inspection Service there are three additional grades for those performing faithful and meritorious service. Grade 12 is placed at $2,800 per annum after 3 years, grade 13 at $2,900 after 5 years, and grade 14 at $3,000 after 7 years. This feature provides regular promotions for employees beginning with their first year of employment and ending with the twenty-fifth year. Ten of the promotions may be attained with 10 years.

In preparation of this bill, the principle of regular promotions over a period of several years has been applied to all classifications of employees below the grade of supervisor. Entrance and maximum salaries have been fixed to correspond with the comparative difficulty and importance of the work.

The carriers in the Rural Delivery Service, who in the past have been paid on a mileage basis, are classified in 14 grades, with automatic promotions to and including grade 11 and three additional grades to which promotion can be made for faithful and meritorious service the same as provided for carriers in the City Delivery Service.

Among the other provisions are those pertaining to overtime and night differential. The bill provides that overtime and night differential payments be made on the basis of 253 days, which is 365 days less 52 Sundays, 52 Saturdays and 8 holidays. Under the present system, overtime is paid on a basis of 305, 306, and 360 days. The change is intended to establish equality among the several branches of the Postal Service and also simplify pay-roll procedures.

In emergencies or if the needs of the Service require, an employee working in excess of 8 hours a day would, under the new plan, be paid on a basis of 150 percent of his hourly rate of pay.

The legislation also includes measures for improvement of the Special Delivery Service.

I believe that benefits to the greatest possible extent should be granted to those in the Postal Service. We all appreciate the fact that the readjustments are badly needed. We know that it has been most difficult for these employees, particularly in the lower-salary groups, to meet the increased cost of living. We know also of the loyalty and efficiency with which these workers have stuck to their posts, keeping the mail service up to standard at all times and under all conditions. Their duties have been multiplied because of the war and the fact that 50,000 postal employees are on military leave, making it necessary for the Post Office Department to employ many older persons, and in numerous instances students from the schools, in order to meet this manpower emergency. The success with which the Postal Service is maintained in time of peace or in time of war and in the face of many handicaps is an outstanding tribute to everyone connected with this great agency of our Government.

An added factor which should be taken into consideration is the realization that the Post Office Department is now a paying institution. From this standpoint, as well as from others, increased salaries are in order for those whose services have contributed to the Department's growth and the gain in revenues. No longer are deficits shown by this phase of Federal operations. Reports show a postal surplus of $37,768,028 for the fiscal year of 1944, and those of $117,643,897 and $265,214,280 are predicted for the fiscal years of 1945 and 1946.

The great number of letters received by Members of Congress from those outside the Postal Service urging support for reclassification legislation shows that the general public is greatly interested in the cause of the postal employees. This is natural, for the duties that these employees perform affect the lives of all our citizens. We all depend upon the mail service, to which we are so accustomed, and which is such a part of the American way of life that we cannot conceive what would happen if this part of the Government was to cease functioning.

I am particularly interested in the adoption of H. R. 3035 from the standpoint of benefits to the clerks and other employees in post offices throughout the land and to the carriers who day by day, through the heat of summer and the cold of winter, amid rain or snow or storm, go faithfully and uncomplainingly about their work. To each and every one of us the mailman is more than just an employee—he is our friend through whom, to such a great extent, we maintain our contacts with our fellow men.

I am also especially in sympathy with the needs of the postmasters. Perhaps in this I am somewhat influenced by the fact that my father was for many years a postmaster and I know, from the services he rendered, the labor and the problems involved in that position.

H. R. 3035 is a worthy and comprehensive measure. There has been no more deserving legislation before Congress, and there is no more deserving group of employees than those who are doing such a fine job in the handling of the vast mail system of our Nation. Aside from the very justice of their case, here is an opportunity for Congress and the country to show all those in the Postal Service appreciation for their loyalty and for the efficiency they demonstrate in their various duties.

"The mail must go through" is the daily creed of everyone connected with the Postal Service.

"H. R. 3035 must go through" should be the motto of Congress in working for speedy enactment of this legislation.

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads is to be highly complimented on the bill (H. R. 3035) to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service.

Although the history of wages for the past 25 years has been one of ups and downs in most fields, there has been no field which has gone steadily downward, with no ups, than has that of the postal workers.

This fact is rather irreconcilable, since postal works are employees of our Government, which makes every effort to see that employees of private business receive just and fair treatment.

Time and one-half for overtime the Government has considered fair for employees of private business, but not fair, apparently, for their own employees.

Sometime during the past 20 or 25 years, practically every kind of worker has had some pay increase. The postal worker, however, because of increasing living costs and a static income, has seen his standard of living go lower and lower.

Why has he been discriminated against? Is the job of delivering the mail less important than other jobs? Is the intelligence requirement lower than for other jobs? Are his hours shorter and less arduous?

The answer to these questions is an emphatic "No."

There are not many jobs fundamentally more important. Many phases of our life today depend on the prompt

and accurate service of the postal employee.

The intelligence requirements for his job are high. Beginning with a Civil Service examination, he is examined 2 or 3 times a year, over facts used in his work. As many as 2,000 unrelated facts must be learned year after year, for the postal employee, and, particularly, for the railway postal clerk, to hold his job.

Many railway postal clerks work from 10 to 14 hours a day, with a minimum of 8 hours per day for postal workers.

The men in the Railway Postal Service have to stand on their feet for this long period of hours, with only a few hours of sleep.

I have seen the health of these workers ruined, because of long, irregular hours and meals.

The post-office employees in 1943 received a bonus of $300, as a wartime measure. The cost of living has increased to such heights that little can be done on the salaries they now receive, including the bonus.

This bill, so far as basic salaries are concerned, is proposed as permanent legislation and proposes to bring about uniformity in the entire postal salary structure and give each class of work its due relative importance. For this, the committee is to be highly commended.

However, under section 9–U, in the supervisory capacity, many supervisors, under this bill, will receive less than a 10-percent increase and I am anxious to see some change brought about that will place these men in the same category as other employees.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I will not take much time to voice my approval of this bill, H. R. 3035, because it will not be necessary, as I am sure the bill has almost unanimous support in the House, as the final vote will show.

This is fair and needed legislation which will show our appreciation and to some degree compensate the postal employees for the wonderful, efficient service rendered to all the people of our Nation.

We are especially grateful to them for their untiring, patriotic service during the war in the efficient handling of all-important military mail and mail to and from our fighting men and women all over the world. It has been a difficult job well done.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the Congress would only do something for the underpaid star-route carriers by passing H. R. 2000, we could then say we have dealt equitably and fairly with all who handle our mail. That bill provides 6 cents per mile equipment allowance plus 75 cents per hour wage. Also it gives permanency to the job, but does not put them under civil service. At the present time star-route carriers receive on an average about 8 cents per mile, which must take care of equipment expense and wages, which has proven to provide a mighty poor existence for these good Americans who dare not bid high enough for fear of losing the contract regardless of pay because it does give them a living, such as it is. I hope the Post Office and Post Roads Committee can induce the Postal Department to recommend the passage of H. R. 2000, for I am sure the Congress and the American taxpayer will approve it when all the facts are properly explained and developed.

Mr. Chairman, no man can say I am too liberal with the taxpayers' dollars, for my record in Congress will prove the exact opposite, but I certainly want the men and women who labor to receive fair and just compensation for their toil, as my record will also prove.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I am more liberal today with the postal employees than I was with my colleagues and myself last week when I opposed the extra expense allowance for Members of this House because I feel we can squeeze through better than many others during these days of rising living costs.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, today the House of Representatives no doubt will vote overwhelmingly for this bill to reclassify salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service, and to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation. This bill, known originally as H. R. 2071, came here to the House from our Post Office and Post Roads Committee under the new title of H. R. 3035.

As a member of this committee, I can testify that the job of whipping H. R. 3035 into shape was no easy one. The committee members have worked long hours on this bill. We are indebted to the Post Office Department for the splendid cooperation they have given Chairman THOMAS BURCH, and the rest of the members of our committee. Representatives of the many postal employee groups and postmaster organizations also have been helpful and are supporting the bill.

Because this measure affects so many thousands of Federal employees who have been underpaid for years, it has created Nation-wide interest and support. Thousands of postal workers and other citizens have written to Members of Congress and to the committee members asking for early passage of this bill.

Many newspapers throughout the Nation have editorialized on the need for a measure which would rectify existing inequalities within the service and would bring the salaries of postal employees onto a level comparable to the salaries of other Government agencies and departments.

Although H. R. 3035 represents a great stride forward for the postal employees, there will be times in the future when revision of the legislation will be necessary and desirable. However, we will take a much-needed and long-desired step forward today. I hope every Member votes for this measure.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to support H. R. 3035, which reclassifies salaries in the Postal Service. It was my privilege to serve on the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads during the sessions of the Seventy-eighth Congress and during that time became rather well acquainted with the problems of our postal employees.

This bill simply proposes to bring about uniformity in the entire postal salary structure and give each class of work its due relative importance. The fact that it is designed to remove inequities and inequalities in the salaries of employees performing like work, and in the bases of their compensation, is commendable.

The necessity for the reclassification and standardizaton of postal salaries is of long standing and this bill remedies a situation which should have had attention long ago.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, during the Seventy-eighth Congress it was my privilege to support H. R. 4715, approved by the House, December 14, and providing a permanent increase of $400 in the basic salaries of postal employees. Unfortunately in the closing days of the Seventy-eighth Congress the measure failed to reach a vote in the Senate with the result that the postal workers of the Nation were denied the increase in salaries they so richly deserve.

I am pleased that during the present session of Congress H. R. 3035 has been introduced and discussed at length in an effort to perfect a measure that would reclassify the salaries of post-office personnel. While this measure may not be perfect in every detail it is agreed that it is a meritorious bill and seeks to correct inequities in the pay schedule of postal workers as compared to the pay rolls of other Federal agencies and in private industry.

An effort has been made by the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads to give justice to the various groups of post-office employees and to report a bill that will reveal a desire to protect the best interests of them. H. R. 3035 embodies the views of this important House committee and is the result of careful deliberation and therefore is entitled to favorable consideration. It is a well-known fact that the Post Office Department through the aid of loyal postal workers has established an enviable record for loyal and efficient service despite wartime conditions that presented many obstacles to the continuance of the high standard of the United States Postal Service. Then too, the realization that the morale of employees is an important consideration in the success of any business enterprise is an added factor in warranting favorable action on H. R. 3035 as it is over 20 years since any increase has been provided in the basic salaries of postal employees.

There are many additional reasons of compelling force for approval of the provisions of H. R. 3035 and I am hopeful that there will be little time lost in recognizing the Nation's debt to the postal employees and that by a favorable vote on this meritorious measure we will in a tangible manner show our appreciation for the loyalty and service of post-office workers who by their efforts have aided immeasurably in maintaining the speed and efficiency of the United States Post Office Department, which is recognized as a model of perfection in the field of communications.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Chairman, the employees of our Postal Service have not received the consideration to which they are entitled. The job which they have done and are doing is remarkable. Since the outbreak of this war, the letter carriers and their postal personnel have been shouldering a work load which

greatly exceeds that of normal times. With the manpower shortage and other obstacles facing the postal employees they have managed to perform their difficult tasks with smoothness and efficiency. They have every reason to believe that an increase in salary should be given them. The mail man making his deliveries in the neighborhood is a friend and comforter to families of many boys now serving in the armed forces. This is one group who are justly deserving of an increase of salary. I am happy to give my support to H. R. 3035.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and to have had a small part in drafting the postal employees pay increase and reclassification bill, known as H. R. 3035, now before the House, and which I trust will be passed by a unanimous vote.

This bill is the first piece of legislation to be considered by the House for 20 years that gives all postal employees and carriers a fair and reasonable increase in pay—which should have been given to them years ago. It provides an average increase of $400 a year to all postal clerks and employees and carriers, with time and one-half pay for overtime work, 10 percent extra pay for night work, 15 days' leave of absence annually with pay, and 10 days sick leave each year with pay; and introduces the principle of longevity pay in several branches of the Postal Service.

Another good feature of this bill is, that for the first time in the history of the Postal Service, the men in this department of service of the United States have a fair and impartial opportunity for advancement and promotion, with resultant pay increases.

In some instances in the reclassification of the various departments of the Postal Service I would like to have seen higher increases provided in the bill for the loyal and faithful work done by those patriotic workers for Uncle Sam who have served their country in this Department of the Government for many years without tangible recognition of their loyalty, and for more and better rewards for the long and many years of faithful service these men have given to the country.

I want to repeat here what I said before the committee and before the House when I appeared in behalf of the Postal Service employees and carriers last fall when H. R. 4715 was before the House for consideration: Postal clerks, employees, and carriers have been working for our Government without an increase in wages for almost 20 years. When it comes to freezing wages at arbitrary levels below the cost of living at pre-war rates, the Government is one of the worst offenders. Freezing wage rates at arbitrary levels below the cost of living and binding men to jobs at pre-war incomes, is destructive of the advancement of a free people and a free government.

Our loyal Postal Service workers have stuck to their jobs early and late, in and out of doors, in the torrid heat of summer and the frigid cold of deep winter, in all forms of weather, under all conditions of climate, in temperatures ranging from 40° below zero in midwinter to 120° in midsummer.

During the years while we have been serving the cause of freedom with our allies bringing the common enemy to their knees, our loyal and faithful postal employees have been serving their country, and have come through 100 percent, in spite of a shortage of manpower, bringing messages of assurance from our fighting men in the service to the folks back home and delivering millions of messages of love and inspiration to the men at the front from their loved ones.

During the past two decades the postal employees have been denied consideration in the adjustment of income in face of the rising cost of living. The people realize what service their postal employees have given them. For the first time in history of pay-increase legislation, the people back home have been writing their Representatives in Congress, exhorting us to draft legislation that will assure the loyal, faithful, and hard-working postal employees an increase in pay which they so well deserve, and to give these men the recognition they have earned, for which they should have been rewarded long ago.

I trust the body at the other side of the Capitol will carry out the wishes of the people, and pass this bill without delay, before the present temporary wage adjustment for postal employees has expired.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to see the unanimity here for the enactment of this bill, and I think it is a fine tribute and acknowledgment to the fine service and spirit of a group of loyal Government employees who have been and are rendering such splendid work, and who have exhibited their devotion to their important work, many even at a personal and a substantial pecuniary sacrifice, and, to say the least, the increase in remuneration, though belated, is certainly, in my opinion, deserved, and I, therefore, will cast my vote favorably on this legislation.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the committee for its splendid work on this legislation. To my way of thinking, the salaries of postal employees should have been reclassified many years ago. No class of people has rendered more loyal service under all conditions. This country should be a model employer, but its record with the postal employees during the past 20 years certainly does not merit that distinction. In my opinion, this bill will correct that situation. I hope H. R. 3035 passes without a dissenting vote.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the committee for this opportunity. I consider this legislation as a just step in the proper adjustment of some of our most faithful of public servants. I feel that this bill should pass unanimously.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to advise the Members that I am heartily in favor of H. R. 3035, and I am glad that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads have acted so promptly in getting this bill before the Seventy-ninth Congress early in the session. I voted for the salary increase for postal employees in the Seventy-eighth Congress and regret that the bill did not become law.

I want to compliment the committee for the fine work they have done and the carefully prepared bill which they have presented. In my opinion, this is a comprehensive bill and eliminates a great many inequities within the service itself and corrects and improves the method on which salary is based.

This is the first increase in the base pay of postal employees in 20 years. I sincerely hope the House will vote unanimously in favor of this group of loyal, hard-working, and efficient Government employees.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I know of no group of men which is more worthy of consideration than the men affected by this bill. They have conscientiously fulfilled their duties regardless of the weather and other conditions which made their work very laborious. Much has been accomplished through them in the way of bringing to the homes from the boys at the front messages that were longingly looked forward to. Regardless of snow, sleet, and rain the mail carrier has performed faithfully the duties assigned to him, and the passage of this bill shall bring to him the much-deserved and too-long-postponed consideration. I heartily favor the passage of H. R. 3035.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to support the bill now before us, H. R. 3035. Certainly, our postal employees have been woefully underpaid, and the bill before us gives them an increase which they greatly merit and honestly deserve.

I hope there will not be a vote against this bill when the roll call takes place.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time that I have ventured to voice my views on the floor of the House. Some of my constituents will probably think it strange that, although during my campaign, I emphasized the need for economy in Government during the post-war period, I am making my first speech in support of salary increases. I do not consider, however, that there is any inconsistency in the two positions. If we are to maintain a sound fiscal condition, we must curb our expenditures, for no nation can long continue to prosper under a policy of deficit financing.

It is now generally recognized, however, that in view of our large Federal debt and other necessary expenditures, we are faced with the necessity of maintaining our national income at a much higher level than that reached at any time prior to the war. To accomplish this we must encourage production and sustain purchasing power.

The proper encouragement of production must come through adjustments of our tax laws designed to restore the profit incentive to industry and to provide inducement for investment capital. Purchasing power can be sustained only by maintaining a high standard of living. Of course, we must guard against excessive inflation and its attendant evils, but if we attempt to solve our post-war economic problems with unreasonably low level salary and wage scales, in

my humble opinion, we shall create chaos rather than order.

The basic pay scales of the postal employees are at present unreasonably low, and there exist many inequalities between individuals and groups. There has not been a general adjustment for over 20 years. The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads has labored long and hard to work out a fair and just bill. The House now has this measure before it as H. R. 3035. No one claims that it is a perfect bill, but it is an honest attempt to properly reward a conscientious group of Federal employees who have always maintained a very high standard of service. In the theatrical world there is a tradition that the show must go on; in the Post Office Department there is a tradition that the mail must be delivered. Such service merits adequate compensation. I trust that it will be the pleasure of the House to pass this bill.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, I, too, am strongly in favor of this bill. It has long been a mystery to me how the letter carrier has survived, squeezed as he has been between the high cost of living and the low-wage scale.

During the past 20 years the general wage scale has risen but the letter carrier has been the "forgotten man" in public service. He has not had a raise in 20 years.

It is time we adjusted this gross inequity. I urge the unanimous passage of this legislation.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I believe the discussion here today has made it crystal clear that, in light of the services which they perform, and commensurate with the ever rising cost of living, our postal employees are the most underpaid of any class of citizens performing a vital task in the cause of our war effort.

In peacetime, their duties are tedious and exacting, but in time of war it is obvious even to the casual observer that these duties multiply many times, and become more arduous. Throughout the country, staffs of experienced postal employees have been diminished to a bare minimum by entrance of men into the armed services, necessitating hiring of inexperienced assistants, and throwing the burden of responsibility on the remaining skeleton forces. These employees work a regulation 48-hour week. However, during the extra load on the first of the month and on so-called heavy days, these hours are extended indefinitely, requiring as many hands as can be mustered to keep the mail moving.

Not only do they work long and hard. Few realize that these public servants must have a never-failing, sympathetic understanding of the problems of those they serve. Let me read to you part of a letter from a personal friend, long a member of the Postal Service. I quote from his letter:

> Another factor in our work as letter carriers, which few people understand, is our intimate contact with a war-torn public. People have war nerves; they are frantic with worry about their sons, husbands, sweethearts, and brothers in the service; they stand anxiously before their homes every day, in rain and cold, and wait for us, or they follow us about, sometimes all over our routes, begging for their letter beforehand, or just pleading for knowledge of received mail. "I don't want to bother you, mailman. I know you are busy, and you are working hard, but please tell me—I'm so worried; my boy is in Germany, fighting on the front line—have you got a letter from him? Can you remember? You don't have to give it to me now if it's too much trouble. Just tell me, have you got a letter?" It is hard to refuse such a poignant request; and we try to remember, as we rack hundreds of letters in the morning before we begin our deliveries, the worst cases of hysteria, and we place those letters in the flaps of our mail pouches for ready reference when the mothers and the wives and the sisters come to us for help. There are dozens of urgent cases like that on every block we serve; and they constitute an added burden for us. But we try to smile, to say an understanding word; we try to ease the pain and worry a little. In our small, humble, real way, we minister to the home front.

In order that fair and adequate wages be paid this worthy group, and in some small way to say thanks for a job well done, I believe we should pass this bill unanimously and give these men their long-deserved raise.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, the people of my congressional district believe that the employees of the Post Office Department deserve a raise in pay. I have heard from them in overwhelming numbers in favor of the passage of this bill, and have not received a single communication in opposition to it. The will of the people is the law of the land, and this measure unmistakably represents the will of my people. It should be enacted by unanimous vote.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, there is no question but that this legislation is long overdue. There is no public servant more faithful than the postman, and certainly no public servant who serves every individual in the Nation more directly than the mailman.

I doubt if the average city dweller has any conception of the multitude of services rendered by the small town postmaster of the second and third class, or that fourth class postmaster whose office is located in his store on the four corners. These men are looked up to in their community as the contact between the citizen and his Government. They perform many duties in addition to those connected with postal affairs, such as selling bonds, defense stamps, car stamps, duck stamps. In fact during recent years these postmasters have given almost their entire time to such services for the paltry sum of a few hundred dollars a year.

I feel that members of the committee have given a careful study to this whole postal salary question, and that the bill reported by it is probably the best solution that can be offered at the present time to correct the inequities which have existed for these many years. I commend members of the committee for their diligent work and the result of their labors. I am heartily in accord with their findings and will support the bill.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Chairman, while it is quite apparent that there is a unanimity of opinion favorable to H. R. 3035, that is seldom witnessed in the House of Representatives, nevertheless I would feel remiss in my obligations to this great loyal, patient, long-suffering and underpaid band of Federal employees if I did not again raise my voice in their behalf today. It is my hope that this bill will be passed without a dissenting vote so the postal employees of the United States will have a 100-percent endorsement of their plea for wages that will be commensurate with the present high cost of living.

The postal employees' motto is "The mail must be delivered" and so it was that during these years when others were receiving pay increases the postal employee struggled on valiantly to do the best job he could in an emergency, while often his own family suffered greatly because of the meager compensation that was contained in his "take home" pay envelope. Even this bill, in my opinion, does not bring the wage of the postal employees up to a figure comparable to that which the majority of skilled workers in the United States are receiving today. It is, nevertheless, a belated recognition of the spendid service that this vast army at the home front has rendered to the American people during the critical days of the war. I have been particularly impressed by the arguments made by the wives and dependents of the postal employees who have pointed out emphatically that the post-office worker for a long time has been the "forgotten man" in the Government service and that they have been members of the "forgotten family." Seldom in my experience in Congress have I derived as much satisfaction as I know will be mine when, in a few moments, I answer the roll call with a resounding "aye" in favor of the great army of long-suffering, patient, loyal, conscientious employees of the United States Postal Service.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this raise for our good and faithful postal employees and will vote for this bill giving the worthy postal groups increases in pay and other proper recognition which are long overdue.

Previously I have pointed out to Congress and to the various Government departments that members of the Armed Forces feel that it is not too much to ask a Government employee to do a full day's work for a full day's pay. When a group of employees gives that full day's measure of work and more without complaint and efficiently operates their department of the Government at a profit, we should recognize such full day's work by giving them proper increases to make the full day's pay to which they are rightfully entitled. I believe this bill is simply the first step in the right direction.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, the reclassifying of salaries in the United States Postal Service is so sensibly, soundly, and sincerely proposed by the Post Office and Post Roads Committee of this great Congress in its most ably prepared bill now being debated by us that I bespeak for its unanimous approval. Having personally appeared before the committee in support of this bill and having discussed its merits with some of the members of the committee who sat through all the hearings, I believe that the analysis of the needs and desserts

of the splendid men and women of our Postal Service are represented by this bill. Not that every classification of our Postal Service is by it receiving every increase which was asked by every particular group of employees, supervisors, or postmasters, but I am confident that our Postal Committee has most sincerely and capably achieved a meritorious result. This bill, if enacted, will level up the income of the mass of postal employees to a decent level for the necessities of life. I do not believe it is yet as high as it should be, but it is an equitable beginning. It is more than 20 years in arrears now. Let us make the vote for it unanimous.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to be able to vote for this long overdue increase in salary to the postal employees who have served so faithfully and efficiently under increased burdens and most difficult circumstances during recent years.

Last fall when H. R. 4715 was before us I hesitated to commit myself because it did not seem to me to deal adequately or fairly with all the inequities which had developed in the Postal Service and which could be remedied only by a rather thorough reclassification and general overhauling, dealing with matter of overtime, night work, holidays, length of time in service, and so forth, as well as with an increase in basic compensation. This present bill, H. R. 3035, accomplishes those things in satisfactory fashion, I believe, and goes a long way toward giving the long-overdue recognition and reward which these employees have so worthily earned.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, having twice voted against general postal pay raises since the outbreak of war, I feel that I probably should give the House a word of explanation of the vote I expect to cast this afternoon. Today I shall vote for this bill. I shall also vote for an increase in the salary of other employees of the Government when that measure comes before us as it will within a few days.

Ever since this war began, I have feared inflation. I supported the Gore amendment to the first Price Control Act. Had this amendment been adopted and had all elements of costs been controlled at the very beginning, I believe we might have avoided much of the increase that we have observed in the cost of living. I opposed the cost-plus system of letting contracts. I believe that system was and is inflationary. I have felt that it was just as important to maintain the purchasing power of the worker's dollar as to increase the number of his dollars. I think that after making a poor start we have done a very helpful job of price control. Certainly, we have done much better than we did during the last war.

Last December I was the only Member of this House who voted against a general pay raise for postal workers. I am human like all the rest of you. I found no pleasure in voting against the wishes of so many of my friends, but I felt then that the passage of that bill could only be followed with a general pay raise for all Government employees, and as soon as this Congress votes a general pay raise for Government workers, it must of necessity allow private employers to raise private wages—and we will be well started on the ruinous road to inflation. The danger is still with us. The war is not won, but it has progressed to a point where we may at least hope to avoid the worst features of inflation—particularly inasmuch as we can reasonably expect a substantial increase in the volume of goods produced for civilian use. I hope we may avoid the disaster that a general pay raise 6 months ago would have surely brought upon us.

I would not, however, be willing to take this chance even today were it not for the fact that I have always tried, throughout my public life, to accord to the humblest citizen every right or privilege that I claimed for myself. I cannot, therefore, in view of the action of the House last week in voting each Member a $2,500 per year expense account, vote against an increase in the income of other citizens, many of whom undoubtedly need an increase more desperately than do the Members of this body. I fear that these increases may very well bring about such an increase in living costs as to wipe out the benefits to both classes, but I am determined to treat my fellow citizens just as we have treated ourselves.

It is true that I voted against and spoke against the increase for Members of Congress. I was defeated. The majority of this House voted for the increase. If it is approved by the Senate and the President, I will share in its benefits, and even if it never becomes law, the collective will of the House is recorded as favoring an immediate increase in the income of Members of this body. I will not be a party to any procedure that denies to others the same privileges that are extended to me. Therefore, I shall vote for this increase in the income of the postal workers with the sincere hope that it will be of real benefit to them in the way of providing added purchasing power. I want to see the postal workers and all workers enjoy the highest possible standard of living. Possibly my fears of the effect of inflation are exaggerated. I hope they are. I hope that the progress of the war against the Japanese will be so favorable that it will be possible for every citizen, whether Congressman, postal employee, or private worker, who may get a larger income in dollars, to enjoy a higher standard of living. In such an event I will gladly confess that I was unduly alarmed.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 3035 is an excellent bill. It deserves and probably will secure the almost unanimous support of the House. The absence of opposition here today is eloquent testimony to the fine cooperative efforts of the postal authorities, the postal employees, and the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. The bill contains a satisfactory increase in basic wages and salaries, it provides advancement for meritorious service, and it establishes proper compensation for overtime work.

