To be senior assistant sanitary engineers, effective date of oath of office

Russell W. Hart.
Paul C. Henderson

To be scientist director, effective date of oath of office

Ralph W. G. Wyckoff

Senior assistant surgeons to be surgeons

Leonard A. Scheele	Alexander G. Gilliam
Warren P. Dearing	James C. Archer

Assistant surgeans to be senior assistant surgeons

Robert L. Cannon	Louis C. Floyd
Merle Bundy	Fred W. Harb
Ira Avrin	James L. Hart
Robert J. Huebner	John W. Murray, Jr.
John K. McBane	Arthur L. Koven
Griffith E. Quinby	Leo P. Krall

Senior dental surgeon to be dental director

Ozias Paquin, Jr.

Senior assistant dental surgeons to be dental surgeons

Bruce D. Forsyth	Ralph S. Lloyd
John W. Knutson	William P. Kroschel
George E. Jones	

Sanitary engineers to be senior sanitary engineers

Judson L. Robertson	John J. Bloomfield
Charles T. Wright	Henry A. Johnson

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 10, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

Our gracious Father, as our thoughts are hushed to silence, may we find Thee moving upon our minds, higher than our highest thought, yet nearer to us than our very selves. Before the toil of a new day opens before us, we lay before Thee the meditations of our hearts. May they be acceptable in Thy sight. Bring all our desires and powers, we beseech Thee, into conformity to Thy will.

As we pray for Thy kingdom's coming to our own hearts and to the world, awake in us a holy awe of this law-abiding universe which is our home and which so inexorably moves from cause to consequence. Bend our pride to Thy control. Prepare us for the role committed to our fallible hands in this appalling day with its vast issues that concern not only our own dear land but all the continents and the islands of the sea. May our loins be girt and our lamps burning and ourselves as men who watch for their Lord's coming. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Saturday, June 8, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I ask unanimous consent that he be excused from attendance upon the session of today and also the session of tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 8, 1946, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1802. An act to provide for the delivery of custody of certain articles of historic interest from the U. S. S. *Nevada*, and the U. S. S. *Wyoming*, to the State of Nevada and the State of Wyoming, respectively;

S. 1862. An act to repeal section 1548 Revised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 592); and

S. 1872. An act to provide for the rank of original appointments in the Corps of Civil Engineers of the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. 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:

Andrews	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Austin	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hickenlooper	Overton
Barkley	Hill	Pepper
Bilbo	Hoey	Radcliffe
Bridges	Huffman	Reed
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Burch	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Bushfield	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Byrd	Knowland	Stanfill
Capehart	La Follette	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Connally	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Tunnell
Donnell	McKellar	Tydings
Downey	McMahon	Vandenberg
Eastland	Magnuson	Wagner
George	Maybank	Walsh
Guffey	Millikin	Wherry
Gurney	Moore	White
Hart	Murdock	Wilson
Hatch	Murray	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE] and the Senators from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT and Mr. TAYLOR] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent on official business, attending the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Bermuda.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate as members of the committee appointed by the United States Senate to attend the Empire Parliamentary Conference in Bermuda.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

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

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

RESCISSIONS OF PORTIONS OF WAR AND WAR-RELATED APPROPRIATIONS (H. Doc. No. 645)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed rescissions of portions of several war and war-related appropriations available for the fiscal year 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

LAWS PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. CROIX AND ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Councils of St. Croix and St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT ON GOVERNMENT-OWNED SYNTHETIC RUBBER PLANTS AND FACILITIES

A letter from the Administration of War Assets Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first supplementary report with respect to Government-owned synthetic rubber plants and facilities (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of Chester J. Polston, of Louisville, Ky., praying for the enactment of legislation to extend the Office of Price Administration; ordered to lie on the table.

A petition of sundry members of the Third Battalion Medical Section, One Hundred and Eighty-seventh Airborne, R. C. T., San Francisco, Calif., praying for the enactment of legislation extending the Selective Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition, from Mrs. Edythe Griffin, of Warrenton, Fla., praying for the enactment of legislation increasing the pensions of widows of World War I

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

veterans from $38 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions of sundry citizens of Baltimore and Denton, Md., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 599, to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in newspapers, periodicals, and motion pictures, and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 2264. A bill to amend the act providing for the appointment of court reporters; without amendment (Rept. No. 1437).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 776. A bill to authorize the naturalization of Filipinos; without amendment (Rept. No. 1439).

By Mr. RUSSELL (for Mr. FULBRIGHT), from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 3517. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1440).

By Mr. BALL, from the Committee on Immigration:

S. 2122. A bill to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancées of members of the armed forces of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1441).

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1947—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations I ask unanimous consent to report favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 6429) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1436) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, along with the bill, I submit a notice in writing to suspend the rule, which may not be necessary, but I give notice of my intention to do so as a protection in case such action is necessary.

The notice submitted by Mr. TYDINGS is as follows:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6429) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

Page 2, beginning in line 1, insert the following:

"There shall be paid to each Senator after January 1, 1946, an expense allowance of $2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, to be paid in equal monthly installments. For making such payments through June 30, 1947, $360,000, of which so much as is required to make such payments for the period from January 1, 1946, to June 30, 1946, both inclusive, shall be immediately available."

Mr. TYDINGS also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6429, the legislative appropriation bill, fiscal year 1947, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For the text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT RELATING TO OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS' INSURANCE BENEFITS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably with amendments, all of which are clarifying, the bill (S. 2204) to amend title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, by giving insurance benefits under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance provisions of that act to survivors of veterans of World War II, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1438) thereon.

It will be my purpose to ask for consideration of the bill, which I do not think will take much time of the Senate, at some suitable and opportune moment. The bill is to amend title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, by giving insurance benefits under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance provisions of that act to survivors of veterans of World War II, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

CLARA E. WASHINGTON

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 189, which authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Senate to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Clara E. Washington, widow of Cosby F. Washington, late an employee of the Senate restaurant, a sum equal to 6 months' basic compensation, and I request its immediate consideration.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, there is so much confusion in the Chamber it is difficult to hear the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. The resolution is simply to pay the widow of a deceased Senate restaurant employee a sum equal to 6 months of his basic compensation.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 189) submitted by Mr. RADCLIFFE on November 9, 1945, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Clara E. Washington, widow of Cosby F. Washington, late an employee of the Senate Restaurant, a sum equal to 6 months' basic compensation at the rate he was receiving from such restaurant at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

(Mr. GEORGE introduced Senate bill S. 2320, to amend the Public Health Service Act in regard to certain matters of personnel and administration, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2321. A bill to amend section 3469 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, so as to exempt from the tax imposed by such section the transportation of persons by certain aircraft not operated on established routes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HART (by request):

S. 2322. A bill for the relief of Archer F. Hallett, of New Haven, Conn., as administrator of the estate of Kenneth M. Hallett, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TUNNELL (for himself, Mr. WALSH, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. GUFFEY, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. BRIGGS):

S. 2323. A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers for veterans in a free competitive economy; to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT RELATING TO PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill, the purpose of which is to amend the Public Health Service Act in certain respects. I present with the bill an accompanying letter from the Federal Security Agency which goes into rather full explanation of the bill. I ask that the bill, together with the letter, be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point, and that the bill may be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2320) to amend the Public Health Service Act in regard to certain matters of personnel and administration, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GEORGE, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A) is amended by inserting immediately before the word "and" at the end of paragraph (j) the words "isonipecaine and its derivatives, compounds, salts, and preparations."

SEC. 2. (a) The title of section 207 of such act is amended to read "Assignments to Certain Positions."

(b) Subsection (a) of such section is amended to read:

"(a) When necessary for the accomplishment of important temporary work the Administrator may establish special temporary positions in the Service at the grade of Assistant Surgeon General. Not more than three such positions shall exist at any one time. Any officer of the Regular or Reserve Corps in the full grade or above may be assigned to any such position by the Surgeon General, and while so assigned such officer shall have the grade of Assistant Surgeon General and shall receive the pay and allowance applicable to such grade."

(c) Such section is further amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection

(c), by amending the second sentence of such subsection to read "Such assignments shall not, except as provided in subsection (b), affect the pay of commissioned officers so assigned.", and by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) Any commissioned officer below the grade of director who is assigned to serve as chief of a division shall, for the duration of such assignment, have the grade of director and receive the pay and allowances applicable to such grade. Regulations of the President may prescribe the grades which shall be applicable to other specified positions; and any commissioned officer of a lower grade assigned or detailed to any such position shall, for the duration of such assignment or detail, have the grade so prescribed and receive the pay and allowances applicable to such grade."

SEC. 3. (a) The second sentence of paragraph (2) of section 208 (a) of such act is amended to read "Reserve commissions shall be for a period of not more than 5 years and may be terminated at any time, as the President may direct."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 208 of such act is amended to read:

"(b) Not more than 10 percent of the original appointments to the Regular Corps authorized to be made during any fiscal year may be made at grades above that of senior assistant but no such appointment may be made to a grade above that of director. For the purpose of this subsection the number of original appointments authorized to be made during a fiscal year shall be (1) the excess of the number of officers of the Regular Corps authorized by the appropriation act or acts for such year over the number of officers on active duty in the Regular Corps on the first day of such year, plus (2) the number of such officers, who during such fiscal year, have been or will be retired upon attainment of age 64 or have for any other reason ceased to be on active duty. In determining the number of appointments authorized by this subsection an appointment shall be deemed to be made in the fiscal year in which the nomination is transmitted by the President to the Senate. No person shall be appointed pursuant to this subsection unless he meets standards established in accordance with regulations of the President. For purposes of pay and pay period, any person appointed under the provisions of this subsection shall be considered as having had on the date of appointment service equal to that of the junior officer of the grade to which appointed, except that, if the active commissioned service in the service of any officer so appointed to the full grade exceeds that of the junior officer of such grade, such service (not exceeding 14 years) shall be credited for purposes of pay and pay period."

(c) Section 208 of such act is further amended by redesignating subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) thereof as subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g), respectively; by changing "subsection (c)" to "subsection (d)" and changing "subsection (d)" to subsection (e)" in the subsection hereby designated as subsection (f); and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) Commissions evidencing the appointment by the President of officers of the Regular or Reserve Corps shall be issued by the Administrator, under the seal of the Federal Security Agency."

(d) Section 208 of the Public Health Service Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Except as may be required by regulations, renewal of the oath of office shall not be required of an officer of the Regular Corps on account of any change in grade, or of an officer on active duty in the Reserve Corps on account of appointment to the Regular Corps or to a different grade in the Reserve Corps, if the period of active service of such officer has been continuous."

SEC. 4. Subsection (h) of section 209 of such act is amended by striking out "section 208 (d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 208 (e)."

SEC. 5. Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 210 of such act is amended by changing the comma after the word "appointment" to a semicolon and striking out the rest of such paragraph.

SEC. 6. (a) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 211 of such act is amended to read "A commissioned officer shall be retired on the first day of the month following the month in which he attains the age of 64 years; and a commissioned officer shall be retired on the first day of a month if he has attained the age of 60 years, has completed 30 years of active service in the Service, and has filed application for retirement."

(b) Subsection (d) of section 211 of such act is amended by changing the words "for age" to "under the provisions of subsection (b)."

(c) Section 211 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) Retired pay pursuant to subsection (a), subsection (b), or subsection (e) shall be terminated if the officer receiving such pay is recalled to active duty, or in the case of an officer of the Reserve Corps, if he is found to have recovered from his disability. Such pay shall be suspended for any period during which an officer fails without good cause to comply with a request by the Surgeon General that he submit to a medical examination, and shall be terminated if such failure continues for 6 months."

SEC. 7. Section 212 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(e) In the case of an officer who is or hereafter becomes entitled to full military benefits, the definition in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall be interpreted as of the effective date of this subsection or as of the date when such officer ceased to be on active duty, whichever date is earlier. The exclusion from full military benefits in such paragraph of the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 shall not be applicable to any such officer if he is separated from the commissioned corps of the service or is relieved from active duty therein within 3 years after the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President."

SEC. 3. Title II of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"TRAINING OF OFFICERS

"SEC. 218. (a) Appropriations available for the pay and allowances of commissioned officers of the Service shall also be available, subject to the limitations prescribed in such appropriations, for payment of tuition, fees, and other necessary expenses incident to attendance at any educational institution by any commissioned officer of the Regular Corps while on active duty.

"(b) Any officer whose tuition and fees while attending an educational institution are paid pursuant to subsection (a) shall be required to reimburse the Service for the expenditures so made if he voluntarily leaves the Service within 2 years after the cessation of such attendance."

SEC. 9. Title III of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART H—EDUCATIONAL GRANTS

"APPROPRIATION FOR GRANTS FOR OPERATION OF SCHOOLS

"SEC. 371. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year a sum sufficient to enable the Surgeon General, through grants to postgraduate schools of public health, to assist in improving the training available in the field of public health and in increasing the number of individuals adequately trained in such field. Grants from funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be used by the schools for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of teaching staffs and the maintenance and operation of facilities (including the acquisition of equipment), and for scholarships (including maintenance) for persons contemplating work in the field of public health.

"APPROPRIATION FOR GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION

"SEC. 372. There are also authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as may be necessary to enable the Surgeon General to make grants for the construction of buildings and other facilities necessary to carry out the purposes of section 371. In recommending estimates of appropriations under this section for any fiscal year, the Surgeon General shall set forth the order and sequence of priority for individual building projects in accordance with their estimated importance or value in carrying out the purposes of section 371; but he shall set forth only such projects as are approved by the National Advisory Health Council. In the Budget the President shall set forth an estimate of expenditures and appropriations for such projects both in summary and by individual projects.

"METHOD OF MAKING GRANTS

"SEC. 373. For each fiscal year the Surgeon General shall determine the total sum from the appropriation under section 371 which shall be available for distribution among postgraduate schools of public health upon the basis of enrollment. The remainder of such appropriation shall be distributed equally among such schools. The Surgeon General, in accordance with regulations, shall determine from time to time the amount to which each school is entitled under this section, and shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts so determined. He shall also, from time to time, certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts to which a school may be entitled from appropriations under section 372. Upon receipt of any such certification, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay in accordance with such certification.

"CONDITIONS FOR GRANTS

"SEC. 374. Grants under this part shall be made upon such conditions as may be prescribed in regulations; and may be made only to such postgraduate schools of public health as are accredited by a body or bodies approved by the Surgeon General.

"USE OF GRANT MONEY

"SEC. 375. Any money paid to a school under this part shall be used solely in carrying out the purposes specified in section 371 or section 372, as the case may be, and any money so paid which is not so used shall be repaid to the United States and deposited in the Treasury."

SEC. 10. Section 402 of such act is amended by changing the period at the end of paragraph (g) thereof to a semicolon and adding the following new paragraph:

"(h) in accordance with regulations, make grants in aid to public and other nonprofit universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other institutions for the establishment and maintenance of facilities for training persons in matters relating to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of cancer and for the conduct of cancer research, including the construction and acquisition of buildings and equipment necessary for such facilities."

The letter presented by Mr. GEORGE, from the Federal Security Agency, in explanation of the bill, is as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, June 3, 1946.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President of the Senate pro tempore,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am enclosing for your consideration a legislative proposal to amend the Public Health Service Act in regard to certain matters of personnel and administration.

The Public Health Service Act (Public Law 410, 78th Cong., 42 U. S. C., ch. 6A) was enacted July 1, 1944, for the purpose of consolidating and revising the laws relating to the Public Health Service. The constructive effects of this legislation upon the administration of the greatly diversified programs of the Public Health Service have been almost incalculable. Yet, despite the extreme care and exhaustive study that went into the drafting of the act, it was impossible then to foresee clearly all of the problems, requiring amendment of that act for solution, which might and did arise. Most of these problems, though arising in connection with the Service's several efforts to regain and restore the losses suffered by civilian health programs as a result of the war, actually resolve themselves chiefly into the one basic problem of personnel.

The Government's policy throughout the war of sacrificing its long-range permanent interests in the Nation's scientific and technical potential for the sake of and in the name of more immediate war needs, however necessary it may have been, is beginning already to reflect itself in a technical labor market more highly competitive than at any time in the Nation's history. This is particularly true in the field of medicine, where throughout the war the Nation's entire educational machinery was geared to the mass production of physicians with the barest minimum of educational requirements and where the vast proportion of research facilities hitherto devoted to the country's fundamental health problems were diverted to the more restricted, but then more impelling, problems of war medicine. The net effect of this policy has been to create a medical generation which, unless aggressive corrective measures are taken, will fail the Nation in the discharge of those obligations which are essential to further health progress.

The Public Health Service will be shortsighted indeed if it fails to take into account the many implications of its expanding obligations in both national and international fields upon its own personnel policy; or if it postpones longer some definitive action looking toward the training of personnel needed in order to make any real progress on such problems as cancer, mental illness, and dental disease.

It is primarily for these broad purposes that this bill to amend the Public Health Service Act is proposed. Some of the amendments proposed in the bill seek to accomplish these purposes by directing their attack toward the inflexible and inadequate existing provisions relating to the appointment of commissioned officers of the Service. Other amendments proposed by the bill seek to accomplish these purposes by directing their attack toward the problem of training personnel.

The amended section 208 (b) seeks to aid the Service in obtaining sufficient qualified officers to carry on its activities by permitting greater flexibility in the number of original appointments authorized annually at a grade above that of the senior assistant grade.

The new section 218 and the new part H of title III of the Public Health Service Act deal with problems of training and education. The new section 218 would authorize the Service to assign a small number of the commissioned officers in the regular corps to educational institutions where training necessary to keep them abreast of advances in medical science is more readily available. The new part H of title III would clarify the procedure under which postgraduate schools of public health receive financial aid from the Federal Government. In order to assure an adequate supply of personnel well trained in the field of public health, the Service would be authorized to make grants directly to postgraduate schools of public health—schools of which there are now only a few, on which the entire country must depend for its supply of formally trained public health personnel, and which will be unable without financial assistance to train adequately a sufficient number of such personnel.

In addition to the amendments designed to accomplish the broad purposes described above, the bill would effect a number of minor, though important, modifications and corrections in the Public Health Service Act.

Section 1 of the enclosed draft amends section 2 (j) of the Public Health Service Act, which defines the term "habit-forming narcotic drug," so as to include isonipecaine (trade name, "demerol"). This is purely a technical amendment, there being no longer any doubt that isonipecaine is a habit-forming drug which should come within the purview of section 302 of the Public Health Service Act. Similar amendments have already been made in the tariff laws and other laws dealing with narcotics (Public Law 414, 78th Cong.).

The very nature of the work of the Public Health Service, and especially the peculiar character of the cooperative administrative relationships it maintains with other Federal agencies, not infrequently create obligations of unusual difficulty and complexity which, though of temporary duration, require the detail and assignment of Service personnel of unusual competence. There will be repeated instances in the future, as there have been in the past, where the importance of such temporary projects will clearly justify for the incumbent the temporary grade of Assistant Surgeon General. Section 2 (b) of the enclosed draft amends section 207 (a) of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide the degree of flexibility considered essential in this regard by authorizing the Administrator rather than the President to establish temporary positions necessary for important temporary work and by not restricting this authority to time of war or emergency, as is done under existing law. It contains, however, sufficient safeguards, through continuing at three the existing limitation on the number of such special positions which may exist at any one time and through restricting the eligible appointees to commissioned officers in the full grade or above, to ensure that appointments made under this authority will be kept well within the limits of propriety. Other provisions of the existing section 207 (a), relating to the creation of other special temporary positions and assignment of commissioned officers to them, are omitted here because that matter will now be more conveniently covered under the other provisions of the section as amended by section 2 (c) of the enclosed draft.

The new section 207 (b), included in section 2 (c) of the draft, continues the existing entitlement of commissioned officers, assigned to serve as chiefs of divisions, to the grade of director while so assigned. It also continues the President's authority to prescribe grades for specified positions as well as the provision entitling officers to such grades while assigned to such positions. The President's authority, however, will be exercised through regulations and will no longer be restricted to positions of a temporary nature; nor will the exercise of such authority be restricted to time of war or emergency.

Section 2 (c) of the draft also makes some changes in the present subsection (b) of section 207, which is to be redesignated as subsection (c), but these are purely technical changes necessitated by other changes in the section. Section 2 (a) of the draft merely changes the title of section 207 of the Public Health Service Act to make it a more accurate indication of the content of the section as amended by the enclosed draft.

Section 3 (a) of the draft amends section 208 (a) (2) of the Public Health Service Act. It is a technical amendment designed solely to clarify and simplify administrative procedure. The Public Health Service Act at present provides for termination of all Reserve Corps commissions in the discretion of the President. The amendment here proposed would authorize the President to direct that actual termination be made by an appropriate official of the Federal Security Agency or in such other manner as he may think appropriate.

Section 3 (b) of the draft amends section 208 (b) of the Public Health Service Act so as to enable the President during each fiscal year to make initial appointments to the Regular Corps of officers in grades above that of senior assistant (equivalent to captain in the Army) in numbers not to exceed ten percent of the total number of appointments authorized to be made for such year. Under present authority, which has existed since 1930, only three such appointments are permissible during any one year. In 1930 and for a considerable time thereafter the total new appointments made annually approximated only about 30 or 35 so that the 3 positions at higher grades then provided for bore substantially the same ratio to the total appointments as that now being sought through this amendment. With both the scope and volume of its work materially increasing the Public Health Service finds it quite impossible under existing limitations to recruit at the grade of senior assistant or below the number of new personnel needed who have already attained the necessary competence in the several specialized fields. The alternative in the past has been an increasing dilution of the more mature and experienced talent of the Service through spreading the limited numbers of such personnel over an increasing range of activities and then filling in with younger and less well trained people. The amendment proposed by section 3 (b) of the enclosed draft would help the Service to overcome the unfortunate results of this dilution of its more experienced and mature personnel. It contains, however, sufficient safeguards assuring appointment of qualified personnel by requiring appointees to meet standards established in accordance with regulations of the President.

Section 3 (c) of the enclosed draft amends section 208 of the Public Health Service Act by inserting a new subsection (c). This new subsection would authorize the Administrator to issue, under the seal of the Federal Security Agency, commissions evidencing the appointment of officers in the Regular or Reserve Corps by the President. This is similar to authority already given under existing law to other agencies of the Government to which commissioned officers may be appointed (see, e. g., the act of March 3, 1875, as amended, 5 U. S. C. 11). It is also authority which the Secretary of the Treasury exercised when the Public Health Service was in his department.

Section 3 (d) of the enclosed draft further amends section 208 of the Public Health Service Act by adding another new subsection (subsec. (h)) under which commissioned officers on continuous and uninterrupted active duty would not ordinarily

be required to renew their oaths of office upon change of grade. Renewal of the oath of office in such cases seems an unnecessary administrative burden. Existing law already exempts Army officers from such a requirement. This amendment makes unnecessary the provision in section 210 (a) (1) of the Public Health Service Act eliminating the requirement of renewal of oath of office in case of temporary wartime promotions. Section 5 of the enclosed draft amends that section of the act accordingly.

Section 4 is merely a technical drafting amendment necessitated by the redesignation, in section 3 (c) of the draft, of the various subsections in section 208 of the Public Health Service Act.

Section 6 (a) of the draft amends the first sentence of section 211 (b) of the Public Health Service Act. It would add to the existing compulsory retirement of commissioned officers of the Regular Corps at age 64 an optional retirement at the age of 60 years, provided they have completed 30 years of active service. This provision is in keeping with the general trend toward earlier retirement throughout both government and industry, although it is less liberal than existing provisions for the other commissioned services.

Section 6 (b) of the draft is merely a technical drafting amendment required by reason of the amendment proposed in section 6 (a).

Section 6 (c) of the draft further amends section 211 of the Public Health Service Act by the addition of a new subsection. This amendment is also of a technical nature designed merely to clarify existing authority in respect to retired pay of officers. At the present time the Service is somewhat doubtful as to the consequences of a Reserve officer's recovery from a disability for which he has been retired and for which he is receiving retired pay. The proposed new subsection would remove these doubts by providing for termination of the retired pay in case of recovery. It would also prescribe suspension of a retired officer's pay for refusal to submit without good cause to a medical examination, and for termination of the pay if the failure to submit to the medical examination continues for 6 months.

Section 7 of the enclosed draft further amends section 212 of the Public Health Service Act by the addition of a new subsection (subsec. (e)). Under the present section 212, commissioned officers of the Service are entitled, with respect to their service on detail to the Army, Navy, or Coast Guard, their service outside of the continental United States in time of war, and active service while the Public Health Service is a part of the armed forces, to the same benefits as were provided on account of active commissioned Army service on July 1, 1944, the date of enactment of the Public Health Service Act. However, there were excluded from the benefits those which are provided for specifically elsewhere in the Public Health Service Act, as well as reemployment rights for Regular officers and Reserve officers called to active duty prior to November 11, 1943. Also excluded are the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944.

The amended section 212 would remove the differences between the Service and other branches of the armed forces in regard to military benefits by speaking as of the date of enactment of the enclosed draft for all officers of the Service who are on active duty on that date. For any officer not on active duty then, but who is entitled to full military benefits by reason of service while the Public Health Service is a part of the military forces or otherwise, the amended section would speak as of the date when his service ceased. The new subsection (e) would also eliminate the exclusion of mustering-out pay from the benefits available to officers entitled to full military benefits. This would seem a logical complement of the extension of full military benefits to all benefits provided for Army service as of the time of enactment of the enclosed draft. Since the Service has been made a part of the military forces of the United States under Executive Order No. 9575 (June 21, 1945, effective July 29, 1945), it seems reasonable that all benefits appertaining to military status should be made available to officers of the Public Health Service as well as to the other commissioned services.

Section 8 of the draft would add a new section to title II of the Public Health Service Act. The new section 218 would authorize the Service to provide, subject to any limitations contained, the appropriations for the pay and allowances of commissioned officers, training for commissioned officers of the Regular Corps through payment of their tuition, fees, and other expenses while attending educational institutions. In public health, as in the sciences generally, progress is a function of an almost continuous process of learning. The Service in order to discharge its functions effectively must keep abreast of the several sciences upon which its work rests.

The field of these sciences, however, is much too large to be encompassed completely by any single organization. Discoveries, new knowledge, and new techniques originate from the widest variety of sources. Accordingly, it is essential that the Service be able to take advantage of such new knowledge by keeping is own officers adequately informed not alone through in-service training, but also through sending them to the institutions where such knowledge can most readily be imparted to them.

Section 9 of the draft, which adds a new part to title III of the Public Health Service Act, is essentially a technical amendment designed to give to the Service explicit authority which has in the past been assumed to exist under the provisions of section 314 of the Public Health Service Act. Under the existing provisions the Public Health Service has in the past given money to the States for use in public health work, and part of these funds has been used to assist accredited schools of public health in providing facilities for training public health personnel for use throughout the country. On these the entire country must depend for its formally trained public health personnel.

It has been the experience of these schools that to provide one academic year of training for a postgraduate student it costs the school approximately $1,000 over and above any revenues it derives from the individual student. Some of these schools are State-owned. Others are supported through endowments. In neither case are the budgets available to them adequate to satisfy the large backlog of need for trained personnel that has accumulated during the war. Moreover, the State institutions quite properly point out the inequity of having a single State bear the extra expense of training personnel admitted from other States. Since almost 100 percent of the students of these schools go ino public service, the desirability of giving them the much needed assistance is unquestionable. The new part H of title III of the Public Health Service Act attempts not only to provide a reasonable formula for making alloments in the program as here expanded, but also to include the safeguards that are considered desirable in relation to grants for construction for carrying out this program of training. It is anticipated that the construction grants will never be large. There will, however, be instances when a small amount of aid for renovation or expansion of physical facilities will provide returns in education all out of proportion to the amounts expended.

Section 10 of the enclosed draft, which amends section 402 of the Public Health Service Act by the addition of a new subsection, is designed to aid the Public Health Service to carry out one of the stated purposes of title IV of the act, viz, "to provide training and instruction in technical matters relating to the diagnosis and treatment of cancer" (section 402 (c) of Public Law 410). Some of the needed training in cancer work can be provided through fellowships pursuant to section 402 (d). If, however, the training program is to be developed in any reasonable relation to the enormity of the need for adequately trained personnel, training facilities must be vastly expanded. At the moment they are extremely limited. All too often the highly developed pedagogical facilities have access to only a limited amount of clinical material; and even more often only limited teaching facilities exist in institutions where clinical material is abundant. To bring the many and varied needed skills and equipment together and at the same time provide care for a sufficient number of patients to serve educational and training purposes is usually beyond the financial competence of any but the exceptional institution. The proposed amendment would help remedy this unfortunate situation.

I shall appreciate it if you will be good enough to refer the enclosed draft bill to the proper committee for action.

The Bureau of the Budget raised some objections to this draft bill in its original form when submitted to that Bureau for advice as to its relationship to the program of the President. The enclosed draft bill has been revised in the light of those objections.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE COLLINS,
Acting Administrator.

PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAYBANK (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 6407) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WHERRY (for himself and Mr. BUTLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MOORE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT 1211 RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT AND CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. McMAHON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 282), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That there be printed 4,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 1211, cur-

rent session, accompanying the bill (S. 1717) for the development and control of atomic energy, of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy, 1,000 for the Senate document room, and 1,000 for the House document room.

PRINTING COMPILATION OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940 WITH AMENDMENTS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a recent compilation of the Nationality Act of 1940, with amendments through March 31, 1946, may be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS, OF UTAH, AT MEETING OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at a rally honoring visiting Soviet journalists under the auspices of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, New York City, May 29, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH AT GALLAUDET COLLEGE

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a commencement address delivered by him at the graduation exercises of Gallaudet College, Washington, D. C., June 1, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH BEFORE MIZARCHI ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Mizarchi Zionist Organization of America at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, June 2, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH ON THE DRAFT BILL

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on the subject of the draft bill, on June 8, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT MAKES A SENATOR—ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "What Makes a Senator?" by Richard L. Neuberger, published in the Wisconsin Progressive of the June 1946 issue, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE OPA AND ITS PROBLEMS

[Mr. HICKENLOOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the OPA and its problems delivered by Chester Bowles, broadcast on June 4 over the Columbia Broadcasting System, and also addresses by Senator TAFT, Senator HICKENLOOPER, and Senator WHERRY on the same subject broadcast on June 6, 1946, over the same network, which appear in the Appendix.]