But H. R. 3035 is not perfect. It contains a number of necessary compromise provisions. It leaves a number of inequalities still existing which should be speedily corrected. To my mind its chief lack is its failure to properly compensate the veteran employees who have waited up to 20 years for a basic wage adjustment, and who have now reached an age in service that will prevent them from enjoying the benefits of the action. It is my intention to support and sponsor legislation to correct this and other injustices that could not be dealt within the bill.

The introduction and hurried consideration of amendments today might only serve to scramble the salary schedule jig-saw puzzle which has been put in orderly outline. It might also result in the defeat and consequent unfavorable attitude toward adjustments that should be made. No single group of postal employees can be satisfactorily dealt with without consideration of the whole group. Hence I hope the Senate of the United States joins us in passing this bill substantially unaltered, or altered only after diligent study.

Some say that the postal employees should not be given a raise at this time because to do so would be to violate the Little Steel formula. This argument has only a surface foundation. The Little Steel formula was agreed to as a means of preventing runaway wages and subsequent inflation. It was designed to affect workers who had the means of bringing extreme pressure on employers for higher wages. It was not and should not have been intended to include groups like the postal employees and school teachers who do not possess the instrumentalities of the strike, slow-down, work stoppage, and collective bargaining.

Postal employees can only secure a pay raise by appealing to Congress, and it is not their fault that their appeals were not heeded before wage freezes existed. The raises which this bill embodies are raises that have long been deferred. If someone cares to be technical, we could well refer to this legislation as a continued contract negotiation. Consequently, I am satisfied, and I think most of the legislators in the several States and in the Congress are satisfied, that the Little Steel formula does not apply to postal employees, school teachers, and others in an analogous situation.

Over and above all other arguments, however, is the fact that the postal employees have been doing a magnificent job despite inadequate compensation. Now, with more than 52,000 of their group in the armed forces, they are efficiently handling more mail than ever and performing a multitude of additional duties as their part of the war effort. The postal employees have earned the raise here provided. They should have received it long ago.

But that is not the end of the matter. The people of the United States want the best postal service possible. They know its vital importance to business, family relations, and the comfort of loved ones. They want it to continue to improve; and to improve the morale of its personnel must be properly sustained. The people are proud of their postal service and they desire to reward their postal servants. I have received hundreds of communications in support of the bill and I would

have received other hundreds had my favorable position not been known. Likewise I am appending to these remarks editorials from the three papers in my home city of Pittsburgh, Pa., which illustrate the same popular support of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that every Member of this House votes for the enactment of H. R. 3035, and I hope the Senate will act just as promptly and just as decisively to give our postal employees adequate and fair compensation.

The following is an editorial appearing in the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Sun-Telegraph:

JUSTICE LONG DELAYED

The Post Office Committee of the House of Representatives, after many weeks of consideration, has finally given favorable and unanimous action to the long-pending measure designed to give the thousands of postal workers in the United States their first basic pay increase in 20 years.

This is an important step in the direction of accorded justice to the postal workers, but of course only a step.

Many times in recent years the postal workers have seen their petition for adequate pay get this far, and no farther.

Committees have reported favorably on the matter before, without achieving the ends of acknowledged justice.

On several occasions, one House or the other of Congress, has actually passed the postal pay increase bill.

But it is no credit to Congress, and none to the country as a whole, that none of these "steps in the right direction" have resulted in upward adjustment of the shamefully low pay of the postal workers.

This time the bill must pass.

This is true because it is no longer only a matter of doing simple justice to the postal workers involved.

President Henry C. Daugherty, of the National Association of Letter Carriers, made this clear in a recent letter to Mr. William Randolph Hearst.

Mr. Daugherty wrote Mr. Hearst because, as he said, "the Hearst newspapers have had a wholesome effect in focusing public attention to the plight of the postal workers."

"The crusade conducted by your newspapers," he continued, "stands out like a beacon light.

"Every citizen should be grateful for the magnificent manner in which you have sounded the warning.

"There still exists a grave danger—the development of an inferior postal system."

That is the real danger in the present situation.

If continued injustices to the postal workers simply meant that these hundreds of thousands of vital workers would be compelled to exist on substandard living wage they have endured for the last 20 years, it would be bad enough.

Mr. Daugherty points out something worse. "The manpower shortages within the Postal Service are already acute," he warns. "Management is finding it practically impossible to recruit needed personnel on the present outmoded pay schedules. Existing critical conditions are no longer a matter affecting letter carriers and postal workers alone. * * * Let it be said that the very future of the Postal Service and the fate of the personnel now rest with the Seventy-ninth Congress."

The future of the Postal Service is at stake because the underpaid postal workers are tired of substandard living, tired after 20 years of futile waiting for the performance and fulfillment of broken promises.

Accordingly, thousands of them have already gone into other fields of employment where they can live the American way, and other thousands will follow them if the present Congress falls down on its promises and duty, as the previous sessions of Congress have been doing for the last 20 years.

If for no other reason than the simple justice of the matter, Congress should approve the postal pay increase bill; but in the vital public interest of preserving our essential and efficient postal system it must do so.

The following is an editorial appearing in the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press of April 21, 1945:

POSTAL WORKERS NEED AID

Nobody outside the armed services has done a better job during this war than the post office. That goes for the whole of them—carriers and clerks and all the other complicated human mechanism that moves the mails.

The Postal Service has moved an unprecedented volume of mail. It has sold bonds and stamps, helped register aliens, delivered millions of ration books and assisted with other special wartime services—and on top of this has been piled the movement of millions of service letters and packages to the ends of the earth.

The Postal Service has not been exempted from the draft. A very large percentage of clerks and carriers and other postal workers are at the front, and it has been difficult and often impossible to fill their places. Therefore this big job has been done by a short-handed staff.

There has never been a postal strike nor disturbance nor any high-pressure action to force better pay.

Yet postal employees get the same pay they did in 1925, save for a $300 per year cost-of-living bonus paid each worker regardless of base pay. This is far less increase compared to pay scales as of 1925 than can be found in practically any other class of work. And this bonus has been paid for only 2 years.

Under existing law even this temporary bonus expires next June 30.

To meet this situation the House Post Office and Post Roads Committee, acting upon recommendations from the Post Office Department, and various employee organizations, has introduced a bill known as H. R. 2071, which would extend the present bonus of $300 and make it $100 higher. In other words, a provision of $400 per year increase over the 1925 pay level. Unless it passes, the pay of postal employees next June will revert to what it was in 1925. The measure would also allow time and one-half for overtime, which postal employees do not now enjoy.

The provisions of this bill seem to us reasonable. In fact, if any private employer had treated his workers as Uncle Sam has done in this case they would have been down on his neck like a ton of brick, with the full backing and encouragement of Government agencies.

The postal employees have done a good job and deserve better treatment than they have had. We hope the public will encourage support of H. R. 2071 (now H. R. 3035).

The following is an editorial appearing in the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette of April 17, 1945:

THE POSTMAN KNOCKS AGAIN

When a delegation of postal employees called on us the other day to ask our support for the Burch bill which would increase their pay, we reminded them that we supported such a measure only a year ago. Whereupon, they thanked us but pointed out that they didn't get an increase then and they haven't had their regular pay schedule boosted in the last 20 years.

It is partly because we don't think the public knows the facts in this case that we are handing the information on to our readers. When postal employees say that their regular pay schedule hasn't been increased in 20 years, they don't mean that they are getting just what they did back in 1925. Two years ago an emergency measure was passed granting them a temporary bonus of $300 a year. But that will expire in June of this year unless the Burch bill is passed. If it is passed, the bonus will be increased $100 and made a permanent part of their pay.

But it is partly because of the way the wages of postal employees are handled that we think they are entitled to public consideration. As their spokesman pointed out, they are employees of the Government who don't strike in war or peace. They don't even bargain collectively or individually with their employer. All they can do is petition Congress for the compensation to which they feel entitled while they keep on working. But that is all the more reason, we believe, why the public whom they serve faithfully and courteously, should support them in their reasonable request.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see this bill come to the House for a vote. We passed a bill last Congress dealing with the question of pay adjustment for our postal employees, but it did not become a law. We now have the opportunity presented to us again. This bill will give some relief to our postal employees. They have worked hard. Their work in the war days has been much harder than in normal times. The mail has been heavy. The responsibility has been great. The labor situation has handicapped the Postal Service also.

I am happy to support this measure and I hope it becomes a law soon.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I repeat the announcement that I previously made that when we get back in the House I shall ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at the conclusion of general debate in the RECORD.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in accord with that suggestion if the gentlemen on this side will agree to it.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time the Clerk will read.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and printed at this point in the RECORD, and that the bill be open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the term "employees" wherever used in this act shall include officers, supervisors, special-delivery messengers in offices of the first class, and all other employees paid from field appropriations of the Postal Service, other than postmasters, skilled-trades employees of the mail-equipment shops, job cleaners in first- and second-class post offices, and employees who are paid on a fee or contract basis.

HOURS OF DUTY

SEC. 2. Employees shall be required to work not more than 8 hours a day except as pro-

vided in section 4. The 8 hours of service shall not extend over a longer period than 10 consecutive hours, and the schedules of duty of the employees shall be regulated accordingly: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to employees of the Railway Mail Service and the Air Mail Service; post-office inspectors; rural carriers; traveling mechanicians; examiners of equipment and supplies; employees in third-class post offices; employees paid on an hourly basis; employees not in the automatic or additional annual salary grades; and carriers in the Village Delivery Service: *Provided further*, That any classified substitute employee who reports for duty at any post office or other postal unit in compliance with an official order shall be employed not less than 2 hours following the hour at which such classified substitute employee is ordered to report. Employment in any branch of the Postal Service will be construed as compliance with the provisions of this section.

COMPENSATORY TIME

SEC. 3. When the needs of the service require employees to perform service on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays, they shall be allowed compensatory time for such service on 1 day within 5 working days next succeeding the Saturday or Sunday and within 30 days next succeeding the holiday: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General may, if the exigencies of the service require, authorize the payment of overtime to other than supervisory employees whose base salaries are more than $3,200 per annum for services performed on Saturdays, Sundays, and Christmas Day during the month of December in lieu of compensatory time: *Provided further*, That supervisory employees whose base salaries are more than $3,200 per annum shall be allowed compensatory time for services performed on Saturdays, Sundays, and on Christmas Day during the month of December within 180 days from the days such service was performed: *And provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to employees of the Railway Mail Service and the Air Mail Service; post-office inspectors; rural carriers; traveling mechanicians; examiners of equipment and supplies; clerks in third-class post offices; and employees paid on an hourly basis.

OVERTIME

SEC. 4. In emergencies or if the needs of the service require, employees may be employed in excess of 8 hours per day and for such overtime service they shall be paid on the basis of 150 percent of the annual rate of pay received by such employees. In computing compensation for such overtime employment, the annual salary or compensation for such employees shall be divided by 2,024, the number of working hours in a year. The quotient thus obtained will be the base hourly compensation and one and one-half times that amount will be the hourly rate of overtime pay: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to employees of the Railway Mail Service and the Air Mail Service; post-office inspectors; rural carriers; traveling mechanicians; examiners of equipment and supplies; employees paid on an hourly basis, and supervisory employees.

NIGHT DIFFERENTIAL

SEC. 5. Employees who are required to perform night work shall be paid extra for each hour of such work at the rate of 10 percent of their base hourly compensation, computed by dividing the base annual salary by 2,024. Night work shall be defined as any work performed between the hours of 6 o'clock P. M. and 6 o'clock A. M. The provisions of this section shall not apply to post-office inspectors; traveling mechanicians; examiners of equipment and supplies; officers of the Railway Mail Service and of the Air Mail Service; and rural carriers.

ANNUAL LEAVE

SEC. 6. Employees shall be granted 15 days' leave of absence with pay, exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, each fiscal year and sick leave with pay at the rate of 10 days a year, exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, to be cumulative. Sick leave shall be granted only upon satisfactory evidence of illness in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Postmaster General: *Provided*, That the 15 days' leave shall be credited at the rate of one and one-quarter days for each month of actual service: *Provided further*, That classified substitute employees, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, shall be granted the same rights and benefits with respect to annual and sick leave that accrue to regular employees in proportion to the time employed in a pay status and 168 hours and 40 minutes of such employment shall entitle the employee to one and one-quarter days' annual leave and 6 hours and 40 minutes' sick leave: *And provided further*, That in no event shall a classified substitute employee be credited during a 12-month period with more than 15 days' annual and 10 days' sick leave.

METHOD OF PAYMENT

SEC. 7. Where the compensation of any postmaster, other officer, or employee is on an annual basis, the following rules for division of time and computation of pay for services rendered are established:

Annual compensation shall be divided into 12 equal installments, one of which shall be the pay for each calendar month and one-half of each such installment shall be paid on the 16th day of the month and the 1st day of the following month, or as soon thereafter as practicable. For the purpose of computing such compensation and for computing time for services rendered during a fractional part of a month, in connection with annual compensation, each and every month shall be held to consist of 30 days, without regard to the actual number of days in any calendar month, thus excluding the 31st day of any calendar month from the computation and treating February as if it actually had 30 days. Any person entering the Postal Service during a 31-day month and serving until the end thereof shall be entitled to pay for that month from the date of entry to the 30th day of said month, both days inclusive; and any person entering said service during the month of February and serving until the end thereof shall be entitled to 1 month's pay, less as many thirtieths thereof as there were days elapsed prior to date of entry. For each day's unauthorized absence on the 31st day of any calendar month, 1 day's pay shall be forfeited.

SEC. 8. (a) The compensation of postmasters shall be annual salaries to be fixed by the Postmaster General from their respective quarterly returns for the calendar year immediately preceding the adjustment, based on gross postal receipts at the following rates: *Provided*, That subsection (c) of section 1001 of the Revenue Act of 1932 (47 Stat. 285), as amended, as hereby repealed, retroactive to January 1, 1944, and thereafter the gross postal receipts shall be counted for the purpose of determining the class of the post office or the compensation or allowances of postmasters or other employees, whose compensation or allowances are based on the annual receipts of such offices: *Provided further*, That in fixing the salaries of the postmaster and supervisory employees in the post office at Washington, D. C., the Postmaster General may, in his discretion, add not to exceed 75 percent to the gross receipts of that office:

First class

$40,000 but less than $50,000	$3,600
$50,000 but less than $60,000	3,700
$60,000 but less than $75,000	3,800
$75,000 but less than $90,000	3,900
$90,000 but less than $120,000	4,000
$120,000 but less than $150,000	4,100
$150,000 but less than $200,000	4,200
$200,000 but less than $250,000	4,300
$250,000 but less than $300,000	4,400
$300,000 but less than $400,000	4,600
$400,000 but less than $500,000	4,800
$500,000 but less than $600,000	5,300
$600,000 but less than $1,000,000	5,600
$1,000,000 but less than $1,500,000	6,000
$1,500,000 but less than $3,000,000	7,000
$3,000,000 but less than $7,000,000	8,000
$7,000,000 but less than $10,000,000	9,000
$10,000,000 but less than $20,000,000	10,000
$20,000,000 but less than $40,000,000	11,000
$40,000,000 and upward	12,000

Second class

$8,000 but less than $12,000	$3,000
$12,000 but less than $15,000	3,000
$15,000 but less than $18,000	3,000
$18,000 but less than $22,000	3,100
$22,000 but less than $27,000	3,200
$27,000 but less than $33,000	3,300
$33,000 but less than $40,000	3,400

Provided, That where the gross postal receipts of a post office of the second class for each of two consecutive calendar years are less than $8,000, or where in any calendar year the gross postal receipts are less than $7,000, it shall be relegated to the third class.

Third class

$1,500 but less than $1,600	$1,400
$1,600 but less than $1,700	1,500
$1,700 but less than $1,900	1,600
$1,900 but less than $2,100	1,700
$2,100 but less than $2,400	1,800
$2,400 but less than $2,700	1,900
$2,700 but less than $3,000	2,000
$3,000 but less than $3,500	2,100
$3,500 but less than $4,200	2,200
$4,200 but less than $5,000	2,300
$5,000 but less than $6,000	2,400
$6,000 but less than $7,000	2,500
$7,000 but less than $8,000	2,500

Fourth class

Less than $100	$168
$100 but less than $150	264
$150 but less than $200	348
$200 but less than $250	432
$250 but less than $300	516
$300 but less than $350	588
$350 but less than $400	636
$400 but less than $450	684
$450 but less than $500	720
$500 but less than $600	804
$600 but less than $700	900
$700 but less than $800	984
$800 but less than $900	1,068
$900 but less than $1,000	1,152
$1,000 but less than $1,100	1,236
$1,100 but less than $1,500	1,320

(b) The base annual compensation of an incumbent postmaster shall not be reduced in the readjustment to conform to the provisions of this act, except for a decrease in gross postal receipts to an amount for which a lower salary grade is provided.

SALARIES OF SUPERVISORS, OFFICES OF THE FIRST CLASS

SEC. 9. (a) At post offices of the first class the annual salaries of supervisory employees shall be based on gross postal receipts for the preceding calendar year as follows:

(b) Receipts of $40,000 but less than $75,000—assistant postmaster, $3,200; superintendent of mails, $3,100.

(c) Receipts of $75,000 but less than $90,000—assistant postmaster, $3,300; superintendent of mails, $3,200.

(d) Receipts of $90,000 but less than $120,000—assistant postmaster, $3,400; superintendent of mails, $3,300; foremen, $3,200; clerks in charge, $3,100.

(e) Receipts of $120,000 but less than $150,000—assistant postmaster, $3,500; superintendent of mails, $3,300; foremen, $3,200; clerks in charge, $3,100.

(f) Receipts of $150,000 but less than $200,000—assistant postmaster, $3,600; superintendent of mails, $3,300; foremen, $3,200; clerks in charge, $3,100.

(g) Receipts of $200,000 but less than $250,000—assistant postmaster, $3,700; superintendent of mails, $3,400; foremen, $3,200; clerks in charge, $3,100.

(h) Receipts of $250,000 but less than $300,000—assistant postmaster, $3,800; superintendent of mails, $3,500; assistant superintendent of mails, $3,300; foremen, $3,200; clerks in charge, $3,100.

(i) Receipts of $300,000 but less than $400,000—assistant postmaster, $3,900; superintendent of mails, $3,600; assistant superintendent of mails, $3,300; foremen, $3,200; clerks in charge, $3,100.

(j) Receipts of $400,000 but less than $500,000—assistant postmaster, $4,000; superintendent of mails, $3,600; assistant superintendent of mails, $3,300; foremen, $3,200; clerks in charge, $3,100.

(k) Receipts of $500,000 but less than $600,000—assistant postmaster, $4,100; superintendent of mails, $3,700; superintendent of postal finance, $3,400; superintendent of money orders, $3,200; assistant superintendent of mails, $3,300; foremen, $3,200; clerks in charge, $3,100.

(l) Receipts of $600,000 but less than $1,000,000—assistant postmaster, $4,200; superintendent of mails, $3,900; superintendent of postal finance, $3,500; superintendent of money orders, $3,300; assistant superintendent of mails, $3,300; foremen, $3,200; clerks in charge, $3,100.

(m) Receipts of $1,000,000 but less than $2,000,000—assistant postmaster, $4,300; superintendent of mails, $4,100; superintendent of postal finance, $3,700; assistant superintendent of postal finance, $3,100; superintendent of money orders, $3,400; assistant superintendent of money orders, $3,100; assistant superintendent of mails, $3,500; auditor, $3,100; station examiners, $3,100; general foremen, $3,300; foremen, $3,200; clerks in charge, $3,100.

(n) Receipts of $2,000,000 but less than $3,000,000—assistant postmaster, $4,400; superintendent of mails, $4,200; superintendent of postal finance, $3,800; assistant superintendent of postal finance, $3,300; superintendent of money orders, $3,500; assistant superintendent of money orders, $3,100; senior assistant superintendent of mails, $3,700; assistant superintendents of mails, $3,500; auditor, $3,100; station examiners, $3,100; general foremen, $3,300; foremen, $3,200; clerks in charge, $3,100.

(o) Receipts of $3,000,000 but less than $5,000,000—assistant postmaster, $4,500; superintendent of mails, $4,300; superintendent of postal finance, $4,000; assistant superintendent of postal finance, $3,500; superintendent of money orders, $3,700; assistant superintendent of money orders, $3,200; senior assistant superintendent of mails, $3,900; assistant superintendents of mails, $3,500; auditor, $3,100; station examiners, $3,200; general foremen, $3,300 foremen, $3,200; clerks in charge, $3,100.

(p) Receipts of $5,000,000 but less than $7,000,000—assistant postmaster, $4,700; superintendent of mails, $4,500; superintendent of postal finance, $4,200; assistant superintendent of postal finance, $3,500; superintendent of money orders, $3,900; assistant superintendent of money orders, $3,300; senior assistant superintendent of mails, $4,100; assistant superintendents of mails, $3,700; auditor, $3,100; station examiners, $3,200; general foremen, $3,500; foremen, $3,200; clerks in charge, $3,100.

(q) Receipts of $7,000,000 but less than $9,000,000—assistant postmaster, $5,100; superintendent of mails, $4,800; superintendent of postal finance, $4,400; assistant superintendent of postal finance, $3,800; superintendent of money orders, $4,000; assistant superintendent of money orders, $3,500; senior assistant superintendent of mails, $4,300; assistant superintendents of mails, $3,900; auditor, $3,100; station examiners, $3,200; general foreman, $3,500; foremen, $3,200; clerks in charge, $3,100.

(r) Receipts of $9,000,000 but less than $14,000,000—assistant postmaster, $5,300; general superintendent of finance, $5,100; general superintendent of mails, $5,100; superintendent of postal finance, $4,500; superintendent of money orders, $4,500; superintendent of incoming mails, $4,500; superintendent of outgoing mails, $4,500; superintendent of carriers, $4,500; superintendent of registry, $4,500; senior assistant superintendents, $4,100; assistant superintendents, $3,900; auditor, $3,200; chief station examiner, $3,600; station examiners, $3,200. general foremen, $3,500; foremen, $3,200; clerks in charge, $3,100.

(s) Receipts of $14,000,000 but less than $20,000,000—assistant postmaster, $5,700; general superintendent of finance, $5,200; general superintendent of mails, $5,200; assistant general superintendent of mails, $4,900; superintendent of postal finance, $4,500; superintendent of money orders, $4,500; superintendent of incoming mails, $4,500; superintendent of outgoing mails, $4,500; superintendent of carriers, $4,500; superintendent of registry, $4,500; senior assistant superintendents, $4,100; assistant superintendents, $3,900; auditor, $3,600; chief station examiner, $3,600; station examiners, $3,200; general foremen, $3,500; foremen, $3,200; clerks in charge, $3,100.

(t) Receipts of $20,000,000 but less than $40,000,000—assistant postmaster, $6,200; general superintendent of finances, $5,500; general superintendent of mails, $5,500; assistant general superintendent of mails, $5,100; superintendent of postal finance, $4,700; superintendent of money orders, $4,700; superintendent of incoming mails, $4,700; superintendent of outgoing mails, $4,700; superintendent of carriers, $4,700; superintendent of registry, $4,700; senior assistant superintendents, $4,500; assistant superintendents, $3,900; auditor, $4,400; assistant auditor, $3,700; chief station examiner, $3,700; station examiners, $3,400; general foremen, $3,600; foremen, $3,200; clerks in charge, $3,100.

(u) Receipts of $40,000,000 and up—assistant postmaster, $6,700; general superintendent of finance, $5,700; general superintendent of mails, $5,700; assistant general superintendent of finance, $5,100; assistant general superintendent of mails, $5,100; superintendent of postal finance, $4,700; superintendent of money orders, $4,700; superintendent of incoming mails, $4,700; superintendent of outgoing mails, $4,700; superintendent of carriers, $4,700; superintendent of registry, $4,700; senior assistant superintendents, $4,500; assistant superintendents, $3,900; auditor, $4,400; assistant auditor, $3,700; chief station examiner, $3,700; station examiners, $3,400; general foremen, $3,600; foremen, $3,200; clerks in charge, $3,100.

(v) The annual salaries of supervisors in the United States Stamped Envelope Agency shall be as follows:

Agent, $4,000; assistant agent, $3,500.

(w) The salary of superintendents of classified stations shall be based on the number of employees assigned thereto and the annual postal receipts. No allowance shall be made for sales of stamps to patrons residing outside of the territory of the stations. At classified station each $25,000 of postal receipts shall be considered equal to one additional employee: *Provided*, That in determining the number of employees at a classified station, credit shall be allowed for service performed by regular employees, substitute employees other than those serving in lieu of regular employees absent from duty for any cause and temporary employees assigned to the station, and for each 2,024 hours of service performed by such employees the station superintendent shall be allowed credit for one employee.

(x) At classified stations the salaries of superintendents, and, where there are more than 50 employees, assistant superintendents, shall be as follows: 1 to 5 employees—superintendent, $3,200; 6 to 15 employees—superintendent, $3,300; 16 to 25 employees—superintendent, $3,400; 26 to 50 employees—superintendent, $3,600; 51 to 75 employees—superintendent, $3,700; assistant superintendents, $3,200; 76 to 100 employees—superintendent, $3,800; assistant superintendents, $3,300; 101 to 150 employees—superintendent, $3,900; assistant superintendents, $3,400; 151 to 200 employees—superintendent, $4,000; assistant superintendents, $3,500; 201 to 300 employees—superintendent, $4,200; assistant superintendents, $3,700; 301 to 400 employees—superintendent, $4,300; assistant superintendents, $3,800; 401 to 500 employees—superintendent, $4,400; assistant superintendents, $3,900; 501 to 1,000 employees—superintendent, $4,600; assistant superintendents, $4,100; 1,001 employees and up—superintendent, $4,700; assistant superintendents, $4,200.

(y) In readjusting supervisory positions at first-class post offices to conform to the provisions of this act, reassignments shall be made as follows:

AT POST OFFICES WITH RECEIPTS OF $9,000,000 AND UP

One of the assistant postmasters shall be the assistant postmaster and the other assistant postmaster shall be one of the general superintendents.

Th superintendent of mails, the superintendent of delivery, the postal cashier, superintendent of registry, or the superintendent of money orders shall be the other general superintendent: *Provided*, That the auditor at offices with receipts of $20,000,000 and up, and the money-order cashier at offices with receipts of less than $20,000,000, may be selected for the position of general superintendent and assigned accordingly.

The postal cashier shall be superintendent of postal finance; and at offices with receipts less than $20,000,000 the money-order cashier shall be superintendent of money orders unless otherwise assigned as provided herein.

At offices with receipts of $40,000,000 and up, selections for assistant general superintendent of finance and assistant general superintendent of mails shall be made from the positions of superintendent of mails, superintendent of delivery, superintendent of money orders, superintendent of registry, assistant superintendent of money orders, auditor, and postal cashier; and those selected shall be assigned accordingly: *Provided*, That at offices with receipts less than $40,000,000, the superintendent of mails or the superintendent of delivery shall be the assistant general superintendent of mails.

At offices with receipts of $20,000,000 and up, the assistant superintendent of money orders and the money-order cashier shall be senior assistant superintendents of money orders, unless otherwise assigned as provided herein.

Assistant superintendents whose annual base pay is $3,700 or more who are not otherwise assigned as provided herein shall be senior assistant superintendents. Assistant superintendents whose annual base pay is $3,500 shall be assistant superintendents. Assistant superintendents whose annual base pay is $3,100 or less shall be general foremen.

Foremen whose annual base pay is $2,700 shall be foremen and foremen whose annual

base pay is less than $2,700 shall be clerks in charge.

At offices with receipts less than $20,000,000 the chief bookkeeper or assistant cashier who performs the duties of auditor shall be auditor, and at offices with receipts of $20,000,000 and up a senior salary grade bookkeeper or the employee performing the duties of chief bookkeeper shall be assistant auditor. Other bookkeepers whose annual base pay is $3,300 shall be general foremen; those whose annual base pay is $2,800 shall be foremen, and those whose annual base pay is $2,600 or less shall be clerks in charge.

The station examiner or the assistant cashier performing the duties of chief station examiner shall be chief station examiner. Senior salary grade assistant cashiers shall be senior assistant superintendents of postal finance or money orders, where such positions are authorized by the Postmaster General; assistant cashiers whose annual base pay is $3,200 or $3,300 shall be assistant superintendents; assistant cashiers whose annual base pay is $3,100 shall be general foremen; assistant cashiers whose annual base pay is $2,800 shall be foremen and those whose annual base pay is $2,600 shall be clerks in charge.

AT POST OFFICES WITH RECEIPTS OF $2,000,000 BUT LESS THAN $9,000,000

The postal cashier shall be superintendent of postal finance and the money-order cashier shall be superintendent of money orders. Senior salary grade assistant cashiers shall be assistant superintendents of postal finance and of money orders, respectively, and other assistant cashiers shall be general foremen, foremen, or clerks in charge, based on the title and salary that most nearly approximates their annual base pay plus $400.

At offices with receipts of $2,000,000 but less than $5,000,000 assistant superintendents of mails whose annual base pay is $3,300 or $3,500 shall be senior assistant superintendents of mails, and those whose annual base pay is $3,000 or $3,100 shall be assistant superintendents of mails; those whose annual base pay is less than $3,000 shall be general foremen. At offices with receipts of $5,000,000 but less than $9,000,000 assistant superintendents whose annual base pay is $3,700 or $3,900 shall be senior assistant superintendents of mails, and those whose annual base pay is $3,300 or $3,500 shall be assistant superintendents of mails; those whose annual base pay is less than $3,300 shall be general foremen.

Foremen whose annual base pay is $2,600 shall be foremen and those whose annual base pay is less than $2,600 shall be clerks in charge. The bookkeeper or other supervisor who performs the duties of auditor shall be auditor, and other bookkeepers shall be clerks in charge.

AT POST OFFICES WITH RECEIPTS OF $500,000 BUT LESS THAN $2,000,000

The postal cashier shall be superintendent of postal finance and the money-order cashier shall be superintendent of money orders.

At offices with receipts of $1,000,000, but less than $2,000,000, assistant cashiers shall be assistant superintendents of postal finance and money orders, respectively.

Bookkeepers or employees performing the duties of auditor shall be auditors where such positions are provided; otherwise they shall be clerks in charge.

Station examiners or employees performing the duties of station examiners shall be station examiners where such positions are provided; otherwise they shall be clerks in charge.

At offices with receipts of $1,000,000 but less than $2,000,000, assistant superintendents of mails whose annual base pay is $3,100 shall be assistant superintendents of mails; those whose annual base pay is less than $3,100 shall be general foremen.

At offices with receipts of $1,000,000 but less than $2,000,000, foremen whose annual base pay is $2,600 shall be foremen; those whose annual base pay is less than $2,600 shall be clerks in charge.

(z) At central accounting offices where the gross postal receipts are less than $5,000,000 the superintendent of postal finance, or the employee in charge of such records and adjustments of the accounts, shall be allowed an increase of $200 per annum. At central accounting offices with gross postal receipts of $9,000,000 and up, the auditor shall be allowed a salary equal to that of the senior assistant superintendent; at central accounting offices with receipts of $2,000,000 but less than $9,000,000, the auditor shall be allowed a salary equal to that of the assistant superintendent of postal finance; at central accounting offices with receipts of less than $2,000,000, the employee performing the duties of auditor shall be allowed a salary equal to that of foremen.

SALARIES OF ASSISTANT POSTMASTERS, OFFICES OF THE SECOND CLASS

SEC. 10. At post offices of the second class the annual salaries of assistant postmasters shall be based on gross postal receipts for the preceding calendar year as follows:

$8,000 but less than $10,000	$2,800
$10,000 but less than $12,000	2,800
$12,000 but less than $15,000	2,800
$15,000 but less than $18,000	2,800
$18,000 but less than $22,000	2,800
$22,000 but less than $27,000	2,900
$27,000 but less than $33,000	2,900
$33,000 but less than $40,000	2,900

SEC. 11. (a) The Postmaster General shall determine the supervisory needs at post offices of the first and second classes and shall fix the number of supervisors to be employed in accordance with the salary schedules provided in sections 9 and 10: *Provided*, That not more than one assistant postmaster may be employed at any post office.

(b) Regular clerks and carriers of grade 9 and above in first- and second-class post offices shall be eligible for promotion to the higher positions in their respective offices, and if for any reason such clerks and carriers of grade 9 and above are not available those clerks and carriers in the lower grades in such offices shall be eligible for such promotions.

SALARIES OF CLERICAL AND CARRIER EMPLOYEES AT FIRST-, SECOND-, AND THIRD-CLASS POST OFFICES AND DISPATCHERS AND OPERATORS OF THE PNEUMATIC TUBE SERVICE

SEC. 12. (a) Carriers in the City Delivery Service, clerks in post offices of the first and second classes, clerks in the United States stamped envelope agency, and dispatchers of the pneumatic tube service shall be divided into 11 grades as follows:

Grade 1	$1,700
Grade 2	1,800
Grade 3	1,900
Grade 4	2,000
Grade 5	2,100
Grade 6	2,200
Grade 7	2,300
Grade 8	2,400
Grade 9	2,500
Grade 10	2,600
Grade 11	2,700

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the eleventh grade: *Provided*, That for such employees at post offices of the first class there shall be three additional grades; that is, grade 12—$2,800; grade 13—$2,900; grade 14—$3,000, and that employees who perform faithful and meritorious service shall be promoted to grade 12 after 3 years of such service in grade 11, shall be promoted to grade 13 after 5 years of such service in grade 12, and shall be promoted to grade 14 after 7 years of such service in grade 13: *Provided further*, That marine carriers assigned to the Detroit River Marine Service shall be paid an annual salary of $300 in excess of the highest salary provided for carriers in the automatic grades in the City Delivery Service: *And provided further*, That the annual salary of such marine carriers shall not be in excess of $3,000.

The pay of substitute, temporary, or auxiliary employees in the services named in the preceding paragraph shall be on an hourly basis at the following rates:

Grade 1	$0.84
Grade 2	.89
Grade 3	.94
Grade 4	.99
Grade 5	1.04
Grade 6	1.09
Grade 7	1.14
Grade 8	1.19
Grade 9	1.24
Grade 10	1.29
Grade 11	1.34

(b) Mail handlers, messengers, and watchmen at post offices of the first and second classes paid from appropriations of the First Assistant Postmaster General; and operators of the pneumatic tube service; shall be divided into six grades with annual salaries as follows:

Grade 1	$1,600
Grade 2	1,700
Grade 3	1,800
Grade 4	1,900
Grade 5	2,000
Grade 6	2,100

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the sixth grade.

(c) The pay of substitute, temporary, or auxiliary employees in the services named in the preceding paragraph shall be on an hourly basis at the following rates:

Grade 1	$0.79
Grade 2	.84
Grade 3	.89
Grade 4	.94
Grade 5	.99
Grade 6	1.04

(d) Classified cleaners at post offices of the first and second classes paid from appropriations of the First Assistant Postmaster General shall be divided into seven grades with annual salaries, as follows:

Grade 1	$1,300
Grade 2	1,400
Grade 3	1,500
Grade 4	1,600
Grade 5	1,700
Grade 6	1,800
Grade 7	1,900

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the seventh grade.

(e) Carriers in the village delivery service, and clerks employed not less than 40 hours per week in post offices of the third class, shall be divided into six grades with annual salaries, as follows: *Provided*, That clerks in post offices of the third class shall not be appointed or promoted to a salary grade in excess of $100 less than the salary of the postmaster at the office to which assigned:

Grade 1	$1,200
Grade 2	1,300
Grade 3	1,400
Grade 4	1,500
Grade 5	1,600
Grade 6	1,700

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the sixth grade.

The pay of substitute, temporary, or auxiliary employees in the services named in the preceding paragraph shall be on an hourly basis at the following rates:

Grade 1	$0.59
Grade 2	.64
Grade 3	.69
Grade 4	.74
Grade 5	.79
Grade 6	.84

Provided, That substitute, temporary, or auxiliary clerks in post offices of the third class shall not be paid in excess of 79 cents per hour where the salary of the postmaster is $1,700 per annum; in excess of 74 cents per hour where the salary of the postmaster is $1,600 per annum; in excess of 69 cents per hour where the salary of the postmaster is $1,500 per annum; or in excess of 64 cents per hour where the salary of the postmaster is $1,400 per annum.

(f) Substitute employees listed in this section shall be promoted to the next higher grade at the beginning of the quarter following 2,024 hours' satisfactory service in a pay status, including time served as a special-delivery messenger: *Provided*, That there shall be not more than one increase in the rate of pay of such employee within a period of 12 months: *And provided further*, That when a substitute employee is appointed, such employee shall be assigned to a salary grade corresponding to the salary as a substitute except as provided for clerks at third-class post offices. Any fractional part of a year's substitute service accumulated since the last compensation increase as a substitute shall be included with the regular service of a regular employee in determining eligibility for promotion to the next higher grade following appointment to a regular position.

MOTOR-VEHICLE EMPLOYEES

SEC. 13. Employees in the Motor Vehicle Service shall be classified as follows: Superintendents, $3,100, $3,200, $3,300, $3,400, $3,800, $4,000, $4,200, and $4,400 per annum: *Provided*, That at offices where the receipts are $20,000,000 or more the salaries shall be $4,700; assistant superintendents, $3,100, $3,200, $3,300, and $3,400; chiefs of records and chief mechanics, $2,700, $2,800, $2,900, $3,100, $3,200, and $3,400; route supervisors, chiefs of supplies, chief dispatchers, and mechanics in charge, $2,700, $2,800, $2,900, $3,100, and $3,200; special mechanics, $2,700, $2,800, $2,900, and $3,000: *Provided further*, That assistant superintendents shall not be authorized at offices where the salary of the superintendent is less than $3,800.

(b) Clerks, driver-mechanics, general mechanics, and dispatchers shall be divided into 11 grades, as follows:

Grade 1	$1,700
Grade 2	1,800
Grade 3	1,900
Grade 4	2,000
Grade 5	2,100
Grade 6	2,200
Grade 7	2,300
Grade 8	2,400
Grade 9	2,500
Grade 10	2,600
Grade 11	2,700

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the eleventh grade: *Provided*, That for such motor-vehicle employees at post offices of the first class there shall be 3 additional grades: that is, grade 12, $2,800; grade 13, $2,900; grade 14, $3,000 and that employees who perform faithful and meritorious service shall be promoted to grade 12 after 3 years of such service in grade 11, shall be promoted to grade 13 after 5 years of such service in grade 12, and shall be promoted to grade 14 after 7 years of such service in grade 13.

(c) The pay of substitute, temporary, or auxiliary special mechanics shall be at the rate of $1.25 per hour. The pay of substitute, temporary, or auxiliary clerks, driver-mechanics, general mechanics, and dispatchers shall be on an hourly basis at the following rates:

Grade 1	$0.84 per hour
Grade 2	.89 per hour
Grade 3	.94 per hour
Grade 4	.99 per hour
Grade 5	1.04 per hour
Grade 6	1.09 per hour
Grade 7	1.14 per hour
Grade 8	1.19 per hour
Grade 9	1.24 per hour
Grade 10	1.29 per hour
Grade 11	1.34 per hour

(d) Garagemen-drivers and mechanics' helpers shall be divided into 6 grades with annual salaries as follows:

Grade 1	$1,600
Grade 2	1,700
Grade 3	1,800
Grade 4	1,900
Grade 5	2,000
Grade 6	2,100

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the sixth grade.

The pay of substitute, temporary, or auxiliary garagemen-drivers, and mechanics' helpers shall be on an hourly basis at the following rates:

Grade 1	$0.79 per hour
Grade 2	.84 per hour
Grade 3	.89 per hour
Grade 4	.94 per hour
Grade 5	.99 per hour
Grade 6	1.04 per hour

(e) Substitute employees in the automatic grades listed in this section shall be promoted to the next higher grade at the beginning of the quarter following 2,024 hours' satisfactory service in a pay status, including time served as a special-delivery messenger: *Provided*, That there shall be not more than one increase in the rate of pay of such employee within a period of 12 months: *Provided further*, That, when a substitute employee is appointed to a regular position, such employee shall be assigned to the salary grade corresponding to the salary grade as a substitute. Any fractional part of a year's substitute service accumulated since the last compensation increase as a substitute shall be included with the regular service of a regular employee in determining eligibility for promotion to the next higher grade following appointment to a regular position.

CUSTODIAL SERVICE

SEC. 14. (a) The annual rates of compensation of supervisory employees in the custodial service shall be as follows:

Supervising superintendent of buildings, $5,200.

Superintendent of mechanical unit, $5,000.

Assistant superintendent of mechanical unit, $4,200.

Inspection engineer, $4,200.

Mechanical engineer, $4,200.

Superintendent of buildings; chief engineer: Buildings of 20,000,000 cubic feet and up, $5,000; buildings of 15,000,000 but less than 20,000,000 cubic feet, $4,500; buildings of 10,000,000 but less than 15,000,000 cubic feet, $4,200; buildings of 6,000,000 but not less than 10,000,000 cubic feet, $3,900; buildings of 3,000,000 but less than 6,000,000 cubic feet, $3,600; buildings of 1,000,000 but less than 3,000,000 cubic feet, $3,300.

Superintending engineers: Buildings of 6,000,000 but less than 15,000,000 cubic feet, $4,500; buildings of 3,000,000 but less than 6,000,000 cubic feet, $4,200; buildings of 1,000,000 but less than 3,000,000 cubic feet, $3,600.

Principal elevator mechanics, $3,600.

Foremen of shops: Buildings of 20,000,000 cubic feet and up, $3,600; buildings of less than 20,000,000 cubic feet, $3,200.

Foremen of conveyors: Buildings of less than 20,000,000 cubic feet, $3,200.

Foremen of mechanics, $3,200.

Engineers, watch, $3,200.

Janitors with fewer than 15 subordinates, $2,200; with 15 to 29 subordinates, $2,400; with 30 to 59 subordinates, $2,600; with 60 to 99 subordinates, $2,800; with 100 or more subordinates, $3,000.

Foremen of elevator operators with 100 or more subordinates, $2,700.

Captains of the guard with fewer than 10 subordinates, $2,400; with 10 to 19 subordinates, $2,600; with 20 to 39 subordinates, $2,800; with 40 or more subordinates, $3,000.

Lieutenants of the guard with fewer than 10 subordinates, $2,400; with 10 or more subordinates, $2,600.

Foremen of aborers with fewer than 15 subordinates, $2,200; with 15 to 29 subordinates, $2,400; with 30 or more subordinates, $2,600.

Enginemen-janitors: Buildings of less than 600,000 cubic feet, $2,400; buildings of over 600,000 cubic feet, $2,600.

Chief clerks, $3,100.

(b) Clerks of the custodial service shall be divided into 11 grades as follows:

Grade 1	$1,700
Grade 2	1,800
Grade 3	1,900
Grade 4	2,000
Grade 5	2,100
Grade 6	2,200
Grade 7	2,300
Grade 8	2,400
Grade 9	2,500
Grade 10	2,600
Grade 11	2,700

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the eleventh grade: *Provided*, That for such custodial employees at first-class post offices there shall be 3 additional grades; that is, grade 12, $2,800; grade 13, $2,900; grade 14, $3,000, and that employees who perform faithful and meritorious service shall be promoted to grade 12 after 3 years of such service in grade 11, shall be promoted to grade 13 after 5 years of such service in grade 12, and shall be promoted to grade 14 after 7 years of such service in grade 13.

(c) Elevator mechanics in the custodial service shall be divided into 8 grades as follows:

Grade 1	$2,300
Grade 2	2,400
Grade 3	2,500
Grade 4	2,600
Grade 5	2,700
Grade 6	2,800
Grade 7	2,900
Grade 8	3,000

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the eighth grade: *Provided*, That for such custodial employees at first-class post offices there shall be 2 additional grades; that is, grade 9, $3,100; grade 10, $3,200, and that employees who perform faithful and meritorious service shall be promoted to grade 9 after 3 years of such service in grade 8, and shall be promoted to grade 10 after 5 years of such service in grade 9.

(d) Mechanics in the custodial service shall be divided into 8 grades as follows:

Grade 1	$2,100
Grade 2	2,200
Grade 3	2,300
Grade 4	2,400
Grade 5	2,500
Grade 6	2,600
Grade 7	2,700
Grade 8	2,800

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the eighth grade: *Provided*, That for such custodial employees at post offices of the first class there shall be 2 additional grades; that is, grade 9, $2,900 and grade 10, $3,000, and that employees who perform faithful and meritorious service shall be promoted to grade 9 after 3 years of such service in grade 8, and shall be promoted to grade 10 after 5 years of such service in grade 9.

(e) Assistant enginemen, assistant mechanics, and elevator mechanic-helpers and chief telephone operators shall be divided into 7 grades as follows:

Grade 1	$1,900
Grade 2	2,000
Grade 3	2,100
Grade 4	2,200
Grade 5	2,300
Grade 6	2,400
Grade 7	2,500

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the seventh grade: *Provided*, That for such custodial employees at post offices of the first class there shall be two additional grades; that is, grade 8, $2,600, and grade 9, $2,700; and that employees who perform faithful and meritorious service shall be promoted to grade 8 after 3 years of such service in grade 7, and shall be promoted to grade 9 after 5 years of such service in grade 8.

(f) General mechanics, assistant chief telephone operators, and elevator starters in the custodial service shall be divided into seven grades as follows:

Grade 1	$1,700
Grade 2	1,800
Grade 3	1,900
Grade 4	2,000
Grade 5	2,100
Grade 6	2,200
Grade 7	2,300

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the seventh grade: *Provided*, That for such custodial employees at post offices of the first class there shall be two additional grades: that is, grade 8, $2,400, and grade 9, $2,500, and that such employees who perform faithful and meritorious service shall be promoted to grade 8 after 3 years of such service in grade 7, and shall be promoted to grade 9 after 5 years of such service in grade 8.

(g) Telephone operators, firemen, gardeners, guards, skilled helpers, and marble polishers of the custodial service shall be divided into seven grades, as follows:

Grade 1	$1,600
Grade 2	1,700
Grade 3	1,800
Grade 4	1,900
Grade 5	2,000
Grade 6	2,100
Grade 7	2,200

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the seventh grade.

(h) Firemen-laborers, oilers, window cleaners, elevator operators, and messengers in the custodial service shall be divided into seven grades as follows:

Grade 1	$1,400
Grade 2	1,500
Grade 3	1,600
Grade 4	1,700
Grade 5	1,800
Grade 6	1,900
Grade 7	2,000

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the seventh grade.

(i) Laborers, matrons, head charmen, and head charwomen in the custodial service shall be divided into seven grades with annual salaries, as follows:

Grade 1	$1,300
Grade 2	1,400
Grade 3	1,500
Grade 4	1,600
Grade 5	1,700
Grade 6	1,800
Grade 7	1,900

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the seventh grade.

(j) Charmen and charwomen working part time shall be divided into six grades with hourly rates of compensation as follows:

Grade 1	$0.65 per hour
Grade 2	.70 per hour
Grade 3	.75 per hour
Grade 4	.80 per hour

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following a total of 2,024 hours of satisfactory service in a pay status in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the sixth grade: *Provided*, That there shall be not more than one increase in the rate of pay of such employees within a period of 12 months. Temporary employees in each group shall be paid at the respective rates of pay of grade 1 provided herein for regular employees.

(k) Examiners of equipment and supplies in the custodial service shall be divided into 10 grades with annual salaries, as follows:

Grade 1	$3,500
Grade 2	3,600
Grade 3	3,700
Grade 4	3,800
Grade 5	3,900
Grade 6	4,000
Grade 7	4,100
Grade 8	4,200
Grade 9	4,300
Grade 10	4,500

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the tenth grade.

POST-OFFICE INSPECTORS AND CLERKS IN THE INSPECTION SERVICE

SEC. 15. (a) The annual salaries of inspectors in charge, assistant inspectors in charge, and supervisory employees at division headquarters of the Inspection Service shall be as follows:

Post-office inspectors in charge, $6,700.

Assistant post-office inspectors in charge, $6,000.

Chief clerks, $4,000.

Assistant chief clerks, $3,500.

Chiefs of sections, $3,400.

(b) Post-office inspectors shall be divided into 10 grades with annual salaries as follows:

Grade 1	$3,200
Grade 2	3,400
Grade 3	3,600
Grade 4	3,800
Grade 5	4,000
Grade 6	4,200
Grade 7	4,600
Grade 8	5,000
Grade 9	5,500
Grade 10	6,000

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade until they reach grade 8: *Provided*, That promotion of not more than 25 percent of the authorized quota of inspectors may be made to grades 9 and 10. The Postmaster General shall assign difficult or complex work to be performed by inspectors in grades 9 and 10 and shall select the inspectors to be assigned to these grades under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe: *Provided further*, That inspectors will not be selected for promotion to grades 9 and 10 until they have completed at least 1 year's faithful and meritorious service in the next lower grade.

(c) The clerical force of the Post Office Inspection Service shall be classified as clerks and principal review clerks.

(d) Clerks at division headquarters and other posts of duty of post-office inspectors shall be divided into nine grades with annual salaries as follows:

Grade 1	$1,900
Grade 2	2,000
Grade 3	2,100
Grade 4	2,200
Grade 5	2,300
Grade 6	2,400
Grade 7	2,500
Grade 8	2,600
Grade 9	2,700

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach grade 9: *Provided*, That for such clerks there shall be three additional grades; that is, grade 10, $2,800; grade 11, $2,900; grade 12, $3,000; and that clerks who perform faithful and meritorious service shall be promoted to grade 10, after 3 years of such service in grade 9; shall be promoted to grade 11, after 5 years of such service in grade 10; and shall be promoted to grade 12, after 7 years of such service in grade 11.

(e) Principal review clerks at division headquarters of post-office inspectors shall be divided into four grades with annual salaries as follows:

Grade 1	$2,700
Grade 2	2,800
Grade 3	2,900
Grade 4	3,000

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the fourth grade: *Provided*, That for such clerks there shall be two additional grades; that is, grade 5, $3,100; grade 6, $3,200; and that such clerks who perform faithful and meritorious service shall be promoted to grade 5 after 3 years of such service in grade 4, and shall be promoted to grade 6 after 5 years of such service in grade 5.

(f) Whenever in the discretion of the Postmaster General the needs of the service require such action, he is authorized to transfer clerks, or carriers in the City Delivery Service to the position of clerk at division headquarters and other posts of duty of post-office inspectors at a salary not to exceed $2,300 when the salary of the employee being transferred is less than $2,300, and when the salary of the employee being transferred is equal to or greater than $2,300, such employee may be transferred at not less than the salary received in the position from which transferred. After such transfer is made effective, employees so transferred shall be eligible for promotion to the grades of salary provided herein for clerks at division headquarters and other posts of duty of post-office inspectors.

RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE AND AIR MAIL SERVICE

SEC. 16. (a) The annual salaries of officers in the Railway Mail Service and the Air Mail Service shall be as follows: Division superintendents, $6,700; assistant division superintendents, $5,700; assistant superintendents at large, $5,500; chief clerks, $5,000; assistant chief clerks, $4,200; chiefs of sections in offices of division superintendents, Railway Mail Service, $4,200; regional superintendents, Air Mail Service, $5,000; and assistant regional superintendents, Air Mail Service, $4,200.

(b) Railway postal clerks, and clerks assigned to offices of regional superintendents of Air Mail Service, shall be divided into 17 grades with annual salaries as follows:

Grade 1	$1,900
Grade 2	2,000
Grade 3	2,100
Grade 4	2,200
Grade 5	2,300
Grade 6	2,400
Grade 7	2,500
Grade 8	2,600
Grade 9	2,700
Grade 10	2,800
Grade 11	2,900
Grade 12	3,000
Grade 13	3,100
Grade 14	3,200
Grade 15	3,300
Grade 16	3,400
Grade 17	3,500

(c) Railway post-office lines shall be divided into two classes, class A and class B, and clerks assigned to class A lines shall be promoted successively to grade 9, and after 3 years of faithful and meritorious service in grade 9 shall be promoted to grade 10; after 5 years of faithful and meritorious service in grade 10 shall be promoted to grade 11, and after 7 years of faithful and meritorious service in grade 11 shall be promoted to grade 12. Clerks in charge in class A lines shall be of grade 14. Clerks assigned to class B lines shall be promoted successively to grade 11 and shall be promoted to grade 12 after 3 years of faithful and meritorious service in grade 11; to grade 13 after 5 years of faithful and meritorious service in grade 12; and to grade 14 after 7 years of faithful and meritorious service in grade 13. Clerks in charge of class B lines shall be of grade 16: *Provided*, That in trains in which more than 60 feet of distributing car space is authorized in either direction over the entire length of the run not less than 5 days per week in either direction, the clerk in charge may be of grade 17 and in such trains there may be a second clerk in charge, who may be of grade 16. The provisions of this paragraph shall apply to the employees assigned to highway post-office service. Lines in class A existing on the effective date of this act shall be continued in class A and lines in class B existing on that date shall be continued in class B.

(d) Clerks assigned to terminal railway post offices and air-mail field railway post offices shall be promoted successively to grade 9; and after 3 years of faithful and meritorious service in grade 9 shall be promoted to grade 10; after 5 years of faithful and meritorious service in grade 10 shall be promoted to grade 11; and after 7 years of faithful and meritorious service in grade 11 shall be promoted to grade 12. Clerks in charge of terminal railway post offices and air-mail field railway post offices with less than 20 employees shall be of grade 14 and the clerks in charge of tours shall be of grade 13. Clerks in charge of terminal railway post offices and air-mail field railway post offices with 20 to 74 employees shall be of grade 16 and clerks in charge of tours shall be of grade 15 and clerks in charge of crews within tours shall be of grade 14. Clerks in charge of terminal railway post offices and air-mail field railway post offices with 75 or more employees shall be of grade 17, the clerks in charge of tours shall be of grade 16, and the clerks in charge of crews within tours shall be of grade 15: *Provided*, That in terminal railway post offices and air-mail field railway post offices having 20 or more employees there shall be appointed for each clerk in charge, including clerks in charge of tours and crews, a clerk of one grade lower than the lowest-grade clerk in charge of each organization and such clerks shall act as clerks in charge during the absences of the clerk in charge for whom designated: *Provided further*, That in terminal railway post offices and air-mail field railway post offices with fewer than 20 employees a relief clerk in charge may be appointed in grade 13 to be the clerk in charge during absences of the clerks in charge.

(e) Clerks assigned to transfer offices shall be promoted successively to grade 11, and after 3 years of faithful and meritorious service in grade 11 shall be promoted to grade 12; after 5 years of faithful and meritorious service in grade 12 shall be promoted to grade 13; and after 7 years of faithful and meritorious service in grade 13 shall be promoted to grade 14. Clerks in charge of transfer offices with 1 to 4 employees and of tours in such transfer offices shall be of grade 15. Clerks in charge of transfer offices with 5 to 19 employees shall be of grade 16 and clerks in charge of tours shall be of grade 15. Clerks in charge of transfer offices with 20 or more employees shall be of grade 17 and the clerks in charge of tours shall be of grade 16: *Provided*, That in transfer offices having 20 or more employees there shall be appointed for each clerk in charge, including clerks in charge of tours, a clerk of one grade lower than the lowest-grade clerk in charge of each organization and such clerks shall act as clerks in charge during the absences of the clerk in charge for whom designated: *Provided further*, That in transfer offices with 19 or fewer employees and having 2 of more clerks in charge regularly assigned a relief clerk in charge may be appointed in grade 15.