OPA RESTAURANT REGULATIONS

[Mr. HICKENLOOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Bernard L. Willis of Lake City, Iowa, dealing with OPA regulations of restaurants and stores, together with application for price adjustment of Palmer's Coffee Shop, at Lake City, Iowa, and a newspaper item relating to OPA settlements, which appear in the Appendix.]

HOUSING AND ACCOMMODATION OF VETERANS AT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

[Mr. HICKENLOOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him under date of June 5, 1946, by Virgil M. Hancher, together with answers to questionnaires by the National Association of State Universities, dealing with the subject of the housing and accommodations at educational institutions, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPEECH BY EDGAR CAMPBELL BEFORE LANCASTER COUNTY INDUSTRIAL UNION COUNCIL

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by Edgar Campbell, candidate for Congress, Ninth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, before the Lancaster County Industrial Union Council, on May 23, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY GEORGE CUSHING

[Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Memorial Day address delivered at Brighton, Mich., on May 30, 1946, by George Cushing, news editor of Station WJR of Detroit, Mich., which appears in the Appendix.]

VINSON BACKS CONGRESS ON LAW—ARTICLE BY JOHN H. CLINE

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Vinson Backs Congress on Law," by John H. Cline, published in the Washington Star of June 9, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNJUST CRITICISM STRIKES AT CONFIDENCE IN CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY REPRESENTATIVE CLARENCE CANNON

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Unjust Criticism Strikes at Confidence in Congress," by Representative CLARENCE CANNON, chairman, House Appropriations Committee, published in the Washington Star of June 9, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOR A MODERN CONGRESS—EDITORIAL IN THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "For a Modern Congress," published in the Washington Post of June 10, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LAND-GRANT COLLEGE; A NEW CHAPTER—ADDRESS BY DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a commencement address entitled "The Land-Grant College: A New Chapter," delivered by David E. Lilienthal, Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority, at Utah Agricultural College, Logan, Utah, June 8, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

KEEP ON KEEPING ON—POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem by Horace C. Carlisle, entitled "Keep On Keeping On," which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 6343. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to lend certain property of the War Department to national veterans' organizations for use at State and national conventions; and

H. J. Res. 347. Joint resolution to correct a technical error in the act approved April 18, 1946 (Public Law 347, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session).

ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2177) to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. McCLELLAN obtained the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to state that it is my hope we can continue consideration of the pending bill today, and if necessary have a session into the evening.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to state that I join in the suggestion of the Senator from Wisconsin. I had thought we might undertake to consider the price-control bill sometime today, but I think the Senate ought to be given an opportunity to vote one way or another on the pending bill. I would not care to begin the consideration of the OPA legislation in the middle of the afternoon. Therefore, I think the Senate should devote the whole day, and if necessary go into the evening, in an effort to obtain a vote on the pending measure. I think the Senate is entitled to vote on the bill one way or another. If the Senate does not wish to adopt the bill it can vote against it, but, after all the work which has been done by the joint committee and the special committee, we ought to bring the matter to a conclusion. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, there will be no effort to bring up any other kind of legislation today.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, when the Senate recessed Saturday afternoon, I was discussing an amendment which I had offered to strike out subsection (a) of section 243 of the pending bill. That part of the measure to which I seriously object and to which the amendment is directed, provides that pages for the Senate and House of Representatives shall be appointed by the Director of Congressional Personnel from among boys who live at home with their parent or parents or guardian, or in orphanages in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia. I might have moved merely to strike out the words "in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia," if my only purpose were to protect boys from the States who might want to become pages; but I moved to strike out the entire subsection, because it provides that all the pages shall be appointed by the Director of Congressional Personnel.

Mr. President, I do not favor the creation of an office of Personnel Director for the Congress of the United States. The

theory is that if we will establish a Personnel Director to select all our employees for us, Members of Congress will be relieved of some work. From my experience I do not believe that that would be true. It would probably increase our work, instead of relieving us of any burden we now have. If we enact this law and create the position of Director of Congressional Personnel, delegating to him all the power contemplated by the bill, that will not keep our constituents from coming to us and seeking positions in Washington, or asking us to assist them in finding employment. They will not go directly to the Director of Personnel, even if the office is created. They will go first to the office of their Senator or Representative. They will ask us for the positions, just as they have always done.

We are trying to say to them, "We no longer have authority over that subject. We have established a Director of Congressional Personnel, and you must file your application with him. He will determine whether you are qualified or not. If he likes you and thinks you are qualified, and you meet the standards which he has established, probably he will give you the job."

That will not satisfy our constituents. That will not satisfy the boy who wants a position in Washington. The next thing he will say will be, "I want you to help me with the Director of Personnel. I want your endorsement. I want you to help me get this job." Today certain positions are allocated to Members of Congress. We know what they are. If application is made to us for one of them and the position is filled we can say so. If it is not filled, we can consider whether to recommend the applicant or give him the position. It is proposed to tie our hands so far as concerns our authority and our willingness to take the responsibility for doing a simple thing, namely, helping some boy or some man who wants an opportunity to work in Washington. It is sought to shift that responsibility. Instead of relieving ourselves of work we shall be stripping ourselves of authority. The appeal will still be made to us. It is proposed to establish another agency or bureau with a director to whom we must go and beg for the very thing we can do now; and he will be able to say, "No."

I do not think the time has come when as a Member of the Senate I ought to have to ask a personnel director whether I can put a boy in the position of elevator operator. I do not believe that the efficiency of our pages has broken down to such an extent that we must have one man to tell us whether a page boy is doing his duty, or whether he ought to be replaced, or whether some applicant ought to be favored with the appointment.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is speaking of the pages. If this bill should become a law, could the Senator from Arkansas or any other Senator appoint a page boy in the Senate from his State?

Mr. McCLELLAN. So far as I know, at present there are no pages from my State; but if I should receive an application—and I anticipate that I shall, because some fathers and mothers have already talked with me about their boys, who would like to have the opportunity to come to Washington as pages—I would not want to deny the boys of my State that opportunity. I do not want to shirk the responsibility of helping a boy to obtain such a position. I will not vote for a bill to establish a personnel director to tell me that a worthy boy from my State cannot have the position if it is available. Other Senators may shift that responsibility if they so desire. They may set up a dictator if they wish to do so. We have enough of that already. In the departments in Washington the chiefs have the authority to employ their own personnel. If an applicant from my State or from the Senator's State desires a position in one of the departments, and we try to help him obtain it, we must write letters or go to the department and plead with some department official, and worry about it.

This provision would take away from us the one thing that is left to us. It would even apply to pages in the United States Senate. Mr. President, if a Senator is not competent to judge the qualifications of a page in the United States Senate, I question his ability to judge and weigh and vote intelligently upon the legislation and the problems facing this country.

It is said that the proposed system would relieve us of work. It would not relieve us of anything except the opportunity to take care of boys from our own States who may be deserving. Someone may say, "Surely the Personnel Director will take that into account." If this section remains in the bill he cannot take it into account unless the boy lives in Washington. I do not know why we must say that page boys must come from the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia. It does not make sense to me. I do not know from what States these boys come; but according to the information which I have obtained from the Secretary of the Senate, only 5 of the 21 are legal residents of the District of Columbia. With respect to the other 16, the parents of some now live in Washington. The parents of others do not. If this bill is enacted, the 8 or 10 boys who are now serving as pages, and whose parents do not live in Washington, or who do not have a legal guardian living in the District of Columbia, will no longer be eligible to serve. I do not think it is fair or just to the page boys. There is no justification for such a provision in the selection of page boys in the future.

This section of the bill is only one of many to which I have serious objection. In the first place, as I have indicated, I am opposed to the general idea and theory of a personnel director to handle all the employees who serve us in the Capitol.

I wish to ask a question. I have been here for 3½ years. So far as I know and so far as I have been able to ascertain, there is no inefficiency, comparatively speaking, on the part of any of the employees of the Senate. However, according to the theory of the pending measure, there is a desire to do away with the Disbursing Office, and to turn it over to the Director of Personnel.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I have been in the Senate for approximately 13 years, and I regard Mr. Oco Thompson as one of the most valuable and one of the most efficient officials with whom I have ever been in contact.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator. That has been my estimation and my appraisal of him, too, from my brief acquaintance with him and from the contacts I have had with him.

The point I am making is simply this: I am not saying that the Congress does not need some overhauling and some reorganization; but when we reorganize it, we should do so with a view to eliminating that which now is inefficient and which now is not functioning properly, and we should try to enact legislation which will make such changes as will improve the situation.

But we have before us a bill which provides a catch-all proposition of placing all Senate employees under the control or direction of a man to be selected by the majority and minority leaders of the Senate and the majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives. If one of them makes the selection, that will be all right. But I cannot understand why it is proposed that we burden ourselves with legislation of this character in an effort to undertake to make a change in all of the agencies and all of the departments here which are doing their work efficiently now. I dare say there has been no complaint. Without complaint, in my judgment there can be no justification for the proposed change.

Suppose we pass the bill. My own opinion is that there will be just as much occasion, and probably more, at least on the part of Senators, for complaint after the bill is enacted as there has been in the past. We hear a great deal of condemnation about the so-called patronage system. I have never cared anything about patronage, and I think any Senator or Member of the House of Representatives who undertakes to depend upon patronage for his political security is simply foolish and is making a mistake. I do not think it is of that much benefit or that much value to Members of Congress. I do not wish to retain the right to select pages because of any political advantage which that right of patronage might give. Actually, I do not know that it would give any advantage at all. If a Senator appoints a page, perhaps the page's father and mother may vote for the Senator, if that is what some persons are thinking of, but I do not know that it would extend much further than that.

I do not see why I should deprive myself of the right to participate in the appointment of pages. If some boy from my State wishes to become a page in the Senate—perhaps an orphan boy or perhaps a boy of humble parentage who has no opportunity to go to school, at least to a school of the quality of the school which he would attend as a page of the Senate—I wish to have the right

to help him if I can, not for the purpose of obtaining votes myself, not for any political gain, although that is one of the points which is mentioned in referring to patronage, but I wish to help that boy by giving him an opportunity to obtain a good education, and I wish to see that the boys of my State have a right in that respect equal to that of boys who live in the District of Columbia. I see no reason for placing residents of the District of Columbia in a preferred status. A boy living in the District of Columbia can serve as a page, as the situation is today; but under the terms of the pending bill a boy living in Wisconsin or Iowa or any other State of the Union would be ineligible to serve as a page, unless his parents moved to the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, sometimes we wonder why men with great ability, men who are capable of earning in private life five times as much salary as they are paid as Senators of the United States or Members of the House of Representatives, will dedicate their lives to the service of their country and of their State here in the Senate or in the House of Representatives for the small salary which they are paid—comparatively small, I say, in proportion to the salary which their abilities would entitled them to earn in positions in private life. Mr. President, what is one of the finest compensations of serving in the Senate of the United States or in the House of Representatives? It is not the little check of about $700 which a Member of the Congress receives each month. That is not what keeps him here. It is the opportunity to serve those who need help. One of the finest compensations of service in the Congress, one which I value and cherish most, is the opportunity which service in the Congress affords the Members of Congress to help someone who is struggling to get an education or to meet some of the other problems of life. That is one of the finest compensations of service in the Congress. If that privilege is denied to those who serve here, the opportunity which Members of the Congress now have to be of service to their constituents will, to a great extent, be gone.

Mr. President, I know that a great deal of the time of Members of Congress is consumed, today, by running errands for their constituents. Entirely too much time is consumed in that way. I know that, and I know the pressure and the burden which it places upon us. Some Members of Congress have greater problems in that respect, possibly, than I do; but I know that in view of the great expansion of Government and all its ramifications which reach out into every community and every home in the Nation, our work with respect to looking after the private problems of our constituency has increased to the point that, today, it consumes a major portion of the time of every Member of Congress. That cannot be helped. To whom else can our constituents go? We may reorganize the Congress all we wish, but we shall still have that problem, unless we simply take a position of refusing to come to the assistance of our constituents or a position of refusing to offer our efforts in their behalf when they appeal to us with their problems. I make no criticism of my constituents for appealing to me about the problems they have with various agencies of the Government. To whom else can they appeal? They can write a letter to some bureau or agency in Washington, but the average humble citizen cannot come to Washington and plead his case. Often he needs an advocate at the bar of authority in order to get his claim or his problem properly presented and even in order to get fair and just consideration and to obtain the action necessary to protect his interests. Ofttimes, even in spite of all the efforts we make, we fail in the attempt to help him in that way. The Congress has established various agencies and departments, and probably rightfully so, and the Congress has given them the responsibility and authority which they exercise. Often when Members of Congress present particular problems to them, they say "No"; and yet they have been created with that power by the elected representatives of the people of this country. We have created them in that way. So our constituents appeal to us to help them with the problems which they have with the various agencies or bureaus. I assume there is no other way to proceed, in many cases. Perhaps the Congress does need reorganization in some respects, but that does not mean that the proposed system with reference to the Congress and with reference to the employees who serve us should be adopted. I am not going to place myself in the ridiculous position of saying that I can no longer be the judge of the worthiness of a boy from my State who has the ambition and the desire and probably the necessity, because of his circumstances in life, in connection with his hope to obtain an education, to become a page in the Senate. I am not going to place myself in the position of having to say to him that he cannot serve as a page here unless he can persuade his parents to move to Washington, D. C.

Mr. President, it may sound as though this is a matter of too little importance upon which to spend much time. I do not wish to consume too much time of the Senate, but this bill does not involve only a small matter. I have pointed out one instance in which I believe we have gone far afield in the purpose to reorganize the Congress in order that it may become more efficient in its operation. If, as a Senator, I thought that the conduct of the page boys who have been selected by other Senators had broken down to such an extent that we are no longer capable of judging the qualifications and merits of those boys, and that we needed an expert at a salary of $10,000 a year to promote the efficiency of Congress, I would vote for this section of the bill. However, I do not believe that any Senator, by any force of argument, eloquence, or logic, can establish the fact that the proposed arrangement will improve the efficiency or service of a single page.

I have been pleased, as I have already said, to talk with the parents of two or three boys who desired to come to Washington some day in order to be a page. The parents of those boys wanted them to have an opportunity to obtain first-hand observation and experience with reference to the functions of the Government, and at the same time be enabled to earn a small amount of compensation in order to sustain them while attending school at night and during recesses of the Congress. Mr. President, the boys who wish to come here and those who have come here are boys of the finest character. They are boys with ambition, and they are looking forward to the future. They have high hopes. I do not wish to dash away such hopes in a boy in my State by being required to say to him, in effect, "I do not want to take any steps in helping you. I have attempted to absolve myself from any responsibility with reference to you, and have provided for a personnel director to size you up and determine whether or not you should have the opportunity which you seek." Mr. President, I am not ready, and I am not willing to do that.

As I have already said, referring particularly to title II of the bill, I am opposed to the general philosophy of that title. I believe that what I have said with reference to the page boys holds substantially true with reference to the employees of all the other departments in the Congress. I see no justification whatever for the revolutionary changes which have been proposed. I predict, Mr. President, that if we pass this bill we will take a course which will not only prove embarrassing to us at times in the future, but it will increase and not relieve our present burdens. It will not help me to be a more efficient Senator, or to give more time to my senatorial duties. If the bill is enacted into law I will probably have less time to devote to my duties because I will be eternally after the Personnel Director to place this boy or that boy in some particular position. We know what the situation is at the present time. A fair allocation is made of the various positions in the Congress. When a boy is placed as an operator of an elevator, for example, he knows that he must be sufficiently proficient to operate that elevator and perform what other duties he may have in connection therewith. I dare say that we have no more difficulty now in that respect then we would have under a civil service personnel director, or whatever title we may decide to give to him.

Mr. President, while I am discussing this section of the bill, which ties into other sections of title II, I wish to refer also to some of the other provisions of the bill. I referred briefly to them last Saturday afternoon.

Over the week end I reread the bill and I read substantially the entire report of the committee which reported the bill to the Senate. As I studied the bill I came to the conclusion that, instead of the present title, namely, "A bill to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government," the appropriate title would be, "A bill to increase the cost of the legislative branch of the Government."

I read that part of the report in which an estimate is set forth of the cost of putting the bill into effect. It has been estimated by the committee that the cost will be between $12,000,000 and $13,000,000 a year. That is, of course, an estimate. It may be an accurate estimate, but I am inclined to the view that, instead of the cost being $12,281,235 per annum, according to the committee report, before we have completed the creation of the jobs which it is proposed to create, the cost will probably be approximately $25,000,000 a year. I am willing to agree that if, by spending that much money we could actually produce greater efficiency and afford more time to the Members of Congress to attend to legislative matters, it would probably be well to make the additional expenditure. But, in my judgment, the greatest contribution which could be made toward reorganizing the Congress so as to produce more efficiency in connection with its legislative functioning, would be to reorganize the present committees so that the Senate and the House would have corresponding committees with like jurisdiction in connection with all legislation. That is my idea of reorganizing the Congress of the United States.

I am not undertaking to say that we should have 16 committees or 25 committees in the Senate. I wish to say for the joint committee which studied the matter, that I believe they made a conscientious effort to make some progress in the right direction. I am not critical of what they have done.

I do not say that it could not have been done somewhat better; I do not know as to that; I do not say I could have done it any better; but this to me is the crux of reorganizing Congress: Set up standing committees corresponding in jurisdiction both in the House and the Senate, and then require those committees to meet in joint session for the consideration of legislation. That would expedite the work of the Congress; it would eliminate waste of time on our part and waste of time on the part of the administrative chiefs and employees who are required to come here to testify before committees.

This morning, Mr. President, I left the the Committee on Commerce of the Senate at 11 o'clock when the Senate convened. In that committee today we began hearings on the bill (H. R. 6407) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes. That bill has already passed the House. The House Committee on Flood Control held extensive hearings on the bill. I do not recall just how much time was consumed in the House hearings, but several days, at any rate. This will illustrate what I have in mind and what I have been talking about. Today we are having hearings on the same bill in the Senate Committee on Commerce. The first witness called to testify at the hearings today is the Chief of Army Engineers. He and a part of his staff are there testifying today. What they are actually doing is covering substantially the same ground which was covered possibly less than a month ago, by the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives on the identical measure.

So, Mr. President, much time and duplication of effort would be saved if we would reorganize committees so as to set up substantially the same number of committees of corresponding jurisdiction in the two branches of Congress, and then require joint hearings on legislation of this character. The Senate committee could make its report to the Senate and the House committee make its report to the House; they would not have to make a joint report, but the same report; and the time that would be consumed in the consideration of a given piece of legislation in committee would simply be cut in half, and the time lost, the time consumed by departmental chiefs who have to testify on the bill in the House committee and then come over to the Senate and testify here would be conserved. They would have to spend only 1 day away from their offices and duties, whereas now they are required to spend at least 2 days, and possibly more.

Mr. President, that is what I have had in mind; that is what I was looking forward to when we would consider the reorganization of Congress. There are other things that can be done and should be done, but to me that is basic, it is fundamental. If we are going to make Congress more efficient, if we are going to conserve our time, if we are going to get better coordination and cooperation between the two bodies, if we are going to do these things, Mr. President, then that, in my judgment, is the way to go about it. Further progress might be made from such an approach, but that, in my judgment, is a proper approach to it. While this bill does provide that the committees may hold joint sessions, and it is probably contemplated that some of them will hold such sessions, I know that unless they are directed to do so, it is most unlikely that such joint meetings will occur.

Mr. President, this bill also seeks to meet a lot of our problems by staffing the committees with special experts. I say with respect to that approach to our problem that, no doubt, committees should have some professional assistance, some expert assistance, and I am not opposed to that approach to the reorganization problem; in fact, I favor it; but I cannot conceive of the Appropriations Committee of the United States Senate needing or requiring 44 experts, which, as I understand, is what the pending bill provides for.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Johnson amendment provides that the subcommittee shall be authorized to appoint not more than four. So that now it is entirely in the hands of the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct, and I think to that extent the modification is helpful, but I am talking about the general approach to this problem.

Moreover, I cannot conceive that many of the other committees will need four experts at $8,000 a year to help them with their legislative work. The present committees in the past have gotten along without any experts. They have had a clerk and possibly some other clerical help. I do not say that the help afforded them has been adequate, but I do say, Mr. President, that we are going pretty far when we are granting authority for the Appropriations Committee to hire 44 experts. I know, and we all know, that when we hire experts the experts have to employ secretaries and staffs. I am not attempting to be facetious, but if this reorganization bill is carried out and the increased number of employees contemplated under the measure are hired, together with the other employees necessary to serve them this Capitol will have to be enlarged, or at least office space in the form of a new building will have to be provided very near the grounds to meet the new situation.

While I have not served on the Appropriations Committee, I am of the opinion that four or five experts would be adequate for the full committee, and certainly the subcommittees, in my judgment, would not require more than one expert. There will be so many experts connected with the Appropriations Committee that it will take a room as large as this Chamber or larger to accommodate all of them for a committee session. Take 13 members of the committee, 44 professional experts, and their clerical help and employees, and we would just about have to move out of this Chamber and turn it over to them so that they could have room to function.

I understand, of course, that the Committee on Appropriations does not have to employ 44 experts, but I do know that when the authority is granted the inclination to exercise it becomes stronger and stronger. I believe we could very well restrain ourselves a bit with respect to that number. I believe the number for the other committees for the present, at least, should be reduced to one, or not over two at the outside.

But, Mr. President, we do not stop there; but we go further. We are going so far in employing experts that we are experting the Congress to death. We go on to provide for the legislative reference service. That is all right. We should have that service, but we increase it to the point of providing experts all along the line. Then that not being enough, we provide in paragraph 2 on page 44, that—

> (2) The Librarian of Congress is further authorized—

We keep going on and on and on—

> to appoint in the Legislative Reference Service—

Listen to this: Not only have we those who now are in the Legislative Reference Service to look up statistics for us and give us information, but we go further in connection with the Legislative Reference Service:

> The Librarian of Congress is to appoint senior specialists in the following broad fields—

Let me say that every senior specialist is going to require a staff about him.

They do not do the "leg" work, so to speak. They place themselves in a supervisory capacity, and each of them

will need an assistant or two. They will have to be staffed with clerks and secretaries. That is why I am saying, Mr. President, that the estimated cost of this change as contained in the bill in my judgment is not in agreement with what the cost will ultimately be. We know that once we start these things, Congress will be most reluctant ever to repeal the law. The more employees a Government officer has, the more he wants.

The Library of Congress is to appoint senior specialists in the following broad fields. First, in Agriculture. We have a Department of Agriculture, with all the specialists needed in it, and I do not know just what a senior specialist would do over in the Library of Congress as an agricultural expert. Perhaps there is some job he could fill after we got him staffed, but in my opinion it would mean a duplication of service that is already being performed.

Then the Librarian is to appoint one on the "American Government and public administration." That is broad enough to cover anything. He is to appoint another one on "American public law." I just wonder where we differentiate between the two. It strikes me that a specialist on American government and public administration would also be a specialist on American public law. If he was not, I do not know that he could be very much of a specialist or authority on government and public administration. Where would we differentiate between them? If there is no differentiation between them, if their duties are relatively the same, why have both of them?

There is to be another on "conservation." I do not know what it is thought that will cover. I do not know whether that refers to soil conservation, or conservation of the strength and energies of Senators, just what function a conservation expert would serve, I am unable to understand.

There is to be one on "education." We have a Department of Education, full of experts, I assume. I imagine that if we get the appropriation for this we will find that if sufficient funds are provided the Librarian can hire and pay for many experts.

There is to be another on "engineering and public works." We have agencies for that work.

Mr. President, I may be wrong about it, but I cannot help feeling and believing that instead of a reorganization of Congress, and getting down to the very basis of a problem which really is burdensome to us today, we are simply asked to go far afield, to create more bureaus and more agencies, and establishing more experts, and when we get through with it, we will meet ourselves coming back.

There is to be one on "full employment." We passed what was called a full employment bill, and set up a number of experts to study full employment, and to make recommendations to the President and to the Congress. Now we are asked to do it again, to create another agency in the Library of Congress on full employment.

There is to be another on "housing." We have a housing agency, with experts in it. We are asked to set up another agency of that character in the Library of Congress.

There is to be one on "industrial organization and corporation financing." I do not know what duty that expert will perform. We have the RFC and all sorts of lending agencies, and their staffs. I do not know just what service this expert could perform.

Then there is to be another on "international affairs." We have a State Department, which should be pretty efficient. We have a splendid Foreign Affairs Committee and Foreign Relations Committee in the House and the Senate. Perhaps they need some assistance. We are going to staff them with four professional experts to begin with. Then we are asked to create this position, senior specialist in the Library of Congress, and of course he is going to have a staff to help him to do his work.

We are to have one on international trade. We have the Department of Commerce and various other agencies of the Government attending to that subject.

What we are doing in this bill, Mr. President, I am afraid—and I am not saying this to be critical of the committee—is not reorganizing Congress. We are merely expanding the Government, increasing the cost of Government, duplicating existing work and positions and authority, which will result in increased confusion instead of simplification of the work we have to do.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator apply that test to title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, found on page 56 of the reprint? Does the Senator think there is any expansion of Government contained in that section?

Mr. McCLELLAN. What is the section, and on what page is it found?

Mr. McMAHON. Page 56, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In the copy of the bill I have, page 56 has on it section 306, not section 301. Section 301 is the first section of title III.

Mr. McMAHON. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator asks me whether we are setting up there another agency of Government?

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator complained that the bill expanded Government and really did not provide for reorganization. I wanted to know whether the Senator was excepting from his description of the bill, title III, the Regulation of the Lobbying Act. In other words, has the Senator any objection to that section?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator means do I have objection to the regulation of lobbying?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. No; I have not. If the bill does what I think it does, however, I want to say with respect to it that I do not know how we are to regulate what we call lobbying except by requiring professional lobbyists to register.

Who is a professional lobbyist? I have had in mind to ask the author of the bill some questions about this title. As the bill is drawn now, and as I read the report, I understand it might apply to an organization such as there is in my State known as the economic council, which is devoting its whole purpose to seeking the enactment of legislation to bring about reforms in government, State and Federal, looking toward economy in government. So far as I know, the organization has no other purpose. It is just an organization of volunteers of citizens from all over the State, from all classes of people who are interested in trying to effectuate economy in government.

As I understand, under the bill as it is now written the secretary of that organization could not write me a letter with respect to any pending legislation until and unless he had registered here, and set out the organization he represented, what salary he was paid, who contributed to it, in other words, be placed in the position of a lobbyist. As I read the report on the bill, that is what the bill provides.

Mr. President, I would say to the Senate that I am wondering whether the provisions of the lobbying title of the bill are intended to include such organizations as the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Manufacturers Association, the CIO and the PAC, and the A. F. of L. Just whom do we include in it? Who and what organizations do the provisions of title 3 apply? Frankly, I should like some interpretation of it.

I should like to say, before going further, that I have not been bothered by lobbyists. So far as the Senator from Arkansas is individually concerned he has no complaint to make respecting lobbyists. I think that the professional lobbyists work where they find the field most fertile, and they have not been any problem to me, because I vote my own sentiments, and I am not very much influenced by professional lobbyists. They do not waste their time on me. I want that known. I have no complaint to make about that matter. But I do think it is well to require them to register. If we can do it by this provision in the bill or by some other means we should require that professional lobbyists who operate in Washington continuously be required to register so we will know who they are, so that Members of Congress when sitting in committees will know the lobbyists when they appear before the committees. It is perfectly all right that such lobbyists should register. I do not regard that as expanding any agency of government. I do not think we would set up a new agency for that purpose. The lobbyists would simply file reports and register with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate.

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

Mr. HOEY. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator spoke of the CIO, the PAC, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and other organizations. I want the RECORD to show that personally I should like to have them all come under the provisions

of the bill, together with 500 or more others that ought to come under it also.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I have said, Mr. President, I have no objection to that. I simply want a clarification of the provision. There is one provision which says that it would not apply to those who would come under the Corrupt Practices Act. The PAC may regard itself as a political committee and therefore it would not be required under the provisions of this bill as now drawn to register.

I should like to know another thing about the provision. Does it mean that each one of the representatives of such agencies must register? Does it mean that the personal representatives of such organization must register before they are at liberty to come here to Washington and buttonhole Representatives and Senators and take up their time in their offices with respect to the enactment of any legislation or the defeat of any pending bill? I do not know. I should like to understand the provision better. I am not opposed to the provision, in fact, I favor its general purpose at least to require professional lobbyists to register and to make themselves known, and the interests they represent, and the pay they receive for their services. I am perfectly willing to see that done.

But, Mr. President, I do not want the provision to be so broad as to require that every constituent I have who happens to be identified with some organization must register before he can come up here and confer with me about legislation in which he is interested. For instance, a representative from the Farm Bureau Federation, or the Farmers' Union, or the Grange, may come up to confer with me. I meant to include those three organizations in the remarks I made a few minutes ago. I wonder if the lobbying provision applies to them, and if they would have to register. Would each individual representing the Grange or representing the other farm organizations be compelled to register before he could come to Washington and confer with me?