(f) In determining the number of employees in terminal railway post offices, transfer offices, and air mail field railway post offices, credit shall be allowed for service performed by regular employees, substitute employees other than those serving in lieu of regular employees absent for any cause, and temporary employees assigned to such offices, and for each 2,024 hours of service performed by such employee the office shall be allowed credit for one employee.

(g) Clerks assigned to offices of division superintendents, regional superintendents, Air Mail Service, and in chief clerks' offices shall be promoted successively to grade 9 and after 3 years of faithful and meritorious service in grade 9 shall be promoted to grade 10; after 5 years of faithful and meritorious service in grade 10 shall be promoted to grade 11; and after 7 years of faithful and meritorious service in grade 11 shall be promoted to grade 12. Assistant chiefs of sections in offices of division superintendents and clerks in charge of units in offices of regional superintendents of Air Mail Service, and in offices of chief clerks, shall be of grade 16 or 17: *Provided*, That all clerks in charge and those clerks designated to act as clerks in charge during absences of clerks in charge, in offices of division superintendents, regional superintendents Air Mail Service, chief clerks, class A runs, terminal railway post offices, and air mail field railway post offices, shall be required to progress through the automatic grades to and including grade 9 before being eligible to receive the salary provided herein for the various grades of clerks in charge and clerks who will act as clerks in charge: *Provided further*, That clerks in charge and clerks designated to act as clerks in charge during absences of clerks in charge in transfer offices and clerks in charge assigned to class B runs shall be required to progress through the automatic grades to and including grade 11 before being eligible to receive the slary provided herein for the various grades of clerks in charge and clerks who will act as clerks in charge.

(h) Examiners shall be of grade 16 and assistant examiners shall be of grade 15 whether assigned to the offices of division superintendent or chief clerk: *Provided*, That examiners to be eligible to receive the salary provided herein shall first progress through the automatic grades to and including grade 9.

(i) In filling positions below that of clerks in charge no clerk shall be advanced more than one grade in a period of a year.

(j) Operators of highway post-office vehicles shall be entitled to the same rights and benefits that accrue to railway postal clerks assigned to road duty, except no allowance shall be given these employees for service required on lay-off periods as provided herein for railway postal clerks assigned to road duty: *Provided*, That such operators shall be promoted successively to grade 9; after 3 years of faithful and meritorious service in grade 9 shall be promoted to grade 10; after 5 years of faithful and meritorious service in grade 10 shall be promoted to grade 11, and after 7 years of faithful and meritorious service in grade 11 shall be promoted to grade 12.

(k) Substitute railway postal clerks shall be paid, for actual services performed when on other than road duty, and shall be paid for road services performed according to the time value of the trip of such road service including a proper allowance for all services required on lay-off periods, as provided herein for regular employees assigned to road duty, on an hourly basis at the following rates:

Grade 1	$0.94 per hour
Grade 2	.99 per hour
Grade 3	1.04 per hour
Grade 4	1.09 per hour
Grade 5	1.14 per hour
Grade 6	1.19 per hour
Grade 7	1.24 per hour
Grade 8	1.29 per hour
Grade 9	1.34 per hour

and shall be promoted successively to grade 9 following 1 year's satisfactory service in the next lower grade: *Provided*, That not more than one promotion to the next higher grade shall be made during any 12-month period.

(l) Substitute railway postal clerks, when appointed regular clerks, shall be appointed in the salary grade corresponding to their salary grade as a substitute. Any fractional part of a year's service accumulated after the last promotion as a substitute shall be included with his service as a regular clerk in determining eligibility for promotion to the next higher grade following appointment to a regular position.

(m) Substitute railway postal clerks shall be credited with full time while traveling under orders of the Department to and from their designated headquarters to take up assignments, together with actual and necessary travel expenses, not to exceed $4 per day, while on duty away from such headquarters. When a substitute railway postal clerk performs service in a railway post office or highway post office starting from his official headquarters, he shall be allowed travel expenses under the law applying to clerks regularly assigned to the run.

(n) Mail handlers in the Railway Mail Service shall be divided into six grades, with annual salaries as follows:

Grade 1	$1,600
Grade 2	1,700
Grade 3	1,800
Grade 4	1,900
Grade 5	2,000
Grade 6	2,100

and shall be promoted successively to grade 6 following 1 year's satisfactory service in the next lower grade.

(o) Substitute mail handlers in the Railway Mail Service shall be paid hourly rates as follows:

Grade 1	$0.79 per hour
Grade 2	.84 per hour
Grade 3	.89 per hour
Grade 4	.94 per hour
Grade 5	.99 per hour
Grade 6	1.04 per hour

and shall be promoted successively to grade 6 following 1 year's satisfactory service in the next lower grade: *Provided*, That not more than one promotion to the next higher grade shall be made during any 12-month period: *Provided further*, That when a substitute mail handler is appointed to a regular position,

such employee shall be assigned to a salary grade corresponding to the salary grade as a substitute and any fractional part of a year's service accumulated since the last promotion shall be included with the service as a regular employee in determining eligibility for promotion to the next higher grade following appointment to a regular position.

(p) When the needs of the service require employees of the Railway Mail and Air Mail Services, other than railway postal clerks assigned to road duty and officers, to perform service on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays they shall be allowed compensatory time for such service within 5 working days next succeeding the Saturday or Sunday, and on 1 day within 30 days next succeeding the holiday: *Provided, however,* That the Postmaster General may, if the exigencies of the service require, authorize the payment of overtime for services performed on the Saturdays, Sundays during the month of December, and on Christmas Day in lieu of compensatory time: *Provided further,* That the service of railway postal clerks assigned to road duty shall be based on an average of not exceeding 8 hours daily for 253 days per annum, including allowances for all service required on lay-off periods, and such allowances shall be not less than 50 minutes per day for 253 days per annum for clerks assigned to class A runs and not less than 1 hour and 35 minutes per day for 253 days per annum for clerks assigned to class B runs, and railway postal clerks assigned to road duty required to perform service in excess of an average of 8 hours daily for 253 days shall be paid for such overtime service on the basis of 150 percent of the annual rate of pay received by such employees. In computing compensation for such overtime employment, the annual salary or compensation for such employees shall be divided by 2,024, the number of working hours in a year. The quotient thus obtained will be the base hourly compensation and 1½ times that amount will be the hourly rate of overtime pay.

(q) Employees of the Railway Mail and Air Mail Services, other than railway postal clerks assigned to road duty and officers, shall be required to work not more than 8 hours a day, and the 8 hours of service shall not extend over a longer period than 10 consecutive hours, but in cases of emergency, or if the needs of the service require, they may be required to work in excess of 8 hours a day and shall be paid overtime for such additional service on the basis of 150 percent of their annual base pay. In computing compensation for such overtime the annual salary or compensation shall be divided by 2,024, the number of working hours in a year. The quotient thus obtained will be the base hourly compensation, and 1½ times that amount will be the hourly rate of overtime pay.

(r) In addition to the salaries provided by this act, the Postmaster General may make travel allowances in lieu of actual expenses, at fixed rates per annum, not exceeding in the aggregate the sum annually appropriated, to railway postal clerks, and substitute railway postal clerks, assigned to road duty in railway post-office cars, and highway post-office vehicles after 10 hours from the time of beginning their initial run, under such regulations as he may prescribe, and in no case shall such allowance exceed $4 per day.

(s) Promotions to automatic grades shall be made at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in the next lower grade. Promotions to additional grades shall be made at the beginning of the quarter following the required periods of faithful and meritorious service as provided herein: *Provided,* That 2,024 hours of service in a pay status shall comprise a year's work for substitute railway postal clerks and substitute mail handlers.

(t) In the readjustment of the service to conform to the provisions of this act, clerks in charge of the Railway Mail Service of grade 5 or higher shall be placed in the grades provided for their assignments. A relief clerk in charge for whom a clerk-in-charge assignment is not provided under this act shall be assigned to one grade lower than the lowest grade clerk in charge in the organization to which such relief clerk in charge is assigned.

RURAL DELIVERY SERVICE

SEC. 17. (a) Carriers in the Rural Delivery Service shall be divided into 11 grades, with salaries based in part on specified rates per mile perannum and in part on fixed compensation per annum, as follows:

For routes 30 miles or less in length served 6 days a week:

Rates per mile	*Fixed compensation*
Grade 1, $54	0
Grade 2, $56	$24
Grade 3, $58	48
Grade 4, $60	72
Grade 5, $62	96
Grade 6, $64	120
Grade 7, $66	144
Grade 8, $68	168
Grade 9, $70	192
Grade 10, $72	216
Grade 11, $74	240

and carriers shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the eleventh grade: *Provided,* That there shall be three additional grades of carriers in the Rural Delivery Service, with rates of pay per mile per annum and fixed compensation per annum, as follows:

Rates per mile	*Fixed compensation*
Grade 12, $76	$264
Grade 13, $78	288
Grade 14, $80	312

and carriers who perform faithful and meritorious service shall be promoted to grade 12 after 3 years of such service in grade 11, and shall be promoted to grade 13 after 5 years of such service in grade 12, and shall be promoted to grade 14 after 7 years of such service in grade 13.

(b) A rural carrier assigned to a route over 30 miles in length served 6 days a week shall be promoted and shall be paid for the first 30 miles at the rates per mile per annum and the fixed compensation per annum, as herein provided for routes 30 miles or less in length, and shall be paid $20 per mile per annum for each mile or major fraction thereof said route is in excess of 30 miles, based on actual mileage.

(c) A rural carrier serving one triweekly route shall be paid a salary on the basis of a route one-half the length of the route served by him. A rural carrier serving two triweekly routes shall be paid a salary on the basis of a route one-half the combined length of the two routes.

(d) The Postmaster General may, in his discretion, allow and pay such additional compensation as he may determine to be fair and reasonable in each individual case to rural carriers serving heavily patronized routes not exceeding 45 miles in length: *Provided,* That the total annual compensation of a rural carrier serving a heavily patronized route of not exceeding 45 miles in length shall not exceed $3,000, exclusive of maintenance allowance: *Provided further,* That a rural carrier below the maximum grade provided herein shall not be granted an additional allowance for serving a heavily patronized route in an amount that would exceed $3,000 when added to the salary he would receive in the maximum grade.

(e) In addition to the salaries provided in this section, each carrier in the Rural Delivery Service shall be paid for equipment maintenance a sum equal to 6 cents per mile per day for each mile or major fraction of a mile scheduled. Payments for equipment and maintenance as provided herein shall be at the same periods and in the same manner as payments for regular compensation to rural carriers.

(f) A substitute rural carrier who performs service for a regular carrier absent with pay shall be paid at the same rate paid the regular carrier for each day's service, exclusive of Sundays and authorized holidays. A temporary rural carrier serving a route in place of a regular carrier absent without pay shall be paid at the same rate paid the regular carrier, Sundays and holidays included except at the beginning or end of the period of employment. A temporary rural carrier serving a route for which there is no regular carrier shall be paid at the rate of salary provided for a carrier of grade 1 for the route on which service is performed, including Sundays and authorized holidays except at the beginning and end of the period of employment.

(g) In the readjustment of the salaries of carriers in the Rural Delivery Service to conform to the provisions of this act, rural carriers assigned to routes 17 miles or more in length shall be placed in grade 8; rural carriers assigned to routes 11 to 16 miles in length, inclusive, shall be placed in grade 9; rural carriers assigned to routes 8 to 10 miles in length, inclusive, shall be placed in grade 10, and rural carriers assigned to routes 7 miles or less in length shall be placed in grade 11: *Provided,* That any carrier in the Rural Mail Delivery Service on June 30, 1945, who serves 6 days a week a rural route of less than 30 miles, or who serves 3 days a week a rural route of less than 60 miles or two routes of a combined length of less than 60 miles, and who is receiving for such service an annual salary in excess of a salary based on the standard rate of $60 per mile per annum for the first 30 miles, and whose annual salary is in excess of such standard rate in conformity with subsection (d) of the first section of the act entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of rural letter carriers, and for other purposes" (48 Stat. 1213), approved June 25, 1934, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 39, sec. 197-a), shall be assigned to the lowest grade that will provide an annual salary of not less than his base pay under all provisions of said act, as amended, plus $300.

MAIL EQUIPMENT SHOPS

SEC. 18. (a) The salary of employees in the mail-equipment shops shall be as follows:

Superintendent, $5,700; assistant superintendent, $4,200; general foremen, $3,600; foremen of the clerical-mechanical service, $2,600 and $2,800; cost accounting and purchasing clerks, $3,100, $3,300, and $3,500; engineers in charge, 93,100; draftsmen, $3,100, $3,300, and $3,500; assistant foremen, $2,400.

(b) Clerks, nurses, and painters shall be divided into 11 grades with annual salaries as follows:

Grade 1	$1,700
Grade 2	1,800
Grade 3	1,900
Grade 4	2,000
Grade 5	2,100
Grade 6	2,200
Grade 7	2,300
Grade 8	2,400
Grade 9	2,500
Grade 10	2,600
Grade 11	2,700

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the eleventh grade: *Provided,* That there shall be three additional grades; that is, grade 12, $2,800; grade 13, $2,900; and grade 14, $3,000; and employees who perform faithful and meritorious service shall be promoted to grade 12 after 3 years of such service in grade 11, shall be promoted to grade 13 after 5 years of such service in grade 12, and shall be promoted to grade 14 after 7 years of such service in grade 13.

(c) Pressmen, lock makers, mail-bag repairers, inspectors, mechanics, and postmarking stamp makers shall be divided into seven grades, with annual salaries as follows:

Grade 1	$1,800
Grade 2	1,900
Grade 3	2,000
Grade 4	2,100
Grade 5	2,200
Grade 6	2,300
Grade 7	2,400

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the seventh grade.

(d) Firemen, firemen-guards, skilled laborers, and sewers shall be divided into six grades, with annual salaries as follows:

Grade 1	$1,600
Grade 2	1,700
Grade 3	1,800
Grade 4	1,900
Grade 5	2,000
Grade 6	2,100

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the sixth grade.

(e) Junior mechanics, laborers, and messengers shall be divided into seven grades with annual salaries as follows:

Grade 1	$1,300
Grade 2	1,400
Grade 3	1,500
Grade 4	1,600
Grade 5	1,700
Grade 6	1,800
Grade 7	1,900

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the seventh grade.

(f) Temporary employees in the mail equipment shops shall be paid at the respective rates of pay of grade 1 provided herein for regular employees.

DIVISION OF EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES

SEC. 19. (a) Traveling mechanicians shall be divided into 11 grades, with annual salaries as follows:

Grade 1	$3,000
Grade 2	3,100
Grade 3	3,200
Grade 4	3,300
Grade 5	3,400
Grade 6	3,500
Grade 7	3,600
Grade 8	3,700
Grade 9	3,800
Grade 10	3,900
Grade 11	4,000

any shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the ninth grade, shall be promoted to the tenth grade, after 3 years' faithful and meritorious service in grade 9, and shall be promoted to the eleventh grade after 5 years' faithful and meritorious service in grade 10.

(b) Storekeepers shall be paid annual salaries of $3,200 and foremen shall be paid annual salaries of $2,700.

(c) Requisition fillers and packers shall be divided into seven grades, with annual salaries as follows:

Grade 1	$1,800
Grade 2	1,900
Grade 3	2,000
Grade 4	2,100
Grade 5	2,200
Grade 6	2,300
Grade 7	2,400

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the seventh grade.

(d) Laborers shall be divided into seven grades with annual salaries as follows:

Grade 1	$1,300
Grade 2	1,400
Grade 3	1,500
Grade 4	1,600
Grade 5	1,700
Grade 6	1,800
Grade 7	1,900

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the seventh grade.

SEC. 20. During the period of the emergency and for 6 months thereafter, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate, when the needs of the service require postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, post-office inspectors, traveling mechanicians, examiners of equipment and supplies, and officers of the Railway Mail and Air Mail Services, to perform service on Saturday they shall be allowed compensatory time for such service on 1 day within 5 working days next succeeding the Saturday on which the excess service was performed: *Provided*, That postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, post-office inspectors, traveling mechanicians, examiners of equipment and supplies, and officers of the Railway Mail and Air Mail Services, shall be on duty not less than 48 hours per week, and shall be paid for the additional 8 hours, as additional pay for working such additional time, as follows: Those whose salaries are over $5,000 and not over $7,999, 5 percent of their base annual salaries; those whose salaries are over $4,000 and not over $5,000, 10 percent of their base annual salaries; those whose salaries are over $2,000 and not over $4,000, 15 percent of their base annual salaries; those whose salaries are $2,000, or under, 20 per centum of their base annual salaries: *Provided further*, That no postmaster whose base annual salary is $8,000 or over shall receive any additional compensation for such overtime work: *Provided further*, That the Postmaster General may, if the exigencies of the service require, authorize the payment of overtime in lieu of compensatory time for service performed on Saturday by employees included in the provisions of section 3 and subsection q of section 16 of this act. In computing compensation for such overtime employment, the annual salary or compensation for such employees shall be divided by 2,024, the number of working hours in a year. The quotient thus obtained will be the base hourly compensation and one and one-half times that amount will be the hourly rate of overtime pay. Such overtime payments shall not be considered as part of the earned basic compensation.

SEC. 21. All employees provided for in this act in automatic grades who have not reached the maximum grade to which they are entitled to progress automatically, shall be promoted at the beginning of the quarter following the completion of 1 year's satisfactory service since their last promotion, regardless of any increases granted them by the provisions of this act.

SPECIAL-DELIVERY MESSENGERS

SEC. 22. (a) Where special-delivery messengers are employed on a full-time basis in offices of the first class, they shall be divided into nine grades, with annual salaries as follows:

Grade 1	$1,600
Grade 2	1,700
Grade 3	1,800
Grade 4	1,900
Grade 5	2,000
Grade 6	2,100
Grade 7	2,200
Grade 8	2,300
Grade 9	2,400

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the ninth grade.

(b) The pay of substitute, temporary, or auxiliary special-delivery messengers in offices of the first class shall be on an hourly basis at the following rates:

Grade 1	$0.79
Grade 2	.84
Grade 3	.89
Grade 4	.94
Grade 5	.99
Grade 6	1.04
Grade 7	1.09
Grade 8	1.14
Grade 9	1.19

and shall be promoted to the next higher grade at the beginning of the quarter following 2,024 hours' satisfactory service in a pay status.

(c) Special-delivery messengers in offices of the first class shall, upon the effective date of this act, be entitled to the grade to conform with their years of service, as follows:

Less than 2 years' service	Grade 1
2 years but less than 3 years' service	Grade 2
3 years but less than 4 years' service	Grade 3
4 years but less than 5 years' service	Grade 4
5 years but less than 6 years' service	Grade 5
6 years' service or more	Grade 6

(d) In addition to compensation provided in subsections (a) and (b), each special-delivery messenger in offices of the first class shall be paid for automotive-equipment maintenance at the rate of 6 cents per mile or major fraction thereof for miles traveled under the direction of the Post Office Department in making delivery of special-delivery mail or at the option of the Post Office Department at the rate of 75 cents per hour spent in making delivery of special-delivery mail. Payment for equipment maintenance as provided herein shall be at the same periods and in the same manner as payments for regular compensation to special-delivery messengers.

(e) Special-delivery messengers may be employed at duties other than the delivery of special-delivery mail when their regular duties do not require 8 hours' work in 10; and special-delivery articles may, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, be delivered by regular, substitute, and temporary postal employees, and such employees shall be paid their regular rate of compensation for such delivery service.

(f) The Postmaster General may provide or hire vehicles under an allowance basis for use in the delivery of special-delivery mail whenever the exigencies of the service may require.

(g) For the purposes of section 8 (b), (c), and (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and of section 3 (b) and (c) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense and to authorize the President to order members and units of reserve components and retired personnel of the Regular Army into active military service," approved August 27, 1940, as amended (relating to reemployment of persons who have served in the armed forces of the United States), services as a special-delivery messenger in the Postal Service shall be considered services as

an employee of the United States in a position other than temporary.

SEC. 23. In the readjustment of salaries to conform to the provisions of this act, regular employees for whom salary steps, automatic and additional grades have been provided in sections 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, and 19 shall be assigned to the salary of their respective positions on the basis of their base salary plus 20 percent, or $400, whichever is the lesser amount, but not less than $300: *Provided*, That when the application of the above formula produces a sum that is not equal to a salary provided for the position, the employee shall be assigned to the next higher salary grade: *Provided further*, That no employee shall be assigned to a salary grade above the maximum automatic or additional grade provided for the position: *And provided further*, That clerks who are employed not less than 40 hours per week at third-class post offices, and who are appointed to regular positions, shall be assigned to the minimum salary rate provided for the position.

SEC. 24. In the readjustment of part-time positions to conform to the provisions of this act, substitute, temporary, auxiliary, and other part-time employees for whom hourly rates of pay have been provided in sections 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, and 19 shall be assigned, respectively, to the hourly rate of pay that most nearly equals their base hourly rate plus 20 percent: *Provided*, That when the base hourly rate plus 20 percent does not equal the hourly rates provided by this act, fractional units of less than 50 percent shall be disregarded and fractional units of 50 percent or more shall be considered as a full unit rate of pay.

SEC. 25. Allowable service under the provisions of this act shall be only such continuous active service as has been rendered and shall not include previous periods or terms of employment: *Provided, however*, That in the case of employees who have been separated or shall hereafter be separated from the field service of the Post Office Department for military duty, the periods or terms of such service immediately preceding entry into the military service as well as the time engaged in military service shall be construed as allowable service and pro rata credit shall be given for the time engaged in military service for each year of such service.

SEC. 26. Nothing contained in this act shall operate to decrease the pay of any present regular employee to an amount less than his annual base pay plus $300.

SEC. 27. The sums appropriated for salaries and compensation of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service in the act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, shall be available for the payment of salaries and compensation of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service at the rates of compensation herein provided; and such additional sums as may be necessary are hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 28. This act shall take effect on July 1, 1945.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this bill. It is well merited and long overdue. It includes in its provisions a change in the situation of special-delivery messengers particularly. Up to now they have been contractors; that is their technical description. This bill changes their situation and puts them in employee status with annual salaries. I think it is a definite improvement in the public interest. Every power the Post Office Department requested in order to improve what it admits is a bad special-delivery service at the present time has been granted.

I wish to read at this time an editorial which I think well expresses the essential things that are in this bill. The editorial comes from the Detroit Labor News, under date of May 11, 1945:

POSTAL WORKERS DESERVE A RAISE

When credit is being given for meritorious deeds performed in helping the war effort don't overlook the post-office worker. Nobody outside the armed services has delivered a better job than they. That goes for all of them—carriers, clerks, and all the other employees of the complex Postal System.

A stupendous volume of mail has been moved by the Postal Service. It has sold bonds and stamps, helped register aliens, delivered millions of ration books, and assisted with other special services. In addition to this has been piled the movement of millions of service letters and packages to all parts of the globe.

This tremendous task has been performed by a staff which has been sorely short-handed due to the introduction of many members in the armed services. A very large percentage of clerks and carriers and other postal workers are at the front. Securing replacements for the positions they vacated has been almost impossible.

Realizing its vital importance, the Postal Service has never called a strike or created any disturbance in an effort to force better pay.

Save for a $300 per year cost-of-living bonus paid to each worker, postal employees receive the same pay they did in 1925. This is far below increases granted in practically any other class of work. And this bonus has been paid for only 2 years.

Under existing law even this temporary bonus expires June 30.

To alleviate this situation, the House of Representatives is now considering a bill, H. R. 3035, which would extend the present $300 bonus and increase it $100. Specifically, a provision of $400 per year increase over the 1925 pay level.

The salary of postal employees next June will revert to the 1925 level if this bill fails to pass.

The measure would also allow time and one-half for overtime, which postal employees do not now enjoy.

Obviously, the provisions of this bill are only reasonable. Postal employees have done a remarkable job and deserve better treatment.

The Mead bill, S. 908, which is similar in most respects to H. R. 3035, is now before the Senate Post Office Committee. Every member of organized labor and their friends should vigorously support these measures. Write your Congressman today.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer a number of amendments which are at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. BURCH: Page 3, line 4, after the word "to", insert "employees."

Page 4, line 25, strike out "Employees" and insert the following: "Postmasters and employees."

Page 10, line 11, strike out "foreman" and insert "foremen."

Page 10, line 16, after the word "assistant", strike out "superintendent" and insert "superintendents."

Page 10, line 21, after the word "assistant", strike out "superintendent" and insert "superintendents."

Page 11, line 3, strike out "superintendent" and insert "superintendents."

Page 12, line 15, after the word "general", strike out "foreman" and insert "foremen."

Page 17, line 3, after the word "delivery" insert a comma.

Page 26, line 7, after the word "appointed", add the following: "to a regular position."

Page 26, line 9, after the word "substitute", insert a period and strike out the following: "except as provided for clerks at third-class post offices."

Page 29, line 14, strike out "superintendent" and insert "superintendents."

Page 29, line 15, strike out "Superintendent" and insert "Superintendents" and strike out "unit" and insert "units."

Page 29, line 16, strike out "superintendent" and insert "superintendents" and strike out "unit" and insert "units."

Page 29, line 17, strike out "engineer" and insert "engineers."

Page 29, line 18, strike out "engineer" and insert "engineers."

Page 29, line 19, strike out "Superintendent" and insert "Superintendents" and strike out "engineer" and insert "engineers."

Page 30, line 14, strike out the following: "Engineers, watch" and insert 'Watch engineers."

Page 35, line 15, after the word "into", strike out "six" and insert "four."

Page 36, line 1, strike out "sixth" and insert "fourth."

Page 59, line 23, after the word "subsection', strike out "q" and insert "(p)."

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. IZAC, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3035, pursuant to House Resolution 246, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The veas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 361, nays 1, not voting 70, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

YEAS—361

Abernethy	Auchincloss	Blackney
Adams	Bailey	Bland
Allen, Ill.	Baldwin, Md.	Bonner
Allen, La.	Barrett, Pa.	Boykin
Andersen, H. Carl	Barrett, Wyo.	Brehm
	Barry	Brooks
Anderson, Calif.	Bates, Ky.	Brown, Ga.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Beall	Brown, Ohio
	Beckworth	Brumbaugh
Andresen, August H.	Bell	Bryson
	Bender	Buck
Angell	Bennet, N. Y.	Buckley
Arends	Bennett, Mo.	Buffett
Arnold	Bishop	Bulwinkle

Burch
Burgin
Butler
Byrne, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Campbell
Canfield
Cannon, Fla.
Cannon, Mo.
Carnahan
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Celler
Chapman
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clason
Clements
Clevenger
Coffee
Cole, Kans.
Cole, Mo.
Colmer
Combs
Cooper
Corbett
Cox
Cravens
Crawford
Crosser
Cunningham
Curtis
D'Alesandro
Daughton, Va.
Davis
Dawson
Delaney, James J.
Delaney, John J.
Dickstein
Dolliver
Domengeaux
Dondero
Doughton, N. C.
Douglas, Calif.
Doyle
Drewry
Durham
Dworshak
Eberharter
Elliott
Ellis
Ellsworth
Elsaesser
Elston
Engel, Mich.
Engle, Calif.
Fallon
Feighan
Fellows
Fenton
Fernandez
Flannagan
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Fulton
Gallagher
Gamble
Gardner
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gerlach
Gibson
Gillespie
Gillette
Gillie
Goodwin
Gordon
Gore
Gorski
Gossett
Graham
Granahan
Grant, Ind.
Green
Gregory
Griffiths
Gross
Gwinn, N. Y.
Gwynne, Iowa
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hand
Hare
Harless, Ariz.
Harness, Ind.
Harris
Hart
Hartley
Havenner
Hays
Hedrick
Heffernan
Henry
Herter
Heselton
Hill
Hinshaw
Hobbs
Hoch
Hoeven
Holifield
Holmes, Wash.
Hope
Horan
Howell
Huber
Hull
Izac
Jackson
Jarman
Jenkins
Jensen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Ill.
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson, Luther A.
Jones
Jonkman
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Kee
Keefe
Kefauver
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, Ill.
Keogh
Kerr
Kilburn
Kilday
Kinzer
Kirwan
Knutson
Kopplemann
Kunkel
LaFollette
Landis
Lane
Lanham
Larcade
Latham
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lemke
Lesinski
Lewis
Link
Luce
Ludlow
Lyle
Lynch
McConnell
McCormack
McCowen
McDonough
McGehee
McGlinchey
McGregor
McKenzie
McMillan, S. C.
McMillen, Ill.
Mahon
Maloney
Manasco
Mansfield, Mont.
Mansfield, Tex.
Marcantonio
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Mason
May
Michener
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Nebr.
Monroney
Morgan
Morrison
Mott
Mundt
Murphy
Murray, Tenn.
Murray, Wis.
Neely
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara
O'Konski
O'Neal
O'Toole
Outland
Pace
Patman
Patrick
Patterson
Peterson, Fla.
Peterson, Ga.
Pfeifer
Philbin
Phillips
Pickett
Pittenger
Ploeser
Plumley
Poage
Price, Fla.
Price, Ill.
Quinn, N. Y.
Rabaut
Rabin
Rains
Ramey
Randolph
Rankin
Rayfiel
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Resa
Rich
Richards
Riley
Rivers
Rizley
Robertson, N. Dak.
Robertson, Va.
Robinson, Utah
Robsion, Ky.
Rockwell
Rodgers, Pa.
Roe, Md.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, N. Y.
Rooney
Rowan
Russell
Ryter
Sadowski
Sasscer
Schwabe, Mo.
Schwabe, Okla.
Scrivner
Shafer
Sharp
Sheppard
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Slaughter
Smith, Maine
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Somers, N. Y.
Sparkman
Spence
Springer
Starkey
Stefan
Stevenson
Stigler
Stockman
Sullivan
Sumner, Ill.
Sumners, Tex.
Sundstrom
Taber
Talbot
Talle
Tarver
Taylor
Thom
Thomas, N. J.
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Tibbott
Tolan
Torrens
Towe
Traynor
Trimble
Vinson
Voorhis, Calif.
Vorys, Ohio
Vursell
Wasielewski
Weaver
Weichel
Weiss
Welch
West
Whitten
Whittington
Wickersham
Wigglesworth
Winstead
Winter
Wolcott
Wolfenden, Pa.
Wolverton, N. J.
Wood
Woodhouse
Woodruff, Mich.
Woodrum, Va.
Zimmerman

NAYS—1

Smith, Ohio

NOT VOTING—70

Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Y.
Baldwin, N. Y.
Barden
Bates, Mass.
Biemiller
Bloom
Bolton
Boren
Bradley, Mich.
Bradley, Pa.
Bunker
Carlson
Clark
Cochran
Cole, N. Y.
Cooley
Courtney
Curley
De Lacy
Dingell
Dirksen
Douglas, Ill.
Earthman
Eaton
Ervin
Fisher
Folger
Fuller
Gearhart
Geelan
Gifford
Granger
Grant, Ala.
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hancock
Healy
Hébert
Hendricks
Hess
Hoffman
Holmes, Mass.
Hook
Jennings
Johnson, Lyndon B.
Johnson, Okla.
King
Lea
Madden
Merrow
Mills
Murdock
Norton
Powell
Powers
Priest
Ramspeck
Roe, N. Y.
Sabath
Savage
Sheridan
Simpson, Pa.
Snyder
Stewart
Wadsworth
Walter
White
Wilson
Worley

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Fuller.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Healy with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Bunker with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. Carlson.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.
Mr. Stewart with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Douglas of Illinois with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Biemiller with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Powers.
Mr. De Lacy with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Fisher with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Hancock.
Mr. Boren with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Hook with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. King with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Lea with Mr. Andrews of New York.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks on the bill just passed at that point in the RECORD where the general debate was concluded.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein certain excerpts.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include an editorial which appeared in the World-Telegram of May 10, 1945.

Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks as to benefits for servicemen, exservicemen, and their dependents.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an order of the War Production Board relaxing the requirements for the building of rural electrification lines.

AMENDING NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 228 and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 387) to amend section 401 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereon to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 387 which comes here with the unanimous report of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. The bill is an amendment to a section of the Immigration Code. Briefly, this is what it does. In the event that the parents of a child move to a foreign country and become naturalized before that child becomes of age, the child's nationality naturally follows that of its parents. We passed an act which provided that if that child desired to return to this country and resume his citizenship here, he could do so of his own free will up to a certain date in 1945. Before that time had expired, however, the war intervened; therefore, a good many people were stranded in foreign countries, and some unfortunate persons are losing their citizenship which they could have regained except for the fact the war prevented them from returning to the United States, which was their native country. This bill merely extends that time within which they can return, from 1945 to 1947. That is all the bill does. As I said, it is the unanimous report of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] whether or not those persons who were born here of foreign parents, that is, of parents who were not naturalized, while the parents were resident in the United States, are included in this act?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Most of the children we are speaking about here are born in the United States, some of naturalized parents and some of aliens who took up residence in foreign countries a few years ago before the war and applied for their citizenship and included the child born here as a citizen of that country.

When those children came back they have indicated to the State Department that they want to be American citizens. Under the Nationality Act we have given them the right to return on or before 1945——

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand that part of it, but I have a further question to ask. As the gentleman knows, a great many native-born Japanese came to this country prior to 1924 and had children, born in the United States, and then, under the Exclusion Act of 1924, they returned to Japan with their children. Those children were born in the United States. Does this act include them?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No. It has nothing to do with the excludable classes at all.

Mr. HINSHAW. But those children were born in the United States and are entitled to claim United States citizenship.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If they have left the country they stay out, and it is up to them to find a way to get back. We make no provision for them to return to this country. In other words, and stated briefly, all that the bill does is this: Under existing law a citizen-child, whether he acquired citizenship through birth or naturalization—and a great majority of these children did acquire citizenship through birth—loses his citizenship through the naturalization of a parent in a foreign country if the child attains the age of 23 years without acquiring permanent residence in the United States, so that the child might not have lost his citizenship through any fault of his own but through the act of his parent. The law gives him until he is 23 years of age to take up residence in the United States. The present law is adequate for real young folks who can return to the United States when transportation becomes available prior to their twenty-third birthday. The Congress recognizing that a number of American citizens had passed the age of 23 when this law went into effect gave them 2 years after the effective date of the act—January 13, 1941—in which to return to the United States to protect their citizenship. However, the war was on and many of them have lost their citizenship because of the inability to secure transportation on which to return to the United States. All this bill attempts to do is to give these folks until January 13, 1947, in which to return to the United States. Those who question the merits of this bill show a definite inconsistency because the Congress on at least three occasions has extended the time in section 409 of the same Nationality Act in which to permit naturalized citizens who have been caught abroad and have been unable to get back, to return to the United States. If you decline to act favorably on this bill you will be in the position of granting greater favors to naturalized citizens than to native-born citizens.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand from the San Francisco Call-Bulletin of May 8, 1945, a large picture of Harry Bridges drinking a toast, and Mr. Molotov in the same picture drinking a toast to Harry Bridges.

The caption under the large picture showing Molotov and Harry Bridges drinking a toast to each other, reads as follows:

> Commissar Molotov provided Harry Bridges with a picture last evening that will undoubtedly wind up in the Bridges album, if any. It was at a party in the Borgia Room of the St. Francis and here the Russian and the longshore leader are toasting each other. Left to right are Dr. Holland Roberts, chairman of the American Russian Institute; Molotov; his interpreter, V. Pavlov, and Bridges. Caviar and vodka were plentiful.

We as American citizens must be careful of what the Communists in this country are interested in doing to America. We in the Congress of the United States and those in high places in authority in the United States must be very careful what the Communists are thinking about in the world and how they are trying to drag America into communism or some other ism that is not Americanism. When you look at that picture and see those two gentlemen drinking that toast, I tell you, "America beware," because you do not know what some people are trying to do, which will ultimately be ruinous to the American people and the American form of government.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman attempt to tell us what Mr. Bridges is saying to Mr. Molotov?

Mr. RICH. I have an idea Mr. Bridges is saying to Mr. Molotov, "Mr. Molotov, you did a good job. If you will keep on you can soon work it out so that we will have communism in America, because that is about what I stand for."

That is what Harry Bridges would say—not I. Do not think that I am for communism, because I do not want to leave that impression in the mind of anybody. America should be vigilant. America should be awake to every transaction that is taking place in America at this time, at the San Francisco Conference or any other place in America. If we are vigilant we will protect the Constitution of the United States and we will protect our form of government. If we do not we will loose our form of government, our freedom, our liberty, our Constitution. Send Harry Bridges back to Australia where he came from.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

R. E. A. SHOULD BE REESTABLISHED AS AN INDEPENDENT AGENCY

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I requested time for the purpose of calling the particular attention of my colleagues to what was done in the other body of the Congress on yesterday. I refer to the passage of S. 89, with special reference to section 5 of that bill. That section provides that the R. E. A. be reestablished as an independent agency of the Federal Government. That the evidence in support of the action taken by that body was convincing and conclusive is proved by the fact that when the final vote was taken not a single voice was raised against the bill.

The demand for reestablishing the R. E. A. as an independent agency comes from the "grass roots" of America, from the farmers who borrow the money and pay it back, the farmers who work and toil to produce food for the Nation, the farmers themselves, who, because they know how important rural electrification is, are determined that it shall be administered on a sound, efficient business basis and free from partisan bickering. They do not want the R. E. A. to be a political football.

Moved by that spirit, managers of the rural electric cooperatives in the State of Iowa met in Des Moines on December 9, 1944, to make their position clear. The resolution adopted at that meeting may be found in my remarks under date of December 18, 1944, on page 4821 in the Appendix of the RECORD. Similar resolutions adopted by individual cooperatives have been recorded with me and I have not to this day received a single dissenting opinion. Throughout our country the demand is unmistakable—the people want the R. E. A. reestablished as an independent agency.

Mr. Speaker, in response to this demand I introduced H. R. 1532 on January 16, 1945. On examination it will be found that my bill is like section 5 of the bill approved in the other Chamber on yesterday.

A matter of such great significance should be free from party differences. In keeping with that attitude, on the very day when I dropped my bill in the hopper my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN] introduced an identical bill. My purpose and that of my distinguished colleague from Missouri is to

act in response to the will of the American farmer, who rightfully demands that the R. E. A. be kept free from partisan politics. The objective is clear—constructive policy, responsiveness to the Congress, able and efficient administration, and no partisan political activity.

Mr. Speaker, rural electrification is the greatest blessing that has come to the American farmer in this century. Our entire Nation has shared in the benefits. I trust, therefore, and I earnestly hope that the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, to which my bill (H. R. 1532) and similar bills were referred will take prompt action. I say "similar bills" because my colleague the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] introduced a bill with similar purpose on February 8, 1945. Voluminous hearings on the conduct of the R. E. A. were held by a subcommittee of the other Chamber last year. The need for reestablishing the R. E. A. as an independent agency sticks out like a sore thumb on every one of the 2,000 pages of those printed hearings. The time to act is now. Let there be no delay.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 82]

Anderson, Calif.	Folger	Madden
Andrews, Ala.	Fuller	Merrow
Barden	Gamble	Miller, Calif.
Bates, Ky.	Gearhart	Mills
Bates, Mass.	Gifford	Murdock
Biemiller	Granger	Norton
Bloom	Grant, Ala.	O'Brien, Mich.
Boren	Hall,	Outland
Bradley, Mich.	Leonard W.	Phillips
Bradley, Pa.	Halleck	Powell
Buckley	Hancock	Powers
Bunker	Harless, Ariz.	Priest
Burgin	Harris	Rains
Byrne, N. Y.	Hart	Rivers
Case, S. Dak.	Hartley	Roe, N. Y.
Celler	Healy	Sabath
Clark	Hébert	Savage
Cochran	Heffernan	Shafer
Cole, Kans.	Hendricks	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, N. Y.	Herter	Snyder
Cooley	Hess	Stewart
Courtney	Hoffman	Sumners, Tex.
Cox	Holmes, Mass.	Thomas, Tex.
Curley	Hook	Vursell
De Lacy	Jackson	Wadsworth
Dirksen	Jennings	Walter
Domengeaux	Johnson,	Weaver
Doughton, N. C.	Lyndon B.	White
Douglas, Ill.	Johnson, Okla.	Wilson
Earthman	Knutson	Worley
Eaton	Lesinski	
Fisher	McKenzie	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 340 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a report by the editors on the atrocities in Germany.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend the remarks that I expect to make this afternoon under special order by including therein certain decisions by the Supreme Court of the United States, citations of other authorities, and other quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GEELAN. Mr. Speaker, during the calling of the roll on the bill H. R. 3035, a bill to classify the salaries of postmasters and officers and employees of the Postal Service, I was in the library off the floor and I was not recorded as voting. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in conference when the recent post-office bill was under consideration. I favor its provisions, and had I been present I would have voted "aye."

AMENDING THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 257) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma is appointed to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

The resolution was agreed to.

AMENDING THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 387), to amend section 401 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 387, with Mr. FOGARTY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I just wish to make this announcement to the House, that H. R. 387 is a bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, not the immigration law.

In view of the fact that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] worked in the preparation of that nationality act, and in all probability knows more about the details of that act than any other member, I am asking the gentleman from Kansas at this time to explain the provisions of this bill and to tell us exactly what it does and also what it does not do.

I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] such time as he desires to take.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I shall take 5 minutes to begin with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this legislation, as the distinguished gentleman from Illinois has just told us, is not an immigration measure. It is an amendment to the Nationality Act. Prior to the passage of the Nationality Act of 1940, persons born in the United States who were taken abroad by their parents and whose parents became citizens of a foreign country could retain American citizenship and at the same time claim citizenship in such foreign country. That is, provided they did not renounce American citizenship. It is known as dual citizenship. There were thousands of people who came under this classification of dual citizenship.

Under the Nationality Act of 1940 it was provided among other things that the persons above referred to would lose their rights of citizenship after reaching the age of 23 years if they did not, prior to that time, return to the United States and claim permanent residence, or if they had reached the age of 23 years they would have a right to claim such citizenship if they would return to the United States for permanent residence within 2 years after the act was made effective, which was January 13, 1941. The extension of 2 years gave them until January 13, 1943.

As I have just suggested, it applies only to those persons born in the United States of parents who had become citizens of foreign countries while such persons were under age. It was our contention then and it is our contention now that such child, provided he complies with other laws of our country, ought to have a reasonable time during which to claim his citizenship in America. As stated above, the act went into effect on January 13, 1941, and the two years provided under the act expired on January 13, 1943. The war has been on in the meantime, so in order to be fair to those individuals, we are extending the time until January 1947. A comparatively small group will take advantage of this legislation. I do not know how many. Probably somewhere in the hundreds will really come back and take up citizenship under this law. As I say, the only intention here is to be fair to a group of people who would have returned but could not do so because of war conditions. Among them are people living in France, Great Britain, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and other

foreign countries. It has been suggested that Japanese would be affected. I have talked to officials in the Bureau of Immigration with respect to this question. They say this amendment could not possibly affect the Japanese, because no one whether under this act or not, will be permitted to come into this country except by securing visas from the State Department.

Everyone who would come to this country under the terms of the act would have to be admitted by our State Department and the immigration authorities, and do not forget that everyone who applies is an American born person who did not lose citizenship in America through any fault of his own.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. Conditions of course have changed since 1940, and there will be many abroad who by subterfuge will be trying to come to the United States. Among other provisions, I am concerned about this language in the bill: "By his own voluntary act."

The sentence being: "Has not theretofore expatriated himself as a citizen of the United States by his own voluntary act." Suppose a young man's parents had gone to Germany and been naturalized in Germany, that when he had reached the age of 21 he became a national of Germany but contended it was not his voluntary act, that he was forced into it in order to save his life. Could he not make the plea that becoming a national of Germany was not his voluntary act, therefore he would be admissible to enter this country?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I may say to the gentleman from Texas that if he did nothing to cause him to lose his citizenship. He can come back and claim citizenship in the United States because he was born here. He could do that before.

Mr. LANHAM. Suppose he insists his act was involuntary, that it was the result of coercion.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Of course, he would have to go before the representatives of our State Department and show he was a citizen, and had done nothing to lose his right to reclaim citizenship. I may say to the gentleman from Texas again that without this act he could have done it for 40, 50, or 60 years.

Mr. LANHAM. But he could not now under the time limitation of the act.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This provision of the act of 1940 went into effect in 1943 and it is a matter of fairness to the person because he could not come back during the period to 1943. None can exercise this right under the act because the war started soon after the act went into effect.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. In the last three or four years there have come into the United States nobody knows exactly how many thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands of refugees. They are here for the duration of the war, we are told; they were brought in here in violation of the immigration laws. We just winked at them and let them come in here. We let them have refuge until the war is over. The children of those people are citizens of the United States by virtue of having been born on American soil. If they go back to other countries with their parents this would give the children the right to come back to the United States and claim citizenship?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] to answer that.

Mr. MASON. I will answer the question in this way: Every refugee in the United States today by virtue of having been given refuge is not a United States citizen. He is here temporarily. This does not change our Constitution. Under our Constitution a child born here is an American citizen. This bill does not affect that child one way or the other because those refugees will go back to their own country after the war is over, and we hope they will all go back. They did not take out naturalization papers here, therefore this bill has nothing to do with their children. You would have to change our Constitution in order to take away from that child his citizenship which he acquired by virtue of having been born here.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. How about the provision in this bill that they must exercise this right before January 1947? Would not that child to whom reference has been made have to come back before January 1947 under the explanation given here?

Mr. MASON. Of course, that is true but a child that is born here during the period his parents were refugees would have to come back here before 1947. If his parents took him back to Germany, France, or wherever they came from, the child would have to come back before 1947, therefore he could not be more than 3 years of age. Somebody would have to sponsor him and he would have to leave his parents back there. So, of course, it is a very extreme supposition that a child 2 or 3 years of age would come back here and live here by himself without anyone to support him or to take care of him, leaving his parents back there. That is an exaggerated illustration of what this bill covers.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Would not that child be in the same position as a child born to a foreign ambassador or minister to this country? He does not become a citizen of this country. He is simply here.

Mr. MASON. Oh, yes.

Mr. DONDERO. When that ambassador goes back to his own country he would become a citizen of the country of his parents.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In any event, this particular measure simply says that unless this individual comes back to this country after his parents have renounced their citizenship in the United States and taken up citizenship in a foreign country, then that individual must get back here before 1947 and claim citizenship here if he is going to become a citizen of the United States. Otherwise he is barred.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Do I understand from what was said here that this would not affect the refugees at all?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct. It does not affect the refugees.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Unless some of those refugees should have children born to them here, and, then the children would become citizens of the United States; is that the gist of the gentleman's statement?

Mr. REES of Kansas. If it is held that such children are citizens of the United States, you have another problem that does not come under this legislation.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I would like to know how broad the limits are. How many people is it contemplated that this legislation will cover?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is rather difficult to estimate, I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky, but it is said that probably a few hundred will take advantage of it. We do not know how many are included in this group.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Of course, we hear statements made and read them in the press that there are seven or eight hundred thousand refugees in this country.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In this country?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This bill does not affect the refugees in this country at all. That is an immigration question. We are talking about a nationality question now.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I think the average Member of the House feels as I do about it, that we do not want to break down our immigration laws.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I agree with that. Neither do I. I want to strengthen them and tighten them up.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana, a member of this committee.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I do not know how many refugees it covers, but I asked the chairman of our committee a moment ago how many it might cover and he said it might run into the thousands. I think the House ought to have the benefit of that information.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. The Selective Service Act was approved, I believe, on September 16, 1940. At that time it covered boys up to 21 years of age. That was the minimum age. Suppose that a father

and mother who had resided in this country had a 20-year-old boy whom they desired to see escape the draft, and had left the country for that purpose, and found it to their advantage in the country to which they went to become naturalized. I take it that boy would have become naturalized, but under this act he would have until 1947 in which to return to the United States and elect to continue his citizenship.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct. Of course, as I said a moment ago, he would have to appear before our representative abroad and show cause why he is entitled to return before he would be granted a visa to come to this country.

Mr. KILDAY. But that type of individual, one who purposely left the United States to evade service in our armed forces, would be granted an additional period of time in which to come back and take up American citizenship which he refused to defend.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We have a law now with respect to the man who left the United States for the purpose of evading the draft. We take care of him in a manner more severe than depriving him of citizenship. There is no question about him.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. It seems to me that the gentleman's committee ought to have at least provided in the bill that this national of another country, before acquiring citizenship in this country, should renounce allegiance to the government of which he had become a national and swear allegiance to the Government of the United States. Under the bill as drafted, all he has to do is to return to this country. He does not have to say to any authority of this Government that he even wants to be an American citizen, but you make him one whether or no, and perhaps whether he desires to be or not.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, no. The persons included under the terms of this legislation have in no way renounced their citizenship in the United States. They are persons who are native-born and have not claimed citizenship abroad.

Mr. TARVER. This is the language of the bill——

Mr. REES of Kansas. If upon his own volition he becomes a citizen of the country abroad, he loses his citizenship here. This legislation does not help that person at all. There is no question about that.

Mr. TARVER. May I point out to the gentleman that the first part of his proviso says:

Provided further, That a person who has acquired foreign nationality.

So that you are unquestionably dealing with people who have become nationals of another country.

Mr. REES of Kansas. To acquire nationality is different. This bill deals only with persons who are American born, and have not on their own volition done anything to renounce that citizenship. They are in a foreign country because their parents, or someone took them there. There is no election involved, except his return is deemed to mean he wants to retain his citizenship on his own account.

Mr. TARVER. You further provide that upon his return to the United States it shall thereafter be "deemed that he has elected to be a citizen of the United States." You do not require him to make an election. You do not even require him to say that he wants to be a citizen of the United States, much less renounce allegiance to the foreign government of which he has become a national or pledge allegiance to the Government of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. May I ask the gentleman what to me is a very pertinent question? As the gentleman knows, subsequent to the Exclusion Act of 1924 a great many Japanese citizens who were in this country and had children born to them in this country returned to Japan. In the years 1937, 1938, 1939, and 1940 the male children who had been born in the United States came back here and they were known as the Kibei. Practically all of them had been through the various schools in Japan. They constitute for the most part the 7,000 Japanese who have been taken into our relocation centers and separated from the other Japanese because they are considered to be subversive of the best interests of the United States. In addition to these 7,000, a number still remain in Japan who were born here and who were not yet 21 years of age on December 7. Would this permit those children to return to the United States and claim their American citizenship before 1947?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No; for the reason that these individuals were not American citizens. They had not become American citizens.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is there any way in the world to draft an act that will prevent that thing continuing?

Mr. REES of Kansas. This measure does not affect that situation at all.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman means that they cannot come in under this bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. Can they come in under any other act?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am not so sure whether they can or cannot. This bill does not make provision to bring them in. I hope we can work out some legislation in line with the thought of the gentleman from California that will apply to those individuals. Of course, if I had my way, I would not permit any of them to come into this country for years and years to come.

Mr. HINSHAW. The Department of Justice has found that at least 90 percent of that particular class of Japs are subversive of the best interests of the United States, and they ought to be excluded.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am in accord with the gentleman's views. If I thought this legislation would ease the situation with respect to Japanese, or would directly or indirectly make it easier for any Japanese to enter this country, I would not support this legislation.

Mr. JENKINS. As I understand, we did not need this law until after the 13th of January 1945. The old law applied up to the 13th of January of this year.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It applied to January 13, 1943.

Mr. JENKINS. 1945; let us have that exactly understood.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The old law provided they could come in any time; that is, before the Nationality Act was passed.

Mr. JENKINS. The old law provided that people could come in any time up to the 13th of January last past. Let us clarify it now so that there will be no misunderstanding about it at all. All these people, whoever they may be, could have come in up to the 13th of January last past, could they not?

Mr. REES of Kansas. If they could get in.

Mr. JENKINS. Nobody has said how many there are. The gentleman has indicated that there are only a few. If there are only a few, why extend the law? If there are very many, who are they? Have there been any hearings before the gentleman's committee to indicate who they are? Who will be benefited by this? If there are only a few, and if nobody knows who they are, what is the use of changing the law? If it is known who they are, why cannot someone tell us how many there are and who will be benefited?

Mr. HINSHAW. Who seeks this law? That is what I want to know.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The reason for extending the time provided in the act is that it was thought to be only fair to the thousands of people abroad who were born in the United States and have not renounced citizenship in the United States and who could not return on account of war conditions, be given a chance to return if they can otherwise qualify to return to the United States and reside permanently. They did not leave on their own volition but were taken abroad by their parents, or someone while they were minors. Before the act of 1940 they could come any time. This says they may have until 1947. The extension is only because of war conditions. They were born in the United States and had not renounced their citizenship by going before a court or by claiming citizenship in some other country.

For years we had that problem of dual citizenship of people all over the world. In order to try to cut that off, we said in the Nationality Act that all persons born in the United States of American parents, either native-born or naturalized, were cut off forevermore from claiming citizenship if they did not come back before January 13, 1943, and claim that citizenship, or they had the right to wait until they were 23 years of age and no longer to decide whether they wanted to continue to claim American citizenship. All this is done is to extend the time on account of war con-

ditions because they could not get here from Italy, Germany, Sweden, Denmark, England, Poland, Holland, or wherever it was. So we thought as a matter of fairness the act ought to be extended until January 1947. Let me repeat this deals only with persons who were born in America and who were taken abroad by their parents, or someone else, and did not go on their own volition. Before the Nationality Act was passed there was no limit. Under this legislation there is a limit to January 13, 1947. I regret this legislation seems to be so much misunderstood.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. JENKINS. Let us be as fair as we can about this.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is what I am trying to do.

Mr. JENKINS. Because this amends the immigration law which will become a part of the permanent law.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We are talking about the nationality law. This is not the immigration law.

Mr. JENKINS. It is a very important law to many people.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Of course it is important.

Mr. JENKINS. If any people were anxious to come back before January 13, 1945, they could have come back before January 13. If the war clouds were coming up, they saw the war clouds coming in 1941, at the time of the attack on Pearl Harbor. They had plenty of time to come back. Now, if they did not come back, what use is it for us to change present law, a law on the basis of which a lot of people have been governed. What is the use of changing that just for fear that somebody, some one or two persons might want to come in; and if you cannot name anybody who does want to come in, we will not know who is interested.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will say to the gentleman this act did not fix the year 1941. It went into effect in 1941 but gave until January 1943, during which these American-born persons might return and assert their rights of American citizenship before being entirely cut off.

Mr. JENKINS. That is exactly what I brought out a while ago in my first question, that these people you are talking about could have come in until the 13th of January just past. Why did they not come in? If they wanted to come in, they should have been here. If you know anybody who wanted to come in after the 13th of January 1945, you ought to tell us; and if you do not, we ought not to bother to amend this very important law.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. This act pertains to those under 23 years of age, both male and female, is that not correct?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No, it can pertain to older persons than those 23 years of age if they have lived abroad, provided they were minors when they were taken abroad and have not become citizens of a foreign country or have done nothing on their own account to become citizens elsewhere.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. We have had our armies all over this globe in the last 4 years; have we not? There was not a thing to prevent any one of those people from joining up with the Army, whether they were male or female, if they were able-bodied. For that matter, they could have been brought back at Government expense and they could have manifested their citizenship in a good way.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Not one of these people who were abroad during these 4 years could have joined up with our forces.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Why?