Mr. President, I should like to know also, after the national representatives of such organizations have registered, whether the State representatives would also have to register. I believe the head of the Farm Bureau is Mr. O'Neal, and Mr. Goss is head of the Grange, and Mr. Patten is head of the Farmers' Union. After they or their assistants have registered, I wonder if it would be necessary for the State president of any one of these organizations to register before he would be at liberty to come to Washington and confer with his Senators or his Representatives respecting legislation in which he is interested? The head of the Farm Bureau Federation in my State, the head of the Farmers' Union in my State, both have come to my office more than once to confer with me about pending legislation. They represent organizations interested in the enactment or the defeat of legislation. They come to see their Senators and their Representatives and talk to them about specific bills which they want defeated or which they want enacted or which they desire to have amended. I wonder if the lobbying title of the bill is broad enough to take in such individuals and require that they place themselves on record as being lobbyists before they can talk to their Senators or their Representatives in respect to legislation in which they are interested.

Mr. President, I have no objection whatever to requiring the registration of professional lobbyists who stay in Washington, who are paid for that purpose, who are here to look after the interests of the organizations they represent and to lobby with Congress or to try to influence Representatives and Senators in the decisions they have to make as to their vote for or against legislation. I have no objection whatever to requiring them to register. It probably would be of some service to the Congress, perhaps it would be of some benefit to the Nation as a whole that the names of such individuals may be made known, that their programs may be known, and that their efforts to wield influence may be known. In other words, the Members of Congress would then have the opportunity to know who such individuals were, whom they represent, and what motivates them in their efforts to influence us with respect to legislation.

But, Mr. President, if I correctly recall, there is in the report upon the bill comment respecting this title which deals with the writing of letters by organizations. I believe that action would be precluded under this bill. I think it is going pretty far to say that unless they are registered, individuals cannot have an organization for a purpose dealing with affairs of government and write letters and send factual information to their Senators and Representatives respecting legislation in which they are interested. I call the Senate's attention to page 27 of the report of the committee. There I find a statement by the committee as to those to whom this lobbying title will apply. After mentioning a number to whom it does not apply, the report states:

> On the other hand the title applies chiefly to three distinct classes of so-called lobbyists:
>
> First, those who do not visit the Capitol but initiate propaganda from all over the country in the form of letters and telegrams, many of which have been based entirely upon misinformation as to facts. This class of persons and organizations will be required until the title, not to cease or curtail their activities in any respect, but merely to disclose the sources of their collections and the methods in which they are disbursed.

The provision may have a wholesome purpose. I do not know whether it can be restricted to that one purpose. One of the purposes is to try to reach those who spend large sums of money for broadcasting, buying radio time, or sending out literature which usually winds up with the request, "Be sure to write your Congressman or Senator to oppose H. R. ——," or to support a certain Senate bill. There is a great deal of such activity. I doubt if there is any Senator who cannot sense the propaganda and pressure type of mail, even before he opens the envelope. It is not difficult. I know the people of my State well enough so that when I receive a letter I can usually tell from the opening sentences whether the letter was inspired by the head of some organization, or by some of the propaganda which is continually being sent out over the channels of the air by commentators and others who spend a great deal of their time criticizing the Congress and trying to bring it into disrepute. They are agitators who think they are smart enough to tell the American people how they should vote in elections, and how Members of Congress should vote. They go even further than that. They are smart enough to tell the President what he ought to do and what he ought not to do.

So I am not very much interested in that class of propaganda. It has no influence on me, and I am not greatly disturbed by it. However, I believe there should be some regulation of the professional propagandists who are always trying to agitate the people and stir them up to write their Senators and Representatives on many subjects. These professional propagandists are motivated purely from a selfish or personal standpoint, or because they are paid for their activity. Does anyone believe that they go on the air in the interest of their country? When they call upon the people to write to their Senators and Representatives, telling them that a certain bill is a vicious measure, they are like criminal lawyers. They are hired, and are serving because they are paid for it. The sooner the people of America realize that, the less influence they will have with their efforts to smear.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does this provision apply to the man who represents a regular organization, such as a farmers' union, an REA cooperative, or something of the kind, but who extends his activities and lobbies in connection with bills which are of no direct interest to his organization? He pretends to say that his organization is for them. Would this bill reach such activity?

Mr. McCLELLAN. In its broader aspects I would say that it would. If the bill does what the report states, it certainly would reach that class of lobbyists.

Mr. CONNALLY. One of the most reprehensible practices is for a man who represents a farm organization, for example, to lobby in connection with something that has nothing to do with farm problems. He pretends that his organization is greatly interested in some legislation with respect to which his organization probably knows nothing. He is simply doing it on his own account, for reasons which I do not care to go into.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate the Senator's contribution. As I stated when I was interrogated about this title of the bill, in my own mind it needs more clarification. I am not sure just what it does. I was reading from the report of the committee. I read a statement with reference to one class which initiates propaganda from all over the country, in the form of letters and telegrams. I receive a great many of such letters and tele-

grams, which are inspired by some outside organization, or by some radio commentator who is trying to tell the Congress how to run the country. He is so smart that he knows all about it, and he ridicules Congress for everything it does and fails to do. If this provision would reach him, it would be all right with me.

But I do not wish to see enacted any so-called antilobbying legislation which would preclude any citizen of my State from getting in touch with me about any legislation, so long as he is confining his efforts to his own representatives in Congress and conferring with them about legislation in which he or the organization which he represents may be interested. I say that he is exercising a constitutional right as a citizen, a right which I do not wish to deny him. I commend the committee for making an effort to reach the evils referred to by incorporating such a provision in the bill.

I believe that the bill, with all its comprehensive objectives and purposes, ought to be broken down into five or six separate bills. The lobbying problem is something with which Congress might well deal. I hope that ultimately a bill can be enacted which will provide some regulation of professional lobbyists. As I stated a while ago, they have not given me any trouble. I am not bothered by them. I am able to sense pretty well the character of the mail which comes to me, and what has inspired it. I am able to separate the wheat from the chaff, throw the chaff into the wastebasket, and give consideration to the letters of my constituents who are actuated by motives of good citizenship, patriotism, and public spirit, and who are sufficiently interested in the affairs of their country to write to me and express their opinions. I always welcome such letters. I give them all the consideration that my time and the pressure of duties will permit.

I do not always agree with my constituents. Often I receive letters from good, conscientious citizens who differ among themselves. Frequently in replying to such letters I tell my constituents that unfortunately I cannot agree with all of them, because they do not always agree among themselves on important issues.

Mr. President, the committee report points out two other classes of lobbyists who are brought within the purview of the bill. I have already referred to the first class. The report continues:

> Second. The second class of lobbyists are those who are employed to come to the Capitol under the false impression that they exert some powerful influence over Members of Congress.

That is one of the things to which I was referring a moment ago. For example, the State president of the CIO in my State was in my office some 2 or 3 months ago, conferring with me about legislation in which he was very much interested and in which his organization was very much interested. I have no doubt that the organization paid his expenses to Washington for the purpose of having him confer with the Arkansas delegation in Congress. I wonder whether under the provisions of the pending measure, in its broad terms, it is intended to require him to register here as a public or professional lobbyist, before he will be privileged to come to Washington and confer with his Senator or his Congressman in regard to pending legislation in which he is interested or in which his organization is interested. I think to impose such a requirement would be going entirely too far. It seems to me that any constituent of mine or any constituent of any other Member of Congress should have the privilege of conferring with his Congressman or his Senator on matters of public importance and interest, without being placed in the category of being a professional lobbyist. I think a distinction should be drawn. So far as I am concerned, as I said earlier in my statement, professional lobbyists do not bother me much; I do not let them take up a great deal of my time.

I read further from the report:

> These individuals spend their time in Washington presumably exerting some mysterious influence with respect to the legislation in which their employers are interested, but carefully conceal from Members of Congress whom they happen to contact the purpose of their presence.

I cannot quite understand that reason for including them. I do not understand how they could lobby very well if they concealed the purpose of their conversation or the purpose of their presence. However that may be, if that provision applies to professional lobbyists and if it will help to expose them to the public and to bring them out into the open and to require them to make a record here of their activities, their collections, and their expenditures, so that it may be a public document and may be known to the country, then I certainly have no objection to such a requirement, and I shall gladly support legislation of that character.

I read further from the report:

> The title in no wise prohibits or curtails their activities. It merely requires that they shall register and disclose the sources and purposes of their employment and the amount of their compensation.

Just as I said a while ago, Mr. President, I should not be willing to pursue that purpose so far as to prevent the president of the Federal Farm Bureau or the president of the CIO or the president of the A. F. of L. or the president of the Farmers Union, or the secretary of the chamber of commerce, or others who fill positions similar to that in my State, from coming to Washington and conferring with their congressional delegation unless they agreed to register and to report as professional lobbyists. I do not think the legislation should go that far. I think there is no need to have it go that far. I think it is probably an abridgement of the civil rights of our citizens and our constituents, when and if the law does go that far.

The report further says:

> Third. There is a third class of entirely honest and respectable representatives of business, professional, and philanthropic organizations who come to Washington openly and frankly to express their views for or against legislation, many of whom serve a useful and perfectly legitimate purpose in expressing the views and interpretations of their employers with respect to legislation which concerns them. They will likewise be required to register and state their compensation and the sources of their employment.

Mr. President, personally I have no objection to requiring them to register, but I think an exception should be written into this measure, or into this title of it, so as to keep it from applying to a citizen who comes within that class, when he contacts the representation of his own State in the Congress. I do not think we have a right to say to any citizen of our State that, as a citizen of the State, he cannot, without becoming a criminal because of violation of this proposed law, contact his Senator or his Representative in Congress and discuss with him legislation in which he or his organization is interested, unless he registers and acknowledges himself to be a lobbyist.

Mr. President, I had not intended to discuss this title of the bill at this time. I wish it clearly understood that I am not by any means condemning the objectives of the title. I think it has a great deal of merit in it. But I should like to see some of these questionable provisions of it modified or amended in such a way as to safeguard the rights of a citizen, whether he represents an organization or whether he comes to Washington in his capacity as an individual, to contact his representatives in Congress at his pleasure and at their convenience. I do not think we should go so far as to abridge that right. I think professional lobbyists—people who are earning their livelihood as lobbyists and who are here in Washington in the performance of that duty or in pursuance of that profession—should be required to register, and I believe that full information should be spread upon the record with regard to their activities—how they are financed, by whom they are paid, and what their expenditures are.

Mr. President, before I was interrogated about the lobbying title of the bill, I was discussing paragraph (2), on page 44 of the bill, and I was referring to the various experts who are to be established as senior specialists in the Library of Congress. I was mentioning the various fields in which such senior specialists would serve, and the last one I mentioned was international affairs. Upon referring to that portion of the bill again, I find that the next field which is mentioned is international trade and economic geography. I do not know what economic geography would involve. Geography is just geography to me. I do not know that there is any economy in it except with reference to the size of the map which may be printed. But I do not know what is meant by international trade and economic geography. Of course, in connection with the field of international trade there are various agencies of the Government which already function, particularly within the Department of Commerce and the Department of State. The Department of State is clothed with authority to negotiate trade agreements. I believe in this bill we are being asked to expand the

Government by creating additional bureaus and agencies, and thereby necessitating an additional expense on the part of Government instead of increasing its efficiency.

There would also be a specialist on price economics. There is much concerning this section of the bill which I do not understand.

There would also be an expert on social welfare. We have a Social Security Administration within our Government at the present time. I do not know what need we would have of a specialist in social welfare.

There would also be a specialist in the field of taxation and fiscal policy. There is already a Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. We are now being asked to provide for an expert, and furnish him with a staff which would deal with the subject of taxation and fiscal policy. What I have already said with reference to standing committees applies in this instance. We have been asked to furnish the Finance Committee with four experts to assist in solving the technical problems associated with tax legislation.

We are also to supply an expert on the subject of transportation and communications. But, Mr. President, we have already taken care of such matters.

We would also supply an expert on the subject of veterans' affairs. Mr. President, what is there about veterans' affairs which cannot be administered by the Veterans' Administration? Under the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress we would furnish an expert on the subject of veterans' affairs. How many veterans would write to that person and inquire with reference to what they must do in order to secure the adjustment of their claims or with reference to other matters of that kind? The only thing which I can see that this expert would do would be to issue a booklet of some kind on the subject, perhaps, on the GI bill of rights. But the Veterans' Administration has already provided information which would be embraced within such a book. Moreover, Mr. President, we have already established various offices throughout the Nation to which the veteran may go and talk directly with some person whom the Government has appointed to give to the veteran the assistance which he requires.

Mr. President, I again emphasize that the bill in its present form merely augments, expands, multiplies, and increases the present number of agencies and bureaus of the Government, all of which would be done at an increased cost and without resulting in any materially increased efficiency.

Mr. President, with reference to the reorganization of committees as proposed in the bill; as I have already said, I am not opposed to the plan which has been proposed. I do not say that it is the best plan which could be offered. Upon further study of it I may have some suggestions to make. I have not served in the Senate as long as some other Members of the Senate have served, and I should prefer to leave final judgment with respect to that phase of the bill to Senators who have been Members of the Senate longer than I have, and who have served on various committees longer than I have served.

So far as I know, the joint committee has done a very good job with respect to the various proposed committees which are dealt with in the bill. It may be that some functions which have been assigned to some of the committees should be assigned to other committees. But I approve of the recommendation in connection with the reduction of the present number of standing committees, and the provision that they shall meet jointly whenever it is possible and feasible to do so in connection with the study of proposed legislation. I approve of the resultant curtailment of the amount of time which it would be necessary for Members of the Congress to consume in connection with legislative matters, and that statement applies also with reference to departmental heads and their staffs. For example, there may be a hearing taking place in the other House in regard to a flood-control bill. Reporters are engaged to report the hearings before the committee, and those hearings are printed. The bill later comes to this body and is referred to a committee. Hearings are again held on the bill, and there is much duplication of work. Mr. President, there is the place to begin to reorganize the Congress.

Mr. President, instead of moving to strike out subsection (a) or section 243 on page 50 of the bill, I should prefer to move to strike out all of title 2, except certain provisions thereunder which may contain much merit. I may say that I believe the Johnson amendment which was agreed to on page 40 of the bill with reference to the manner of selecting experts for the various committees, was a decided improvement of the bill. Certainly, every committee should have the prerogative, jurisdiction, and authority to select its own employees. In carrying out the same philosophy which is contained in the Johnson amendment as adopted by the Senate, I assert that there is no need for the establishment of a personnel director. Every committee, in my judgment, should have the right to employ its own clerical staff and its own experts. The Johnson amendment would allow that to be done. I do not know what the practice has been in the past; I do not know whether it has been the prerogative of the chairman of a committee to select the entire staff of the committee. Perhaps there may be some objection to that practice. If so, it has been corrected by the Johnson amendment. Under the bill now with the Johnson amendment the selection is made by the majority of the committee. The democratic process is invoked, and the majority of the committee selects the members of its staff and discharges them whenever it sees fit to do so. That is the way it should be done. That is why I feel the way I do with reference to the pages in the United States Senate.

I believe that the adoption of this section of the bill might be interpreted throughout the country as meaning that the present system which is pursued in connection with the selection of pages has not proved to be successful, that the pages are not efficient, that there is a need for reorganizing the system which is used in connection with the employment of pages, and that some person should be employed to screen them, and determine finally that they must be residents of the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia or else they will be ineligible to serve.

Mr. President, to one section of this bill I desire to make special reference. It meets with my approval and I want to commend the committee for including it in the bill. I refer to the provision on page 26, section 122. It is in line with what I have been saying with respect to what is needed basically to reorganize the Congress so as to give it greater efficiency. Section 122 provides:

> The standing committees of the two Houses are authorized to hold joint hearings with respect to subject matter within their respective jurisdiction.

I suggest, Mr. President, that after the word "authorized" there should be inserted an amendment reading, "and directed, whenever practicable and feasible, to hold joint hearings with respect to subject matters within their respective jurisdictions."

When I offer that amendment, as I expect to do in the course of these proceedings, I hope it will be agreed to, because it is the very crux of any proposal to reorganize Congress if there is a desire to prevent duplication of effort and the wasteful expenditure of time.

There are other provisions of the bill which I expect to discuss when I offer another amendment which I have had printed and which is lying on the desk.

One of the ways to increase the efficiency of Congress and to conserve its time and to provide for greater economy and for better government, in my judgment, is, after the Congress enacts legislation, to follow through the administration of the legislation by the executive departments of the Government. We need to find some way by prescribing a formula or providing machinery, to obviate the necessity for the creation of special committees. Many special committees could be eliminated. This bill prohibits the creation of any special committees in the future. I do not know that it would be a proper solution of the question or a wise policy to enact a law absolutely prohibiting under any circumstances the creation of a special committee. I do not think, however, the provision relating to special committees has any great significance because all we would have to do would be simply to pass a resolution saying that, notwithstanding any other provision of law, there is hereby created a special committee to do this or to do that. That is all we would have to do to get around that provision of the bill. What I think is needed is to set up a joint committee of the two Houses of Congress, to serve as a continuing committee, a permanent committee, and charge it with the duty and responsibility of making such investigations as the Congress may authorize from time to time, or to investigate on complaints made to it, or to Members of Congress, which the committee feels have such

merit as to warrant an investigation, or to act on its own initiative.

To me the important thing in order to obviate the duplication which now occurs, is to have a standing joint committee to conduct investigations. We have had many instances of a House committee investigating the OPA, for instance, or some other activity of administrative agencies of the Government, and at the same time a special committee of the Senate or a subcommittee of one of the standing committees of the Senate conducting a similar investigation, making an inquiry into the same subject matter and into the same general complaints. That would be obviated, and the Congress could make some progress toward streamlining itself and avoiding the necessity for duplicating overlapping activities on the part of the two Houses, by having one joint committee do that work.

When I offer the amendment which I have sent to the desk, and which is printed and on the desks of Senators, I shall point out the duties and functions, as set forth in the bill and in the report of the committee, which are imposed upon the new Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. By forming the two committees, the House committee and the Senate committee into a joint committee, for the purpose of making the investigations and studies which the pending legislation directs each committee—at least, each Senate committee—to make, this work could be done, if the committee were properly staffed with men competent to assist it, and a better surveillance could be kept over the different administrative and executive agencies of the Government.

Unless that is done, Mr. President, I do not believe that the provisions of the pending bill will solve that problem. I do not have the provision before me at the moment, but under the terms of the bill each standing committee is authorized or required in the future to follow through in the administrative departments of the Government all legislation and laws that come under the committee's jurisdiction, see to it that the laws are properly administered, and to keep informed as to the policies of the department, or branch, or agency, or bureau of the Government that is administering a law which the particular committee may have handled and may have reported. I assume the provision would apply to such laws as may previously have been enacted and which would normally have been handled by the committee in question.

Mr. President, that is all right so far as it goes, and if the committee could find time to do it, that would be of some benefit, and I think they would do it. I would not want to remove that provision from the bill. I think it ought to remain in the bill. If the committees have the time and if they will undertake such work, I think this provision of the bill would serve a good purpose.

Mr. President, one of the most important reforms we need in this Government is to make governmental agencies more responsive to the elected representatives of the people. That is one of the great problems confronting us.

I am sure every Member of the Senate has had similar experiences to some I have had. No matter how meritorious may be the complaints we have from our constituents, we know what occurs. We go down to a Government agency to present the matter, and actually we contact a youth who has been placed at the head of a division, a young man who may never have had 1 day's practical experience in the line of work of which he is put in supervision, but who has been given authority and jurisdiction, indeed the power, to tell a United States Senator that he does not know what he is talking about; that he is running that show, and he is going to make this order and make that one.

Mr. President, I am sure every Senator has had some such experience. I know it is impossible for the Senate or the Congress to retain absolute control. Some power must be delegated, but there should be a follow-up on these agencies by the Congress, with sufficient persuasion and influence to supervise their administration of the law, so that the Congress could keep advised as to whether their interpretation of the law was in accordance with the will and intent of the Congress at the time the law was passed.

We do not have that power now. The committee which I would set up would have duties along the lines of those prescribed for the committee to be set up under the bill, on expenditures in executive departments. The joint committee I would set up would be charged with continuing duties.

Mr. President, we get many complaints, some of which are justified, some of which are fully warranted, some of which are meritorious. I get some complaints, and I am sure every Senator does, asking me to investigate this or investigate that in some agency in my State. Some constituent will say, "I want an investigation made. They have done this or have done that." I cannot go down and investigate personally. I have no authority to do so. I could go and make some inquiry if I had the time, but, of course, I do not have the time, and other Senators do not. I cannot leave my office every time I receive a complaint and go and make an investigation. So, when I get such a letter, all I can do is to call up, or we write this or that bureau, and the head of the bureau makes the investigation. He sends out his own staff to investigate his own employees, and 99 times out of a hundred he comes back with some explanation sufficient to satisfy him that nothing is wrong.

I have in mind an instance to which I shall refer and which I shall discuss when the OPA measure is before the Senate. There is a case in my State in which I think there was a flagrant violation of duty on the part of a public servant. Yet the cloak of protection is thrown around him, and he is holding his job today. I have no way of investigating such things, but in this instance I happen to have this man's own letter, over his own signature, which is irrefutable, and which is sufficient, in my judgment, to indicate that he was proceeding on a policy that was contrary to every concept of the duty of a public servant.

Mr. President, it is cases like that which are brought to our attention. I am sure we get many complaints in which there is no merit whatever, but we do get complaints of such a character and nature that they should be investigated. I can write a letter, any other Senator can write a letter, and get an answer, but if we had the joint committee which I shal propose in the amendment I shall submit, if such a joint committee were created by the Congress, properly and adequately staffed as a permanent committee, when a complaint of this nature, when a dereliction of duty of this character, was brought to our attention, instead of writing the chief of the department or calling him on the telephone and having him make some sort of an investigation by his employees, while that is the only way he has of doing it, and then making a report to us, if the committee thought there was any merit in the complaint, or believed there was prima facie justification for the complaint being made, the committee could not only call in the chief and have him explain with regard to his policy in connection with matters involved in the complaint, but the joint committee could subpena any employee, or could have his chief require that employee in our State to appear before the committee and give an account and report, and give testimony with regard to his activities.

Once such a committee has been set up, and has been functioning a short time, we will not have so many of these complaints. The employees will know that the eyes of Congress are still upon them.

Ah, Mr. President, too frequently today we pass legislation and delegate powers. We have nothing to do with who is employed. We do as we are asked to do here now with reference to the employees of the Senate, give some fellow a big job, and it is his responsibility to get the employees, and he gets them. Then the Congress has lost touch, has lost contact. The only contact we have is by going and pleading and begging for something which we think is right.

The joint committee I propose is not to be a new committee. We would, in effect, be doing exactly what the bill in section 122, which I read, actually is intended to do, but does not adequately do; that is, set up one committee composed of two presently existing committees, one of the House and one of the Senate, charged with responsibility for the supervision of the efficiency and expenditures in the executive departments of the Government.

Once that committee is set up and functioning those who would place distorted interpretations upon the laws Congress passes in order to serve their own ideas of what the law is and how they want it to function could immediately be called before this committee, and there could be thrashed out the question of the interpretation of the law and the practices they are pursuing under it.

If that committee disagreed with the officials and found their practices to be wrong, if they did not desist from them upon being advised how the committee felt about it, the committee would be in position to report, and the bill would require that the committee make a report to the Congress, and any member of the committee would then be in position to stand here on the floor of the Senate and make a report about it, and indicate the attitude of the affected agency or public servant acting contrary to the will of the Congress in the interpretation of the law, and in the application of it, and in the practices being pursued in connection with that agency.

Mr. President, that will help us streamline Congress. We will not have to appoint a special committee to investigate the OPA, we will not have to appoint a special committee to investigate the sale of surplus property, we will not have to appoint a special committee to look into war contracts, and to look into this, that, or the other. There would be this joint committee to make the investigations. There would not be duplication. The committee would make its report to Congress annually, or at any time, would report on the efforts to bring about changes. If they found the law susceptible to interpretation that really violated the will of Congress, the committee could immediately report a bill to Congress to correct the evil, and recommend the necessary amendment or change in the original law so that it would no longer permit of the distorted interpretation placed upon it.

That, Mr. President, will bring about efficiency. That is the type of reorganization needed. That is what should be done by Congress. Instead of wasting our time here in trying to set up a personnel director for page boys we ought to bring more closely under the will of the Congress those who are administering our laws, so they will be more responsive to the will of the citizens of the Nation who in public affairs speak only through their elected representatives.

I want to bring the Government closer to the people, nearer to the people. I want to bring the Government back to the people. One way to take it farther from the people is to put these little page boys under a personnel director. If the staff of experts provided by the bill is set up and if several other things provided by the bill are done it will result in moving the Government farther and farther from the people themselves; it will be less and less in touch with the people; it will be farther from the reach of the people, and the people will wield less influence on government.

Mr. President, the people have no one to appeal to other than Congress. They can write to the OPA and other agencies and state their problems. I could use any other agency of government, but I make reference to OPA because it is much in the minds of the people at this time. People either want to continue OPA in some form or are against it entirely. So I use OPA simply as an illustration. The point I make is that any citizen who feels that he has been wronged by the OPA or that he has been mistreated by some of its representatives, or unjustly dealt with by reason of some of its regulations, or has been unjustly accused by it, may write in and make complaint. It is contended that those so injured can go to the courts for relief, but from my observations of the past I would say that there is very little relief such an individual can obtain in the courts.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Talking about bureaucracies, has it not occurred to the Senator from Arkansas that if we were to enact this bill into law there would be established here in our legislative bodies a bureaucracy in one of its worst forms, under which we would have a director who is to recommend and practically to select the employees of the Senate, as well presumably later on of the House; that those employees will in effect be under his control and under his domination, and that as time goes on and the present membership of this body is succeeded by other members this bureaucracy will be so installed here, its members will have such a dominion over the councils of committees and of the whole legislative process, because they are going to be associated with every committee, that we are going to have a permanent bureaucracy here in our own legislative body.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is exactly what we are doing by this bill, Mr. President. We are simply setting up, as I said the other afternoon, a super civil service without it being in civil service. The Director makes his own plans. It is said he must submit them to Congress, but I call attention to the fact that he employs whom he pleases, he employs as many as he pleases, he fixes their salaries himself. The salaries are not fixed by the Congress, but this Director fixes the salaries. Of course Congress would have to make an appropriation for the salaries. By doing the things to which I have called the attention of my colleagues today we are creating another bureaucracy, as the Senator from Louisiana has said. Apparently we do not have enough of bureaucracy in the executive departments, so we are bringing a bureaucracy here into the legislative division. If we do that, Mr. President, the Congress will simply be abdicating its responsibility to its constituents.

Mr. OVERTON. Not only that, but it will be abdicating its influence.

Mr. McCLELLAN. When Senators and Representatives lose their influence they cannot help their constituents. That is the very point I am making. I am not going to sing like a honey bee around these bureaucrats so that I may get for my constituents what they are entitled to receive. I am going to do what I think is right, and ask for justice and proper consideration. But I am not going to humiliate myself or my position or my constituency by going to some personnel director and begging for some little favors. I am not going to do that while I am a United States Senator if I can help it.

I shall try to keep this measure from becoming law in its present form. I hope we can succeed in doing that.

I do not see why the wisdom of a United States Senator or the collective wisdom of the United States Senate is not adequate for the selection of the little page boys for the Senate. Another thing, Mr. President, the matter of the selection of page boys does not take up much of the time of Senators. If a vacancy occurs a Senator selects a boy to serve as a page, and he is on that Senator's patronage, but he will never require him to do anything in the world in return. What the Senator has done is to give that boy an opportunity he may never otherwise have gotten. He will be given the opportunity for an education. The boy will be given the opportunity to satisfy his ambition to watch the United States, and the Congress function. That, Mr. President, will be an inspiration to that boy. Many pages in the past, who have served in Congress, have drawn inspiration from the deliberations of this and the other body. They have been fascinated by their experience, and have become desirous of entering the public service. They have gone back to their constituency in later years and asked them to confer upon them the honor which they have seen conferred upon Members of Congress. They have asked their constituents to repose in them confidence to represent them in the legislative halls of the State or of the Nation.

Mr. President, I recall when I was a mere boy I had the ambition to serve as a page in the legislature of my State. I did not have the opportunity for some reason to serve as a page. But also, Mr. President, from my earliest days I had a desire and ambition to some day serve in the United States Congress. My father was a farmer. I had no more opportunity afforded me than thousands upon thousands of young boys in my State whose fathers were in a situation comparative to that of my own father. My father named me for a Member of Congress. All through the years that in itself inspired in me the ambition to become a Member of Congress. When I was 8 years old I wrote a letter to that Member of Congress for whom I was named, John S. Little, from the Second Congressional District of my State, and told him of my labors for that week in the fields, told him how much cotton I had picked during that time. I received a reply from him. I still have that letter and I cherish it. He wrote me of course as he might write to any other boy and commended me for my labors and predicted that some day I might aspire to fill a high position in the Government.

Mr. President, that was an inspiration to me. Is it not an inspiration to these boys? Every one of them will say that it is. If it is, why do we wish to limit appointments to boys in the District of Columbia? Can we with good conscience vote to make ineligible a boy from Virginia, a boy from Louisiana, or a boy from Texas? I will not vote to say to a boy from Arkansas, "You may want to be a page, but the only way you can become one is to get your father and mother

to move to the District of Columbia, and then take it up with the Personnel Director to see if he will let you serve." That simply means that we would exclude boys from the States.

A Senator could not have a boy appointed unless he courted the favor of the Personnel Director. I never did like to do things that way. I like to ask for things on their merits, and if I am entitled to them, get them. That is the way I want to keep it. That is the way it is now. If the Committee on Rules assigns to me a page position for my State, I want someone in my State to have it. If a position as elevator operator is assigned to my State, if someone from my State wishes to work in Washington so as to have an opportunity to further his education, I want him to have it. He is entitled to it, just as a man from any other State is entitled to a position assigned to that State. Other Senators may vote as they please, but I will not vote to make the boys of my State ineligible for any of these opportunities that may be afforded in Washington.