Mr. MASON. Because in the first place they were living under the laws of the country in which they were residing.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. They were still American citizens.

Mr. MASON. That does not make any difference whatever.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Any American citizen can join the armed forces.

Mr. MASON. Well, you now are talking about American citizens 50 years of age living in England, France, and Germany, and saying they could have joined our armed services. Our armed services, in the first place, would not have received them. They would not have received them or acknowledged them because they would be useless for military purposes.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I do not see how this could apply to a person 50 years of age.

Mr. MASON. It can and does.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Will the gentleman explain to me how it does apply?

Mr. MASON. The gentleman who now has the floor has explained time and again that any person living abroad, that is, an American citizen born here, could have come at any time whether he is 40, 50, or 60 years of age. This act simply extends that time 2 years.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to know from the gentleman to what extent the public welfare would be served by the passage of this legislation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is just a matter of being fair to American citizens who live abroad and who have not had a chance to come back and live in this country and retain their American citizenship. They are in England, Holland, Sweden, Norway, Italy, France, Mexico, Russia, and in various countries of the world. It is hardly fair to cut them off and say, "You do not even have a chance to come back and claim your citizenship because there is a war on and you cannot get here." That is all there is to it. It is just a matter of fair dealing with them. Do not forget these people must comply with every other law and regulation dealing with the subject.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Were any hearings printed in connection with this bill that the gentleman knows of?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No. Not on this amendment to the act.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman have in mind any specific instance of American citizens who were compelled to live abroad and who wanted to come back to the United States and found that they could not come back to this country? Do you have in mind any of these extreme cases the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will put it this way, that there are a number of individuals who were born in the United States who have been living abroad for years. If they were born here, they had the right heretofore through all the years from the beginning, since our Constitution was adopted to retain their citizenship. I trust the gentleman listened to the explanation I made with respect to this legislation.

Mr. KEEFE. They had the right but they never saw fit to elect to take that right until the war broke out and their peaceful living in Europe was disturbed.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, yes. I tried to tell the gentleman a while ago there was no time limit at all when they could return until the limit of January 1943 went into effect.

Mr. KEEFE. Now they want to come back to America.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, now, the gentleman ought to understand by this time.

Mr. KEEFE. I can give you some specific cases if you want to know about them.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The specific cases are all persons born in the United States, whose parent or parents may have been either American-born or naturalized citizens. We are not talking about foreigners. They are people who were taken to foreign countries when they were minors. We are not even talking about Americans who went abroad after reaching the age of majority. We do not know how many there are, but they are all American-born. It is my judgment, as I told you, that possibly a few hundred may avail themselves of this legislation. They are Americans who have not in any way taken allegiance to any foreign powers, or have done anything to indicate their interest in a foreign government. Some Members would have you believe some of them are foreign enemies. They do not belong to that class at all.

Someone suggested these Americans had until January 1943 to return to this country. Surely, it has been made plain this act did not even go into effect until January 1941. There was very little travel to this country after that date.

I regret we do not have the number who have been taken abroad through the years past. I only suggest that it is probable that a few hundred may get to come home under this measure. They are, after all, Americans. It is suggested they may be alien enemies. Alien enemies cannot and will not come, whether this legislation is passed. These people live in various countries. They

are in Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Poland, Australia and in practically all other countries.

Something has been said about Japanese being permitted to come into this country under the terms of this extension to the Nationality Act. It will not make it one bit easier for Japanese to come into this country. Not at all. If I thought so, of course I would not support it. Let me call the attention of some of you who have been talking so much about the Japanese this afternoon, that as far back as 1939, 1940, and in May 1941 I called attention on the floor of this House to the immense amounts of scrap steel and iron that was going to Japan. Even in May 1941 I called attention to a shipment of 800,000 barrels of high octane gas that was consigned to Japan. Of course, I did not forsee a war with Japan, certainly not, but I did not think it could be right that we should furnish Japan with more scrap than all countries, so she could use it for building her arms and munitions. My record with respect to that matter is on a par with any of the Members of this House, I think. Mr. Chairman, this legislation has nothing to do with the Japanese problem, or any problems dealing with Axis Powers. This legislation deals only with American-born Americans.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this bill, but I think there is a great deal of confusion about the measure. I want to make something clear that I do not think is understood.

In the first place, for 50 or more years it has been the habit of many Americans to go abroad, buy a home, a chateau, and live there, and then go to the American consul every year and renew their passport and continue as Americans. We have found the richest ladies of this land who have taken all their millions over there to marry a duke or a count, or whatever he may be. They have lived there in glory and pleasure, drawing upon the pocketbooks of the American people. Then, after a 5-year study of what is known as the Nationality Act, we said to all of the so-called Americans, some of whom avoided the payment of taxes, some of whom never lived here or voted here except that they claimed the protection of our American consul when they were in trouble over there—and they were in trouble almost all of the time. Under the Nationality Act we said, "You are either going to be an American or not. Unless you return to your home country and establish the fact that you owe allegiance to the United States instead of to France or England or Belgium, you are through forever." We said to them, "We will expatriate you forever, irrespective of the fact that you were born in this country." So under the Nationality Act we gave them the right to return on or before the 13th of January 1943. If they did not return, it was presumed, under the law, that they lost their right to claim American citizenship and advised the consuls to that effect.

Many of those people attempted to come back, but a number of them could not get boats because the war was on, and it was humanly impossible to obtain passage. This bill simply provides that those who were unable to return be given an opportunity to extend the statute of limitations from January 13, 1943, until 1947. That is all this bill does. Many Americans lost their citizenship on January 13, 1943, through no fault of their own. In other words, they are now expatriated. What the committee is asking you to do, at the request of the Department of Justice, is to extend the statutory period until January 13, 1947, because of the war and because they were unable to come back here.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman that I recall very distinctly the efforts made by our State Department at that very time about which the gentleman is speaking, urging upon United States nationals to get out of those nations and get out of those countries.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. And they were furnished the means of transportation.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, now, the gentleman says "No." Will the gentleman address himself——

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am trying to agree with the gentleman, that some stranded Americans were given aid to come back here, but the people I am talking about, the general mass of people did not ask for aid. All they asked was a boat to get back to the United States to repatriate themselves in the country in which they were born. But it was too late—the war was on and only an insignificant few were returned on the steamship *Gripsholm*.

Mr. KEEFE. Has the gentleman any hearings or is there any evidence to which we can turn to show those facts?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No; but the State Department will verify these statements.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not find any hearings or any evidence, but I have to go back in my recollection of what I saw in the orders of the State Department, and the advice that was given and the pleas that were made for those people to return to America.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I want to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that as many as possible returned because of the warning of the State Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

But a lot of American citizens who were trying to comply with the very law that was passed and repatriate themselves by returning to their mother country could not possibly get a steamship on which to come back. They did not ask for any financial aid from the State Department.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. While the State Department did warn these people that they had better get back here, yet that same State Department is asking for the extension of time. These same people whom the State Department warned could not, or in some cases in all probability, did not, take advantage of it. The State Department therefore is asking us to extend this time.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is right.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. For a brief question; I wish to make some other observations.

Mr. BREHM. Right along that line, are not shipping facilities more critical now and will they not be until 1947 than they were before?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No; I believe the gentleman has the situation confused.

Mr. BREHM. They are according to the War Department.

Mr. MASON. We are just asking that the time be extended to 1947. If the war is still going on in 1947 and we cannot get transportation we may even have to ask for a further extension of time.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I believe the gentleman from Ohio is a little confused about this. Let us at least understand the case as it is. The gentleman said that transportation was better before than after. There has not been any transportation at any time for civilians since the war broke out, and it was pretty hard even before we entered the war after Pearl Harbor for them to get transportation back to this country. I have been assured by the statement of men in the steamship business that no one was able to come in and no one was able to go out.

Mr. BREHM. They were between January 13, 1941, and December 7, 1941.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. A number of them did come but there were thousands who could not in that short time. I am speaking about those who could not possibly get transportation back, who could not get travel priority.

Mr. HINSHAW. Was not that because they were confined within areas occupied by Germany?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Both—some were interned in enemy countries and could not get out—others in friendly countries could not secure transportation. All we are asking——

Mr. HINSHAW. Would they come under this bill.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. All we asked was that those Americans who claimed to be American citizens and wanted to continue being American citizens return by a certain date. A lot of them came back. A lot of them were helped financially by the State Department to get back; but there were a great many more who could not come back, who could not find any ships, with whom it was not a question of receiving financial aid from the State Department. In the case of a number of the younger men who were able to serve in the armed forces, they enlisted in the Allied forces.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am sorry; I cannot; there are too many others wishing to interrogate me.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman seems to have been speaking generally about these Americans who were abroad but who were not able to get back. If I read this amendment correctly, it refers only to a person who has acquired foreign nationality through the nationalization of his parents. That is all this bill refers to, is it not? That is the entire subject matter. Am I right or am I wrong?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I want to emphasize by repetition the explanation I made to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. Under existing law a citizen-child, whether he acquired citizenship through birth or naturalization—and a majority of these children did acquire citizenship through birth—loses his citizenship through the naturalization of a parent in a foreign country if the child attains the age of 23 years without acquiring permanent residence in the United States, so that the child might not have lost his citizenship through any fault of his own but through the act of his parent. The law gives him until he is 23 years of age to take up residence in the United States. The present law is adequate for real young folks, who can return to the United States when transportation becomes available prior to their twenty-third birthday. The Congress, recognizing that a number of American citizens had passed the age of 23 when this law went into effect, gave them 2 years after the effective date of the act—January 13, 1941—in which to return to the United States to protect their citizenship. However, the war was on and many of them have lost their citizenship because of the inability to secure transportation on which to return to the United States. All this bill attempts to do is to give these folks until January 13, 1947, in which to return to the United States. Those who question the merits of this bill show a definite inconsistency because the Congress on at least three occasions has extended the time in section 409 of the same Nationality Act in which to permit naturalized citizens who have been caught abroad and have been unable to get back, to return to the United States. If you decline to act favorably on this bill, you will be in the position of granting greater favors to naturalized citizens than to native-born citizens.

Mr. MOTT. Does the gentleman claim those people are covered by this bill?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Certainly.

Mr. MOTT. This bill, unless I read it entirely erroneously, pertains only to Americans who have lost their citizenship through the nationalization of their parents in a foreign country.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is true, and I am trying to follow that. Suppose the parents came here 20 years ago and children were born to them. These children became naturalized. Their children became naturalized if they were under 21. Also the native-born. Then before the children became 21 they took the children and moved to England and renounced citizenship in the United States in favor of England. They became English citizens. Under Czechoslovakia law or Italian law or any other law that child was expatriated without his consent, even though born in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, these children now want to return here and claim their birthright, but they cannot return although we gave them the right to do so under the Nationality Act. It was impossible to obtain shipping space. This simply asks for a 2-year extension.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. They can return if they are under 23 years of age.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes; but this bill takes care of the many who are over 23.

Mr. MOTT. No. The present law says anyone can return before he is 23 years of age without any restriction whatever. This applies only to those over 23 years of age who have lost their American citizenship through the foreign naturalization of their parents. I cannot possibly conceive of anybody coming under this.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is right. We simply provided in the Nationality Act they must return before they are 23 years of age, or within 2 years after the effective date of the act January 13, 1941.

Mr. MOTT. So this would involve people over 23.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes. In 1943 they tried to get back, because the State Department is loaded with telegrams and letters asking for permission to return.

Mr. MOTT. How many of those did not come back because their sons were approaching the draft age?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not know and I have no sympathy for that kind of business. The gentleman knows that and I have explained that the Seventy-eighth Congress took care of that.

Mr. MOTT. Nevertheless they would be taken in under this.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am not defending those rats who ran away from the defense of their country. They are taken care of.

Mr. MOTT. They would come in here under this.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am interested in the legitimate men and women.

Mr. MOTT. Those people would come in.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We have a State Department and consuls. They can examine those people and they can throw them out under different clauses and refuse them admission or refuse them a passport. They must refuse them under Public Law 431 of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. It would also include some who have actually fought in the German Army against this country?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If any individual fought against the United States in this war they lose their citizenship under subsection (c) of the very section we are trying to amend.

Mr. ELSTON. The way this reads now it would permit them to come in.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No; existing law takes care of that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to make the observation that to cut these individuals off is not cutting off Germans, and Japanese, and all that sort of thing so much as it is cutting off our own friendly allies. That is the trouble. It is unfair to them. The gentleman from Ohio suggested that they should have been able to see this war coming on and therefore should have come in here and should have come back to this country and established their citizenship in the meantime. There are a good many of us who did not see the war coming on, as far as that is concerned. This is a matter of fairness to the individuals themselves who are our friends and our friendly allies. We want to protect them.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I want to ask this question in line with another question that has been asked the gentleman. When we got to work and passed the conscription law before the war came on there was a rather heavy exodus of people from the United States to other countries in order to avoid the draft. Since the war has come along lots of those people can plead that boats were not available for them to come back on and to bring their sons back to serve in the Army of our country.

Will this bill allow those people who have gone out of the country to evade the draft to become American citizens again?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman makes an excellent contribution because it reminds me that the Seventy-eighth Congress passed an act—Public Law 431, approved September 7, 1944, to the effect that any individual who was subject to the draft and then left the country shall be always and forever barred from entering the country again.

Mr. BROOKS. Without an amendment, that man could return.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 more minute in order to answer certain statements.

Statements have been made to the effect that there are thousands of refugees coming in here. I think that is an unfair statement. There was a statement made to the effect that there were thousands of aliens coming in. That is unfair, because in the last 5 or 6 years nine-hundred-and-some-odd thousand were kept out of this country, and instead of the 150,000 or 160,000 quota for last year, only about 28,000 numbers were used up. There are no thousands of refugees coming in, and it is not proper or fair to the lot of these people who are helping us in

this war effort to charge them with being undesirable and not entitled to be here. The people who are here as refugees are here under a permit to come here for business purposes. I think the injection of that bugaboo story of a lot of refugees flooding this country is unfair in considering this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of the second proviso of section 401 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1168; 8 U. S. C. 801 (a)), is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That a person who has acquired foreign nationality through the naturalization of his parent or parents, and who at the same time is a citizen of the United States, shall, if he is abroad and has not theretofore expatriated himself as a citizen of the United States by his own voluntary act, be permitted at any time prior to January 13, 1947, to return to the United States and take up permanent residence therein, and it shall be thereafter deemed that he has elected to be a citizen of the United States."

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MASON. May I ask if this motion is debatable?

The CHAIRMAN. Five minutes on each side is allowed.

Mr. MASON. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I have thought a great deal about this bill. Frankly, I wish it were possible for me to give the bill my wholehearted support. This bill was reported out of committee in the last Congress, but we have a habit of again reporting out most of those bills that die on the calendar in the previous Congress when a new Congress meets, reserving the right to any Member of the committee to favor or oppose in the House any bill brought up for consideration. I am therefore exercising the right I reserved.

Perhaps a mistake was made in bringing this bill to the House. I do not recall whether I was present when the bill was first voted out in the last Congress. We have so many bills in that committee that one cannot keep all of them in mind.

But this debate has brought additional information. For instance, the chairman of our committee now says quite frankly that the bill might cover thousands of persons. It is evident to me that the House would like to have further information as to how far this bill might go, how many persons it might cover, what countries might be involved, and other angles.

This question ought to have further study and consideration. This bill is rather broad, rather inclusive, perhaps too much so. It has been suggested here that it might let in some Japs. I am not certain about that. Maybe it will. The contention is made that if it lets in any Japs, there will only be a "handful." If it lets in one Jap, that is one too many.

It might do this also. It might permit some young men to come to this country to claim this citizenship who actually fought against the American boys on foreign soil. Do not say it could not do that, because it could. Parents who took their children back to Europe before the war and remained there during the war no doubt had sons fighting in the armies against our sons. If this bill gives any possibility of those being able to come back to America and claim citizenship, it ought to be changed. In my mind such is a distinct possibility.

It might also make a very convenient vehicle for draft dodgers, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]. All sorts of reports have come to us of parents taking their sons to other countries just prior to this war to evade military service for their sons. If this bill makes it possible for such sons to come back here now and claim citizenship, we want it changed.

I recognize that it only extends a right under the 1940 Nationality Act, but I am not certain that we were right in the 1940 Nationality Act in that respect. If we made a mistake by writing that provision into the 1940 act there is no reason why we should perpetuate the mistake and make it even worse here. We have found other things in the 1940 Nationality Act that needed correcting and this may be one also. This bill perhaps indicates the need of further study on that particular point. This phase of the 1940 act should be reviewed in the light of world conditions existing at this time.

One other point: When people come to this country from a foreign land, any child under the age of 21 derives citizenship from its parents. If the aliens, the father and mother, come here and get naturalized, all their children under 21 years of age derive their citizenship from them. The children thus become American citizens. Now, if those same parents go back to their former country and take out citizenship again in their former countries, thus renouncing American citizenship, are we under obligations to receive those children back here as American ctizens, notwithstanding the actions of their parents? This bill would probably bring about just that peculiar situation.

These are only some of the possibilities under this bill which have been revealed by this debate. There may be deserving cases. Some legislation on this question might perhaps be justified. I am not passing on that now. I am simply saying that this bill is too broad, too inclusive, to warrant final passage at this time. We should explore the entire question further. I certainly do not want to do anybody any harm. I have no prejudices in the matter at all. I merely feel that we should call a halt on this procedure at this time. I shall be glad to give consideration to deserving cases in the future, but I am unwilling to proceed further with this very broad and all-inclusive bill. I therefore ask favorable consideration of my motion to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Chairman, this House by a large majority passed the Nationality Act. In that Nationality Act this House sought to correct an evil that had been prevailing for at least 50 years or more, and that was the dual citizenship situation. Up until we passed the 1940 Nationality Act, any citizen of the United States could live in a foreign country as long as he pleased and still claim citizenship here, still return here and be accepted as an American citizen. We felt that that was a bad situation, and the Congress in its wisdom passed the Nationality Act, which stated that that practice could not go on any longer; that an American citizen living outside of the United States, in a foreign country, must before a certain date or before he is 21 years of age state that he wants to retain his citizenship and must come back to this country in order to do that.

We all felt we were accomplishing a great deal at that time, but the war came on, and these people could not get back. They could not state right here in the United States that they wanted to retain their citizenship. Then this Congress in its wisdom extended the time that that could be done until 1943. From 1941 to 1943 we were at war. They could have come back before 1941, perhaps, although it was difficult then, but from 1941 to 1943 we were at war, and they could not come back.

All this bill does is to do justice to those American citizens, and they are American citizens, although under the act the time limit has expired, and automatically they lose their citizenship. The purpose of this act is to extend to them this further time to come here and reclaim their citizenship.

The question has been raised that some of these people might have, if they were in Germany, fought against our boys. That is true; that is possible. But not one of those who have fought in the German Army, even if they are native-born American citizens, can come back here. There are other laws that take care of that situation. Visas are required. Certainly their record, when they apply for a visa, will be scanned to see if that was the case. Therefore, we do not need to worry about that end of it. So far as the Jap is concerned, I am willing to state emphatically right now that not one Jap will be returned to this country from Japan because of being a native-born citizen of the United States. This bill has nothing to do with that type of case anyway because the parents in their case do not become naturalized citizens of Japan again. This bill does not touch that type of citizen anyway. So we have some things raised in connection with this bill which have nothing to do with the bill. We are just seeking to extend the time so that it will be possible for an American citizen who desires to retain his citizenship to come here and state that fact. That is all the bill does.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, where a motion to strike the enacting clause is sustained by a vote of the Committee of the Whole, can the bill then be further considered by the legislative committee from which it came?

The CHAIRMAN. If the motion is adopted, it will be reported back to the House and it will then depend upon the action taken in the House.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JENKINS. There seems to be some confusion, Mr. Chairman. Those who wish to defeat this measure should vote "aye" on the motion to send it back.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DICKSTEIN) there were—ayes 90, noes 45.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FOGARTY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 387, directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is, Shall the enacting clause be stricken out?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DICKSTEIN) there were ayes 93 and noes 61.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 177, nays 157, not voting 98, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]

YEAS—177

Abernethy	Brown, Ohio	Daughton, Va.
Allen, La.	Brumbaugh	Davis
Andersen, H. Carl	Bryson	Doughton, N. C.
	Bulwinkle	Drewry
Andresen, August H.	Butler	Durham
	Byrnes, Wis.	Dworshak
Angell	Camp	Elliott
Arnold	Campbell	Ellis
Auchincloss	Carlson	Ellsworth
Baldwin, Md.	Carnahan	Elston
Barrett, Wyo.	Chapman	Engel, Mich.
Bates, Ky.	Chelf	Ervin
Beckworth	Chiperfield	Fallon
Bell	Church	Fellows
Bender	Clements	Fenton
Bennett, Mo.	Clevenger	Gathings
Bishop	Cole, Mo.	Gibson
Blackney	Colmer	Gillespie
Bolton	Combs	Gillette
Bonner	Cooper	Gillie
Brehm	Cravens	Goodwin
Brooks	Crawford	Gore
Brown, Ga.	Cunningham	Graham
Grant, Ind.	McDonough	Robertson, Va.
Gregory	McGregor	Robsion, Ky.
Griffiths	McKenzie	Rockwell
Gross	McMillen, Ill.	Rodgers, Pa.
Gwynne, Iowa	Mahon	Roe, Md.
Hare	Maloney	Rogers, N. Y.
Harness, Ind.	Manasco	Russell
Harris	Mansfield, Mont.	Schwabe, Mo.
Henry		Schwabe, Okla.
Heselton	Martin, Iowa	Scrivner
Hinshaw	Merrow	Shafer
Hobbs	Miller, Nebr.	Sheppard
Hoch	Mills	Short
Holmes, Wash.	Mott	Sikes
Hull	Mundt	Smith, Ohio
Izac	Murdock	Smith, Wis.
Jenkins	Murray, Tenn.	Springer
Jensen	Norrell	Sumner, Ill.
Johnson, Calif.	O'Hara	Taber
Johnson, Ill.	Peterson, Fla.	Talle
Johnson, Ind.	Peterson, Ga.	Tarver
Johnson, Luther A.	Pickett	Thomason
	Pittenger	Tibbott
Jones	Ploeser	Trimble
Jonkman	Poage	Vorys, Ohio
Keefe	Price, Fla.	Weaver
Kerr	Ramey	Weichel
Kilday	Ramspeck	West
Kinzer	Randolph	Whitten
Landis	Rankin	Whittington
Lanham	Reed, N. Y.	Winstead
Larcade	Rich	Winter
Latham	Richards	Wolcott
Lewis	Riley	Wolfenden, Pa.
Ludlow	Rivers	Wood
Lyle	Rizley	Woodruff, Mich.
McConnell	Robertson, N. Dak.	Woodrum, Va.
McCowen		

NAYS—157

Adams	Gossett	Neely
Allen, Ill.	Granahan	O'Brien, Ill.
Anderson, Calif.	Green	O'Brien, Mich.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Hagen	O'Konski
	Hale	O'Toole
Andrews, N. Y.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Outland
Bailey		Patrick
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hand	Patterson
Barrett, Pa.	Harless, Ariz.	Philbin
Beall	Havenner	Powers
Buck	Hays	Price, Ill.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hedrick	Quinn, N. Y.
Canfield	Herter	Rabin
Cannon, Fla.	Hill	Rayfiel
Cannon, Mo.	Hoeven	Reed, Ill.
Case, N. J.	Holifield	Rees, Kans.
Celler	Hope	Resa
Chenoweth	Horan	Rogers, Fla.
Clason	Howell	Rogers, Mass.
Coffee	Huber	Rooney
Corbett	Jackson	Rowan
Crosser	Jarman	Ryter
Curtis	Judd	Sadowski
D'Alesandro	Kean	Sasscer
Delaney, James J.	Kearney	Sharp
	Kee	Sheridan
Delaney, John J.	Kelley, Pa.	Simpson, Ill.
	Kelly, Ill.	Smith, Maine
Dickstein	Keogh	Somers, N. Y.
Dingell	Kilburn	Sparkman
Dolliver	King	Spence
Dondero	Kirwan	Starkey
Douglas, Calif.	Kopplemann	Stefan
Doyle	Kunkel	Stevenson
Eberharter	LaFollette	Stigler
Elsaesser	Lane	Stockman
Engle, Calif.	LeCompte	Sullivan
Feighan	LeFevre	Sumners, Tex.
Fernandez	Lemke	Sundstrom
Flannagan	Lesinski	Talbot
Flood	Link	Taylor
Fogarty	Luce	Thom
Folger	Lynch	Thomas, Tex.
Forand	McCormack	Torrens
Fulton	McGlinchey	Towe
Gallagher	Marcantonio	Traynor
Gamble	Martin, Mass.	Voorhis, Calif.
Gardner	Mason	Vursell
Gary	May	Wasielewski
Gavin	Michener	Wickersham
Geelan	Miller, Calif.	Wigglesworth
Gerlach	Monroney	Wolverton, N. J.
Gordon	Morgan	Woodhouse
Gorski	Murray, Wis.	

NOT VOTING—98

Andrews, Ala.	Bradley, Pa.	Courtney
Arends	Buckley	Cox
Barden	Buffett	Curley
Barry	Bunker	Dawson
Bates, Mass.	Burch	De Lacy
Bennet, N. Y.	Burgin	Dirksen
Biemiller	Case, S. Dak.	Domengeaux
Bland	Clark	Douglas, Ill.
Bloom	Cochran	Earthman
Boren	Cole, Kans.	Eaton
Boykin	Cole, N. Y.	Fisher
Bradley, Mich.	Cooley	Fuller
Gearhart	Johnson, Okla.	Robinson, Utah
Gifford	Kefauver	Roe, N. Y.
Granger	Knutson	Sabath
Grant, Ala.	Lea	Savage
Gwinn, N. Y.	McGehee	Simpson, Pa.
Hall, Leonard W.	McMillan, S. C.	Slaughter
	Madden	Smith, Va.
Halleck	Mansfield, Tex.	Snyder
Hancock	Morrison	Stewart
Hart	Murphy	Thomas, N. J.
Hartley	Norton	Tolan
Healy	O'Neal	Vinson
Hébert	Pace	Wadsworth
Heffernan	Patman	Walter
Hendricks	Pfeifer	Weiss
Hess	Phillips	Welch
Hoffman	Plumley	White
Holmes, Mass.	Powell	Wilson
Hook	Priest	Worley
Jennings	Rabaut	Zimmerman
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rains	
	Reece, Tenn.	

So the enacting clause was stricken out.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Biemiller against.

General pairs:

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Fuller.
Mr. Healy with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Bunker with Mr. Wilson.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Stewart with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.
Mrs. Douglas of Illinois with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. De Lacy with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Boren with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Hancock.
Mr. Hook with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Knutson.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. CANNON of Florida changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. RICH changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion by Mr. RANKIN, a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3038. An act to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 383) entitled "An act to provide for further development of cooperative agricultural extension work"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. BILBO, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. CAPPER, and Mr. SHIPSTEAD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in

order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix in two instances and to include therewith statements before the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. NORRELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a press release by Secretary Ickes.

Mr. FLANNAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a prayer by Dr. O. F. Blackwelder, pastor of the Church of Reformation, Washington, D. C.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Indianapolis Times.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include therein a radio address she made to the WAC's on yesterday, their third birthday.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, May 22, after the reading of the Journal and disposition of business on the Speaker's table and all legislative matters, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today after the other special orders I may address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained this afternoon when the vote was taken on the post office pay bill, H. R. 3035. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

NEWS BLACK-OUT

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, late editions of Washington newspapers carry the information that President Truman has reversed Elmer Davis' news black-out policy in the Reich. This is a very encouraging sign. By his action, President Truman has made it very clear that he intends to have a free press not only in the United States but in the countries we occupy. He has further indicated that he does not intend to permit power-drunk bureaucrats to form the policies for his administration. His action today will be hailed by ever true American.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] is recognized for 1 hour.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMISSION

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2232 is entitled "A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin or ancestry." But if it were truly and frankly given the title it deserves, it would be this: "A bill to assassinate Abraham Lincoln again; to foment racial and religious hatred, jealousy, dissension, strife, discord, and disunity, while weakening patriotism; also to subvert and prostitute the Constitution of the United States, particularly the Bill of Rights; and to extirpate those rights retained by the people and guaranteed by the ninth amendment; also, to substitute the false and cowardly whine of inferiority complex, for free competition on a basis of honest merit; also, to create a superbureau to dwarf and dominate the rest of Government, provide as many of the 60,000,000 jobs as may be necessary, and enslave everyone but the Commission and its pets."

WHY?

Why is this bill here? The obvious answer is that both of the major political parties in the United States have disgraced themselves by vying with each other in seeking to curry favor with the voters of minority groups whose political support it is thought can be bought by making them beneficiaries of such guaranteed favoritism.

But, while this is true, it does not account for all of those who are pushing this measure. Many of them are just as sincere and honest in their support as we are in our opposition. These are not demagogues and are for the bill because they believe that the members of these groups or some of them are being made the object of unfair and hostile discrimination. They believe in the American principle of fairness, "the square deal," as all good citizens do! The difference between them and us is not too great to be reconciled.

When we think this proposal and its manifest prognosis through, in the light of the Constitution, we are bound to realize that if this theory should become approved practice, our "Bill of Rights" will have become emasculated; the "land of the free" will have lost its freedom; slavery, which we all hoped and prayed was gone forever, will have been reestablished; the United States of America will have become "the home of the brave" only in memory; and while America's heroic millions continue to fight abroad, as bravely as men ever fought, to free the world and to preserve our own freedom, on the home front it is proposed to sell our birthright and theirs for a mess of pottage and establish a Fourth Reich in all but name.

Let us be frank and honest with each other. There is really very little discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin or ancestry.

To be discriminating is a virtue. It is a characteristic to be sought and acquired. Discrimination in the choice of music, painting, sculpture, or any other art, including the art of the artisan or salesman, is a quality of which one may be proud. To differentiate because of low motives such as prejudice or hatred, is unworthy, to say the least. To eschew the lower and choose because of higher motives is commendable. Rotary teaches its members: "He profits most who serves best." We have never risen to the high level of that business ethic, and still seek to make money only for money's sake. But, whether the business ethic be higher or lower, most of the discrimination in employment is because of the profit motive, and the belief that the applicant employed was better fitted for the job or would be of more financial benefit to the employer than the rejected applicants. The same is true of discharges. Almost every business institution, large or small, is a stadium wherein is played the cruel game of "survival of the fittest." The fittest like it, and pridefully admit the truth. The others do not like it, and nearly always yell: "Kill the umpire." They charge crooked favoritism or any other "alibi" they can frame. Sometimes character, qualifications, and experience being equal, the determining factor in employment, or in replacement, is the family connections or friends of the respective applicants, and their comparative pulling power of business or good will. But as used in the laboratories of personnel procurement, retention, or promotion, the best neutralizer of the acid of prejudice or hatred is the alkali of dollar-value!

Suppose, however, that the profit motive is a myth, the survival of the fittest but a false figment of a diseased imagination, and assuming the truth of the theory of the F. E. P. C. bill, to wit, that hatred because of race, creed, or color caused and causes every failure to get or to keep employment. If hate be the cause, is forcing the hated on the hater the cure?

QUO WARRANTO?

Who are we? And, "Upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed, That he is grown so great?" We are not the sovereign, we are but the representatives of the sovereign; chosen by the sovereign for the shortest term known to our election laws, to use only those legislative powers granted us in the Constitution. This limitation of power is true only of the Congress.

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress (art. I, sec. 1).

The executive power shall be vested in a President (art. II, sec. 1).

The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish (art. III, sec. 1).

So, if you are a man of honor, you cannot vote for a bill, no matter how good you may think it, unless you can point to your authority in the Constitution.

I challenge anyone so to justify this bill or any part of it.

This is a free country. Our freedoms are guaranteed by the Constitution and by the honor of the Congress and the courts. Nor do our rights have to be enumerated—we are free—and have all rights that we have not voluntarily surrendered.

The provision "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress" means that Congress "within the limits of its powers and observing the restrictions imposed by the Constitution may, in its discretion, enact any statute appropriate to accomplish the objects for which the National Government was established." (*Burton* v. *United States* (202 U. S. 344, 367 (1906)).)

The only legislative powers vested in Congress are those "herein granted." "Whenever, therefore, a question arises concerning the constitutionality of a particular power, the first question is whether the power be expressed in the Constitution. If it be, the question is decided. If it be not expressed, the next inquiry must be whether it is properly an incident to an express power and necessary to its execution. If it be, then it may be exercised by Congress. If not, Congress cannot exercise it." (Justice Story, Commentaries on the Constitution, sec. 1243, quoted with approval in *United States* v. *Harris* (106 U. S. 629, 636 (1883)).)

The Government of the United States is one of delegated, limited, and enumerated powers. Therefore, every valid act of Congress must find in the Constitution some warrant for its passage. This is apparent by reference to certain provisions of the Constitution: e. g., (a) article I, section 1 that all legislative powers granted by the Constitution shall be vested in the Congress of the United States; (b) article I, section 8, which enumerates the powers granted to Congress, and concludes the enumeration with a grant of power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper to carry into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof"; and (c) the tenth amendment which declares that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." (*Martin* v. *Hunter's Lessee* (1 Wheat. 304 (1816)); *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316 (1819)); *Gibbons* v. *Ogden* (9 Wheat. 1 (1824)); *United States* v. *Harris* (106 U. S. 629, 635 (1883)); *Civil Rights Cases* (109 U. S. 3); *Butts* v. *Merchants Transportation Co.* (230 U. S. 126). (None of these cases has been overruled or qualified on the point now at issue.) *U. S.* v. *Cruikshank* (92 U. S. 545); *Pettibone* v. *U. S.* (149 U. S. 202); *Logan* v. *U. S.* (144 U. S. 263, 286, 293) (wherein is clearly shown the distinction between rights that are "recognized" by the Constitution and those that are so "granted" or "created").)

Nor should it be forgotten that there are other definite and pointed limitations upon the power of Congress.

No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed (art. I, sec. 9).

A bill of attainder is a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial. If punishment be less than death, it is a bill of pains and penalties—*Cummings* v. *Missouri* (4 Wall. 277, 323).

Every law that makes an act done before the passage of such law criminal, which was innocent when done, or that alters rules of evidence, is an ex post facto law—*Calder* v. *Bull* (3 Dall. 386, 390); *Ex parte Garland* (4 Wall. 333, 377); *Cummings* v. *Missouri* (4 Wall. 277, 325–328); *Burgess* v. *Salmon* (97 U. S. 381, 384).

The F. E. P. C. bill, among other things, seeks to regulate private employment by Federal law. This, on the specious and absurd pretext that discrimination in such employment affects interstate or foreign commerce.

This bill also seeks to regulate upon the same theory the membership and privileges of members of labor unions.

The case of *Hodges* v. *U. S.* (203 U. S. 1) clearly shows that any attempt by the Federal Government to regulate such private affairs is unconstitutional and void. This case was decided in 1906 but has not been overruled nor qualified, and has stood the test of time for nearly 40 years. For the convenience of the House, I quote the majority opinion in full:

Mr. Justice Brewer, after making the foregoing statement, delivered the opinion of the court.

While the indictment was founded on sections 1977 and 5508, we have quoted other sections to show the scope of the legislation of Congress on the general question involved.

That prior to three post bellum amendments to the Constitution the National Government had no jurisdiction over a wrong like that charged in this indictment is conceded; that the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments do not justify the legislation is also beyond dispute, for they, as repeatedly held are restrictions upon State action, and no action on the part of the State is complained of. Unless, therefore, the thirteenth amendment vests in the Nation the jurisdiction claimed the remedy must be sought through State action and in State tribunals subject to the supervision of this court by writ of error in proper cases.

In the *Slaughter House cases* (16 Wall. 36, 76), in defining the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States, this is quoted from the opinion of Mr. Justice Washington in *Corfield* v. *Coryell* (4 Wash. Cir. Ct. 371, 380):

" 'The inquiry,' he says, 'is, what are the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States? We feel no hesitation in confining these expressions to those privileges and immunities which are, in their nature, fundamental; which belong, of right, to the citizens of all free governments; and which have, at all times, been enjoyed by citizens of the several States which compose this Union, from the time of their becoming free, independent, and sovereign. What these fundamental principles are, it would be more tedious than difficult to enumerate. They may, however, be all comprehended under the following general heads: Protection by the Government, the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the right to acquire and possess property of every kind, and to pursue and obtain happiness and safety; subject, nevertheless, to such restraints as the Government may prescribe for the general good of the whole.' "

And after referring to other cases this court added (p. 77):

"It would be the vainest show of learning to attempt to prove by citations of authority that up to the adoption of the recent amendments no claim or pretense was set up that those rights depended on the Federal Government for their existence or protection, beyond the very few express limitations which the Federal Constitution imposed upon the States—such, for instance, as the prohibition against ex post facto laws, bills of attainder, and laws impairing the obligation of contracts. But with the exception of these and a few other restrictions, the entire domain of the privileges and immunities of citizens of the States, as above defined, lay within the constitutional and legislative power of the States, and without that of the Federal Government."

Notwithstanding the adoption of these three amendments, the National Government still remains one of enumerated powers, and the tenth amendment, which reads "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people," is not shorn of its vitality. True, the thirteenth amendment grants certain specified and additional power to Congress, but any congressional legislation directed against individual action which was not warranted before the thirteenth amendment must find authority in it. And in interpreting the scope of that amendment it is well to bear in mind the words of Mr. Chief Justice Marshall in *Gibbons* v. *Ogden* (9 Wheat. 1, 188), which, though spoken more than four score years ago, are still the rule of construction of constitutional provisions:

"As men whose intentions require no concealment generally employ the words which most directly and aptly express the ideas they intend to convey, the enlightened patriots who framed our Constitution and the people who adopted it must be understood to have employed words in their natural sense and to have intended what they have said."

The thirteenth amendment reads:

"SEC. 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

The meaning of this is as clear as language can make it. The things denounced are slavery and involuntary servitude, and Congress is given power to enforce that denunciation. All understand by these terms a condition of enforced compulsory service of one to another. While the inciting cause of the amendment was the emancipation of the colored race, yet it is not an attempt to commit that race to the care of the Nation. It is the denunciation of a condition and not a declaration in favor of a particular people. It reaches every race and every individual, and if in any respect it commits one race to the Nation it commits every race and every individual thereof. Slavery or involuntary servitude of the Chinese, of the Italian, of the Anglo-Saxon are as much within its compass as slavery or involuntary servitude of the African. Of this amendment it was said by Mr. Justice Miller in *Slaughter House cases* (16 Wall. 36, 69), "Its two short sections seem hardly to admit of construction." And again: "To withdraw the mind from the contemplation of this grand yet simple declaration of the personal freedom of all the human race within the jurisdiction of this Government * * * requires an effort, to say the least of it."

A reference to the definitions in the dictionaries of words whose meaning is so thoroughly understood by all seems an affectation, yet in Webster "slavery" is defined as "the state of entire subjection of one person to the will of another." Even the secondary meaning given recognizes the fact of subjection, as "one who has lost the power of resistance; one who surrenders himself to any power whatever; as a slave to passion, to

lust, to strong drink, to ambition," and "servitude" is by the same authority declared to be "the state of voluntary or compulsory subjection to a master."

It is said, however, that one of the disabilities of slavery, one of the indicia of its existence, was a lack of power to make or perform contracts, and that when these defendants, by intimidation and force, compelled the colored men named in the indictment to desist from performing their contract they to that extent reduced those parties to a condition of slavery; that is, of subjection to the will of defendants, and deprived them of a freeman's power to perform his contract. But every wrong done to an individual by another, acting singly or in concert with others, operates pro tanto to abridge some of the freedom to which the individual is entitled. A freeman has a right to be protected in his person from an assault and battery. He is entitled to hold his property safe from trespass or appropriation, but no mere personal assault or trespass or appropriation operates to reduce the individual to a condition of slavery. Indeed, this is conceded by counsel for the Government, for in their brief (after referring to certain decisions of this court) it is said:

"With these decisions, and many others that might be cited, before us, it is vain to contend that the Federal Constitution secures to a citizen of the United States the right to work at a given occupation or particular calling free from injury, oppression, or interference by individual citizens."

"Even though such right be a natural or inalienable right, the duty of protecting the citizen in the enjoyment of such right, free from individual interference, rests alone with the State.

"Unless, therefore, the additional element, to wit, the infliction of an injury upon one individual citizen by another, solely on account of his color, be sufficient ground to redress such injury the individual citizen suffering such injury must be left for redress of his grievance to the State laws."

The logic of this concession points irresistibly to the contention that the thirteenth amendment operates only to protect the African race. This is evident from the fact that nowhere in the record does it appear that the parties charged to have been wronged by the defendants had ever been themselves slaves, or were the descendants of slaves. They took no more from the amendment than any other citizens of the United States. But if, as we have seen, that denounces a condition possible for all races and all individuals, then a like wrong perpetrated by white men upon a Chinese, or by black men upon a white man, or by any men upon any man on account of his race, would come within the jurisdiction of Congress, and that protection of individual rights which prior to the thirteenth amendment was unquestionably within the jurisdiction solely of the States, would by virtue of that amendment be transferred to the Nation, and subject to the legislation of Congress.

But that it was not the intent of the amendment to denounce every act done to an individual which was wrong if done to a free man and yet justified in a condition of slavery, and to give authority to Congress to enforce such denunciation, consider the legislation in respect to the Chinese. In slave times in the slave States not infrequently every free Negro was required to carry with him a copy of a judicial decree or other evidence of his right to freedom or be subject to arrest. That was one of the incidents or badges of slavery. By the act of May 5, 1892, Congress required all Chinese laborers within the limits of the United States to apply for a certificate, and anyone who after 1 year from the passage of the act should be found within the jurisdiction of the United States without such certificate, might be arrested and deported. In *Fong Yue Ting* v. *United States* (149 U. S. 698), the validity of the Chinese Deportation Act was presented, elaborately argued, and fully considered by this court. While there was a division of opinion, yet at no time during the progress of the litigation, and by no individual, counsel, or court connected with it, was it suggested that the requiring of such a certificate was evidence of a condition of slavery or prohibited by the thirteenth amendment.

One thing more: At the close of the Civil War, when the problem of the emancipated slaves was before the Nation, it might have left them in a condition of alienage or established them as wards of the Government like the Indian tribes, and thus retained for the Nation jurisdiction over them, or it might, as it did, give them citizenship. It chose the latter. By the fourteenth amendment it made citizens of all born within the limits of the United States and subject to its jurisdiction. By the fifteenth it prohibited any State from denying the right of suffrage on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, and by the thirteenth it forbade slavery or involuntary servitude anywhere within the limits of the land. Whether this was or was not the wiser way to deal with the great problem is not a matter for the courts to consider. It is for us to accept the decision, which declined to constitute them wards of the Nation or leave them in a condition of alienage, where they would be subject to the jurisdiction of Congress, but gave them citizenship, doubtless believing that thereby in the long run their best interests would be served, they taking their chances with other citizens in the States where they should make their homes.

For these reasons we think the United States court had no jurisdiction of the wrong charged in the indictment.

The judgments are reversed and the case remanded with instructions to sustain the demurrer to the indictment.

Mr. Justice Brown concurs in the judgments.

Mr. Justice Harlan, with whom concurs Mr. Justice Day, dissenting.

THE POWER TO REGULATE INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Of course, Congress is given specifically the power "to regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

The Supreme Court has held: That industrial disputes involving the intent to affect interstate commerce are within the control power of Congress. If industrial strife presents a reasonable likelihood, if it occurred, that it would involve an intent to affect interstate commerce, it would be within the regulatory power of Congress; if an industrial dispute would have the necessary effect of substantially burdening interstate commerce, such disputes would be within the regulatory power of Congress; where a conspiracy against interstate commerce was proven, Congress could intervene under its power to regulate interstate commerce—*United Mine Workers* v. *Coronado Coal Co.* (259 U. S. 344); *Bedford Cut Stone Co. Case* (274 U. S. 37); *Industrial Association* v. *U. S.* (268 U. S. 64, 81).

But to bring a case within the regulatory power of Congress over interstate commerce, its effect upon interstate commerce must be "direct," not remote or speculative—*Schechter Corporation* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 495).

Again, it was held that where the business of a stockyard or a grain exchange being mere instrumentalities of interstate commerce, they are within the regulatory power of Congress—*Stafford* v. *Wallace* (258 U. S. 495); *Chicago Board of Trade* v. *Olsen* (262 U. S. 1).

The National Labor Relations Act was held constitutional as being within the regulatory power of Congress over interstate commerce, as applied to the fourth largest steel business in the Nation, which included the mining of iron ore, the hauling thereof by ships and rail and its processing, manufacture, and delivery to consumers—*N. L. R. B.* v. *Jones and Laughlin Steel Co.* (301 U. S. 1).

The wage-hour law was held to be within the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce, the argument in support of the decision running thus:

> While manufacture is not of itself interstate commerce, the shipment of manufactured goods interstate is such commerce and the prohibition of such shipment by Congress is a regulation of interstate commerce—(*United States* v. *F. W. Darby Lumber Co., et al.* (312 U. S. 100, 113, headnote 2; *Opp Cotton Mills* v. *Administrator* (312 U. S. 126).

From these and all the other cases construing the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce, a pattern of thought emerges, which clearly differentiates each of the cases held to be within that power, from any case that might arise under the F. E. P. C. bill.

This pattern establishes limits beyond which the Supreme Court will not go in approving legislation as being within the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce. These are: That the law so upheld must be truly a regulation of interstate commerce, or must condemn practices engaged in with the intent to affect and which do substantially, necessarily, and directly affect interstate commerce.

It can be seen that violations of the National Labor Relations Act guaranteeing the long-recognized rights of labor to organize and to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, might, in bona fide cases involving interstate commerce, come within the rule laid down by the Supreme Court and bring the act within the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce because such violations would directly, substantially, necessarily, and intentionally burden interstate commerce.

Similarly it is conceivable that violations of the Wages and Hours Act by employers engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, might put complying competitors out of business and thereby directly, substantially, necessarily, and intentionally burden interstate commerce.

But it is inconceivable and absurd to contend that the exercise by any employer of the right retained under the ninth amendment to select his own employees could have any such burdening effect upon interstate commerce. For, bear in mind, this right must be exercised under and in accordance with the national labor relations and the wage and hour laws, as well as in accordance with the other Federal laws already safeguarding the rights of employees against injustice or hostile discrimination, and in obedience to the mandates of the fourteenth amendment.

The pending bill is, therefore, but a procrustean bed upon which to stretch

the regulatory power of Congress over interstate commerce to include a foreign field with no other supporting reason than its own foolish ipse dixit?

There is enough law now to protect against any unjust discrimination.

Section 41, title 8, United States Code Annotated:

EQUAL RIGHTS UNDER THE LAW

All persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall have the same right in every State and Territory to make and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, give evidence, and to the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishment, pains, penalties, taxes, licenses, and exaction of every kind, and to no other (R. S. 1977).

To deprive one of right to select and follow any lawful occupation—that is, to labor or contract to labor, if he so desires and can find employment—is to deprive him of both liberty and property within meaning of this section—*In re Parrott* (C. C. Cal. 1880, 1 F., 481, 510).

Indenture of apprentice of Negro child, which did not contain provisions for his security and benefit required by general laws of State in indentures of white apprentices, was void under Civil Rights Act of 1866—*In re Turner* (C. C. Md. 1867, Fed. Cas. No. 14,247).

Section 43, title 8, United States Code Annotated:

CIVIL ACTION FOR DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS

Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress (R. S. 1979).

Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects, or causes to be subjected, any inhabitant of any State, Territory, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, on account of such inhabitant being an alien, or by reason of his color, or race, than are prescribed for the punishment of citizens, shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both (sec. 20 of the Criminal Code, 18 U. S. C., sec. 52; *Screws et al* v. *U. S.*, decided May 7, 1945).

Persons of African descent have same, but no greater, rights than other citizens in State where they make their home; rights and privileges protected from infringement by this section, and infringement of which creates a cause of action for damages, being common to all citizens—*Brawner* v. *Irvin* (C. C. Ga., 1909, 169 F. 964).

Colored teacher could maintain suit to enjoin salary discrimination between white and colored teachers, as against contention that he could not complain because he was public employee—*Mills* v. *Board of Education of Anne Arundel County* (D. C. Md. 1939, 30 F. Supp. 245).

Action for damages for deprivation of civil rights sounds in tort, and jury may award exemplary or punitive damages—*Hague* v. *Committee for Industrial Organization* (C. C. A. N. J. 1939, 101 F. 2d 774), modifying *Committee for Industrial Organization* v. *Hague* (D. C., 25 F. Supp. 127), certiorari granted *Hague* v. *Committee for Industrial Organization* (1939, 59 S. Ct. 486, 306 U. S. 624, 83 L. Ed. 1028). Modified on other grounds (1939, 59 S. Ct. 954, 307 U. S. 496, 83 L. Ed. 14).

Kerr against the Enoch Pratt Free Library of Baltimore City et al., decided by Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, April 17, 1945, holds:

We think that the special charter of the library should not be interpreted as endowing it with the power to discriminate between the people of the State on account of race and that if the charter is susceptible of this construction, it violates the fourteenth amendment since the board of trustees must be deemed the representative of the State. The question of interpretation is not unlike that which was before the Supreme Court in *Steele* v. *Louisville & N. R. Co.* (65 S. Ct. 226), where it was held that a labor union which was empowered by the Federal Railway Labor Act to represent a whole craft of employees could not discriminate against Negro members thereof. The Court said (pp. 203, 232):

"If, as the State court has held, the act confers this power on the bargaining representative of a craft or class of employees without any commensurate statutory duty toward its members, constitutional questions arise. For the representative is clothed with power not unlike that of a legislature which is subject to constitutional limitations on its power to deny, restrict, destroy, or discriminate against the rights of those for whom it legislates and which is also under an affirmative constitutional duty equally to protect those rights. If the Railway Labor Act purports to impose on petitioner and the other Negro members of the craft the legal duty to comply with the terms of a contract whereby the representative has discriminatorily restricted their employment for the benefit and advantage of the Brotherhood's own members we must decide the constitutional questions which petitioner raises in his pleading.

* * * * *

"We think that the Railway Labor Act imposes upon the statutory representative of a craft at least as exacting a duty to protect equally the interests of the members of the craft as the Constitution imposes upon a legislature to give equal protection to the interests of those for whom it legislates. Congress has seen fit to clothe the bargaining representative with powers comparable to those possessed by a legislative body both to create and restrict the rights of those whom it represents, cf. *J. I. Case Co.* v. *National Labor Relations Board*, supra (321 U. S. 335, 64 Ct. 579), but it has also imposed on the representative a corresponding duty. We hold that the language of the act to which we have referred, read in the light of the purposes of the act, expresses the aim of Congress to impose on the bargaining representative of a craft or class of employees the duty to exercise fairly the power conferred upon it in behalf of all those for whom it acts, without hostile discrimination against them."

For like reasons we think that the charter of the Library which empowers the Board of Trustees to manage the institution for a benevolent public purpose should not be construed to authorize them to pass a regulation in respect to the appointment of its agents which violates the spirit of the constitutional prohibition against race discrimination. Nor do we assume that the act would be so interpreted by the Court of Appeals of Maryland which in *Mayor, etc.* v. *Radecke* (49 Md. 217) pointed out the duty of the courts to look beneath the language of an act to find the true purpose of a grant of legislative power. In that case the court said:

"While we hold that this power of control by the courts is one to be most cautiously exercised, we are yet of opinion there may be a case in which an ordinance passed under grants of power like those we have cited, is so clearly unreasonable, so arbitrary, oppressive or partial, as to raise the presumption that the legislature never intended to confer the power to pass it, and to justify the courts in interfering and setting it aside as a plain abuse of authority."

REPEALING THE CONSTITUTION

The reason the F. E. P. C. law is so passionately desired by its proponents is—and they virtually admit it—to avoid the necessity of complying with "the supreme law of the land":

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Senators and Representatives beforementioned, and the members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath of affirmation to support this Constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States (art. VI).

The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The judges, both of the Supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior.

The judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority.

The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury; and such trial shall be held in the State where the said crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the trial shall be at such place or places as the Congress may by law have directed (art. III).

Amendment VI: In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor: and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

Amendment VII: In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States than according to the rules of the common law.

Amendment IX: The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment X: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

From these quotations from the Constitution, it is perfectly clear that this bill seeks:

First. To legislate not in pursuance of the Constitution, but in spite of it.

Second. To divest the courts of their judicial power, and to give it, together with legislative and executive powers, to a new bureau created by this bill and by it clothed with omnipotence.

Third. To annul the constitutional guaranties of the right of trial by jury.

Fourth. To annihilate the freedom of choice of private organizations to select their own members.

Practically the only right of the people guaranteed by the Constitution that would not be annihilated if this bill becomes law, is habeas corpus.

This bill proclaims that it is seeking to eliminate only discrimination in employment. Yet, its design to go much further is seen by the provision that no labor union can "deny full membership and privileges to any individual" because of his race, creed, or color. Full membership and privileges means dances and all other social functions, as well as purely business meetings.

Of course, those labor brotherhoods whose memberships have long been built by respecting the color line were perfectly innocent of any wrong in so doing. Now, long after that status has become fixed, it is sought to make it a crime to have or keep the membership of a labor union for white only. This is primarily an ex post facto law which the Constitution expressly prohibits.

Under the terms of this bill is any place of business, office, lodge room or home, safe from unreasonable searches and seizures? The fourth amendment says:

> The right of the people to be secure * * * against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated.

Now read section 9 (a), captioned "Investigatory Powers," beginning on page 10 of the bill.

The sixth amendment of the Constitution of the United States, another part of our Bill of Rights, reads in its pertinent part so far as this point is concerned:

> In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed—

Yet you will search in vain for any word in the F. E. P. C. bill giving any accused thereunder anything resembling a speedy and public judicial trial, much less a trial by jury.

This bill gives him a hearing before a kangaroo court composed of the Commission or some person they may designate, so, therefore, usually just one kangaroo. Such a hearing may be held at any place fixed in the notice of hearing.

They can only punish by the issuance by the Commission of a cease and desist order, plus "such affirmative action, including reinstatement or hiring of employees with or without back pay, as will effectuate the policies of this act."

Of course, such an adjudication of guilt and its accompanying cease and desist order may cause you to close your business or factory, and the affirmative action enjoined may confiscate your entire estate by requiring you to hire 1,000 new employees that you have no vacancies for, do not need, and never have wanted, and not only put them on your pay roll, but also require you to pay them accumulated back pay for the months or years that have elapsed since they applied to you for employment and were not employed.

But, they contend, proceedings under this gentle, sweet, and benevolent bill, should it become law, could never be "criminal prosecutions" within the meaning of the sixth amendment. To use the most appropriate and classic rejoinder of General McAuliffe of Bastogne—the answer is, "Nuts!"