We hear a great deal of talk about the patronage system. I am sure that it has been abused. But I say to Senators that there are some abuses in the civil service that outstink anything that ever occurred under the patronage system. It was said that we would be rid of the problem when Government employees were placed under civil service. It was expected that we would not be bothered with it any more. But after an employee has served for a time in the civil service he thinks he is entitled to a promotion. He wants his Senator or Representative to get him promoted to a higher grade. Perhaps he wants a transfer to some other desk, or some other city. I do not know of any way, in a democracy, by which Senators and Representatives can rid themselves of the responsibilities which go with this office.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not see the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] in the Chamber. Following up the argument made by the able Senator from Arkansas, I do not think we could find a better illustration of his argument than that afforded by the very distinguished Senator from Maine, the minority leader.

Mr. WHITE entered the Chamber.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator from Maine made some remarks on the floor of the Senate on Saturday last, following my observations in connection with the bill. Unfortunately I had to leave the Chamber in order to attend a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations, which lasted for some time. I apologized to the Senator from Maine for leaving, and expressed my regret that I could not remain to hear what he had to say. I shall not comment at this time on what he had to say. What I am pointing out is that we could not find a better illustration of what the Senator from Arkansas is speaking about than the one afforded by the Senator from Maine, with respect to his own experience.

What was his first association in the United States Senate? He told us that he was an assistant clerk to the Senate Committee on Commerce. That is the way he began his career. He became very much interested in congressional work. In my opinion there has never been any more conscientious, painstaking, hard-working, or patriotic Senator than the Senator from Maine. He deservedly occupies a very high position in this body in his own party. He deservedly commands the respect of his colleagues and of the country generally. If it had not been that he began as an assistant clerk in the Senate Committee on Commerce in years gone by, perhaps he would not have developed the interest in congressional work which caused him to be first a Member of the House, and later a Member of this body.

That is exactly the point which the Senator from Arkansas is bringing out. A boy from the Senator's own State of Arkansas whom he would like to have appointed, and who is bright and capable, might never be appointed to an assistant clerkship or clerkship in any committee of the Senate, because, perforce, there stands in the threshold a director of personnel who may not approve of him. If there had been a director of personnel perhaps the able Senator from Maine would not in his younger days have met with the approval of the director, and he might never have had that clerkship. The magnificent and illustrious career of the Senator from Maine began in an assistant clerkship to the Senate Committee on Commerce. I know that he was a fine assistant clerk to the Senate Committee on Commerce, just as he has been a magnificent and deservedly renowned Member of this great body.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I ask the Senator to yield to me only long enough to permit me to bow to the Senator from Louisiana and express my thanks for the kind things he has said. He has exaggerated to some extent; nevertheless, he has spoken in kindly terms, and I am appreciative.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I join with the Senator from Louisiana in the very kind things he has said about the able and distinguished minority leader. I also join with the Senator from Louisiana in his evaluation of the merits of this proposal.

Mr. President, I feel that each Senator should ask himself this question: If a director of personnel is established to take over these page boys, and a boy from his State desires one of the positions, will the Senator refuse to go with him to see the Personnel Director and try to have him appointed? I say to my colleagues that they will spend just as much time on the problem as they do now. The only difference will be that there will be someone to say "No" to us. We shall not get rid of any burden we now carry. That is my honest judgment.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator put a question to me. He asked me, in effect, if I would go with a Maine boy to the Director of Personnel and urge his appointment. Of course, I would, and I would go in the full expectation that a boy from Maine would be so well qualified in all respects that he would receive the certification and recommendation of the Director. If he did not measure up to the standard of qualifications, I do not believe that either he or I would expect his recommendation or appointment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. WHITE. I hope the Senator will not ask too many questions.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does not the Senator feel that he is competent to judge whether or not a boy measures up to the requirements? How would the Director of Personnel know any more about a boy from Maine than would the Senator? I do not believe the Senator would admit that a personnel director would know more about that boy than would the Senator. I do not think he would have any better way of finding out.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator is asking questions which are somewhat embarrassing, but I am perfectly willing to answer them.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not directing them to the Senator from Maine primarily. I am directing them to every Member of the Senate. I think what I have said is what is involved.

Mr. WHITE. I am perfectly willing to state my attitude toward the proposal. Of course, I would want a Maine boy appointed. Of course, I would go with him to the Personnel Director and I would recommend him to the Personnel Director. But if he did not meet the standards laid down by the Director of Personnel and if he did not commend himself to the agency we are setting up to pass upon the merits of the applicants without regard to personal or political considerations, I would not think he was entitled to appointment and I would not think he was entitled to preference over someone who did meet the standards.

That is just the point. In this whole matter the Senator from Arkansas and I are moved by personal considerations, namely, our acquaintance with the boy and our acquaintance with his father and mother and with his neighbors. But that is not the basis upon which the appointment should rest. The appointment should rest upon the boy's qualifications, as the qualifications are determined and established by the appointing head. If the boy cannot meet those specifications and if he does not measure up to them, then, however much I might like to see him appointed, he simply is not entitled to that place, over another boy who does meet the qualifications.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Senator's remarks suggest another question.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if I am going to keep on suggesting questions, I shall sit down.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Well, I wish to make this observation: In the first place, the Senator from Maine is not going to recommend a boy whom he does not believe would meet the requirements. I will wager that since the Senator from Maine has been a Senator, he has not recommended a boy to be appointed a page if the boy has not met the necessary requirements. When we consider the entire situation, as applied to everyone in Congress, we readily admit that an exception might occur; but exceptions would occur no more often under the present system than they would under the proposed system.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator from Arkansas believe that a Member of the Senate who knows a boy's background and qualifications is better able to judge whether that young man measures up to the standards than an agency or an employee we might set up could?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I say to my colleague that I do not think it is necessary to set up a personnel director to supervise the employment of elevator boys and page boys for the Senate. I think such a step would be going far afield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator think that by virtue of setting up the civil-service system we have raised the standard of efficiency of Government employees?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not complaining about the civil-service system, but I will say that by establishing that system we have merely placed in Government jobs certain persons who have been able to meet certain requirements, and they hold those particular positions indefinitely, and the efficiency ratings they are given are often fixed on the basis of the likes or dislikes of their superiors. We cannot establish a standard or a formula for the measuring or for the evaluation of merit and at the same time guarantee that it will preclude the consideration of the personal and human equation. The personal and human equation enters into the matter all the time.

With reference to the page boys, I say we would do well to continue the present system. Under it everyone will be happier. There has not been any friction because of it or dissatisfaction with it, so far as I know, or any inefficiency on the part of any page boy who has been appointed under the present system. If any of us were informed that one of the page boys did not satisfactorily perform his duties, we would not keep him here. No Senator would. Yet it is proposed that we turn the whole matter over to a personnel director.

Mr. President, I have talked much longer than I intended to speak when I began my presentation of this matter. I did wish to take occasion to discuss some of the other provisions of the bill, and I have referred to some of them. But I wish to say in concluding my remarks that I hope the Senate will vote this section out of the bill. It has no place in it. This provision will not reorganize Congress, and neither will it promote the efficiency of Congress. The provisions of title II with respect to the establishment of a personnel director would, if enacted into law, result in the setting up of another bureau and the establishment of so many experts that the Congress would be "experted" to where it would not know whether it was going or coming. The result would be to create more confusion, instead of to reduce it.

I hope my colleagues will not vote to turn the page boys over to a director of personnel. I hope that both the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives will, as individual Members of the Congress, accept in full measure the responsibilities and obligations which go with service in the Congress. I think those responsibilities embrace the duty which we owe to ourselves to pass upon the merits of those who serve us in our legislative duties. By setting up a personnel director and giving him complete authority and power in such matters, including the right to say "No" to a Senator or to a committee of Senators, or even to the whole Senate, with respect to who shall be employed, I do not believe we make progress in the interest of economy or efficiency or expedition of the business of Congress, nor do I believe such a step will serve to relieve any Senator of any work or responsibility which now rests upon him.

Mr. President, just as the Senator from Maine said a moment ago, I say that if a boy from his State wanted such a position and if he came to see the Senator about it, the Senator would go with that boy from the Senate Office Building to the Director of Personnel, and would talk with him about the matter. But if we do not establish a personnel director, all the Senator will have to do will be to pass judgment on that boy's qualifications himself. I believe that the Senator from Maine or any other Senator is just as competent to pass upon the qualifications of a page boy as would be any $10,000-a-year director who might be employed by the Congress. Yet under the proposed system, the Senator would have to go to the Personnel Director and present the boy's case, whereas under the present system if a Senator has allocated to him the right to appoint a page, all he has to do is give him the job and place his name on the pay roll.

At the present time none of the Senate pages come from Arkansas. Nevertheless, I am unwilling to vote to make the boys of my State ineligible to appointment as pages in the Senate.

I do not know whether there will be any other discussion of this amendment; but before it is voted on, I shall hope to have a quorum present and I shall ask for the yeas and nays, in order that we may record our votes on this question.

Mr. BRIDGES obtained the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. 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:

Andrews	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Austin	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hickenlooper	Overton
Barkley	Hill	Pepper
Bilbo	Hoey	Radcliffe
Bridges	Huffman	Reed
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Burch	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Bushfield	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Byrd	Knowland	Stanfill
Capehart	La Follette	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Connally	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Tunnell
Donnell	McKellar	Tydings
Downey	McMahon	Vandenberg
Eastland	Magnuson	Wagner
George	Maybank	Walsh
Guffey	Millikin	Wherry
Gurney	Moore	White
Hart	Murdock	Wilson
Hatch	Murray	

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

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, when our Government was founded and the Constitution was adopted there was provision made for three separate and distinct branches—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. When they were created, they were more or less equal. But the executive branch of the Government has mushroomed into the greatest governmental bureaucracy not only this country but any other country in the world has known. The legislative branch of the Government has relatively stood still. The judicial branch has varied only insofar as the country has developed, and additional judicial divisions and district courts, appeals courts, have been made necessary as a result of increases in population and in the development of the country.

Under the leadership of the late Senator Maloney, of Connecticut, who was one of the ablest and hardest working Members of the Senate, and who realized the overworked condition of Senators and Representatives, a proposal was made to reorganize or streamline Congress. When Senator Maloney died, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress performed a service for which every thoughtful citizen of this country and every progressive-minded person, as well as the Members of Congress, should be most grateful.

The work of the committee has been long, arduous, and tedious. The committee has worked faithfully and hard. As a result of long and extended hearings, a report was made, and subsequently the bill which is now before the Senate was presented.

This committee, in a very general way, concentrated its study on ways and means by which the Senate and the House of Representatives could improve their organization. The war years, and this most important period of transition from a wartime economy to a peacetime economy, have increased the responsibilities of the American Congress and correspondingly the responsibilities and duties of every Senator and every Representative. Yet, to cope with our

ever-increasing national problems, which, under our system of government, must be solved by legislative decision, we have practically the same organization and the same work system that have been peculiar to Congress since the beginning of the Government.

It will not be denied, I am sure, that we can expect only a further increase of congressional responsibilities. Therefore, I believe, Mr. President, it has become increasingly evident to everyone that it is imperative that our legislative organization and our work system in Congress be so modernized as to enable it to deal adequately with the multitudinous problems now facing the Nation. National problems increased tremendously during the period of war; they have increased in the past year, and we can foresee nothing but a further increase in their number and complexity in the years and decades ahead.

Mr. President, I believe the committee, because of the various studies it made, the extended hearings it held, and the conscientious work it performed in connection with this problem, has rendered a distinct service to the country, culminating in the recommendations which the committee has submitted to the Congress and which, in the form of a bill, are now under consideration by the Senate.

Mr. President, the ever-increasing responsibilities rest not only upon the Congress as a whole, but they daily become more burdensome to the individual Members, whose time is often so divided between committee studies of issues as to make it impossible to give any single issue, whatever may be its importance, the degree of attention it merits.

Very few people, except the Members of Congress themselves, realize how involved is the situation we face. I recall very distinctly that while speaking at a meeting during the past year, a man stood up in the back of the audience and asked, "What is your position on H. R. 4943?" When I told him that I did not know what the bill was all about, he said, "Just what I thought; it is typical of the average Senator down there in Washington. You do not know what you are doing or what you are legislating upon. You do not know what the bill is about." Then I went on to try to explain to him that more than 9,000 bills were pending before the Congress, and that it was almost impossible for a Senator to be informed respecting more than the very important bills, or the bills coming before his particular committees, which might number a few hundred or perhaps a thousand or more. People have no conception of the duties the average Senator is called upon to perform.

Since I have been a Member of the Senate—and I have been here rather a brief period of time, but about 10 years—I have seen man after man in the United States Senate whom I highly respected, die from overwork. Overwork has been the primary cause of death of most of the Senators I have in mind. Senator Maloney died solely from the strain of overwork. Senator McNary, our very able floor leader, died by reason of a great accumulation of work. The same thing is true of Senator Scrugham of Nevada, Senator Thomas of Idaho, Senator Sheppard of Texas, Senator Harrison of Mississippi, and Senator Adams of Colorado. I sat with Senator Adams on the Appropriations Committee. At that time there was not a harder-working man in the Senate than Senator Adams. He literally worked himself into his grave. Senator Pittman of Nevada and Senator Gibson of Vermont died from overwork. Senator Copeland of New York is another man who literally worked himself into his grave. The same cause, overwork, has sent many other Senators and Congressmen to their deaths. Senator BANKHEAD is very seriously ill at the moment due to the strain of overwork. Yet, with the increased responsibilities placed on the shoulders of United States Senators and Representatives, we have done practically nothing to meet the situation or to relieve Senators of the too great burdens which they are trying to carry in the performance of their duties.

Today, Senators have the terrific problem of making both ends meet. A Senator receives $10,000 a year. A House Member, I may say, receives $10,000 a year plus $2,500 for expenses, an allowance which at times I have advocated on this floor should also be given to Senators, but the proposal has been killed by Members of our own body. A Senator not only has to pay the Federal income tax which every other citizen has to pay, which takes approximately one-quarter of his salary, but he must maintain two homes, one in his home State and one in Washington. He has to maintain two homes if he is to continue to represent his State in the Senate. He must travel back and forth between his State and Washington. Aside from one allowance for a round trip, he has to pay his own travel expenses. He either has to maintain a car in his home State as well as a car in Washington, or he has to get around in Washington on streetcars and by taxi, and pay for such travel out of his own pocket.

I desire to say a few words about one of the most disgusting things I have noticed in Washington. We talked about it in the Appropriations Committee today. I refer to the use of Government cars by the bureaucrats downtown. I was in Woodward & Lothrop's store the other day buying an article which I needed. While I was there, outside the store were four black Government limousines, with chauffeurs. They were not occupied by the Government officials themselves to whom the cars were assigned, but their wives or members of the family had taken the cars and were driven by Government chauffeurs on a shopping expedition.

Recently I attended a dinner in Washington which was quite widely attended. I see on the floor other Senators who were also present. It was a rainy night, and when the dinner party was over I saw Senators and their wives and Representatives and their wives running out in the rain and, getting very wet, trying to hail taxis or to get to streetcar lines. Yet more than 20 sleek black limousines, driven by Government chauffeurs, pulled up and picked up the various Government bureaucrats and took them on their way. As I said, I saw United States Senators and Representatives and their wives get sopping wet while trying to get taxis or proceeding to streetcar lines. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] suggests to me that I did not mention that the cars in question were Government cars. I intended, of course, to say that they were Government cars, with Government-paid chauffeurs. It will be found that not only Cabinet members and other high-ranking members of the Government have the use of Government cars, but pretty nearly every little bureaucrat in Washington has such a car, and most of them have Government-paid chauffeurs. Yet there is objection not only to giving a Senator who directly serves the people an adequate salary, but objection to granting him a simple allowance for his expense account as well.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the law on this subject. We are going to do something about this matter. Some years ago Congress passed a law which prohibits the use of Government cars for private use. We checked on that matter this morning in the Appropriations Committee. I have the law before me. I shall raise that point now, and I think Congress should take steps to find out why the law is not being lived up to, and just who ought to be brought to task. I read from the law:

> (b) For the maintenance, operation, and repair of any Government-owned motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle not used exclusively for official purposes; and "official purposes" shall not include the transportation of officers and employees between their domiciles and places of employment, except in case of medical officers on out-patient medical services and except in cases of officers and employees engaged in field work the character of whose duties makes such transportation necessary.

Then the law provides:

> Any officer or employee of the Government who willfully uses or authorizes the use of any Government-owned motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, or of any motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle leased by the Government, for other than official purposes or otherwise violates the provisions of this subsection shall be suspended from duty by the head of the department or establishment concerned, without compensation, for not less than 1 month, and shall be suspended for a longer period or summarily removed from office if circumstances warrant. The limitations of this subsection (b) shall not apply to any motor vehicles for official use of the President, the heads of the executive departments, Ambassadors, Ministers, chargés d'affaires, and other principal diplomatic and consular officials.

I assume from that language that, very properly, the President and Cabinet members are exempt from the provision, but the law does not exempt the average little bureau head or division head downtown. What is going on is disgraceful. If it is necessary for the Congress to designate someone to enforce that provision of the law it should be done. I call it to the attention of the Senate now for the purpose of further indicating that Senators and Representatives are deprived of action which would help them to serve

the people while bureaucrats abuse privileges. Senators are now limited to 26 official long-distance telephone calls a month. Yet any third-class clerk in a Government department or agency can pick up the telephone and call San Francisco, Seattle, or any other distant point at any time of the day he wishes, and we assume that it is for official purposes. There is no accurate check on it. Yet an adequate provision for the American Congress is approached with timidity by the average Senator or Representative.

Neither the members of the committee, in spite of their long and conscientious study of congressional reorganization, nor other individual Members vitally concerned in this subject claim perfection for the bill which the Senate is now asked to approve. I have long been interested in congressional reorganization; and, insofar as possible, have encouraged the Members of Congress who have made this study for us. The bill which the committee has reported is much better than I expected would be possible. I am not in agreement with all the provisions of the bill; but instead of being against it all along the line, why can we not get together? If amendments are needed in order to perfect the legislation, let us offer the amendments and adopt them, and take a forward-looking step, rather than oppose the whole proposal.

There has been hope for the work of the joint committee from the beginning, largely due to the fact that those upon whom the committee first called for advice and suggestions were Members of Congress, who, of course, have the deepest recognition of the faults of their own organization. The bill representing the report has been followed on the floor of the Senate during the past 3 days by the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who has with interest and cooperation listened very patiently to the various objections offered by his colleagues. He has already accepted a series of amendments to bring the bill into line with what the leaders of this body consider to be the most workable system. I hope that in the final discussion today Senators will continue the procedure so far followed in the debate. I believe that this is an opportunity for every Senator who believes that the Congress should be kept abreast of the times to do his bit to place Congress in a position adequately to meet the problems of the day. His opportunity to do so is today.

Instead of opposing the entire bill, as many Senators are now doing today, and have done in the past, let us get down to the meat of the proposal and see if a workable basis cannot be found. Let us pass a bill for the modernization of Congress. The committee has given freely of its time and has worked faithfully. There is not a member of the committee who is not ordinarily overworked. The committee is composed of busy Senators and Representatives. They have done their part. Now it is the job of the Senate and the House to do their part. In my judgment, their part is not to stall or oppose generally the provisions of the bill, but to endeavor to meet the problems of the day by improving it and passing a bill which will be a definite step in the right direction. If it does not work properly, let us correct it afterward, rather than oppose the whole thing now and get no legislation, which is very likely to be the situation if we fail to meet our responsibilities.

Many members of the public are critical of the American Congress; but I know of no one who can be more progressively interested or constructively critical than Members of Congress themselves. Every Senator present knows that he does not have adequate help in his office. Every Senator knows that unless he is financially independent he is unable to make both ends meet on his salary. The membership of the Senate should not be limited to millionaires, or to men who have outside income. The Senate of the United States should be a cross section of the citizenship of America. It should contain rich men, poor men, and men of modest means. We cannot have a cross section of America if Senators receive $10,000 a year and must pay a quarter of it in Federal income taxes, maintain two homes, pay their own traveling expenses, and meet all the obligations which devolve upon them, such as subscriptions for this and that, and all the other expenses they are called upon to bear. It simply cannot be done.

The pending bill offers an opportunity to remedy that condition. In the bill we are not asking the Congress to approve a salary increase by itself. What the committee is saying to the American Congress is, "Let us improve all along the line. Let us establish an adequate retirement system. Let us increase salaries; but at the same time let us make ourselves more efficient so that we can more adequately cope with the problems of the day." That is a sound reason for the legislation which we are now considering.

Let me say a word about the retirement feature of the bill. Although I believe that what the bill proposes in connection with retirement is very good, I do not think it is good enough. As I understand, there is a movement on foot in the Senate to offer an amendment to strike out the retirement provisions of the bill and substitute a much more limited scale. To my mind that would be foolish in every way. We should provide adequate retirement for Members of the Congress. We provide it for generals, admirals, captains, lieutenants, sergeants, corporals, privates, and others in the Army and Navy. We have provided it for every little civil-service employee in the Federal Government. We have provided it for the judiciary, all the way down the line. Why exclude Senators and Representatives from the benefits of retirement? I would go much further than is proposed in the bill with respect to retirement.

I believe that we should encourage young men to become Members of the American Congress. Let us assume that a man becomes a Member of the Senate or the House when he is 30 years of age, spends the most productive years of his life as a Member of Congress, and then gives up his position. I think he should be protected when he is defeated or forced to retire because of ill health, because he has given up the productive years of his life.

For example, take the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. He is a member of the opposition party, but he is a man for whom I have very high respect. The Senator from Illinois is a lawyer. If he had remained out of public life, during the most productive years of his life his ability would have enabled him to earn sufficient income adequately to provide for his retirement in the course of a few years. On the other hand, he is giving up a lucrative law practice and devoting the most productive years of his life to public service. When the time comes when his health fails or he is forced to retire, he will not have a great reserve built up, because he will have given the most productive years of his life to public service.

I say that the American Government can make no better investment than to provide adequate retirement for Members of Congress, instead of limiting the retirement privileges as they are limited in this bill, or trying to limit them further, as I understand is proposed by an amendment. I would make them very much more liberal. I intend to offer an amendment in that direction when the opportunity presents itself.

I have sat in committee rooms of the Senate for the past 10 years and have heard many Senators tell what is the matter with Congress and what we should do. We have an opportunity today to do something. I should like to see Senators who have been sitting in committee rooms and telling us privately what is wrong come to the forefront and help put this bill across. If it is not all it should be, let us try to make it better; if some of its provisions should be more liberal, let us liberalize them; if it needs to be corrected in other respects, let us correct it; but let us pass a bill which will do the job which we are called upon to do.

The other day the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] referred to the days when he began his service in the Senate. Conditions have changed since that time. Even in the 10 years I have been a Member of the Senate I have seen the problems so increased and the burdens thrown on the shoulders of United States Senators so multiplied that it is foolish to compare the present situation even with that of a few brief years ago. The situation will not improve. It was hoped that when the war was over our burdens would be gradually lifted. However, in the post-war period our problems are greater; the burdens on our shoulders are more onerous than they were at the height of the war. Let no one think for a minute that they will become any lighter. With the concentration of authority which we have in Washington today, and with Washington becoming the nerve center of America and the world, as well as the capital of this country, the work of Congress cannot be lessened. Now is our chance to do something about it.

I do not wish to take more of the time of the Senate, but I hope that this measure will not be bypassed, and I hope that we can meet the issue fairly, and

that any objections which we may have can be ironed out.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a minute, before he suggests the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, probably I am in as good a position as is any other Member of this body to express an opinion regarding what the Senator from New Hampshire has been saying. When I came to the Senate I realized that the burdens on Senators who were serious minded, as I believe most of them are, were very heavy. I have been connected with business affairs, and I have seen the trials and troubles of business in both good and bad times. But I have never seen a load that was heavier than the load which is placed upon every serious-minded Member of the Senate of the United States.

I say to you, Mr. President, that it may be some years before the people of the United States find it out; but as affairs are going, the load is too heavy for any normal man in the world to carry.

In regard to one matter which the Senator from New Hampshire has mentioned, I wish to say that I am very deeply in favor of some kind of proper pension or retirement system for the men who give up their lives to their country by service in the Senate and the House of Representatives. I do not expect to participate in such a pension, so I am free to make this statement. It is just plain common sense for the people of the United States to make provision for such a pension or retirement system. Inasmuch as our people are spending so many billions of dollars on governmental affairs, they should realize that insofar as their public servants who are giving their time, abilities, and services in the interest of preserving this great form of government and way of life are concerned, it is to the interest of the people of the United States and it is merely plain common sense to say that the situation the Senator from New Hampshire has mentioned should be corrected, and it should be corrected on a fair and just basis.

As I am speaking now, I am reminded that last year we went all the way back to the old workers on the Panama Canal and we voted to give to those who worked on the Canal from 1908 to 1914, as I recall, pensions equal to 60 percent of the salaries they received during the last 5 years of their work on the Panama Canal.

Mr. President, my only reason for speaking now is that it will be recalled that a few months ago I objected to a proposal to increase the salaries of the Members of Congress because I believed that was not the appropriate time to do so. However, I believe the present is the appropriate time to consider any increases and improvements now that the reorganization bill is before the Senate.

I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire that we should pass the pending bill in some form. It may be that some amendments should be made to it; in fact, I think there are some amendments which should be adopted. But we should take this step, because it is a step in the right direction. The fact that we are discussing the affairs of Senators and Representatives in Congress is no reason for considering this measure in a light any different from that in which we would consider a measure having to do with the affairs of anyone else connected with or working for any branch or agency of the Government of the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator.

I venture to say that the able Senator from New Jersey reaches his office at around 9 o'clock in the morning and leaves it late at night. I have been at my office many times late in the evening and on Saturday afternoon and during the day on Sunday, but I have never been in the Senate Office Building that I did not see one or more Senators working there still later, at almost any hour of the night. I venture to say that Senators work more hours than do any other single group of people in the Nation. The objective of this bill is to save their lives, to make this country a better country, to give our country a more progressive, efficient government, to equalize the difference between the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches of government which were set up when this country was founded. That is a sound objective to seek, and I hope we can obtain some action on it here today.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. BRIDGES. I withhold the suggestion.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have been endeavoring to ascertain whether it will be possible to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement to bring this bill to its final disposition this afternoon. Before proposing a unanimous-consent agreement for that purpose, I should like to suggest the amendments which I am prepared to offer if that unanimous-consent agreement is entered into.

I am prepared to eliminate from the bill the references to the Congressional Personnel Director, and I am prepared to increase the membership of the Appropriations Committee from 13 to 21.

I can state the amendments which I shall offer if the unanimous-consent request is agreed to; I am now referring to the original print of the bill, which is the bill which is at the desk, and not the reprint of the bill which was made for the information of Senators, in order to show what changes had been made in the measure by way of amendment during the time it has been under consideration:

Beginning on page 35, in line 4, strike out all down to and including line 5 on page 38.

Mr. President, let me say that I shall send a copy of these amendments to the desk if it becomes necessary to do so.

On page 38, in line 7, strike out "Director" and insert "Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives"; and in line 13 strike out "the" and insert "they."

On page 41, line 12, beginning with the word "Until", strike out through the word "the" in line 15, and insert in lieu thereof the word "The."

On page 41, beginning with line 20, strike out through line 2 on page 42.

On page 43, in lines 17 and 18, strike out "upon recommendation and certification of the Director of Congressional Personnel."

On page 50, beginning in line 20, strike out subsection (a) of section 243.

On page 51, in line 3, strike out "said" and insert "Congressional."

Also reletter the sections.

On page 6, in line 20, strike out the word "thirteen" and insert the words "twenty-one."

The effect of these amendments, as I stated a few months ago, will be to eliminate from the bill the creation of the office of Director of Congressional Personnel and to eliminate from title 2 any references to his duties and powers, and to make in the remaining sections of title 2 the corresponding changes which logically flow from the fact that this would be a proposal to eliminate that office from the measure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further debate on the pending measure and all amendments and motions thereto shall be concluded at not later than 4:30 p. m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Just a moment, Mr. President. In order to obtain that consent I believe it would be necessary, under the rule, to have a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In order to obtain an agreement to limit debate on a measure it is not necessary to have a quorum present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the necessity for having a quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A request for limitation of debate does not require the presence of a quorum. The request is simply for a limitation on debate, and it is not necessary to have a quorum present in order to provide for such a limitation.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Am I to understand that the amendments to which the Senator has referred have already been formally agreed to by the Senate?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I said that, if I could obtain the unanimous-consent agreement which I requested, I would offer the amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator offer them now?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I would prefer first to obtain unanimous consent. Unanimous consent has not yet been granted.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thought it had been granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I object, Mr. President.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in view of the objection I have only one thing to say with reference to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The reason that the joint committee made its recommendation with regard to the pages of the Senate and of the House is that it felt Congress was not properly discharging its responsibilities in reference to the youths who come to Washington to serve as pages in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. I have been interested in their welfare, although I have never recommended the appointment of a boy to be a page in the Senate. I know that they are hard working and efficient youths, but I believe that too few Senators realize that many of them come to Washington on the threshold of adolescence, and are here frequently without friends, relatives, or guardians. Many of them live in boarding houses. The long hours which they are required to serve creates a very difficult problem so far as their education is concerned, and in order to comply with the requirements of the compulsory school attendance act a quasi-private school has been created and is now located in the subterranean passages of the Capitol. The head of the school, Mr. Kendall, and the teachers of the school have made the best of a very bad situation. One of the schoolrooms in the Capitol has no outside ventilation whatever. The average attendance in that one room affords only 100 cubic feet of air space to each pupil. Senators will recall that the report with reference to the horrors of the concentration camp at Buchenwald disclosed that the inmates of that horrible institution were allowed only 85 cubic feet of air space a person. At the moment, and for a number of years past, in the classroom to which I have referred the students have available only 15 more cubic feet of air space than was allowed to the Nazi victims in the concentration camp at Buchenwald.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am very hopeful that the Senator from Wisconsin will restate his unanimous consent request, because I believe that some of us did not quite comprehend the effect of it when he made his request in the first instance.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I shall be very happy to restate it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further debate on Senate bill 2177 be brought to a close by not later than 4:30 p. m. today.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have a very important amendment which I wish to offer, and I do not believe I could agree to the unanimous consent request which the Senator from Wisconsin has made. My amendment would restore that section of the bill which relates to the payment of retirement funds, and puts the matter on the same basis as that with reference to civil-service employees of the Government. As presently written, this provision would give to Members of Congress nearly twice as much in money benefits as is received by those who are employed under civil service. I would want ample time in which to discuss the matter, because I consider it to be very important.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, would it be agreeable to the able Senator from Virginia if, following the amendments which I intend to offer, the disposal of which I do not believe would require more than a few minutes, we should devote the remaining time until 4:30 on the Senator's amendment?

Mr. BYRD. Is it the proposal of the Senator from Wisconsin to allow an hour and a half for the discussion of my amendment?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator from Virginia would be allowed until 4:30 o'clock whatever time remained after the adoption of the amendments which I have indicated I shall offer. I do not believe that the consideration and disposal of my amendments would consume more than a very few minutes.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I suggest that the Senator from Wisconsin allow his unanimous-consent request to stand with reference to the amendments which he will offer, and all other amendments which may be offered with the exception of the Byrd amendment, that all of them be disposed of by 3:30 o'clock this afternoon, and the remaining time until 4:30 o'clock be divided equally between the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Wisconsin. In that way we would all have an opportunity to offer amendments and have them disposed of.

Mr. BYRD. I believe that the amendment which I will offer could not very well be disposed of in less than an hour and a half.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest that what the Senator from Wisconsin is seeking to do is to bring to a close the debate so that we may vote on the bill today. I think that he might well extend the time which he has suggested to 5 o'clock.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Very well. I am willing to modify my suggestion so as to extend the time to 5 o'clock, and agree that the time remaining after my amendments have been disposed of until 5 o'clock shall be divided between the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and myself.

Mr. BYRD. With the understanding that the time which shall actually be allowed for a discussion of the amendment may be not less than an hour and a half.

Mr. BARKLEY. I believe that there will be more than an hour and a half left after disposing of the amendments which will be offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, because it is not yet 3 o'clock and disposal of the amendments which the Senator will offer will not consume more than a very few minutes. I believe that perhaps there will be no debate on them at all.

Mr. BYRD. If any change in my amendment is to be suggested, no less than an hour and a half should be allowed in debate on the amendment before it is voted upon.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have an amendment which I shall wish to offer. I shall not consume very much time in discussing it. If I may be given on opportunity to offer it I will agree not to consume over 5 minutes. The amendment now lies on the desk, and, so far as I am concerned, it may be voted upon now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the unanimous consent request which has been made by the Senator from Wisconsin is granted, it will not preclude the offering of further amendments.

Mr. McCLELLAN. No; but when a larger number of Senators are present I shall briefly state what my amendment proposes to do. I have already used a great deal of time of the Senate in discussing the bill, and it is not my purpose unnecessarily to delay a final vote upon it.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin that if the agreement to vote at 5 o'clock is entered into, and he proceeds to offer his amendments, I believe that we can vote on them without delay? I do not believe they will occasion any debate. After they are disposed of the Senator from Arkansas could offer his amendment, and have it disposed of at least prior to 3:30 o'clock. We would then have until 5 o'clock to consider and dispose of the amendment which the Senator from Virginia has said he desires to offer.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I have an amendment also which I wish to offer at the proper time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, let us first get this other matter straightened out.

I ask unanimous consent that further debate on Senate bill 2177, and all the amendments and motions relating thereto, shall be concluded by 5 o'clock p. m. today; that not later than 3:30 o'clock p. m. today, the amendment which the Senator from Virginia has said he will offer will be the pending amendment, and that the control of such time as remains between that hour and the time when the amendment shall be voted upon by the Senate shall be divided equally between the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, before that motion is put, I ask the Senator from Wisconsin to refer to page 43 of the bill. On page 43 it is provided that it shall be the duty of the Legislative Reference Service "to assist representatives of the press and radio in reporting on the proceedings of Congress, and for this purpose the Director of the Legislative Reference Service is authorized to assign competent persons to the press and radio galleries of the Senate and the House of Representatives, who shall make available relevant records, debates, and background data."

Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin to the fact that that is in conflict with one of the Senate rules which provides that those who are employed in legislative or executive departments of the Government cannot be admitted to the press or radio galleries. I think that is a very good rule and should be preserved, that no agency of the Government should have access to the Senate galleries either the press section of it or the radio section, and thereby have an opportunity, by propaganda or otherwise, to color the news which is sent out. I should like to ask the Senator if he would accept an amendment to strike that out.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, that provision is in conformity with a provision contained in the report of the joint committee, the sole purpose of it being to furnish a digest of bills and reports, and thus to facilitate the work in the press gallery. I personally think it would be a very good service.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Wisconsin and I myself, as chairman of the Committee on Rules, had an understanding that only certain specific rules of the Senate would be abrogated.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. We had an agreement, as I understood, that we would not go outside of the recommendations of the report of the joint committee.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator will recall, we had a definite list of the rules which would be changed under the bill, and it was understood that no others would be taken up.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If there is any question about it, Mr. President, I should certainly want absolutely to stick to the letter of my understanding with the Senator from Virginia, but I assumed that we were within the understanding in providing this paragraph to carry out the recommendation of the report of the joint committee.

Mr. BYRD. It abrogates an existing rule relating to the press gallery.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator feels that it is not within the purview of the report which the Rules Committee made in recommending the creation of the special committee to consider the bill, I should certainly want to eliminate it.

Mr. BYRD. I shall offer an amendment to that effect.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it seems to me there is another vital reason why this provision should go out altogether. I do not think that we should provide by this bill any service which could in any sense be interpreted as an attempt to tutor the representatives of the press and the radio. We should not, it seems to me, in any circumstances undertake to control the sources of information of the press and the radio.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There certainly was no such intention.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Knowing the Senator as I do, I am certain he had no such purpose, and I recommend most earnestly that he himself move to strike the provision from the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I shall be glad to accept the amendment of the Senator from Virginia, without admitting the interpretation which the Senator from Wyoming has placed upon the intent of the joint committee in making its recommendation, because I feel it is not in conformity with the report which the committee made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, was the Chair putting the request for unanimous consent for voting on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. BILBO. I wish to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is already agreed to.

Mr. BILBO. I had expressed to the leader that I wanted to speak on the bill and I would not have time to get through before 5 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Debate would be in order under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I send forward the amendments I desire to offer and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Beginning on page 35, line 4, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 5 on page 38.

The amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 38, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "Director" and to insert "Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives"; and on line 13, to strike out "he" and insert "they."

The amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 41, line 13, beginning with the word "Until", it is proposed to strike out through the word "the" in line 15, before the word "professional", and to insert in lieu thereof the word "The."

The amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 41, beginning with line 20, it is proposed to strike out through line 2 on page 42.

The amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 43, lines 17 and 18, it is proposed to strike out ", upon recommendation and certification of the director of Congressional Personnel,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 50, beginning in line 20, it is proposed to strike out subsection (a) of section 243; and on page 51, line 3, to strike out "said" and insert "Congressional."

The amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed that the subsections be relettered in conformity with the amendments just made.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is now offering these amendments all together as one amendment?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. They have been agreed to seriatim.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is another amendment pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments just agreed to were those offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand, but there was already an amendment pending, and I desire to make a statement about it. The amendments which have just been agreed to incorporate the amendment I had offered to strike out certain language in the bill. The amendment has already been acted on, but my amendment was still pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk advises the Chair that the Senator's amendment was covered in the action taken.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to have the RECORD show that in view of the action taken I withdraw the amendment I previously offered, and which was the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, on page 6, line 20, I move to strike out the word "thirteen" and insert the word "twenty-one."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask for its present consideration.

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

Mr. HILL. For what purpose?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. To make an inquiry of the Chair.

Mr. HILL. I think it will take but a moment to dispose of my amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What disposition has been made of the amendment on page 44, lines 21 to 25?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Whose amendment was that?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am merely seeking information.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understood the Senator from Virginia to make the statement that he intended to offer an amendment to strike out the provision to which he referred.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It has not been disposed of?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; it has not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the amendment on page 44, line 21?

Mr. BYRD. That is a different amendment. The amendment to which I referred was in the middle of page 43.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Apparently we have different prints.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will let us dispose of my amendment, I think it will take but a moment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well.

Mr. HILL. I ask that my amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 69, after line 21, it is proposed to insert the following:

(1) Any claim arising from the activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, when the Tennessee Valley Authority went into the Tennessee Valley, as we know, it took the place of private utility companies in most of the States now served

by the Tennessee Valley Authority. Of course, the people in that valley had certain rights to file claims against the private utility companies.

When we wrote the basic Tennessee Valley Authority Act, we permitted such rights to be exercised against the Tennessee Valley Authority exactly as they could have been exercised against the private utility companies. In order to make sure that the pending bill does not interfere with any rights in the Tennessee Valley, so far as the Tennessee Valley Authority is concerned, I offer this amendment, and I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will agree to accept it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was not on the floor on Saturday, being out of the city, and I find in a print of the bill before me—I do not know exactly how to identify it except that it is the print which contains many italicized amendments——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Those are the amendments which have been agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In section 205 there appears a paragraph numbered paragraph (h), which reads as follows:

No individual who is employed as a professional staff member of any committee as provided in this section shall be eligible for appointment to any office or position in the executive branch of the Government for a period of 5 years after he shall have ceased to be such a member.

My inquiry is, Has that amendment been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was agreed to at the time the other amendments were adopted, and is incorporated in the bill which incorporated the amendments adopted up to that time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It seems to me that is a strikingly awkward and shortsighted provision, in that it means that, so far as the employees of the Senate and House are hereafter concerned, their chief source of employment after they are separated from Congress will be as lobbyists. They cannot go into the executive branch of the Government, but there is no prohibition against their serving special interests as lobbyists. It seems to me that we should not undertake to place such a restriction upon the employees of the Senate and the House, and I wonder what the source of the amendment was. It certainly was not in the committee report, was it?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I offered the amendment because there was apprehension expressed to me that if committee staff members were in a position where they could move from the committees to the executive branch of the Government without any restriction there might be a tendency for them not to serve the committees impartially, but to have their eyes on preferred employment in the executive branch of the Government.

I want to emphasize that the amendment does not apply to anyone except the four staff members who are to be appointed to the new committees. It was the purpose of the Senator from Wisconsin to create a situation whereby they would be beholden to the committee, and not be tempted to change their employment and to go to departments downtown. Some Senators pointed out to me privately that even in their own offices they are constantly losing employees at a time when they become most valuable to them, because the employees can find better positions in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The plan of the Senator then was to create a special class of indentured public servants. This seems to me to be an invasion of elementary freedom. I can certainly understand the provision of law which prohibits officials of the executive departments practicing law before their department for a period of 2 years after they have resigned, but to prohibit an employee of the Senate or the House from seeking employment in the executive branch of the Government or having an appointment in the civil service seems to be an extraordinary legislative procedure.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will say that the whole purpose with respect to these four staff assistants to the committees is to secure persons who will serve the committees and will be in an independent position, and thus enable the committees to have the service of men and women of training and experience who will impartially evaluate the material the committees receive not only from persons interested in legislation outside the Government, but also from the executive branch of the Government. I do not see anything wrong in making that a condition of employment. If a person wants to accept employment in the executive branch of the Government he may do so; but if he becomes a member of a committee staff, I think he should be prohibited from taking employment in the executive branch of the Government for a period of time after he has severed his connection with the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it seems to me that the inevitable result of this provision will be to reduce the character and grade of the persons who will accept employment.

I should like to ask unanimous consent that that amendment may be reconsidered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I could not grant unanimous consent for that purpose. Of course the Senator can move to do so. But I think it is a very sound provision. We are proposing here salaries between $6,000 and $8,000 a year, and I think we are entitled to have these persons enter this service with the idea of serving the committees of Congress, and not of using such service as a stepping stone into the executive branch of the Government. The desire here is to strengthen the Congress, not the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A much better way to do that, it seems to me, would be to make it a condition precedent that a person accepting such a provision should enter into a contract for a specified period instead of saying to such an employee, "After you have severed your connection with the Congress, after you have been discharged perhaps, after you have voluntarily retired, avenues of employment in the executive branch are closed to you for 5 years."

Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin is unwilling to grant unanimous consent, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming, that the vote by which the amendment on page 42, after line 8, was adopted be reconsidered.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to strike out on page 43, subsection 4, the following provision:

(4) to assist representatives of the press and radio in reporting on the proceedings of Congress, and for this purpose the Director of the Legislative Reference Service is authorized to assign competent persons to the press and radio galleries of the Senate and the House of Representatives, who shall make available relevant records, debates, and background data.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 26, after line 7, it is proposed to insert the following subtitle and new sections:

Joint Committee on Administrative Practices and Efficiency.

That (a) there is hereby created a joint congressional committee, to be known as the Joint Committee on Administrative Practices and Efficiency (hereinafter referred to as the "committee.")

(b) The committee shall be composed of the Members of the Senate who are members of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the Members of the House of Representatives who are members of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

(c) No person shall continue to serve as a member of the committee after he has ceased to be a member of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments or the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, as the case may be.

(d) Vacancies in the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee.

(e) The members of the committee shall serve without additional compensation for their services, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the committee, other than expenses in connection with the meetings of the committee held in the District of Columbia during such time as the Congress is in session.

(f) The committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members.

(g) The committee shall, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, employ and fix the compensation of such professional, clerical, and other employees as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the committee, and all of such employees shall be appointed without regard to political affiliation and solely on the ground of fitness to perform the duties to which they may be assigned. Employees of the committee, upon the written authority of the chairman or vice chairman, shall have the right to examine the books, documents, papers, reports, or other records of any department or agency of the Government in the District of Columbia or elsewhere.

(h) No decision shall be made by the committee except upon a majority vote of the members representing each House, taken separately.

SEC. 2. (a) The committee is authorized and empowered to conduct investigations and studies into the practices, procedures, administrative processes, and efficiency of any department or agency of the Government or any corporation owned by the Government or in which the Government has a financial interest. The committee shall receive and consider complaints relating to the practices, procedures, administrative processes, and efficiency of any such department, agency, or corporation. The committee is empowered, upon complaint or upon its own initiative to make such investigations and studies under this subsection as in its judgment may be necessary to keep the Congress fully informed as to whether or not the laws of the United States are being properly and efficiently administered and as to whether or not additional legislation is necessary and appropriate to improve their administration. It shall be the duty of the committee to make such studies and investigations when directed by resolution of either House of Congress.

(b) The committee shall report to the Congress annually on or before the 15th of January, and at such other times as it deems advisable, the results of its investigations and studies and may make such recommendations as it deems advisable.

SEC. 3. The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act anywhere within or without the District of Columbia whether the Congress is in session or has adjourned or is in recess; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title II, secs. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

SEC. 4. Appropriations for the expenses of the committee shall be disbursed one-half by the Secretary of the Senate and one-half by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman or the vice chairman.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the amendment is offered following section 122 of the pending bill, section 122 provides:

The standing committees of the two Houses are authorized to hold joint hearings with respect to subject matter within their respective jurisdictions.

Mr. President, the amendment is in fact a bill which was introduced in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The bill, after hearings, was reported favorably, and it is now on the calendar, having been reported July 25, 1945.

Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to strengthen the pending bill. I have already discussed some of the merits of it in my previous remarks on the bill. The reorganization would place upon the new Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments certain duties set forth in the report. I shall not take the time to read them. This amendment would establish a standing joint committee of the two Houses and direct it to make investigations with respect to administrative affairs, and questions relating to efficiency in the administrative branch of the Government.

Under the terms of the bill as it now stands the committees would be authorized to continue to investigate, or to exercise surveillance over the particular agencies or departments of Government coming within their jurisdiction. In the past committees could have done so, but they have not done so, and they will not do so. If the committee proposed by my amendment is established, there will be a standing joint committee of the two Houses charged with the responsibility imposed in the bill. The committee will be directed to make investigations from time to time as the occasion may arise. Such a committee would obviate the necessity of creating a special committee every time some question arises.

At the time of the hearings on my bill in July 1945, I received a report from the Library of Congress as to the number of resolutions which had been introduced up to that time in the two Houses of Congress asking for particular investigations or studies. Many of them pertained to the affairs of the executive and administrative departments of Government. I have not time to read all of them, but it required 16 pages to list the number of resolutions which had been introduced up to that time calling for such investigations. I have a subsequent report from the Library of Congress up to and including February 1, 1946. There are 13 pages more listing the resolutions calling for various kinds of studies and investigations.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

This amendment would not cover every investigation which might be made; but if any question should arise which the Congress wished to investigate in any department of the Government, there would be a joint committee of the two Houses ready to act. It would obviate duplication. The committee would be empowered and directed to make the investigation. Resolutions authorizing investigations could continue to be submitted and adopted by either branch of Congress, but it would not be necessary to create special committees. There would be a standing joint committee of the two Houses to conduct the investigations.

I am now happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am exceedingly sorry to have to rise to oppose this amendment. The recommendations contained in the bill charge the expenditures and accounts committees of the two Houses with many of the same obligations contained in the pending amendment.

Secondly, we have come to the conclusion that no one committee can possibly give oversight to the actions of the myriad agencies and departments of Government and make certain that they are keeping within the bounds of the intent of Congress in delegating power to them to issue rules and regulations which have the force of law. For that reason we have placed that responsibility on the reorganized standing committees. Likewise, the bill contains a provision permitting those committees to form joint committees with their opposite numbers in the House. It seems to me that this amendment would simply duplicate what the committee has attempted to do through the standing committeee. In my opinion it would disrupt the plan as we have conceived it. We feel that dumping this entire load upon one joint committee would simply swamp it. It would have neither the staff nor the time to handle the matters which might be submitted to it.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield briefly. I wish to conclude.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I understand, this amendment is substantially the same as the bill which the Senator introduced sometime ago as a separate measure.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. HICKELOOPER. Is that the bill which was the subject of hearings before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That committee has already held hearings and has reported the bill. It is now on the calendar.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am in a quandary on this question. I am very much in favor of the purpose of the Senator's amendment. I was for it as an original bill. If the bill which we are considering is enacted as it now stands, there may be no need for this amendment. But if the bill is not enacted, I assure the Senator that I believe that his original bill should be enacted into law.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate the Senator's remarks.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I question the advisability of this amendment in the pending bill, but I am thoroughly in accord with the Senator's purpose.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very happy to have the Senator's sympathetic endorsement of the objectives of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour 3:30 having arrived, the so-called Byrd

amendment is in order. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is recognized.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me briefly?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas for 3 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the truth is that my amendment would not detract from the pending bill. It is said that the standing committees would do the investigating; but when an investigatory resolution is adopted a committee will have to be constituted for that purpose, whereas if we had a standing joint committee, 9 out of 10 resolutions calling for investigations would be referred to that committee. It would be, as it ought to be, a continuous investigating committee to investigate conditions in the various agencies of the Government.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have the floor in my own right.

Mr. BYRD. I assume that the Senator from Arkansas wishes a vote on his amendment. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia yields for a vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, may I have the floor at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Mississippi that under the unanimous consent agreement at 3:30 o'clock p. m. the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] was to be considered. The Senator from Virginia was to have half the time and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] the remaining half, until 5 o'clock, when a vote was to be had on the bill and all amendments thereto.

The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me? I should like to offer a short amendment, consideration of which will require only a minute or two.

Mr. BYRD. I am willing to yield at this time to the Senator from Nebraska. However, I think it is very important for me to reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, after line 22, it is proposed to insert:

Every committee and subcommittee serving the Senate and House of Representatives shall report the name, profession, and total salary of each staff member employed by it, and shall make an accounting of funds appropriated to it and expended by it, to the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, at least once every 6 months, and such information shall be published periodically in the Congressional Directory when and as the same is issued, and as Senate and House documents respectively, every 3 months.

On page 29, line 23, it is proposed to change the subsection designation from "(b) to "(c)."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this amendment would simply write into this legislation the provisions of what is known as Senate Resolution 77.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. BYRD. I will yield to the Senator from Mississippi, but after that I cannot yield further.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I am sorry that I came in at the eleventh hour. I arrived here this morning after having been absent for more than a month. I have not had an opportunity to read the provisions of this piece of legislation or to participate in its discussion.

From what I have seen and heard, I am frank to say that I shall be compelled to vote against it. My impression has been that the Senate has been doing a fine job in handling the Nations' business, even in the Great World War, and amid all the perplexing problems which face us as the aftermath of the war.

I love the Republicans, but I do not like to surrender so many chairmanships while the Democratic Party is in power. We have 33 committees, and most of them have plenty of business to attend to. I believe that that business can be much better attended to under the present system than under a system which would undertake to consolidate so much business in the hands of 15 or 16 committees. I think that would be a mistake governmentally. It certainly would be a mistake politically.

I wish to discuss especially section 601, by which it is proposed not only to raise the salaries of Senators and Representatives to $15,000 a year, but to strike out the expense allowance of $2,500 to House Members. Of course, Mr. President, all of us can use $15,000 a year; but I think I am speaking the sentiment of the people of this country who have the $200,000,000,000 or $300,000,000,000 war debt to meet—and the debt will be larger than that after we get through paying the expenses incident to the war—when I say that this is no time to increase the salaries of the Members of the Congress.

I do not know whether Senators have figured up the cost of the proposed increase in the salaries of Members of Congress, but it amounts to $2,655,000 a year. In my limited view and in the view of the people who live in my section of the country, $2,655,000 is a considerable sum of money. When we are preaching economy and when we are face to face with the tremendous war debt and other obligations incident to the war which we must meet if we are to be faithful to those who won the war for us, I am inclined to think that this is no time to be voting salary increases for ourselves. I have been here nearly 12 years, and I have gotten along reasonably well on $10,000 a year, plus my mileage. The fact of the matter is that I have gotten fat on the job because I have been getting so much. Recently I have been in Mississippi trying to persuade the people of my State to let me have another term of 6 years as Senator, at $10,000 a year. I shall be very glad to get the job at that price, and so would my four opponents.

But seriously, Mr. President—and I am serious—I think this whole bill needs study. I think we had better turn it over to the newspapers of the country and let them analyze it for the American people, because from what I have learned about the bill—I have never read it; I wish that to be understood—there are in it a number of provisions which are not exactly American. My friend the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] suggested a while ago that we should prevent any man or women from having an opportunity to be employed by any of the governmental agencies within 5 years after he or she had served on Capitol Hill as a member of the staff of some committee. Mr. President, that would be robbing a man of his individual liberty and his freedom.

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

Mr. BILBO. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. One of the most vicious practices in Washington today is that of men who have served in governmental departments resigning and entering private practice and accepting large fees as a result of the knowledge they acquired in a Government department and as a result of the officials they came to know while serving in the department.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask the Senator if he is a lawyer.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am not.

Mr. BILBO. Perhaps that explains the Senator's position, because lawyers always charge for what they know. Perhaps the Senator would not be entitled to the increased fee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. BILBO. But, Mr. President, the point I make is that this is no time to pass this bill. We should put the bill over until the first of January, and should let the people have an opportunity to understand all the implications of all the monkey business that is in the bill, which, as I understand, was written at the suggestion of approximately 40 so-called experts or economists.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Beginning with line 4 on page 81 it is proposed to strike out down through line 3 on page 84.

On page 84, line 4 it is proposed to strike out "(9)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)."

On page 84, in line 7, it is proposed to strike out "(10)" and insert in lieu thereof "(3)."

On page 84, between lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to insert the following:

(c) Section 7 (a) of such Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the

following new sentence: "Any Member of Congress who becomes separated from the service by reason of the expiration of the term for which he was elected or appointed shall be deemed to have been involuntarily separated from the service."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the purpose of that amendment is in lieu of the more favorable provisions in the bill is to offer to any Member of Congress or to a delegate from a Territory or to the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico the same opportunity to participate in the retirement benefits as is now given to civil service employees.

Before I discuss the amendment more fully, I wish to say just a few words about the pending bill. The resolution which authorized the committee to make the study which has been made was presented on January 22, 1945, and it was referred to the Rules Committee, of which I am chairman. It was reported by the Rules Committee on February 8, 1945. The original resolution was introduced by the late Senator Maloney, of Connecticut. In the interim the great Senator that he was unfortunately has passed away; and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has assumed the chairmanship of the special committee which has been instructed to make the report. The original resolution provided that the report should be made to the Rules Committee. Because of the fact that I was sympathetic with the general purpose of the proposed legislation, I urged the Rules Committee to authorize or to recommend to the Senate the appointment of a special committee, so that the entire matter could come before the Senate in the most expeditious way.

The original resolution, which was introduced on January 22, 1945, contained no reference whatever to increasing the salaries of Members of Congress, nor did it have any reference to allowing pensions or retirement benefits to Members of Congress. To that extent, I think the original resolution, as introduced by the late Senator Maloney, of Connecticut, has been overreached.

I may say, Mr. President, that with many of the matters and many of the recommendations made by the committee, I am in hearty accord. I think the time has come for a reorganization of the Senate, especially with respect to the numerous committees. I myself am a member of so many committees that it is practically impossible for me to attend and give the diligent attention which I should give to all the committee meetings which are being held.

I shall not delay the Senate, in the limited time which is allotted me, by indicating all the parts of the bill of which I approve. I especially approve, I may say, of the provision, which I trust has not been deleted, that Senators may not vote by proxy in committees. Let me ask the Senator from Wisconsin—for I have been away for several days—whether that provision still is in the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The bill now provides that the reporting of bills shall take place only when a majority membership is present in the committee, and a record vote shall be had.

Mr. BYRD. I simply wish to say, Mr. President, that I am in thorough sympathy and accord with that provision of the bill.

I do not think the provision with respect to salaries should have been inserted in the bill. My feeling about salaries is this: I think there should be no larger increase in the salaries of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives than the increase which already has been given to the members of the classified service. That increase amounts to approximately 35 percent. Therefore, I would be prepared to vote for an increase of 35 percent in the salaries of Members of Congress.

Mr. President, what I have just said also applies to the retirement fund. The Members of the Congress are the ones who make the laws. Whenever the Congress of the United States votes to itself special privileges, privileges which are in excess of those of other employees of the Federal Government, I think the Congress is subjecting itself to very severe criticism. I have heard it said during the debate that democracy is on trial here, that we must make the Congress more efficient, so that it will function better. I agree with that statement. But, Mr. President, democracy is also on trial when those who serve in elective office and who have the power to vote appropriations, give to themselves benefits far in excess of those enjoyed by other employees of the Government, as they will be doing, by the pending bill, in the case of the retirement fund benefits.

Mr. President, I would not care if the difference were nominal; I would not care if it were merely a small matter. I still say in connection with matters such as retirement funds there should be no difference between the benefits granted to employees of the Civil Service and the benefits granted to Members of Congress. The Members of the House of Representatives and the Members of the Senate should use particular care and should be very diligent to see that they do not give to themselves more in any way than is given to the regular classified service employees of the Government.

Mr. President, a table has been distributed to the desk of each Senator. If Senators will refer to it they will see that by a payment of $2,674 a Senator who entered the service on January 3, 1941, and retires on January 3, 1947, under the terms of the bill will be able to receive from the Federal Treasury $1,465 a year as long as he lives after he reaches 62 years of age. That means, Mr. President, that if he enjoys the ordinary life expectancy for 15 years he will receive $1,465 annually, or a total of approximately $22,000, and for that he will have paid only $2,674.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. In order that I may follow the Senator, am I to understand that the life expectancy table indicates that men who have reached 62 years of age will live, on the average, until they have reached 77?

Mr. BYRD. That is my understanding, from Civil Service Commission actuaries.

Mr. TYDINGS. That seems pretty high to me. I think the Senator is in error in his statement, but I do not have any figures available to support my belief. I know that the Senator does not wish to make an inaccurate statement.

Mr. BYRD. I have given the best information I have been able to obtain on the subject, and I may say it is based on Government statistics.

Mr. President, let us take a Government official earning $10,000, for example, under the same conditions. He pays the same amount and receives $822 a year after he reaches 62.

Let us go on down through the table. Take, for example, a Senator who became a Member of the Congress on January 3, 1939. He will receive $1,892 and the civil-service employee will receive only $1,035.

Let us take further, for example, a Senator who became a Member of the Congress on March 4, 1933. That Senator upon the payment of $2,674 will receive at retirement, $3,100 yearly. If he lives 15 years longer he will receive approximately $46,000, while the civil-service employee with comparable service under similar conditions will receive only $1,106 a year.

Let us take further, for example, a Senator who became a Member of Congress on March 4, 1925. He would be paid $4,673 yearly when 62 years of age, and, under the same conditions, the civil-service employee would be paid $2,322.

Those are the general differences.

Mr. President, I am not contending whatever that a pension of $3,100 for a Senator is too high, or that $3,500 or $3,800 is too high. What I am endeavoring to call to the attention of the Senate is that we must not vote ourselves greater benefits and greater privileges than are to be proportionately received by the 2,000,000 other employees of the Federal Government.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is the Senator from Virginia familiar with the financial requirements of a man who has not been under the Civil Service Retirement Act, and who comes under it by virtue of an act of Congress, or because of other reasons? How much of the back yearly payments is he required to make up in order to get on the civil-service floor?

Mr. BYRD. He is covered in by law and does not have to pay anything in order to cover the past.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is what I mean. My recollection is that, in connection with many of the Government projects—I am thinking of the Aberdeen Proving Grounds and the Edgewood Arsenal, both of which are located near my home—when Congress has covered in some of the employees who have heretofore been out, those employees are not required to make up any back payment at all.