If the proponents of this bill did not concede that this bill includes criminal penalties and that it might entail a criminal case, why do they include section 9 (f) which reads:

> No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing documentary or other evidence in obedience to the subpena of the Commission, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

The only provision in the Constitution guaranteeing an accused against such oppression is contained in the fifth article in our Bill of Rights, which, you will notice, applies only in criminal cases. It reads:

> No person * * * shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself.

Just because the promoters of this bill tried to deprive us of judicial trial and trial by jury and do not denominate the money they would take from us as a "fine," the truism is no less true that "a rose by any other name would smell as sweet!"

The F. E. P. C. bill not only denies judicial trial, including trial by jury, it denies also all right of appeal to any court. American jurisprudence gives an appeal as a matter of right even to a self-confessed criminal. A rapist or murderer is not only given "his day in court"—a real court—but a trial by jury, and then an appeal to another court whose sole business it is to see if justice has been done.

What H. R. 2232 calls "Judicial Review" is not an appeal.

It is not even Judicial Review in any true sense of the meaning of those words. It is a mockery, with no review in reality by any judge or court to ascertain if justice had been done, even leaving out of consideration the time-honored, basic principle of criminal law, the presumption of the innocence of the accused until it is removed, if it be removed, by legal evidence which after considering it all, has established guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

No! Nothing like that! Here the defendant has at least two strikes against him according to the law imposed by us on the umpire, who is required to treat the Commission's findings of fact, if supported by evidence, as conclusive.

In other words, this bill asks us to swallow again the cruel mockery of the same provisions for so-called judicial review rammed down our throats in the National Labor Relations Board Act, after we have seen that scheme in operation.

Notice, please, it does not say how much evidence, nor credible evidence, nor legal evidence. Oh, no! It simply says that the "kangaroo court" of the Bureau is right beyond question, if, according to the record of the proceedings before it, as made up by it, there is some evidence—some substantial evidence it has been held to mean—that supports its finding.

Good night, justice! Here is another black-out!

This bill would give the Commission the right, from time to time, to make all "such regulations as it deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and to amend or rescind, from time to time, any such regulation whenever it deems such amendment or rescission necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

So, they make the law!

They say who is to be prosecuted!

They prosecute!

They try you, and judge you!

That is as much governmental power in its sphere, as all three branches of our Government have! More than the Executive Branch! More than the Judicial Branch! And, much more than the Legislative!

But, the vaulting ambition of the kangaroos is not easily satiated. The more power they planned for themselves as this bill grew, the more they desired, and the less they could brook opposition. So they finally capped the climax. After they had completed their bill that was to make them almost omnipotent, and had put in everything but the crown, they added section 13 which put in the crown. The same provision is in the National Labor Relations Act, so they try it here. It reads:

> Any person who shall willfully resist, prevent, impede, or interfere with any member of the Commission or any of its referees, agents, or agencies, in the performance of duties pursuant to this Act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

Please do not just say: "That's horrible," and quit listening. I want you to realize how horrible section 13 is.

In a former section of the bill, 9 (e), page 11, in case you have been guilty of contumacy toward one of the kangaroos anywhere down the line, or of refusal to obey a subpena issued by any member of the Commission, they may get an order of a real court requiring you to appear before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, there to give or produce evidence, and failing therein you may be punished for contempt of court.

But here, in section 13, to get fined up to $5,000 and be imprisoned for not more than a year, you do not have to be contumacious, nor refuse to obey a subpena

issued by a bureaucrat; all you have to do is fail to heil Hitler, or give the prescribed equivalent, every time you see, hear, or read about any one of the 60,000,000.

You get on a crowded bus. You willfully impede 1 or several of the 60,000,000, who, though you did not know it, were in the performance of snooping duties pursuant to this act. You are guilty.

Take another case. One of the kangaroos has put you to trial before him because of some alleged violation of section 7 (a) (1). You show him the Constitution of the United States and call his attention to pertinent Supreme Court decisions. He decides the case in your favor. But are you free? Oh, no. As you start out, another kangaroo calls a United States marshal and you are arrested. There is no chance of acquittal this time, for, do you not see, you willfully resisted the first kangaroo and prevented him from punishing you in the first case.

It is doubtful if the kangaroos would contend that where a regular court had freed you on habeas corpus, you could, for that reason, be punished under section 13 for interference with one of them, but if this bill should become law, we shall see.

THE NEW YORK LAW AGAINST DISCRIMINATION

The new Ives-Quinn Act just passed by the Legislature of New York and approved by the Governor is quite similar to the bill, H. R. 2232, now pending in Congress.

While this State statute is much more nearly a sound piece of legislation than is the similar bill in Congress, yet it also denies the accused the right guaranteed him in the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States, that no person "shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself," as well as the right of trial by jury. But it grants any person aggrieved by the order of the State Commission Against Discrimination the right to go into the local State court by filing a petition, and after the decision of that court, he may appeal to the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court, and thereafter to the Court of Appeals.

While the New York law provides that "the findings of the Commission as to the facts shall be conclusive if supported by sufficient evidence on the record considered as a whole," this is infinitely better than the Federal law that makes the commission's findings of fact conclusive "if supported by evidence."

The main reason that the State statute is more nearly sound is that it is a State statute. The State of New York, just as every other State of the United States, has sovereign legislative power except as certain legislative powers may have been granted by the States to the Congress of the United States, or denied to themselves, in the Constitution of the United States. Therefore, the Congress has only such limited legislative powers as are granted in the Constitution. The several States have all other legislative power, save for the grants or inhibitions they fixed in the Constitution of the United States.

There is no grant of power to the Congress to legislate as is proposed in H. R. 2232, now pending.

There is no general inhibition against a State so legislating. Any State may do so, provided it respects the guaranties of other rights in its own constitution and in the Constitution of the United States.

The law passed by New York is New York's business, except as it throws light upon ours.

There is no adverse criticism of New York in order. That great State is trying what they think is another "noble experiment." We shall see. New York has the right so to legislate for New York. Congress has not.

THE NEW JERSEY LAW AGAINST DISCRIMINATION

The New Jersey statute is not yet available in Washington. From the newspapers it seems very much like the New York law.

ANALYSIS OF H. R. 2232

If you please, let us see what this so-called F. E. P. C. bill is. Let us be specific.

After the enacting clause, and the bill's misnomer, the first section—2 (a)—is captioned "Findings and Declaration of Policy." And what does the first substantive section say. Let me read it paragraph by paragraph, commenting on each seriatim.

SEC. 2 (a) The Congress hereby finds—

(1) That the practice of discriminating in the matter of employment, and in matters relating thereto, against properly qualified persons because of their race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry leads to domestic and industrial strife and unrest and forces large segments of the population permanently into substandard conditions of living, thereby creating a drain upon the resources of the Nation and a constant threat to the maintenance of industrial peace and of the standard of living necessary to the health, efficiency, and well-being of workers.

This paragraph illustrates an amateurish trick of a specious pleader, who, having a weak case at law, cannot make the simple, essential averment, because if he averred it, he would have to prove it, and he could not possibly do that. So he tries to give the impression that he has said that such discrimination is being practiced. But, if you read carefully, you will see that he studiously avoided making any such statement of fact. No; he says nothing of the kind. He says:

The Congress hereby finds that the practice of discriminating * * * leads to domestic strife—

And so forth.

There is practically no discrimination against properly qualified persons, because of race, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, or anything else.

Another point in this first paragraph is so far from truth as to assure any economist a laugh. It is that discrimination "forces large segments of the population permanently into substandard conditions of living," although they were and are "properly qualified persons" to fill better jobs.

O tempora! O mores! Show me, I pray, any properly qualified person, not in the fighting forces, who cannot get employment at a fair wage, and so is in danger of becoming a public charge or a drain upon the resources of the Nation!

The next paragraph, section 2 (a) (2), reads as follows:

That the existence of such practices in industries engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce causes the means and instrumentalities of commerce to be used to spread and perpetuate such conditions throughout the several States and causes diminution of employment and wages in such volume as substantially to impair and disrupt the market for goods in commerce, and burdens, hinders, and obstructs commerce.

Of course, this paragraph just quoted, cannot be taken seriously. It is a joke, but such a poor one that you must have a perverted sense of humor to get a laugh!

It is absurd—a preposterous attempt to supply a nonexistent constitutional basis for this bill, to wit, the power to regulate interstate commerce.

The next paragraph, section 2 (b), reads as follows:

Individuals shall have the right to work without discrimination against them, because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

Notice that the bill here shifts its ground. At first it was hypothesized that the ones for whom the authors' hearts were bleeding were those who were properly qualified persons. Now, we see that all individuals, whether qualified for employment or not, are to be guaranteed the right to work.

And well the proponents may guarantee jobs for all, for if this bill passes the new Bureau created will have just exactly that unlimited power. This bill, if passed, would give the new commission power to appoint "such officers and employees as it deems necessary!" "Sixty million jobs?" Why not?

Of course, if applicants for jobs are qualified for the jobs they seek, economic law has always made such a law as this unnecessary.

But Congress has no semblance of power so to enact even if something of the kind were necessary.

And, if backers of this bill wish to use the money of private employers to pay the down-trodden objects of solicitude wages above their due in the market, they had better consider those freedoms which antedated the Bill of Rights, or even our Constitution, and, yet, which are guaranteed by those immortal documents: Freedom of thought, freedom of contract, freedom to engage in legitimate business, or to refrain therefrom, freedom of peaceable assemblage, freedom to select one's own associates, freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures; and they might take into account the provisions of our Constitution guaranteeing every defendant in any criminal case against being compelled to be a witness against himself and the right of trial by jury; for every one of these nine rights is sought to be outlawed by the terms of this so-called permanent F. E. P. C. bill.

The next paragraph, 2 (c), reads:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to protect such right and to eliminate all such discriminations to the

fullest extent permitted by the Constitution. This act shall be construed to effectuate such policy.

Here we have an unexpected and heartening confession: The authors of this bill seem to admit that, in spite of all they can do to write the Constitution of the United States out of existence, it may still stand, and be enforced by the courts of the Nation.

We who have the honor to oppose this bill agree on this one point with the proponents, that the Constitution will weather this storm. We do not lack faith in Congress so far as to think it possible to pass it.

But if enough of us forget our sworn duty to support and defend the Constitution and pass a bill that we are wholly without authority to pass, and which violates nearly every one of the freedoms guaranteed thereby, even then, we have faith in the Courts to observe the oath of office taken by the members of our judiciary faithfully and impartially to discharge and perform their duties agreeably to the Constitution.

Now we come to section 3, which is captioned and contains certain definitions. We shall quarrel with only three.

The term "employer" means a person having in his employ six or more individuals, or any other person acting in the interest of such an employer, directly or indirectly.

Does this mean that if a man is married to a dutiful wife, he is an "employer" whether or not he employs anyone? Read it!

Without questioning the English or the veracity of this definition, may we not submit that an employer is an employer, however small or large the number of his employees may be? And if the crime denounced by this bill be so heinous and horrible, why leave a loophole of escape for any employer of fewer than six? If the employer of six or more must be hanged, drawn, and quartered, why should an employer of even one so sinned against be classed as innocent?

In the second place, we must inveigh against what the framers are pleased to call a definition of "affecting commerce." The very term "affecting commerce" is almost, if not quite, a badge of fraud, plus a confession of guilt!

The very first section of the very first article of the Constitution of the United States warns us that it is only such legislative power as is "herein granted" Congress, and no other, that shall be vested in a Congress.

Where are we authorized to regulate anything but commerce?

What have we to do with anything merely "affecting commerce"?

Why need we a "definition" of something the Constitution says we have no power over?

But here is what this infamous bill says—section 3 (e):

The term "affecting commerce" means in commerce, or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce, or having led or tending to lead to a labor dispute burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.

Now, can you conceive of anything beyond the pale of interstate commerce? (For "commerce" is defined in section 3 (d) as meaning interstate commerce, as usually defined.) Please read section 3 (e), just quoted, and see if you can figure it out.

And now section 4: "Right to freedom from Discrimination in Employment."

It reads:

The right to work and to seek work without discrimination because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry is declared to be an immunity of all citizens of the United States, which shall not be abridged by any State or by an instrumentality or creature of the United States or of any State.

Let us throw the mantle of amused charity over section 4, and say to those inclined to be harsh, "Excuse this inexcusable, if you please; it is too naive to be harmful." They simply must have overlooked repeated holdings of the Supreme Court directly to the contrary!—*U. S.* v. *Wheeler* (254 U. S. 281); *U. S.* v. *Harris* (106 U. S. 629, 643); *Corfield* v. *Coryell* (4 Wash. (U. S.) 371).

Suffice it to say, if the right to work and to seek work without discrimination were an immunity of all citizens, then there is no need of section 4, for article IV and the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution already cover the subject and give full protection. But, if it is not, then saying it is cannot make it so! Hence, again, in either case, there is no need of section 4.

What of section 5? "Unfair Employment Practices Defined."

Somewhere, let us stop, and look, and listen.

Suppose I own a little country store or farm. No matter whether I employ 6 or 60, Congress has no right to strike down my freedom of employment, nor theirs, because nowhere in the Constitution has any such power been granted Congress.

Suppose I am a member of a labor union. I had been working for years at the craft of which I had become a master. But I never could seem to do better than "make ends meet." I talked to the boss. He knew all the answers, while I just knew my job. Finally, I heard about and joined a union. A mighty fine bunch of fellows. It was a fraternity. If a man was all right, straight, clean, honest, and the kind you could depend upon to give your widow and children a square deal, all of us would vote for him and we would make him one of us. It was an honor to be a member. We appreciated our membership and kept it clean. Some of our members studied and learned the answers like the boss. They talked for the rest of us and got us contracts that paid us more, and things were easier and happier.

Neither Congress, nor any other power can force me to vote to take the wrong kind of a man into the membership of our union, as long as this is a free country!

Now section 6—Creating the billion-dollar commission!

A new, permanent bureau. Five members at $10,000 each, plus all now working for the F. E. P. C., plus technical assistants to the public, plus "such officers and employees as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions!"

Sixty million jobs! Sure! Easy!

Now section 7—Enforcement.

As under section 3 (e), supra, every person, every act, every transaction, as well as frequently the absence thereof, "affects commerce," so, every employer, and every labor union is almost necessarily within the condemnation and the enforcement provisions of this bill.

Only a casual consideration is needed to condemn this bill as a bill of attainder or ex post facto law, either of which is specifically prohibited for Congress to pass by article I, section 9, clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

For it is manifest that the very central purpose is to inflict punishment by legislative act without judicial trial, and that countless thousands of past employments which were innocent when made, are by this bill made crimes. It is, of course, true that in other countless thousands of cases employment has been refused, or "full membership rights and privileges" in labor unions have been denied, each one of which may be made the basis of a criminal prosecution if this bill become law, although clearly ex post facto.

What of section 8—Judicial Review?

This section is a delusion and a snare.

It affords neither judicial trial (much less trial by jury) nor judicial review.

What the framers call judicial review is not even a clever "trap for fools." The judicial process is not to be used except to declare that there are five aces in the poker hand of the dealer who admittedly put them there!

Now section 9—"Investigatory Powers."

Subsection (a) of section 9 reads as follows:

For the purpose of all investigations, proceedings, or hearings which the Commission deems necessary or proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by this act, the Commission, or its authorized agents or agencies, shall at all reasonable times have the right to examine or copy any evidence of any person being investigated or proceeded against relating to any such investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

If this makes sense, I confess my insanity and ask to be committed! If it means to wipe out the fourth amendment of our Bill of Rights, that has been a part of the Constitution of the United States since 1791, let the fight begin!

At least 100,000,000 Americans believe in that amendment and will fight for it to the death!

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated. * * *

We now come to the inevitable section 10.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

We are creating another bureau and giving it all of the powers of government—legislative, executive, and judicial! Here we give them the power to make all the law they think they may need. Oh! But they say, we give Congress the veto over our lawmaking. So they do. But what a veto power! Even if Congress had nothing else to do but to keep up with the regulations and amendments issued by this Commission, and even if Congress kept up daily with such matters, it would be impossible to get the concurrent veto resolution through

both Houses within the 60 days allowed for such action. There is no limit upon debate in the Senate!

A distinguished, able, and popular Member of the House of Representatives had run on a platform of just one plank: "Get at least one law a day repealed." He stayed in Congress 4 years and worked hard on his self-assigned task. I watched him. If he ever got one repealed in the whole 4 years I cannot remember it, nor the fact. I know he did not average one a day, nor one every 60 days, nor one a year. And those who wrote this bill know it, too!

The bureaucrats of Washington are said to have passed more laws within 10 years than Congress has in more than 150 years!

Section 11 requires the inclusion of an antidiscrimination clause in Government contracts.

Except the ex post facto principle, and the quasi bribery implicit in the practice, there are many other features in this bill more objectionable.

Section 12, "Enforcement Against Government Agencies."

Most respectfully it is submitted that once the policy of this bill be determined upon, the modus operandi of enforcement of this section makes no difference.

Section 13, "Willful Interference With Commission Agents."

Judged by the apparent appraisal of the enormity of the offenses condemned in this bill, the victims are lucky not to have the punishment fixed for each offense at death, at least.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GORE). Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 2 minutes.

PROFESSIONAL STATUS FOR NURSES OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have been working for months with the Veterans' Administration and General Hines asking that the nurses be given professional status. At last he has acted. I have a letter from him, dated May 12, reading as follows:

MAY 12, 1945.

Hon. EDITH N. ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Knowing of your very keen interest in the status of nurses in the Veterans' Administration and the need for offering every possible inducement to recruit against our present and expanding requirements, I am sure you will be pleased to learn that I have instructed, effective not later than July 1, 1945, all nursing positions within the Veterans' Administration, comprehending some 5,363 presently authorized jobs, be placed in the Professional and Scientific Service, whereas they now are in the subprofessional service.

Not only will this action recognize the professional character of their services, but also will result in the great majority of cases, in increasing the pay of those presently on duty, and raising the entrance salary. Typical of this is the position of staff nurse, where the present basic entrance salary is $1,800, and under the new classification the entrance salary will be $2,000. This rate of pay, of course, excludes overtime.

Similar action is being taken in certain other medical technical positions, such as dietitians, librarians, psychiatric social workers, etc. Pharmacists of the Veterans' Administration are already classified in the professional service.

Very sincerely yours,
FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, I hope very much that the House soon will pass a permanent Nurse Corps bill for the Veterans' Administration. That is the only way, in my opinion, that enough nurses will be induced to go into the Veterans' Administration and the nursing service. It is only just also that they should be given the benefit of a permanent corps. They are a thousand nurses short today; they will need a thousand more in the very near future. A permanent Medical Corps ought to be established also.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

THE BEEF SHORTAGE

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, if the order establishing slaughter quotas on cattle in all nonfederally inspected packing plants is lifted we will have a more adequate supply of beef on the shelves of the meat markets of this country.

We now have the anomalous situation where there is a surplus of cattle on the western ranges, but no beefsteak. The flow of cattle to the markets has been greater in the first 3 months of this year than last year. Irate customers, eyeing empty meat counters, cannot understand why they cannot purchase beef in areas where the supply of livestock is greater than ever before, the packer is ready to process the same, but still the retailer can get no meat.

This order, as I understand it, established these quotas for the purpose of diverting the flow of cattle from the small local packers to the federally inspected plants in order to increase meat supplies in the industrial centers outside of the meat-producing areas. The theory is beautiful, but it has not worked out in practice. The result has been to cut off supplies of meat in areas where the retail markets get their beef from local packers. It is obvious that this order was a mistake, and it should be canceled immediately.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. COURTNEY, for 1 day, on account of illness.

INCREASE IN SALARY OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. As a general rule I do not leave Capitol Hill when the House is in session, but today I had the honor and privilege of introducing the next Postmaster General, Hon. Robert E. Hannegan, at a luncheon given by the Advertising Clubs of Washington, and therefore missed the vote on the bill dealing with salaries of employees in the Postal Service. If I had been present I would have voted for the bill but with the reservation that if it is vetoed I will not vote to override the veto. I want to ascertain first if it is within the stabilization program. If it is not, and if it should be vetoed, I am going to vote to sustain the stabilization program. If there is any question about this matter I hope the Senate committee will straighten it out. I am very glad that the bill provides additional grades of salary, thus furnishing employees a real career and proper reward for good service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 89. An act to provide for the planning of rural electrification projects, to reestablish the Rural Electrification Administration as an independent agency of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2992. An act to extend the provisions of the act of July 11, 1941 (Public Law 163, 77th Cong.); and

H. R. 3038. An act to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2992. An act to extend the provisions of the act of July 11, 1941 (Public Law 163, 77th Cong.).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 16, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE OF WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in open hearing at 10 a. m., Wednesday, May 16, 1945, in the committee room 356, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of Subcommittee No. 2 of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee on Wednesday, May 16, 1945, at 10 a. m., at which time hearings will be had on H. R. 2543, a bill to require weekly newspapers enjoying mailing privileges to make sworn statements with respect to their circulation, and on H. R. 2798, a bill to permit weekly newspapers to suspend publication for not more than two issues in any one calendar year without loss of second-class mail privileges.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Wednesday, May 16, 1945, to resume public hearings on H. R. 3170, a bill to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports and to amend existing law relating to air-navigation facilities.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold a hearing at 10 o'clock a. m. on Wednesday, May 16, 1945, on H. R. 714, H. R. 1350, H. R. 2299, and H. R. 2650.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10:30 o'clock a. m. on Wednesday, May 16, 1945, for consideration of H. R. 3187.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold an executive session on Thursday, May 17, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room 247, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the bridge subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m. Thursday, May 17, 1945, to resume public hearings on H. R. 541, a bill authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes. (Proponent witnesses.)

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

The Committee on the Public Lands will meet at 10:30 a. m. on Thursday, May 17, 1945, for the purpose of hearing testimony and acting upon the following bills: H. R. 1867, H. R. 2416, H. R. 2854, S. 497. The session will be open, to be followed by a short executive session.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

464. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Public Health Service, and their dependents to occupy certain Government housing facilities on a rental basis without loss of rental allowances; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

465. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

466. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

467. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report concerning the claim of A. M. Strauss against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

468. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 3539 of the Revised Statutes, relating to taking trial pieces of coins; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

469. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated March 15, 1945, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a study of beach erosion of the Ohio shore line of Lake Erie from the Ohio-Michigan State line to Marblehead, Ohio, made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, and as act of Congress approved on June 26, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 177); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

470. A letter from the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, transmitting a report of the negotiation and entering into a compact for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Flood Control. S. 938. An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 581). Referred to the Committe of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. S. 93. An act for the relief of Mary G. Marggraf; without amendment (Rept. No. 572). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1091. A bill for the relief of Harold J. Grim; with amendment (Rept. No. 573). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1328. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cecilia M. Tonner; with amendment (Rept. No. 574). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1548. A bill for the relief of August W. Dietz. with amendment (Rept. No. 575). Referred to the Committe of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1725. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Surface Shaughnessy; with amendment (Rept. No. 576). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1975. A bill for the relief of Glassell-Taylor Co., Robinson and Young; with amendment (Rept. No. 577). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2518. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Eastern Contracting Co., a corporation against the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 578). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2578. A bill for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock; with amendment (Rept. No. 579). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2666. A bill for the relief of Oscar N. McLean; without amendment (Rept. No. 580). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. House Resolution 249. Resolution directing the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of all plans of their respective departments for providing transportation home to persons in the armed forces returning to the United States on furlough after victory in Europe (Rept. No. 571). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 3219. A bill to amend the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1935; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3220. A bill to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 3221. A bill to create an Agricultural Credit Agency, to consolidate therein all Federal agricultural lending agencies, to create a public farm-appraisal system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. J. Res. 196. Joint resolution declaring that it is the sense of Congress that the United Nations assume responsibility for the repatriation of the Hebrews in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. J. Res. 197. Joint resolution to provide for temporary suspension of the controls affecting the distribution and sale of meat for civilian consumption; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 258. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 2913, a bill authorizing rehabilitation on the island of Guam; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas memorializing the President and the Congress of the United

States to include members of the United States Maritime Service, the United States merchant marine, and the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps in the class of persons given special income-tax exemptions because of their service in the war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Egyptian Chamber of Deputies, by President Hamed Gouda, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States upon the speedy victory of the Allied forces in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Republic of Guatemala, by President Jose Granados, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States upon the Allied victory in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to offer no lenient peace terms but rather to make the punishment fit the crime in relation to our war criminals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to extend certain existing income-tax exemptions to all members of the military and naval personnel of the United States who are serving or have served in any foreign area or in Alaska; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolution were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 3222. A bill for the relief of A. F. Crawford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 3223. A bill for the relief of James P. Arthur; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 3224. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lionel Comeaux and New Orleans Public Service, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 3225. A bill for the relief of Rolla Duncan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 3226. A bill to extend the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, to John J. Arnold; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Ohio:

H. R. 3227. A bill for the relief of J. Aron & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 3228. A bill for the relief of Sam Dishong; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 3229. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Leslie Price, Mr. Philip C. Price, Mrs. Louise Keyton, Annie Curry, and James Curry; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

652. By Mr. CLASON: Petition of the third annual legislative conference held at Springfield, Mass., on May 6, 1945, asking immediate extension and improvement of the present social-security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

653. By Mr. HOPE: Petition by residents of Harper, Kans., regarding House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

654. By Mr. RICH: Petition of Young Ladies Sodality of St. Boniface Church, Williamsport, Pa., opposing legislation concerning peacetime conscription of 18-year-old boys; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

655. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts to extend certain existing income-tax exemptions to all Members of the military and naval personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

656. By the SPEAKER: Petition of C. H. R. Hovde, M. D., of San Francisco, Calif., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to securing release from his present detention; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 16, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Infinite and eternal God, who art the light of all that is true, the strength of all that is good, and the glory of all that is beautiful, we thank Thee for the joys which cheer us and for the trials which teach us to put our trust in Thee.

We pray that Thou wilt establish within us those loyalties which cannot be shaken and those integrities which shall be our support in every confusion, our guide in every darkness, and our hope when we are discouraged and disillusioned.

Help us to discipline ourselves to do Thy will more perfectly, for we know that in the doing of Thy will we find our peace. Enable us by Thy grave to be fortified against those temptations and influences which assail the citadel of our soul and seek to undermine and corrupt our character.

Grant that our President, our Speaker, and the Members of this legislative branch of our Government may be plenteously endowed with wisdom and understanding as they respond to their high calling of statesmanship to release the hidden splendors of human personality and open for all mankind the way toward the more abundant life.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2907. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. OVERTON, Mr. GLASS, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. GREEN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. WHITE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MARLIN-ROCKWELL CORPORATION

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1044) for the relief of Marlin-Rockwell Corporation with respect to the jurisdiction of the Tax Court of the United States to redetermine its excessive profits for its fiscal year ending December 31, 1942, subject to renegotiation under the Renegotiation Act. This bill has a unanimous report from the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time within which a petition may be filed with The Tax Court of the United States, by Marlin-Rockwell Corporation, a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware, having its principal place of business in Jamestown, N. Y., for a redetermination under the Renegotiation Act of its excessive profits for its fiscal year ending December 31, 1942, as determined by the Under Secretary of War under date of April 26, 1944, be, and the same is hereby, extended to and including July 27, 1944, and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon The Tax Court of the United States, and it is hereby authorized and directed to hear and determine on the merits under the Renegotiation Act, such petition as heretofore filed or as hereafter amended, any finding, determination, judgment, rule of law, or statute to the contrary notwithstanding.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 534) to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I object. Mr. Speaker.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time that Americans have faith in America. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by the distinguished columnist, Mr. Lowell Mellett, as published in the Washington Star of May 14.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PUERTO RICO

Mr. PIÑERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.