Mr. BYRD. That is very true, but the annuity of that employee is reduced by that much.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I believe that while there may be some differential involved, nevertheless, that employee takes, from the time he is covered in, exactly

what he would have taken if he had come in earlier.

Mr. BYRD. He does not receive the increased annuity. A table has been prepared which covers that situation exactly.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator from Virginia put Members of Congress on the same basis with civil-service employees instead of putting them on the basis of the judiciary or officers of the Army and of the Navy?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Virginia considers the Congress of the United States on the basis of the body which makes the laws. We, as Members of the Congress, make the laws and we should not go before the people of the country and tell them, in order to secure a few hundred dollars more a year additional for each Member of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, that we have voted for ourselves a larger rate of proportionate compensation than is provided for employees of the Government who work under civil service.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Senator from Virginia believe that the Members of Congress should be placed in the same stratum or in the same echelon of Government service as judges, for example, are placed? If so, I may say that I do not see where there is any comparison between employees of that character and the average civil-service employee.

Mr. BYRD. I think there is a fair comparison to be made between the Members of Congress and those who fill the top jobs in the various departments and agencies of the Government. But the point I am endeavoring to make is this: I do not believe it is a good thing for the Congress of the United States to vote its Members larger benefits than are to be afforded to civil-service employees of the Government on the same basis.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the provision of the bill to which the Senator from Virginia objects should become law, would the Congress thereby be giving to its Members any greater benefits than it gives to members of the judiciary who occupy the same comparable echelon of Government service?

Mr. BYRD. I cannot say with reference to the judiciary, but if we pass this provision we will give ourselves more than Cabinet officers or heads of the various agencies of government will receive. I do not believe that we are comparable to the judiciary.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have never been sure that I was in favor of any sort of congressional retirement privileges, at least not of a financial nature. However, inasmuch as the members of the judiciary, and the high-ranking officers of the Army and of the Navy have been brought into the question, I may say that it is my understanding that none of them make any contribution to a retirement fund. Judges who are appointed for life are not required to campaign for reelection every 2 years or every 6 years. When they have once received their appointment they serve during good behavior for the remainder of their lives, or at least until the retiring age of 70 years has been reached, at full pay. Officers of the Army and of the Navy do not retire at full pay, but when they are graduated from West Point or Annapolis and receive their appointments as officers in the Army and the Navy, they become permanently associated with those services and receive promotion from time to time as earned. They do not pay out anything for the creation of a retirement fund. Through the amendment of the Senator from Virginia he would seek to put Members of Congress on the basis of civil-service employees who have lifetime jobs.

Mr. BYRD. I cannot agree with the Senator's statement in that respect. By the action which the Senate took the other day, thousands of Government employees will be dismissed from Government service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's statement, and I may say that the Senator from Virginia is advocating the discharge of thousands more, if not millions.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. However, the theory of civil-service employment is that of life service.

Mr. BYRD. I cannot agree with that statement. Civil-service employees are retained as long as there is work for them to do.

Mr. BARKLEY. Nevertheless, those who are retained are retained permanently.

Mr. BYRD. But there is no obligation to keep them and furnish them with jobs.

Mr. BARKLEY. But if they are kept, they are kept.

Mr. BYRD. They may not be kept.

Mr. BARKLEY. Has the Senator given any consideration to the question of expenses which are necessarily incurred in conducting campaigns in an effort to be reelected as Members of Congress? If the Senator has not given consideration to that subject, does he still believe that it is proper to put Members of Congress upon the same basis as those who are appointed for life, or as long as they wish to remain in Government service until the retiring age has been reached? They are not subject to removal except for cause, or because of the lack of a job. If the Government does not need them, they are dismissed, but those who are retained in the employ of the Government are not required to put themselves to any financial outlay in order to retain their positions. I wonder if the Senator has given any thought to that subject?

Mr. BYRD. I have given thought to the subject. I would be reluctant to believe that Congress should allow its Members additional expenses merely because of the necessity of meeting financial outlays in connection with political ambition. No compulsion is exercised upon a man to become a Member of the United States Senate. No one compelled me to be a candidate for the United States Senate. I became a candidate because I wanted the honor of being a United States Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as that is concerned, I do not believe that any person has ever been compelled to become a Government employee. Whoever became a Government employee became so voluntarily.

Mr. BYRD. I would not wish the Senator to connect pensions with the question of political expenses.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; but the question does have something to do with a man's ability to support himself after a long tenure in public office and he finds it no longer possible to retain his office. Of course, I realize that men who are ambitious to become Members of Congress consider it to be an honor to be a Member of Congress. The Senator also knows that some of our very distinguished colleagues who have been either defeated for reelection to their positions, or have resigned, by reason of their long tenure as Senators and their experience, have been able to obtain jobs which paid them $25,000 or $40,000 or $50,000 a year.

Mr. BYRD. I am not advised on that, and hope the Senator from Kentucky will not take that as applying to himself.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield.

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think if we had not departed from the Civil Service Retirement Act, all the remarks of the Senator from Virginia would be apropos, and I am not saying that they are not without great force and weight even though we have departed from it. But let me point out to the Senator that my recollection is that a judge on the Federal bench, even a circuit judge, can retire at any time for disability on three-quarters pay, that a judge in the United States judiciary can retire after a certain age at full pay, that an Army or Navy officer can retire at 60 or 62 years of age at three-quarters pay; and that none of them contributes a single cent to the retirement fund.

Mr. BYRD. Their salaries are much less than $10,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. I know all about that, and their expenses are much less, too.

Mr. BYRD. A great many of their expenses are paid.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am unwilling to write the Senate off as being less worthy than the Federal judiciary, or Army and Navy officers, for the reason that it seems to me that of all the offices within the gift of the Government, the Cabinet perhaps excepted, and perhaps the Supreme Court excepted, I rank the Senate and House of Representatives right at the top.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There was some discussion between the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Virginia in reference to the permanency of civil-service employment. I think that does make a difference in these comparisons.

I wonder if the Senator would not agree with me that there is a permanency in what we call permanent civil-service employment. I suspect that the

figures would show that the involuntary retirement of so-called permanent civil-service employees would probably be much less than 10 percent of the total.

Mr. BYRD. There can be no such thing as permanent civil-service employment. It is not permanent unless the Government of the United States has a job to give to a man.

Mr. President, I have only 15 minutes left. The point the Senator from Virginia is making is that this provision gives to Senators and Representatives twice as much, in proportion to the payment they make in the retirement fund, as is paid to Cabinet members and as is paid to those in every other branch of the Government except the judiciary. It may be that the judiciary, for reasons best known to Congress, was placed in a special category. Army and Navy officers are in an entirely different situation. The high officers of the Army and Navy are not paid as much as Senators receive, and their situation is entirely different.

Mr. President, I have 12 more minutes, and I presume those opposed to the amendment will probably wish to speak next. I reserve 12 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the joint committee and the select committee gave very careful consideration to the question of congressional retirement. I think I can say that we were not unmindful of the fact that a proposal of a retirement system for Members of the House and Senate, if it is to accomplish its objectives, must provide a sufficient amount of annuity so that Members of Congress who reach the elder-age bracket will feel that they can retire, and so that sitting Members of Congress, knowing that such a system is in operation, will be enabled to be even more independent in their actions on public questions.

I am fully aware of the situation which developed when the last action was taken in this connection, but I am convinced that the people of the United States have come to appreciate the fact that nearly every other activity in life, public or private, is now either covered by a retirement or annuity system, or soon will be. There is being made now by the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives a thorough study of the proposal to broaden the social-security system so that it will include nearly all the groups which are now not covered by it. I think the people of the country recognize that nearly every important industrial concern now has a provision for the retirement of its executive personnel.

As has been pointed out, some years ago Congress extended the system of retirement to the employees of the Federal Government. We have provided retirement for members of the judiciary, whose salaries range from $10,000 to $22,500. They may retire, at any time after their appointment, on three-fourths of their salary, for disability, and after they have served 10 years they may retire at their full salary; and they are not required to make any contribution whatsoever to the retirement system. The officers and enlisted personnel of the armed forces are provided with the retirement privilege, to which they do not have to make any contribution.

We believed that the congressional retirement system should be a contributory one, but we recognized, after studying the problem, that there is no analogy between the service of Members of the House and the Senate, and the employment situation of those who are in the executive arm of the Government. Under the civil-service system, employees who pass their examinations and serve their probationary period and become permanent employees, after 6 months, may stay in that system, during good behavior, if they maintain their health, until they reach retirement age. That is not the situation confronting Members of the House and Senate. They have no guaranty at all of continuity of service. Therefore, if we should apply the ironclad contributory principle to the Members of the House and Senate, the resulting annuity benefit would not accomplish any of the objectives which would be accomplished by a sound retirement system.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that civil-service employees do not go into office and remain at static salaries. Their compensation is increased from time to time during their entire service, provided they are worthy and are entitled to be promoted. They have a classification system.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. They have a classification act which makes them eligible for promotion at certain stated intervals of time, and is so calculated as to bring about their promotion unless their service has been unsatisfactory.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, that is not true with respect to Members of either branch of the Congress.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No. The compensation of Members of the Congress has not been increased since 1925. It is true it is proposed by this bill to increase it to $15,000, beginning with the new Congress, if the bill should become law; but I believe I am reliably informed when I say that there have been increases in the salaries and compensation of those in the Government service since 1925 which approximates the 50 percent increase in salaries proposed in the pending measure.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am sure the distinguished Senator is correct in his last statement. In 1928 a raise was given Federal employees which was diversified. It was not a regular raise, but I think it ran from 8 to as high as 20 percent, and I believe must have averaged at least 12 percent.

As the distinguished Senator from Virginia has said, in the last two pay raises we have given Federal employees about a 35-percent increase. As a matter of fact, I think their increase since 1940, because of in-grade increases and salary increases, has reached close to 40 percent.

So the increase here proposed would do nothing more than give to Members of the Congress about the same increase we have given to Federal employees.

If I may intrude further upon the time of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, manifestly any annuity which would be of any considerable value to Senators and Members of the House could not follow the regular annuity system applied to other Federal employees. Of course, the reason for that is very plain, namely, that Senators and Representatives average about 50 years of age when they enter on their offices, and they serve only about half the length of time other Federal employees do who are in office for any considerable period of time. Consequently, serving for comparatively short periods of time and rendering service at a rather advanced age, the regular annuity system of the Federal employees would not be of great value to them.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator uses the increases made in civil-service employment to make comparison, he should point out the fact that the heads of the bureaus have had no increases. If they are comparable to Senators, they have had no increases. When they reach the top, which is $10,000 a year, heads of bureaus do not receive automatic increases, so they may be in the same position as Senators during this period.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I reply to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Virginia by saying that we are steadily losing from the governmental service men at the $10,000 bracket, which is now the limit, because they can obtain substantially higher salaries in private industry. I certainly do not think that because we are unwise in doing an injustice to that particular class of public servant, we should therefore be guided in that unfortunate respect in deciding upon the retirement provision in this bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I may say also, Mr. President, that your committee considered the relationship of the recommendations which we should make with regard to the increase in compensation and the recommendations which we would make in regard to retirement. The committee was urged by some of the witnesses to recommend a very much higher salary increase than it finally recommended, and it was also urged to provide a very much more generous retirement system than it has recommended. We have endeavored, Mr. President, to be reasonable in both respects, and while maintaining the contributory principle, we have attempted in our retirement recommendations to strike a balance which will give very reasonable and modest retirement compensation, but at the same time will be sufficient to achieve the two primary objectives of a retirement system for Members of Congress. I repeat, those objectives are, first, that when they

reach the upper-age brackets they should feel that they have the opportunity to retire after years of faithful service, and, second, to give an added sense of independence to the representatives of the people in the discharge of their high responsibilities as Members of the policy-making arm of the Federal Government.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is it not one of the purposes of retirement systems that they be made sufficiently adequate to encourage men to retire when they reach an age when perhaps they are not quite completely physically handicapped, but when a continuation of their work involves some detriment to their efficiency? Unless the provision is made adequate and made sufficiently attractive to them there would not be the encouragement for members of the legislative body to retire when many of them probably should if they knew how they could live after they retired.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I agree with the Senator from Washington. I do not believe that the annuities provided for in this proposal can be attacked by anyone on the ground that they are excessive when all the considerations that surround life and service in the Congress are taken into account. Who can say that a man who has served in this body since March 4, 1913, and who makes a full back payment, should not be entitled to receive an annuity of $7,500? Who can say that a man who has served in this body since March 4, 1913, and decides to retire, and finds himself in a position where he cannot make more than the $2,674 back payment, and he receives an annuity of $6,536, is receiving an amount which is excessive in relation to the service which he has rendered to his own people and to the country?

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. We have a rather unique situation in the Senate in relation to the conditions we are now discussing. Men whose seniority goes back to that date have been returned many times by the people of their States to this high office, and the reason they were returned was because by their conduct here they won the confidence and the affection and the admiration of the people of their States. I have not found myself wholly in agreement on many matters with some of the more senior Members of the Senate, but the longer I have been here the better I have recognized their high ability. I know that there are distinguished Senators who in the open competitive field of the law would have been among the most distinguished lawyers this Nation has produced, and would have been capable, with a very small part of the work they have had to do and the burdens they have borne here, of earning many times the salaries which they have been content to accept as a matter of public service. They have made that sacrifice and they have made it willingly, and they do not regret it. But I would say, as a very young man in the Senate, that I feel sure the Nation would want to reward by decent annuities the fine work and the high service of these men.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to say further that your committee was not unmindful of the fact, either, that it is becoming increasingly difficult, if not impossible, for men to remain in the service of the House and the Senate and of their constituencies and States in these times, especially men who do not enjoy any outside income, and who find themselves dependent on the salary that they receive. We have already seen, unfortunately, in the case of the House of Representatives, the voluntary retirement of several of its most distinguished and experienced Members who have resigned from the House, acknowledging that they were no longer able in justice to themselves and to their families to continue to serve under the compensation they receive and without any retirement benefits.

The only trouble with the amendment which the Senator from Virginia offers is that it will not accomplish the objective for which the congressional retirement system is devised. I have confidence, Mr. President, in the intelligence of the American people, and I believe that they stand ready to support the Congress in doing the courageous thing in providing a compensation which is sufficient to permit a Member of the Congress and his family to live in modest decency and comfort, to educate his children, and to discharge his family responsibilities and also in providing a retirement system which will enable those who, either because of disability or because of long service or because of the accidents of political elections, find themselves no longer Members of either the House or the Senate.

I know that it is easy to say that we are in the unfortunate position of having to pass upon our own compensation and upon our retirement system. But I say, Mr. President, that I think the time has come, if representative government in America is to be supported, when we must attract men of the highest abilities, and we must retain, insofar as the people are willing to retain them, the men who have by experience and ability become familiar with the intricate problems of government with which the Congress now has to deal.

I say very frankly that I believe the people will support us if we have the courage to meet this situation and to strengthen the personnel and the independence of the Congress of the United States.

I reserve the remainder of my time, but I shall be glad to yield it to any other Senator who wishes to oppose the pending amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to have 10 minutes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as I stated a while ago in a colloquy with the Senator from Virginia, whose efforts at economy we all, of course, appreciate, I have never been thoroughly sold, so far as I am personally concerned, on the retirement system for Members of Congress. That attitude may have been superinduced by my reaction to the political implications involved in it, just as my action in voting against the salary increases may have been unconsciously influenced by the political repercussions.

I remember when I was in the House of Representatives, when the last increase in salaries occurred for Members of Congress. The salaries were increased from $7,500 to $10,000 a year. I voted against that salary increase. I voted against it, in part, at least, because 2 or 3 weeks before that I had voted against a general increase in the salaries of Government employees, and I was not willing to vote myself an increase when I had voted against increases for others. The newspapers in my congressional district mentioned rather favorably the fact that I had voted against that increase in salary. Some of them had editorials after this fashion: "Old BARKLEY stood by the people; he did not engage in this raid on the Treasury"; and so forth.

Congress adjourned shortly after that, and I expected to be patted on the back by everyone I saw when I got home because I had voted against the increase in the salaries of Members of Congress. I was at home for a week. I went up and down Broadway in my home city and into the stores to see my friends and visit with them. I spent an entire week there, and no one mentioned the subject. No one said a word about it. Finally an old farmer friend of mine, much older than I was, but a very dear friend who always came to town when he heard that Congress had adjourned, heard that I had returned home, and he wanted to talk about what was going on. He was a well-informed man. We stood in the shade of a brick wall for about an hour and talked about what had happened in Congress. Finally he said, "I see that you fellows in Congress increased your salaries." I replied, "Yes, Uncle Jack. They did, but I voted against it." He looked straight into my eyes for about 5 minutes, and finally he said, "You are just a damn fool." [Laughter.]

That is the only comment I ever heard in my congressional district upon the vote which I cast against increasing salaries from $7,500 to $10,000 a year.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I am delighted to note from the Senator's remarks that he seems to have grown wiser since that day.

Mr. BARKLEY. That little conversation taught me a lesson which has been of some value to me. Frequently we underestimate the intelligence of the American people whom we represent here, and who have honored us by membership in this body.

I happen to be one of those who date back to March 4, 1913. I suppose service in the two branches is cumulative. I came to the House of Representatives on the 4th of March 1913, on the day when Woodrow Wilson was first inaugurated President of the United States. I use my own case as an example, which I think is typical. I was a young man in the practice of law. I had served as prosecuting attorney and as judge, but had not been able to save any money. I had a hard race in my first contest for the

House of Representatives. I had a growing family to educate. The result was that it was about all I could do to get by, maintaining a home in my home city and a home in Washington. A man with children must maintain a home wherever he is, and he must educate his children, wherever he is.

As I have stated, I go back to March 4, 1913. In order to draw the amount set out in this table I would be required to pay into the retirement fund $14,747.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator will pardon me, he is mistaken. If he will look at the other columns he will find that if he retires on January 1, 1947, he may pay $2,674 and receive an annual pension of $6,538.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the 5-year repayment.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator retires on January 1, 1947, he may pay in $2,674 and receive an annual pension of $6,538. This table was prepared by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me see. I do not wish to be mistaken. Column 2 is headed "Amount owed as of January 2, 1947." Coming down to March 4, 1913, the figure is $14,747.

Mr. BYRD. That is an option which the Senator would have, but he would not be compelled to exercise that option.

Mr. BARKLEY. In order to receive $7,500 a year, which is three-fourths of the present salary, I would have to pay in $14,747.

Mr. BYRD. But——

Mr. BARKLEY. However, I might choose to pay in for only 5 years.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator should choose that plan, if he were to retire on January 1, 1947, he would pay in $2,674 and would receive $6,538 a year for as long as he lived. I pray that he will live for many years to come, and will not retire.

Mr. BARKLEY. I join in that prayer. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRD. The Senator would draw $6,538 a year, but the head of an agency who receives $10,000 a year and pays in the same amount would receive only $3,859.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was taking the sheet column by column.

Mr. BYRD. The first column is somewhat confusing, because it represents an option which gives slightly more.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize that.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator will read the heading, he will see that all he has to pay is $2,674, for the last 5 years of service, and he receives $6,538 a year.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand, but I have not yet come to the 5-year option.

Mr. BYRD. I was afraid the Senator would not get to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. However, if I wished to receive retirement income of $7,500 a year, I would have to pay into the fund $14,747, or practically $15,000. There is an option under which I could pay only for the last 5 years of service—and under this system if one does not pay at least that much into the fund he does not receive any retirement benefits. I suppose most of us would pay back $2,674 instead of $14,747, for obvious reasons. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I realize that service in this body and in the House of Representatives constitutes a great honor. The men who sit here help to make history, and sometimes they make important history. There is nothing derogatory about the ambition of a man to serve in the Senate or the House of Representatives for a long time. When I was a young student in college and read about Webster, Clay, and Calhoun, I thought that I would rather serve in the United States Senate and attain the reputation that they enjoyed—if I could—than to be any President of the United States who was ever elected. I still believe that. I believe that to be a long-time Member of this body and render distinguished service is an honor not to be excelled by that of any other position to which the American people could elevate one of their fellow citizens.

To me it has always seemed abhorrent that those of us who are not rich should hang on to membership in this body merely for the sake of having a job. Of course we cannot afford to have a Senate composed exclusively of rich men. The same observation applies to the House of Representatives. To me it has always been abhorrent and tragic for a man to serve here with distinction and arrive at an elederly state in life when he looks upon membership in the United States Senate as a mere job, something to be held on to because he does not have sufficient means to support himself and has not been able to lay aside enough to support himself after he retires from long service in this body or in the House of Representatives. Before I would permit myself to reach the age where I was merely hanging on to my seat in the Senate because it was a job which provided me a living, rather than the greater obligation and the greater concept of duty, I would retire tomorrow, at an age when I might still be able to make money and indulge in profitable activities, and in a comparatively short time lay aside something for a rainy day.

Therefore, Mr. President, in view of these reflections of mine, I shall vote for the provisions of the bill to increase the salaries of Members of the two Houses to $15,000 a year. I am satisfied that if my old friend were yet living—which I regret to say he is not—instead of commenting upon my vote as he did 21 years ago, if he could meet me in my home town after the adjournment of Congress and we could stand on the shady side of a wall and talk about what had happened, he would approve my vote this time. If any one in my district disapproved it, I would probably never hear about it.

Mr. President, I believe that membership in this body or in the other body of Congress is of equal dignity with that of the judiciary. After 10 years' service Federal judges are retired at full pay, without having to contribute a nickel. I would not want them to do so. I would not vote to require them to do so. Judges who give up their practice and go on the bench and serve for 10 years can retire at full pay. I am not willing to say that our service here is of a dignity and importance less than that of judges; and I am not willing to say that our service here is of a dignity and importance less than that of Army and Navy officers, who can retire at the age of 64. None of them has ever been required to contribute a single dime to the fund out of which they receive their retirement pay.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it is a matter of regret to me that I find myself in total disagreement with the Senator from Virginia with respect to this amendment. I believe that it is sound in practice and wise in principle to write a retirement law of this sort. I do not know how it will work in individual cases. No one would ever suspect, looking at the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and then looking at me, that I am also among the group who would have to pay the sum of almost $15,000 to obtain the benefits of retirement. When I saw those figures I stepped across the aisle and said to the Senator from Kentucky, "How am I going to take advantage of this unless you will lend me the $15,000?" The Senator from Kentucky replied that he would gladly do so if I would tell him where he could get it. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator should make it clear that he could pay in $2,674 and receive $6,538 a year.

Mr. WHITE. I understand that.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator ought to state both propositions. Why there is such an alternative in the bill I do not know.

Mr. WHITE. I understand that. I shall speak of it in a moment if I do not talk too long about other things.

Mr. President, I believe in the principle of retirement. We have extended it to the entire Federal judiciary of the United States. Members of the Supreme Court and of district courts throughout the entire length and breadth of the country are the beneficiaries of a retirement system. The officers of our Army and Navy have the benefit of retirement laws. Many of our Federal civil employees have the benefit of retirement laws. Modern, liberal, and forward-looking industries have been putting into effect, and I venture to say will continue to put into effect, retirement systems for their employees.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for moment?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that judges who have been retired are subject to being called back to duty, and officers of the Army and the Navy who have retired are subject to being called back to duty. But Members of Congress are not subject to being called back, unless they are reelected.

Mr. WHITE. I admit that that is true. I merely say that they are the beneficiaries of retirement systems, and I stop with that statement.

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

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Would not the Senator agree that all Members of Congress who are defeated would be delighted to be called back to the service? [Laughter.]

Mr. WHITE. Well, it may be that I shall give the people of Maine a chance to call me back to service, but with no intervening defeat. But, Mr. President, I wish to say that I am in favor of the bill because of its basic and fundamental principles. I am in favor of the retirement system which it proposes, for, as I have said, retirement systems are provided for Government employees who are under the civil-service system, for officers of the Army and the Navy, and retirement systems are provided for the employees of practically all forward-looking industrial concerns in our land.

Some fear and some criticism have been expressed because of the provision that the Members of Congress vote themselves the proposed retirement benefits. However, if we do not do so, who will? The Members of the House and the Members of the Senate have always faced the responsibility of fixing their own salaries, because under our constitutional system no one else can do so. The Members of Congress have always provided, in their judgment, for their clerical assistants and they have always provided for their railroad mileage and their stationery allowances. All that we have done because under our constitutional system no one else can do it. That burden was placed on the Members of Congress by the Constitution of the United States, and we who are the present Members of Congress are charged with the duty of fixing our own salaries and allowances.

As the Senator from Kentucky has said, he and I have voted to reduce salaries and allowances, and there is no difference in principle between doing that and voting now to increase these salaries and benefits.

The Senator from Virginia has voiced the criticism that under the proposed system the Members of the Congress would enjoy larger retirement benefits than those which many of the civil-service employees enjoy. That is true. But it is also true that we who are Members of Congress provide larger salaries for ourselves than we do for various of the civil-service employees. If the logic of what the Senator from Virginia has said were to be applied all the way through, we should either increase the pay of all civil-service employees to the level of the pay we receive, or we should reduce our pay to the amount of theirs. However, no one seriously makes such a contention.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I simply wish to make it clear that the comparisons made on the chart which I have presented are based on salaries of $10,000 a year for civil-service employees.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I have said, I believe in the principle of retirement, and I hope the Byrd amendment will be defeated. I hope the bill will be passed with the provision for the retirement benefits, and I hope I shall be able to negotiate some sort of arrangement with the Senator from Kentucky under which I may enjoy the most-favored benefits of the provision.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if I may be given a minute, I should like to say that I might make an arrangement like the one which is often mentioned as having been made between Henry Clay and Daniel Webster. There is a very old story, which is told here in Washington, that Henry Clay went downtown to a bank, to borrow $500. The requirement of the bank was that he must have someone sign the note with him. So he took the blank note which he had to sign and went out to get another signature. He met Webster, and said to him, "Mr. Webster, I want to borrow $500 at the bank, and they require another signature. Will you go on the note with me?" Webster is said to have replied, "Yes. But I need $500 myself. Let us make it $1,000."

So the two of them signed it, and each got $500 apiece for the joint note which they had signed jointly.

So, Mr. President, if the Senator from Maine can negotiate some such arrangement in Washington, I will sign his note if he will sign mine. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHITE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall not take that much time. I should like to call attention to the fact that if one were to make payments to the retirement fund for the 5 years required under the provisions of the bill, and also thereafter were to pay 6 percent of his annual salary, he would, if he were in the situation in which I find myself, for instance, pay in $2,674 and then, in my case, if I should be fortunate enough to live out the period of my present term—4 years from now—would pay, at the same rate, approximately $2,400 more, and on the basis of the proposed increased salary approximately $3,600 more. The annuity which I would be entitled to receive at that time would be in the neighborhood of $4,700.

Mr. President, it would rarely occur that a man who spent his life in this body, until he reached 70 years of age, would live long enough thereafter to draw many annuity payments. He would be very fortunate indeed if he lived to receive back the amount of money he paid in, plus his actual contributions on the basis required by this bill. Indeed, it would be more or less of a gamble if one were required to pay in $2,674, plus 6 percent upon, let us say, $15,000, assuming that the salary will be raised to that amount—or $900 a year—with the possibility of getting back only approximately $4,700, if he did not have the assurance that whatever payments he actually made would be returned to him, in any and in all events—which is true under the provisions of the bill; and it is also true that one who retired under the proposed retirement system could elect to have his wife or his dependents receive a portion of his annuity, but in that event the amount he would receive would be reduced substantially.

So when one considers that after a long period of service in this body, after a man has reached the age of 65 or 70 years he has only a fair opportunity to receive an annuity equal to the amount of his actual contributions, it is obvious that we shall not be over-generous with ourselves if we set up the proposed retirement system.

Furthermore, I should like to say that, from long experience in public life—and I have been in public life since 1906—I believe it does not matter very much what salary a man receives, because if that is all the income a Member of Congress has, all of it will be spent in connection with his office or in getting reelected to his office. In other words, the salary is not of great consequence.

I would far prefer to receive the retirement benefits provided by this bill, meager as they are, than to have a greatly increased salary, although at my time of life it probably would be better to have a sharp increase in salary. But I know that all moneys honestly received for services actually rendered in public office are consumed or absorbed in the discharge of one's duties and in the meeting of his obligations in public office. His only possible recompense, if he is a man of very limited income or if he is a poor man, is to be able to feel that he has some meager retirement benefits which he may claim at the end of his service.

I have no hesitancy in saying, Mr. President, that under this bill there would be no great inducement to me to pay in $2,674 and 6 percent annually henceforth on my salary, in return for the possibility of drawing the retirement amount which I might be able to receive if I were to retire at the end of my present term.

At the same time, I have always felt, ever since I entered service in this body, that the surest way to obtain public servants of the right character and the right quality was to give them some assurance of receiving retirement benefits at the time when their services end.

So, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will vote into law the retirement provision provided by this bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I shall make a very brief statement, and then I shall turn over the balance of the time to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

I should like to say, in answer to the statement of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], that under the provisions of this bill it will not be necessary to pay the $2,674 now and then pay 6 percent on the salary thereafter. The option to come under the retirement system can be exercised at any time within 6 months after any Member of the Congress takes his oath.

Mr. GEORGE. Is the Senator from Virginia willing to guarantee that I shall be living 6 months from now, or at the end of my term?

Mr. BYRD. I think I would.

Mr. GEORGE. I hope the Senator's guaranty would be good, but I would not take a chance on it. If this bill passed, I would immediately take the benefit of the retirement and I would pay in my

money, the $2,674, and would pay the 6 percent thereafter.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to say one other word. Comparison has been made here between the retirement proposed for Members of Congress and the retirement provided for judges and for officers of the Army and the Navy. I submit that such a comparison cannot properly be made, because a judge can be called back to public service and, likewise, retired officers of the Army and Navy can be called back for subsequent service.

Mr. President, I wish to give only two examples of how this proposal would affect those in executive agencies receiving $10,000 a year. The table which I now hold, and which I will later ask to be printed in the RECORD, has been prepared on the basis of an annual salary of $10,000 for Members of Congress and for the heads of various governmental agencies.

If a Member of Congress who was elected in 1933 retires on January 1, 1947, he will have paid $2,674, and will receive $3,100. If his life expectancy is 15 years longer, he will receive $46,000.

An official of the Government, drawing $10,000 a year, who has paid $2,674 will receive $1,606, and if his life expectancy at age 62 is 15 years longer, he will receive during that time $21,000.

If a Member of Congress were elected in 1933 and retires on January 1, 1947, and has paid in $2,674, he will receive $4,975, which, on the basis of 15 more years of life expectancy, will result in his drawing $75,000. The head of an agency who is receiving $10,000 a year will, on the same basis, receive only $37,500.

The objection to this provision is that it makes a difference between Members of Congress who appropriate the money and control the purse strings and the heads of the various agencies. I do not believe this should be. If any good reason could be advanced for doing it, then the money should be paid out of a special fund. The money should not be paid out of a fund which has been contributed to by the civil-service employees and by the Government. Seventy percent of the civil-service retirement fund is contributed by the Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter from the United States Civil Service Commission dated June 5, 1946, which confirms the statements which I have made. Included with the letter is the table which we have been discussing.

There being no objection, the letter and the table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 5, 1946.

Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Reference is made to your recent telephone request that the Commission submit an analysis of that portion of Senate bill 2177 relating to retirement pay for Members of Congress.

Subsection (a) of section 602 of the bill amends section 3 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, so as to include Members of Congress within the terms of the Civil Service Retirement Act. The amendment would apply to Senators and Representatives of Congress and Delegates from Alaska and Hawaii and Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico. The exclusion of the President and Vice President as now contained in the Retirement Act would be continued.

Subsection (b) of section 602 adds a new section 3A to the Retirement Act. This section outlines the benefits which would be provided in the case of Members of Congress differing from those applicable to other members of the system.

Members of the Congress would be permitted to exercise an option to become members of the system. This option must be exercised at any time within 6 months after the date of enactment of this bill, or at any time within 6 months after last taking the oath of office as a Member of Congress. Thus, a Member could not wait until he was out of office and then elect to come under the act, nor would the act apply to former Members of Congress. Any former Member, however, who may later again become a Member of Congress will, of course, have the opportunity at that time to elect to come within the purview of the retirement law.

Members of Congress who elect to become subject to the provisions of the act would be required to contribute to the retirement fund at the rate of 6 percent of their base pay from the date of such election rather than 5 percent as is the case of other persons subject to the retirement law. Deposit for any service as a Member of Congress subsequent to the date of enactment would be required at the rate of 6 percent of base pay. Deposit for the purpose of purchasing credit for past service performed prior to the date of enactment could be made at the same rate as in the case of other persons subject to the civil-service retirement law; that is, 2½ percent for service from August 1, 1920, to June 30, 1926, 3½ percent from July 1, 1926, to June 30, 1942, and 5 percent from July 1, 1942. No deposit would be required for service rendered prior to August 1, 1920.

All contributions and deposits for service as a Member of Congress would be credited to the individual account of the Member, and if the service of the Member should terminate for any reason before eligibility for annuity attached, his contributions would be refunded with interest thereon at the rate of 4 percent compounded annually. Unless the Member of Congress was retired for disability, in which case it would be necessary that he serve a minimum of 5 years, he would not be eligible for annuity benefits unless he has completed at least 6 years of service as a Member of Congress and makes deposit for at least 5 years of his congressional service.

The annuity of a Member of Congress would, if he contributed or made deposit for all of his congressional service subsequent to July 31, 1920, be in an amount equal to 2½ percent of the average annual pay he received as a Member of Congress, multiplied by his years of service as a Member of Congress but limited to three-fourths of his average annual pay. If a Member of Congress fails to contribute or make deposit for all his years of congressional service, the years for which he did not contribute or make deposit would be included in computing his annuity, but the annuity would be reduced by an amount equal to the amount of annuity which his contributions or deposit, including interest thereon, would purchase if made.

If a Member of Congress is 62 years of age or over when he leaves office, his annuity would become payable on the first day of the month following the month in which he separates. If, however, he leaves office prior to attaining the age of 62, his annuity would not commence until the first day of the month following the month in which he attains age 62.

A Member of Congress would be privileged to elect any of the types of annuity provided for by the retirement law; that is, life annuity with return of the unexpended balance, forfeiture annuity, or a joint and survivorship annuity.

In case any Member of Congress has received a refund of contributions made by him as such Member and he later has additional service which qualifies him for annuity, he must redeposit the amount refunded to him with interest in order to receive such annuity.

Under the Retirement Act, at present, service as a Member of Congress is creditable for annuity purposes in cases where the annuitant had other subsequent governmental service which was within the purview of the act. This would be changed under the amendment so that in any case in which a person can qualify for a congressional annuity (i. e., if he has 6 years of service as a Member of Congress, any of which occurs after the date of enactment of the amendment), his service as a Member of Congress cannot be credited for the purposes of a regular annuity under the act. If, however, he has less than 6 years of service as a Member of Congress, or if all of his congressional service was performed prior to the enactment of the amendment, such service can be credited for the purposes of a regular annuity provided he has other Government service bringing him under the act. In no case can service other than service as a Member of Congress be considered in computing a congressional annuity under the amendment. There may be instances, of course, where a person has six or more years of service as a Member of Congress, thus qualifying him for an annuity under the amendment, and also has five or more years of other governmental service performed either prior to or after his congressional service, also qualifying him for an annuity under other provisions of the act. In such a case the annuity payable would be equal to the aggregate of the two annuities separately computed. It should be emphasized, however, that period of service credited for the purposes of the one computation may in no event be credited for the purposes of the other computation.

In case a Member of Congress is retired and receives an annuity, but is thereafter again elected to Congress, his annuity would be suspended during the period he holds office. He may then again elect to become a member of the system, in which event he would be required to contribute 6 percent of his basic salary, and his annuity would be recomputed with the inclusion of the additional service upon subsequent separation. If, however, he does not elect to again become a member of the system and have deductions made for this subsequent period of service, the annuity upon his separation will be resumed in the same amount, and there will be no recomputation of the annuity to allow credit for the subsequent service.

Under the present retirement system, retirement is compulsory upon attaining age 70 after completion of 15 years' service. An employee may retire at his option after attaining the age of 60 and completion of 30 years of service, or attaining the age of 62 and rendering 15 years' service. These provisions for automatic separation and optional retirement would not apply to Members of Congress.

There is inclosed herewith chart showing the annuities payable under S. 2177 and the Civil Service Retirement Act to members of Congress should their services be terminated January 2, 1947.

If further information on this subject is desired, the Commission will be pleased to furnish same upon your request.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President.

Annuities payable under S. 2177 and the Civil Service Retirement Act to Members of Congress whose services are terminated January 2, 1947, according to indicated entry date into service and whether full contributions for all prior service or only contributions for the last 5 years of service ($2,674) have been made. In the latter case the annuity shown is for indicated select ages:

Date of entry into service	Amount owed as of Jan. 2, 1947	Annuity payable if contributions are made for all prior service		Annuity payable at indicated ages if contributions are made only for the last 5 years of service ($2,674)[1]							
				62		65		70		75	
		S. 2177	Civil Service Retirement Act	S. 2177	Civil Service Retirement Act	S. 2177	Civil Service Retirement Act	S. 2177	Civil Service Retirement Act	S. 2177	Civil Service Retirement Act
Jan. 3, 1941	$3,108	$1,500	$857	$1,465	$822	$1,463	$820	$1,458	$815	$1,451	$808
Jan. 3, 1939	4,030	2,000	1,143	1,892	1,035	1,884	1,027	1,868	1,011	1,846	989
Jan. 3, 1937	5,026	2,500	1,429	2,313	1,242	2,299	1,228	2,271	1,200	2,133	1,162
Jan. 3, 1935	6,105	3,000	1,714	2,727	1,441	2,707	1,421	2,666	1,380	2,611	1,325
Mar. 4, 1933	7,168	3,458	1,964	3,100	1,606	3,074	1,580	3,020	1,526	2,949	1,455
Mar. 4, 1931	8,421	3,958	2,250	3,500	1,792	3,467	1,759	3,398	1,690	3,307	1,599
Mar. 4, 1929	9,777	4,458	2,536	3,892	1,970	3,851	1,929	3,766	1,844	3,653	1,731
Mar. 4, 1927	11,243	4,958	2,821	4,275	2,138	4,226	2,089	4,123	1,986	3,987	1,850
Mar. 4, 1925	12,525	5,458	3,107	4,673	2,322	4,616	2,265	4,498	2,147	4,341	1,990
Mar. 4, 1923	13,444	5,833	3,393	4,975	2,535	4,913	2,473	4,783	2,343	4,612	2,172
Mar. 4, 1921	14,438	6,208	3,679	5,271	2,742	5,203	2,674	5,061	2,532	4,875	2,346
Mar. 4, 1919	14,747	6,583	3,964	5,621	3,002	5,551	2,932	5,406	2,787	5,215	2,595
Mar. 4, 1917	14,747	6,958	4,250	5,996	3,288	5,926	3,218	5,781	3,073	5,590	2,882
Mar. 4, 1915	14,747	7,333	4,536	6,371	3,574	6,301	3,504	6,156	3,359	5,955	3,168
Mar. 4, 1913	14,747	7,500	4,821	6,538	3,859	6,468	3,789	6,323	3,644	6,132	3,453

[1] The paradoxical situation of employees receiving less at the older ages where full contributions have not been made for all service rendered after July 1920 is due to the fact that the full annuity is reduced by the annuity equivalent to the amount of indebtedness to the fund, which increases with age.

NOTE.—As Members of Congress receive a constant salary their contributions in relation to salary—and, therefore, annuity—would be in general appreciably higher than for other employees. This point should be understood in comparing S. 2177 with the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I feel that I must support the Byrd amendment for several reasons. In the first place, I am a member of the Civil Service Committee of the Senate and served through two lengthy and trying considerations of the task of adjusting pay schedules of Federal employees. During those two considerations we were confronted with many problems, not the least of which was the tremendous responsibility which descended upon this sovereign body of fixing in equity and fairness, without hope of recourse on their part, the salaries of subordinate officials. Such a responsibility was not an easy one to discharge.

In the first place, the overriding interest was that of the public at large. In fixing salaries of Government employees, care must be exercised or pressure groups, some of which are hostile during times of emotion and economic chaos, will lead the Congress to invade the public interest by allowing salaries of public employees and officials to become too great.

On the other hand, the responsibility of the Members of the Congress, from whom there is no appeal, demands that they shall be as equitable and fair in their treatment of subordinate employees as their duty to the public will permit. I do not say that we have done a perfect job in that regard, but I do assert that in some instances we have reduced the scale of increases in the salaries of public employees to such an extent that those employees may justifiably feel that they have been unfairly treated.

Perhaps in other instances we granted increases in salaries which were more than commensurate with the duties to be performed.

Mr. President, while I am not satisfied with many of the provisions of this bill, yet I expect to support it in its finality because it is a step in a most needed approach toward a reorganization of the administration of the National Congress.

I once said, before I had been a Member of the Senate 2 or 3 years, and had begun to think that I had acquired sufficient seniority to give me the privilege of suggesting such a thing, that I hoped sometime to have a chance to vote on a measure to reorganize the machinery of the Congress.

Mr. President, I feel that in this reorganization bill the question of retirement should not have been approached. I also believe that the question of congressional salaries should not have been approached in a bill dealing with the reorganization of the mechanics of the Congress.

The way I feel about the proposed retirement provision is this: In the first place, I believe that the dignity and responsibility of the Congress of the United States are fully equivalent to that of the Federal courts, and equal to that of the Army and of the Navy. But the pending bill does not approach the retirement benefits of those accorded members of those departments. I would say that if an equitable retirement bill were being considered, it should be considered on the basis of the equality of the superior or paramount branches of the Government. But the pending bill does not approach the subject on that basis. It is neither fish, flesh, nor fowl. It is half way between the retirement of the regular civil-service employees, who are career people, and those who, as a part of the rewards of their position, accept their employment with retirement benefits already stipulated.

I believe, therefore, that if we are going to approach the situation as a collateral matter to the reorganization of the mechanics of the Congress, we should first begin on the basis of civil-service retirement benefits, and if they are found to be good and proper, and at some later time it be the will of the Congress, we can alter or readjust the retirement benefits for Members of Congress who have given long and satisfactory service to their country.

Mr. President, there is a difference between service in the national legislative body and service in any elective office in a city or county; at least, I hope there is such a difference. If there is not, I have a misconception of the ideals of public service. I assert that no Member of this body, or any other elected official of the United States was required to seek the office which he holds. I have seen many advertisements in the newspapers which read something like this: "Having been urged by my friends to run for the office * * *." I have yet to see the man who, as a candidate for a substantial office, had to be urged very strongly by his friends to become a candidate for that office. Perhaps some of his friends said to him, "Charlie, we think you ought to run for this office," but early in the spring when the flies begin to come out of their winter hiding places, fish snap very fast when the bait is tossed to them. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I do not make that statement in any way disparaging to the magnificent public service which has been rendered to our country during the past 150 years in the States, and in the national legislative body. But that service, Mr. President, was rendered in the main, I believe, first, by persons who had a bent for public affairs, and secondly, by those who had a desire to render public service, knowing that such service had to be compensated for to a large degree by the satisfaction they would receive in trying as best they could to present their views and those of the people whom they represented.

Mr. President, I agree that the salary which is paid a Member of the United States Congress is not too great when one considers the expenses attached to the office. I knew what the expenses were when I came to Washington as a Member of the Senate. I lived in the State of Iowa where it did not cost as much to live as it does in the city of Washington. I was told what my salary as a United States Senator would be, and what it would cost me to live in the city of Washington. I am much like the fellow who went to a judge and said he wanted to obtain a divorce from his wife. The judge said, "Why, Henry, didn't you take this woman for better or for worse?" The man replied, "Yes, Judge, but she was a lot worse than I took her for."

[Laughter.] I believe that the average man who becomes a Member of the Senate finds that situation to obtain so far as the expenses of his office are concerned. But that is beside the point.

Mr. President, Members of Congress do have a grave responsibility. We are a sovereign body. We have an unappealable control over the subordinate officials of the Government in respect to their compensation. We therefore acquire a tremendous responsibility in connection with fixing the compensation which the employees of the Government shall receive. In fixing our own emoluments, and in prescribing the benefits which may be associated with our office, we must be careful not to go beyond the bounds of propriety, fairness, and equity. In exercising our judgment in regard to that subject, we may sometimes lean over backward and deny ourselves some of the emoluments which perhaps we should have, but it would be better to do that than to do something which would result in our being accused of using the power of our office to provide for ourselves benefits which would be greater than those received by others over whom we have control and dominion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 5 o'clock has arrived.

Mr. BYRD. I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

Andrews	Hawkes	Murray
Austin	Hayden	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Overton
Bilbo	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Huffman	Radcliffe
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Burch	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Bushfield	Kilgore	Russell
Byrd	Knowland	Saltonstall
Capehart	La Follette	Stanfill
Capper	Lucas	Stewart
Connally	McCarran	Taft
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McKellar	Tunnell
Downey	McMahon	Tydings
Eastland	Magnuson	Vandenberg
George	Maybank	Wagner
Guffey	Millikin	Walsh
Gurney	Moore	Wherry
Hart	Morse	White
Hatch	Murdock	

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE] and the Senators from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT and Mr. TAYLOR] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent on official business, attending the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Bermuda.

I also announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate as members of the committee appointed by the United States Senate to attend the Empire Parliamentary Conference in Bermuda. If present the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who is absent by leave of the Senate, has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business. If present he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is necessarily detained. If present he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS 22

Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Burch	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Byrd	Knowland	Stanfill
Capehart	McClellan	Stewart
Connally	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	Millikin	Walsh
Hickenlooper	Moore	
Huffman	O'Daniel	

NAYS—43

Andrews	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Austin	Hawkes	Overton
Ball	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hill	Reed
Bridges	Hoey	Russell
Brooks	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Bushfield	La Follette	Taft
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McCarran	Tunnell
Donnell	McMahon	Tydings
Downey	Magnuson	Wagner
George	Maybank	Wherry
Guffey	Morse	White
Gurney	Murdock	
Hart	Murray	

NOT VOTING—31

Aiken	Brewster	Butler
Bailey	Briggs	Carville
Bankhead	Buck	Chavez
Ellender	Mead	Tobey
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wheeler
Fulbright	Myers	Wiley
Gerry	Revercomb	Willis
Gossett	Shipstead	Wilson
Green	Smith	Young
Langer	Taylor	
McFarland	Thomas, Okla.	

So Mr. BYRD's amendment was rejected.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 79, beginning in line 18, it is proposed to strike out through line 2, on page 80.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 80, line 10, after the word "repeal", it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I send to the desk a unanimous-consent request, which I ask to have read and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized and directed to make all necessary clerical and technical changes, including changes in section numbers and cross references, in the engrossed bill (S. 2177) to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the request is granted.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have several letters from departments of the Government relating to the bill which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement it seems to the Chair that the request is out of order. The letters may be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MURRAY. I ask that the letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., June 10, 1946.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: In response to your letter of June 3, I am glad to submit additional comments, in view of subsequent amendments, on sections 130 and 208 of S. 2177, which provides for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government. You ask particularly whether

these provisions would have the effect of preventing flexible fiscal policy on the part of both the Congress and the Executive.

So far as section 130 is concerned, it seems entirely proper for the Congress in the spring of each year to state the sense of the Congress in respect to total Federal expenditures, revenues, and deficits.

Section 208, however, would seriously hamper the development of a flexible fiscal policy on the part of the Federal Government.

In face of changed conditions, it would give the President a mandate to reduce expenditures in place of requiring him to submit recommendations for congressional consideration on expenditures, revenues, debt, and other proposed legislation.

Sections 130 and 208 taken together would seem to cause automatic adjustments in Federal expenditures that might well produce unfavorable, rather than favorable, effects. Such a procedure, even if the President is granted more latitude in assigning the reductions, may still cripple economically and socially programs planned and under way on the basis of congressional appropriations. It must be assumed that such expenditures are desirable and needed or they would not have been authorized by the Congress originally. This subsequent reduction would likely aggravate any business decline still further. In such a case, at the very moment the President and joint committee under the Employment Act of 1946 are requesting Congress to undertake means to compensate for a business decline and mounting unemployment, the President, on the other hand, would be forced to devise a means of reducing appropriations which might be contrary to the recommendations he would make under the Employment Act.

If strictly adhered to, it would tend to nullify the very constructive provisions of the Employment Act of 1946. This act requires that the President and Joint Committee on the Economic Report constantly review current economic conditions and recommend all "practicable means" for preventing unemployment. One of these widely recognized means is flexible fiscal policy—the increasing or decreasing of expenditures and revenues by the Congress as conditions and economic needs change and without waiting for a new fiscal year or until conditions become so depressed that the President feels compelled to declare a state of national emergency.

A legal issue also arises which deserves attention. If under section 208 the President is required to cut during the latter half of a fiscal year the appropriations approved subsequent to the concurrent resolution, he must then act on the basis of a congressional resolution without having had an opportunity to exercise his constitutional power of veto.

* * * * *

If the obligation upon the President to cut expenditures should remain in the legislation, then the concurrent resolution should be changed into a joint resolution.

I hope you will call upon me at any time that I can be of further service.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL H. APPLEBY,
Acting Director.

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION,
Washington, D. C., June 10, 1946.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: You have requested my views on sections 130 and 208 of the legislative reorganization bill, S. 2177. In my opinion, these sections raise grave questions warranting the most careful consideration.

These sections represent a new method of developing and enacting executive appropriations for each fiscal year, and under certain conditions, for reducing these appropriations in the middle of the year. The procedure proposed is a drastic departure from existing techniques. In this letter I would like to outline two of the problems raised by these provisions.

Section 130 provides that the revenue (Senate Finance, House Ways and Means) and Appropriations Committees of both Houses shall meet jointly early in the calendar year to prepare an estimate of total Federal receipts and expenditures for the next fiscal year. In discharging this function these committees will largely overlap the work of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report established by the Employment Act of 1946. Not only will the functions overlap, but both groups will be engaged in examining the same subject matter at approximately the same time.

Section 208, or any similar provision which operates to reduce appropriations in the middle of the fiscal year, will seriously interfere with the orderly operations of the executive agencies. I would also anticipate that such a provision would directly result in inefficiency because of the inability of executive agencies to plan their expenditures for the full fiscal year.

No executive agency has been afforded an opportunity to be heard on these provisions of th reorganization bill. Because of the importance of these provisions to the operations of the executive branch, I believe it essential that an opportunity be afforded the various agencies to give specific illustrations of how such a provision would affect their operations, their efficiency, and their personnel.

For these reasons I am of the opinion that the enactment of these provisions without further study would be undesirable.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. SNYDER,
Director.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
June 10, 1946.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Reference is made to your request of June 4, 1946, for an expression of our views on sections 130 and 208 of S. 2177, a bill to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government.

Section 130 of the bill provides that by joint action the Revenue and Appropriation Committees of both Houses shall report to the Congress the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year, such report to be made within 60 days after the opening of each regular session or by April 15, whichever occurs first. If the report indicates that estimated expenditures exceed estimated receipts, Congress would authorize an increase in the public debts by the amount of such excess, before considering the general appropriation bills for the ensuing fiscal year. This section would not be applicable in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President.

Section 208 provides that if on December 31 in any fiscal year the President is of the opinion that the excess of expenditures over receipts will be in an amount greater than that authorized by the Congress pursuant to section 130, he shall reduce all appropriations, with certain exceptions, by a uniform percentage in an aggregate amount sufficient to reduce such excess to the amount of the excess approved by the Congress. The provisions of this section would not apply in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President.

Section 130 apparently has the objective of an over-all coordination of the revenue and appropriation processes of the Government. With this objective we are in complete agreement. It is felt, however, that the provisions of sections 130 and 208 raise some rather fundamental questions.

These sections would require the administration of certain phases of the budget and fiscal affairs of the Government by rule rather than by any criteria of necessity. Under section 208 the major consideration appears to be to balance the amount of the difference of expenditures and receipts against a predetermined amount fixed by concurrent resolution of Congress months before the needs become evident and before the amount of receipts can be determined. For example, the Employment Act of 1946 provides for not only annual reports to be submitted during the beginning of each year, but also interim reports to be submitted later in the year which may indicate substantial changes in the employment situation and the need for Government action in the public interest. The large extent to which the employment situation can change within a period of only a few months was definitely indicated by the experience which the country had in 1937 when the index of industrial production went down from 116 in January to 87 in December. Thus the Government had to take action during the last few months of the year to alleviate economic distress which could not have been anticipated accurately during the first few weeks of the year. The bill in its present form does not appear to provide sufficient flexibility for the recognition of such a situation.

The Employment Act of 1946 (Pub. Law 304, 79th Cong), provides that the President shall submit to Congress within 60 days after the beginning of each regular session an economic report and that the Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report shall submit its comments thereon not later than May 1 of each year. S. 2177, however, requires that the revenue and appropriation committees shall submit and report on the over-all estimates of appropriations and receipts not later than 60 days after the beginning of each regular session, or on April 15. This would mean that the joint committee, in making their study, would not have the benefit of the recommendations of the joint committee on the economic report and that, therefore, the objectives of the Employment Act might be nullified to some extent unless the concurrent resolution as provided for in section 130 (a) should be subsequently revised, if necessary, to give effect to the recommendations of the joint committee on the economic report. Moreover, if sufficient time is allowed for the studies provided for in this bill and the Employment Act, it is doubtful whether enough time would remain for the appropriation bills to be considered adequately and acted upon before the beginning of the ensuing fiscal year.

The provisions of section 208 of the bill, for the reduction of approprations on December 31, after one-half of the fiscal year has expired, could present some very difficult problems in planning work programs, budgetary control, etc. For instance, appropriation acts provide for the accomplishment of certain projects or programs which are undertaken shortly after July 1 only after considerable planning. The elimination or curtailment of such programs midway in the fiscal year would not only prevent the completion of work contemplated by the Congress in the appropriation acts, but in many instances would result in the expenditure of time and money without commensurate benefits to the Government. It is apparent that in operation one-half of the year's program would be forced to bear the entire burden of the reduction.

In this connection, it should be noted that many of the programs administered by this Department do not progress at a uniform rate throughout the year, but fluctuate with crop-growing seasons and weather conditions.

Moreover, the reduction of appropriations by a uniform percentage would fail to recognize the necessity for essential and urgently

needed appropriations, such as those for the protection of public health, public safety, and public property, for the continuance of the national policy on employment, for the control or eradication of crop or livestock pests and diseases, and for other essential activities as well as emergency and unforeseeable needs. It is conceivable that exceptions to section 208 of the bill might be made in the case of certain appropriations, thus resulting in a disproportionate reduction in those appropriations to which such exceptions did not apply. In addition, to the extent that supplemental or deficiency appropriations may be made subsequently for urgent and unforeseeable situations, the appropriations made in the annual appropriation bills might necessarily be reduced. It would seem that a more constructive method for the reduction of expenditures, when necessary, would be accomplished after a thorough review and analysis, through the regular appropriation processes, of the relative needs and purposes of each appropriation which would be affected. The provisions of this section also fail to recognize a possible need for a thorough study of revenues and receipts with the view that such action as may be required might be taken by increasing income rather than by decreasing appropriations.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

N. E. DODD,
Under Secretary.

Since this report was written, the bill was amended somewhat on the floor of the Senate Saturday. Even as so amended, however, it does not meet entirely the points raised in this report. I am therefore asking Mr. Carl Sapp, of this Department, to deliver the above letter and discuss it with you.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
June 6, 1946.

The Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of June 4 asking for our views on sections 130 and 208 of the legislative reorganization bill, S. 2177.

The purposes of the Legislative Reorganization bill as a whole are thoroughly laudable and its effects in equipping the Senate and the House of Representatives to discharge their obligations are badly needed.

The purpose of sections 130 and 208 is apparently to insure more systematic over-all consideration of the Government's total program—less piecemeal legislation and especially more recognition of the fact that revenue policies and expenditure policies are closely related in their economic consequences. This also is a laudable purpose which I have urged repeatedly.

But the specific terms of these two sections seem to conflict with the well-considered provisions of the Employment Act of 1946 and furthermore it seems to me would restrict and hamper rather than encourage the development of a unified and enlightened economic program.

Section 130 calls for a joint committee report by April 15 of each year setting forth estimates of both revenue and expenditures for the next fiscal year and would prevent the consideration of any appropriation bill until both Houses had adopted a concurrent resolution with respect to the Federal debt limitation. This concurrent resolution might require weeks of debate, and thus make for hasty consideration of the revenue bills themselves.

It seems impossible for the other working committees of the two Houses to have their work in shape as early as April 15th so that the Appropriation and Finance committees of the Senate and the Appropriations and the Ways and Means committees of the House could formulate intelligent estimates. This April 15th report would either conflict with or be superseded by the May 1st report of the Joint Committee already created by the Employment Act of 1946. If the April 15th report were binding it would be because the four committees on revenue and expenditures had become de facto a supergovernment, overriding—by a simple concurrent resolution which would not require the signature of the President—the Constitutional powers of the separate chambers and constraining the responsible policy committees of each House in the discharge of their appropriate duties.

The Joint Committee on the Economic Report established by the Employment Act of 1946 was designed for the express purpose of obtaining mature and responsible consideration of the economic state of the Nation. This report will include consideration of the relation of the Federal Budget to our total national economy. Section 130 of this bill would seem to be a retrogression in that it would tend to lose sight of the inevitable major effect of Federal revenue and appropriation policies on the total economy and interfere with proper consideration of the National program by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

Section 208 also seems unduly restrictive in requiring the President at the end of each year to make blanket cuts according to whatever ceiling had been set by the concurrent resolution the previous April. Arbitrary action like this might well impede or even defeat the purpose of this bill itself as well as of the Employment Act of 1946. Section 209 would add to this effect. Some more rational and more workable procedure surely can be worked out to establish closer relations between the formulation of policies and programs by the Congress and their execution by the executive branch.

The underlying purpose of the legislative reorganization bill is, of course, not to prevent responsible action by the Congress and the Executive, but to strengthen our ability to take wise and enlightened and timely action. I should think sections 130 and 208 of this bill would seriously interfere with this objective—perhaps even prevent its attainment in respect to economic policies and programs.

Yet I recognize clearly that the committees on revenue and expenditures have heavy responsibilities and that a clearer relationship between revenue policies and expenditure policies is badly needed. I think, too, that it will be a very healthy thing for everybody concerned to realize more clearly what is happening to the public debt year by year. Could not these four vital committees—perhaps through their chairmen and ranking minority members—be articulated with the work of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report? If this were accomplished, then the four committees would be in a position to act promptly on the report of the joint committee after May 1 of each year and thus present their views for due and weighty consideration during the floor debates on the joint committee report.

If something along these lines can't be worked out just now, I would respectfully suggest that the picture might be clearer early in the next session after we have all had time to get the basic machinery of the Employment Act into operation. I hope it is not necessary to delay adopting the highly desirable and important features of the legislative reorganization bill which are very clear and apparently meet with almost universal welcome.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. WALLACE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. GUFFEY. I announce that my colleague Mr. MYERS is necessarily absent on official business. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE] and the Senators from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT and Mr. TAYLOR] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent on official business, attending the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Bermuda.

I also announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

I announce further that on this question the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

I also announce that on this question the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay."

I announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate as members of the committee appointed by the United States Senate to attend the Empire Parliamentary Conference in Bermuda. If present the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who is absent by leave of the Senate, has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is unavoidably detained. If present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—49

Andrews	Hatch	Murdock
Austin	Hawkes	Pepper
Ball	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bridges	Hill	Russell
Brooks	Hoey	Saltonstall
Burch	Huffman	Stanfill
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Capehart	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Knowland	Tunnell
Cordon	La Follette	Tydings
Donnell	Lucas	Vandenberg
Downey	McMahon	Wagner
George	Magnuson	Wherry
Guffey	Maybank	White
Gurney	Moore	
Hart	Morse	

NAYS—16

Bilbo	McClellan	Overton
Bushfield	McKellar	Robertson
Connally	Millikin	Stewart
Eastland	Murray	Walsh
Johnston, S. C.	O'Daniel	
McCarran	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—31

Aiken	Fulbright	Smith
Bailey	Gerry	Taylor
Bankhead	Gossett	Thomas, Okla.
Brewster	Green	Tobey
Briggs	Langer	Wheeler
Buck	McFarland	Wiley
Butler	Mead	Willis
Carville	Mitchell	Wilson
Chavez	Myers	Young
Ellender	Revercomb	
Ferguson	Shipstead	

So the bill (S. 2177) was passed.

EXTENSION OF PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACT

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1458, House bill 6042, to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6042), to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the measure providing for extension of the OPA has just been made the unfinished business of the Senate. It is my purpose to ask that the Senate convene at 11 o'clock tomorrow. We all realize that this is one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before the Senate, and all Senators are interested in it. I dare express the hope that Senators will attend as diligently as possible during the discussion of the bill and that we may, if necessary, hold evening sessions in order that we may dispose of it. I am very anxious that the bill be disposed of this week, because time is running, and the measure will have to go to conference and be acted upon in time to reach the President for his signature or such action as he sees fit to take well in advance of the 30th of June. So that there will be some time for him to consider the legislation when it reaches him, I hope we may speed up consideration without in any way interfering with deliberate consideration of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Is the Senator willing to say definitely whether there will be a night session tomorrow night or not?

I suggest that on the first day it would be difficult to have a night session.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I have not contemplated a night session tomorrow night, and will not ask for it. Beyond that, I think we might prepare ourselves for it.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. If we are to work every night until 11 or 12 o'clock, is it the majority leader's intention to keep us here on Saturdays too?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not like to say in advance, but during the remainder of this session I think all Members might well prepare themselves for Saturday sessions if we are to wind up the business of the session and have an adjournment, as I hope—and as we all hope, I believe—about the middle of July. I think we can well afford to hold sessions on Saturday. If we should finish this bill, we shall have many other bills ready for consideration. Five appropriation bills are now awaiting action on the part of the Senate. There is much further legislation crowding the calendar, and there is great pressure for its consideration.

It is now nearly the middle of June. Therefore I think we may well prepare ourselves for a Saturday session each week during the remainder of this session, subject to any hiatus which may be deemed advisable when any particular Saturday arrives.

Mr. McMAHON. May we count on having Sundays off?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that I will do the best I can to arrange it.

Mr. McMAHON. I shall be very grateful. I should like to have 1 day off.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator would not like it any better than the rest of us. But we have not had too many Saturday sessions since the 1st of January.

Now that we are hoping to reach an adjournment it seems that we might very well devote ourselves to sessions of the Senate on such Saturdays as may be necessary between now and the time of adjournment.

COLUMBIA RIVER DAMS AND FISHERIES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, some years ago the United States Government embarked upon a program of developing the great hydroelectric resources of the Columbia River, which flows mainly in my State, and also divides the States of Oregon and Washington. Prior to the Government undertaking the development of the great Bonneville Dam and the greatest of all dams, the Grand Coulee, there had been some private development of the Columbia River. One major dam, known as the Rock Island Dam, is situated in the Washington part of the river. It is a low-level dam. Other than that, there was no other hydroelectric development.

The Columbia River furnished annually for the residents of Oregon and Washington an industry conservatively estimated at from $250,000,000 to $400,000,000 a year, depending upon the run of salmon. When the Rock Island Dam was built it was not very difficult to place salmon ladders, as we call them, to allow the salmon to go upstream into the Columbia River and its tributaries to spawn.

However, with the building of the Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams there arose a great scientific argument as to whether or not the salmon could be moved up salmon ladders so that the run would not be seriously depleted. At any rate, we proceeded with the hydroelectric development, because the potentialities of the development of hydroelectric resources on the river and the benefits of the dams probably far outweighed the importance of the salmon industry, taking into consideration the fact that we could preserve a portion of it or a great deal of it.

Since that time there has been much argument between sportsmen and commercial river fishermen as to whether or not these dams and developments have actually depleted the salmon in the river. The truth is that there are fewer salmon in the river now than there were in previous times. That may be the result of many other causes. Surely the dams have contributed to a certain extent to the depletion of the great salmon runs in the Columbia River.

The State departments of fisheries of both Oregon and Washington have had a running controversy with the Fish and Wildlife Service, upon which rests the duty of doing what it can to preserve the fish, in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation and other agencies which were building the dams. That controversy has continued for many years. There are sportsmen in my section of the country who claim that the value of having fighting salmon running in the river, attracting easterners and others throughout the world to fish, represents more in dollars and cents to the potential income of the region than even the commercial fisheries. Some of them even go so far as to say that the value is greater than that of the dams. Perhaps that is farfetched, because had it not been for the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams on the Columbia River, providing the greatest source of hydroelectric power the world has ever known, probably some of the things which we accomplished during the war, including the atomic bomb itself, could not have been completed in the short time in which they were completed because of this power pool.

The Government has other great projects contemplated for the area, because of the ready access to power from the Columbia River. There are other sites on the river, on which we shall have the reports of engineers. One project is known as the Foster Creek Dam, which

is 56 miles riverwise below Grand Coulee. The reports of the engineers show that it could produce cheaper hydroelectric power than any other known site in the entire world. Because of great scientific developments and possibilities of great scientific research in supersonics, atomic energy, and other developments, we shall probably have need for even more power.

So the controversy has again arisen regarding what few salmon are left. The Government conducted quite an experiment in connection with the building of the Grand Coulee Dam. The Grand Coulee Dam shut off all the runs of salmon north, because the dam is so high that it was impossible to build fish ladders which would work. The Fish and Wildlife Service spent three or four million dollars in picking up salmon below Grand Coulee and below the Rock Island Dam, placing them in refrigerator cars, and taking them up new tributaries above the dams, in hope that it would be possible to change the habits of the salmon, which every 4 years for thousands of years have fought their way back over thousands of miles to the exact stream where they were born. That experiment in the 4-year cycle was conducted probably 2 years ago. It was found that salmon could be trained to make that change, because the salmon returned and went over the low dams of Bonneville and Rock Island. They turned and went up those streams. How many of them did so we do not know. Some of the salmon were found at the bottom of Grand Coulee, trying to get up the Grand Coulee Dam, and, of course, they killed themselves.

But the controversy is again in progress. I do not pose as an expert. I like to fish for salmon, and I like to see dams built. However, I have been receiving a great number of communications. I shall ask unanimous consent to place two of them in the RECORD.

One of the items consists of a letter from one of the most prominent sportsmen and conservationists in the Pacific Northwest, and I believe that he takes a very sensible attitude toward the controversy which involves two great industries. His name is Ben M. Paris. He has written me a letter on the subject, and I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

BEN PARIS SPORTING GOODS
& RECREATION CO., INC.,
Seattle, Wash., May 16, 1946.

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WARREN: Your letter of the 6th, together with copy of your reply to Pete Antoncich in regard to the McNary Dam, was received.

I'm glad to see that you're making a fight to protect the important salmon runs along the Columbia River. I suppose the conservation interests won't be strong enough to stop construction of the McNary Dam at this time, but it does seem a shame that the river can't be developed from the top down, at Foster Creek, Rocky Beach, and Priest Rapids in order, rather than from Bonneville up. I believe that ample power can be obtained from the above installations without the serious effects on the fish runs that will be created by a dam at Umatilla, and I believe that the value of the fish runs both now and in the future will exceed any benefits from transportation. But if the McNary Dam is a certainty, then nothing should be left undone to salvage everything possible from the fish runs, and these plans should be an integral part of the plans for construction of the dam before any further appropriations are made. The various Oregon and Washington fish and game departments should be a party to these plans, and not just the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, who all too frequently are overwhelmed by the prestige of the engineers or Reclamation Service, and therefore are not able or are unwilling to put forth their best in the interest of conservation.

You know what my attitude is in respect to the comparative values of commercial and sport fisheries to this State, and while we should both work together in protecting our mutual interests, our sport fishery is far more valuable to the economy of this State than is the commercial. No one yet, of national reputation and authority, has given full credit to what sport fishing for migratory salmon and steelheads means to the State of Washington, or even to the Nation as a whole. But I believe that it is one of our most valued and treasured resources, and that economically it returns many hundreds of millions of dollars to this State annually, and not just a few millions as does the commercial fishery.

Many thousands of people have moved out to Washington and remained here solely because of the excellence of its sport fishing on salmon and steelheads. Many thousands more will come and remain if the sport is maintained, because that sort of recreation is an important and determining factor in their lives and where they live. I contend that 75,000 people reside in the Puget Sound area alone, and remain here, solely because of the sport they enjoy the year around on salmon and steelheads, a sport that is accessible almost any afternoon or week end close at hand.

It is estimated these people, ranging from big executives to laborers and through all the professions, earn and spend here an average of $3,000 each year, which totals up to $225,000,000 annually, a value to the economy of this State which can be attributed directly to the sport salmon and steelhead fishing that is available. Capitalized at 4 percent, this represents a capital resource to this region with a value of nearly $6,000,000,000.

And I believe the Columbia, producing as it does much of the sport fishing in Idaho, Oregon, and other parts of Washington, approaches or equals the values claimed for Puget Sound.

And while on this subject, I think it's nothing short of a crime the way the Army engineers and irrigation and power interests and others who are equally short-sighted, are covetously eyeing the lower reaches of virtually every river flowing into Puget Sound and through western Washington for dam sites, under the guise of flood control, power, or irrigation. Any dam on the lower reaches at the sites now proposed will virtually destroy the runs of fish in those rivers, causing a loss that will exceed the benefits to be obtained one-hundred-fold—yes, one-hundred-fold. For example, the annual average flood loss proposed to be prevented by a dam on Green River, 6 miles east of Auburn, is $200,000, according to the engineers' figures. The loss that will result to this immediate locality's economy on the basis quoted above will be upward of $30,000,000 annually.

The trouble is that the engineers get some of these professional civilian consultants or touts to egg them on, and it's almost impossible to stop them, or divert them from their original plans.

But in most cases these rivers, all of them, can be controlled or harnessed by a series of dams in their upper reaches above the range of the salmon's migration, which would not seriously interfere with or deplete the runs. True, they would cost more money, but the added cost can be readily justified if the fisheries were considered and appraised at their true value from an economic viewpoint and not at the cold dollar and cent value of a pound of dead fish.

WARREN, if you put this viewpoint over in Congress, you can be the most popular man ever to go to Washington from the Pacific coast, and you'll be the greatest. What do you suppose these tens of thousands of people will think, whom the industrialists plan to lure out here, if they can find a job and with it, the finest, cleanest, and most readily accessible recreation in the world, that of sport salmon and steelhead fishing? Puget Sound and its bordering cities can really be America's Utopia, so easily. We can have industrial development plus our God-given recreational heritage, if only a little common sense is used.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

B. M. PARIS.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The other item is a résumé of this subject written by one of the great newspaper men of our State who is also a sportsman and a conservationist interested in the development of our State. His name is Gordon M. Quarnstrom, and he is editor of the Longview Daily News. He made a survey of the future of Columbia River salmon with the present dams, and taking into consideration the possibility of further dams. He goes into the subject in great detail. I believe that his statement should be a part of the RECORD. I hope that Members of the Senate as well as Members of the House who may lean toward the fishing side or the side of those interested in the construction of dams, and all those who are interested in the preservation of these great resources together with such fish and wildlife as we can preserve, will read these articles. The controversy will again be before us in connection with appropriations for fish ladders and other things.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONGVIEW DAILY NEWS,
Longview, Wash., April 15, 1946.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am sorry to have delayed so long in sending you a copy of my article on the Columbia River dams and fisheries, but the only copy available was being used by The Fisherman, a new magazine, and I had to wait until I could track it down and have it returned to me.

I enclose it herewith.

Sincerely,

GORDON M. QUARNSTROM.

FUTURE OF COLUMBIA RIVER SALMON RUNS WORRIES CONSERVATIONISTS

(By Gordon M. Quarnstrom)

A controversy over whether the Federal Government will be able to further harness the mighty Columbia River, bringing greater hydroelectric, irrigation, and navigation developments, without destroying the quarter billion dollar salmon fisheries industry is growing in the Pacific Northwest.

The commercial fisherman contends that the Government's hope to gain added industry and other benefits from the building of a series of eight more dams does not compensate for the loss of food resources and

employment which will result from such a program.

Federal agencies and certain other persons interested in Pacific Northwest development, on the other hand, feel the fisherman's fears are unfounded. As proof they point to what they label as the successful experiment of restoring salmon and steelhead runs which had been threatened by the building of the gigantic Grand Coulee Dam. This experiment, which meant the trapping of salmon and steelhead below Grand Coulee and then starting new runs of the fish in tributaries below the dam, has been praised by Department of the Interior publicists and by a number of free lance writers.

DECLARED INADEQUATE

However, the commercial fisherman, whose very existence depends on the practicability of the program, characterizes the Grand Coulee fish transplant project as inadequate, successful only in the glowing reports of Federal press agents.

The fisherman increasingly often is making the grave charge that various news releases are giving a false picture of the Grand Coulee salmon hatchery and transplanting program.

The men who make their living from the Columbia River's once tremendous salmon runs react like a bull to a red flag whenever they read reports which tell how the stream's fisheries have been saved. And they react in similar fashion whenever they read how some agencies want to build eight more dams on the Columbia, "without damaging existing fisheries," or how various power systems, publicly or privately owned, want to erect mighty dams on the Columbia's lower tributaries.

"Another high dam on the Columbia River below the Snake River could easily eliminate the salmon as a valuable commercial resource," declares W. William Puustinen, veteran fisherman and a Columbia Basin policy consultant.

DIFFERENCE IN VIEWS

It is right at this point that the whole question of Northwest industrial development enters. There are those who look with favoring eyes on a great Pacific Northwest manufacturing empire, capitalizing on gains made in wartime and utilizing still undeveloped power resources to compete with the East in light-metals production and general industrial development. And there are those who favor a balanced Columbia River economy, with fisheries and a moderately developed industrial program, using power from facilities which would not further damage the salmon runs, teeming with forestry and agriculture to produce a lasting wealth.

The fisherman is in the balanced-economy group. And, because he is, he feels that any story which minimizes the dangers to the Columbia's fisheries is against his interests. Each story about the effectiveness of steps taken at Bonneville Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, or any other dam, is another blow below the belt, overlooked by the referee and not noticed by the spectators.

"If the writers and propagandists of the various Federal agencies would tell the whole story about what has happened to our salmon, a different approach would be taken toward public-power development and fanciful dreams of additional towering dams, linked by lakes for navigation, would be forgotten," the fisherman will assert.

GREAT FOOD RESOURCE

When Lewis and Clark first visited the Columbia River more than a century ago, they found therein the greatest food resource in the Nation. The salmon came up the river in such hordes that they took days to pass a mile-wide point on the river. The sight was incredible, millions upon millions of fish returning to their native streams to spawn and start a new generation on the return trip to the sea.

Since the turn of the century the Columbia fish population has been decreasing. A 1938 report of the Washington State Fisheries Department, dealing with the possible methods of preserving the river's salmon and steelhead, declares:

"The constant inroads of civilization have continually worked to the detriment of the fish populations. First irrigation diversions, then small hydroelectric dams on several tributaries, then more and larger irrigation diversions, overfishing by the commercial interests, increase in sport fishing, gaffing of fish on the spawning grounds and the increasing industrial and domestic pollution, bringing pressure constantly against the fish population, have decreased their former abundance. So many factors were at work in so many different ways that the public's attention was never riveted for any length of time on the decreasing value of this enormous natural asset."

STEPS WERE TAKEN

The perilous danger facing the salmon fisheries was brought sharply to the public's attention by the initial reports on the development of the Columbia River for navigation, irrigation, power, and flood-control purposes. For it was shown the reports did not provide adequate protection for the fish runs and that complete wiping out was possible.

Public opinion then forced passage in the State of Washington of an initiative restricting certain commercial fishing gear, construction of protective devices for fish at Bonneville Dam and the Puget Sound Power & Light Co. Dam at Rock Island, near Wenatchee, Wash., and the grandiose Federal plan to make up for the loss of 1,100 miles of spawning streams above Grand Coulee by the development of an artificial propagation project below the dam.

It is this Federal plan to preserve the salmon runs that riles the gill-netters and others interested in the fisheries problems, for the stories concerning it invariably are rosy-hued and encouraging.

The building of Grand Coulee Dam meant a severe blow to Columbia River fisheries, so the Federal Government was forced to take steps to help preserve the stream's valuable salmon and steelhead runs.

Briefly, what the Government did was to build three hatcheries in eastern Washington—at Leavenworth, Entiat, and Winthrop—at a cost of approximately $4,000,000. Salmon coming upriver to spawn were trapped at Rock Island, below Grand Coulee, and a portion were taken to hatchery holding ponds and the rest distributed in streams for natural spawn. The eggs were stripped from the portion held in the hatchery ponds and artificial propagation was begun in the most magnificent set of hatcheries ever built.

So far, so good. The fishermen were pleased at the interest the Government was showing, but still they remained skeptical.

"What will happen when the fish released by those hatcheries come back upriver to spawn?" the skeptics asked. "Will salmon whose past generations spawned 1,000 miles above Grand Coulee return to an artificial parent stream below the dam, or will they make their way back upriver and die beneath the dam in a great effort to get over the mighty barrier?"

There were other questions, too, as to whether the young fish would survive in the transplanted streams—whether the streams used in the transplantings could support a fish population equal to that which formerly came from the great river network above Grand Coulee.

A veritable flood of magazine articles and news releases for the past several years have given much of the Nation the idea the $4,000,000 hatchery program has been an unparalleled success, that the fish are coming back in great numbers to the streams where they were transplanted, and that the $250,000,000 Columbia River fishing industry has nothing to worry about.

Here is a 1945 example of the type of writing which riles the commercial fisherman. It is taken from an article appearing in the Saturday Evening Post, and reads:

"So it was that last season, when salmon appeared at Rock Island Dam, no traps barred them. They were allowed to pass, headed straight toward Grand Coulee. Nervously, with doubts and misgivings, but most of all with insatiable curiosity, the men who had accepted the tremendous task years earlier now watched them slowly eating up the last miles of river. Their actions would soon tell whether money, time, and enormous effort had been wisely spent or paid out in graft to a wise and smirking Mother Nature.

"There had been blueback salmon among those artificially spawned fingerlings. Would they turn off into the Wenatchee and Okanogan Rivers, which had their sources in the lakes necessary to the natural environment habits of this species? Would the regal chinooks rush headlong to their deaths beneath the mammoth man-made falls which is Grand Coulee?

"The salmon soon gave their own answers. As the mouth of each artificial parent stream was reached groups of fish swung obediently into it. Bluebacks turned into their lake-fed rivers. Chinooks passed their tests like seniors parading after diplomas. No single salmon attempted to pass on toward the seething white water at the foot of towering Grand Coulee. Dr. Ira Gabrielson's experts had gambled a lot of Government money and a lot of fish and they had hit the jack-pot.

"The remainder of the fish," the article continued, "will undoubtedly return as obediently during the next 4 years. This will mean that the entire salmon population which formerly spawned above Grand Coulee has been saved from extinction. To salmon men, it will mean the salvage of a considerable portion of a huge industry. To the average American it will mean continuation of a full stock of salmon on grocery shelves."

When the fishermen read that particular article, they yelled loud and long. So loud and so long, in fact, that many persons who otherwise had taken things for granted began visiting the Federal hatcheries which supposedly had accomplished the miracle.

What they found was something quite different.

The Leavenworth, Winthrop, and Entiat hatcheries had turned out only a comparative handful of fish from eggs taken in 1944 from salmon coming back up the Columbia. If the return of salmon had been great in 1944, there should have been plenty of eggs available for a big hatchery output. Embarrassed hatchery employees tried best to give satisfying answers as to why only 11 of the 70 Leavenworth hatchery rearing ponds were in use on July 16, 1945, for instance. Their best excuse, the fact that low water at the Dryden power diversion some miles downstream in the Wenatchee River did not allow the salmon to get past, brought from the investigators the reply that immediate steps should have been taken to trap the fish which could not get past the diversion, so that the eggs could have been taken. As it was, the salmon which did come up the Wenatchee spawned at the diversion point in a place which may not be suitable for spawning at the time that generation of fish comes back in 1948.

In 1944, the Entiat hatchery was able to trap only 35 Chinook salmon, getting a mere 17,000 eggs. The run proved better this year, but the Entiat always had had a good run of salmon in the years before Grand Coulee, so there should have been fish coming back, Grand Coulee or no Grand Coulee. The Entiat hatchery on July 17, 1945, had only 50,000 Chinook fingerlings, 104,000 silver salmon from the State hatchery on the Lewis River, Wash., and 25,000 steelhead fry. Most of the rearing ponds were dry. Using

eggs from Leavenworth, the hatchery produced 1,213,000 fish in 1944.

The Winthrop hatchery that same day had on hand a mere 67,000 blueback salmon and 40,500 silver salmon fry but had released 90,000 bluebacks the previous May. Of the 32 ponds, a fraction were used for rearing fish. Some had water in them but were used as swimming pools.

A few miles away from the Federal hatcheries is the Washington State game department's Chelan hatchery. On hand July 17, 1945, were 840,000 rainbow trout, 200,000 cutthroat trout, and 50,000 Montana graylings, all in 9 small ponds. During 1944 the hatchery had released 660,000 rainbow fingerlings, 300,000 cutthroat fry, 300,000 rainbow fry, and 5,500,000 silver trout fry, for a total of 6,780,000. (The silver trout fry are easily raised and quickly released, however, so do not present the same rearing problem as do the other trout or the salmon.)

Also nearby is the Yakima State game department hatchery, which the same day was holding 400,000 rainbow fry and which had plans to release in 1945 a total of 853,000 rainbow fry, 1,500,000 silver trout fry, 350,000 rainbow fingerlings, and 260,000 rainbow fry. The hatchery has 10 ponds.

The figures merely emphasized the fact the Federal hatcheries were nearly devoid of fish as compared with the nearby State hatcheries.

A comparison of State and Federal hatcheries can be made on the basis of fish plantings for the year 1943. In that year the Federal hatchery at Entiat, with 16 rearing ponds, planted 62,398 yearling sockeye salmon and 55,950 fingerling Chinook, plus 1,240,000 fingerling steelhead and 8,000 yearling steelhead. In the same year, the Federal hatchery at Leavenworth with 70 ponds planted 876,731 fingerling blueback, 12,459 yearling blueback, 422,528 fingerling Chinook, plus relatively small numbers of steelhead and silver salmon. The Winthrop hatchery, also federally operated, with 24 ponds, planted 66,564 yearling Chinook and 741,350 steelhead fingerlings.

Do those figures sound large to you? Well, read on.

The State of Washington fisheries department hatchery at Issaquah, with 18 ponds, turned out 481,437 blueback fingerlings, 31,349 blueback fry, 891,000 Chinooff fingerlings, 379,000 silver salmon fingerlings, 356,000 silver salmon yearlings. The Green River hatchery, with 17 ponds, turned out 252,000 blueback fingerlings, 5,312,000 blueback fry, 1,789,000 Chinook fingerlings, 1,929,000 Chinook fry, 496,000 silver salmon fingerlings, and 315,000 silver salmon yearlings.

OTHERS AS GOOD

There are other State-operated hatcheries with records as good. The two mentioned were chosen because they were the stations with the largest number of rearing ponds. As for employees, the personnel involved in the operation of the three Federal hatcheries in eastern Washington probably is equal to the entire staff of the 13 stations operated by the State fisheries department.

As for the report that no salmon had ventured upstream as far as Grand Coulee, a questioning of employees at the dam site brought the report—heard by a number of men—that there had been a large group of salmon in the waters immediately below the dam in 1944 and that some fish already had been seen by July 15, 1945. This was taken as an indication that fish were traveling beyond their artificial parent streams into waters where the passage was barred and where no spawning grounds were available.

The fish, true enough, might have been strays, of which there usually is a small percentage in any group of returning salmon. A question that arises in this regard, however, is: How is it possible for anyone to make a statement that not one of the adults had bypassed the tributaries they were transplanted to below the dam? Yet this statement has been made many times, and has appeared in print as well.

MOORE IS CRITICAL

Is anyone besides the commercial fisherman taking a critical view of the matter? The answer is a definite "Yes," with numerous sports groups being interested and with Milo Moore, Washington State Director of Fisheries, being extremely active.

Alarmed over the prospects of the building of new high dams on the Columbia River below the mouth of the Snake River, and on other salmon streams, Moore says that action must be taken now "to conserve the valuable runs of salmon and steelhead trout that will be lost if their spawning grounds are destroyed."

"In the past," Moore continues, "the United States Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have shifted the responsibility of fish protection at such structures to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. That organization has then been forced to make hurried decisions regarding ways and means of providing fishways or hatcheries and rearing ponds to take care of the salmon runs that have been interfered with.

"While statements that have been made and other information indicate that the efforts of the Fish and Wildlife Service have been successful in transferring the runs of salmon originally passing Grand Coulee Dam to tributaries entering the Columbia River below that structure, the number of salmon returning from these transplants and artificial operations is alarmingly low."

Moore, taking the position that the State of Washington's fisheries department is better qualified to direct the salmon hatchery program and that it has responsibility for protecting the salmon runs within the State, is seeking Federal funds for the building and operation of at least five hatcheries on lower Columbia River tributary streams, below Bonneville Dam, and on the coastal streams of Washington.

Men from the fisheries department already are in the field surveying these streams for future hatchery sites.

WILL BE BIG AID

Will these additional lower river hatcheries be sufficient to bring back the salmon runs? Moore says they won't be by themselves—but they will be a tremendous aid when coordinated with a strict antipollution campaign, increased use of Federal hatchery facilities which now are available, stricter control of water diversions for power and irrigation purposes, a 100-percent complete screening of irrigation ditches to keep downstream salmon migrants from being lost, and an improved operation of Federal dam fish ladder and fish lift facilities.

"The problem is a tremendous one," Moore asserts, "but with proper emphasis on the important points, we can go a long way toward solving it. State leadership in the matter is necessary, for the State has proved what can be done in the work to bring back the salmon runs in the Puget Sound area. The State has the men and the 'know how' to do the job. Give us the Federal funds which are rightfully due us, and we can go a long way toward perpetuating the Columbia River salmon and steelhead—provided no more high dams are built below the mouth of the Snake River."

If the Northeast power planners can be content with low dams of the Bonneville and Rock Island varieties, and if the program that Moore envisages can be carried out, there may be that balanced economy which the fishermen want. But if some of the power advocates hold out for dams 70 feet or more high, and if hatchery production is not improved and pollution ended, the Columbia River salmon hordes may take the long trail that the buffalo took—into oblivion.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

John W. Snyder, of Missouri, to be Secretary of the Treasury; and

Clarence P. LeMire, of Missouri, to be a judge of The Tax Court of the United States for a term of 12 years from June 2, 1946.

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

Ben Moreell to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of admiral, for temporary service.

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

Sundry postmasters.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow. There is no Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 11, 1946, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 10 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

IN THE NAVY

Midshipman Samuel A. Pillar to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the 5th day of June 1946.

The following-named officers for appointment in the United States Navy in the corps, grades, and ranks hereinafter stated:

The following-named officers to the ranks indicated in the line of the Navy:

COMMANDER

Edward W. Rounds

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Harry W. Baltazzi	Albert E. Hindmarsh
Willis H. Beltz	Frederick F. Sima
John B. Cleland, Jr.	David J. Studabaker
Maurice M. DeWolf	William B. Tucker

LIEUTENANTS

Benjamin F. Bailey	Joseph A. E. O'Handley
Donald C. Brown	Edward S. Quilter
James R. Cain, Jr.	George N. Robillard
Edward B. Carlson	Robert T. Simpson
Herbert G. Claudius	William C. Taylor
Herbert C. Ferguson	Hubert E. Thomas
Albert F. Hindrelet	David J. Walsh
Draper L. Kauffman	Robert H. Wanless
Charles O. Larson	Richard D. White
Chester M. Lindsley	Claude K. Wilkinson
Robert D. Lowther	Allan D. Yost
Louis C. Mabley	Raymond J. Zanzot
John L. Maloney	

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Marion S. Alexander	Robert L. Bence
Samuel F. Allison	Charles A. Berry
Robert D. Ballantyne	Robert A. Bever
John J. Becker	Richard A. Bevernick
John B. Behan, Jr.	Aaron F. Beyer, Jr.

Carl R. Brandt
Harold Braune
Kenneth L. Butler
William E. Calder 3d
George H. Chapman, Jr.
Arthur D. Cook
Conrad W. Craven
Roger J. Crowley, Jr.
James H. Curran
Prescott H. Currier
Carlos L. Dean
Orville O. Dean
Luther L. L. Dilley
Arthur L. Downing
Francis L. DuBois
George N. Eisenhart
Claude S. Farmer
Thomas R. Fonick
Cyril Fox
Henry H. Fox, Jr.
Charles H. Franklin
Severance W. Gavitt
James W. Greely
Edward J. Greer
Charles W. Harbert
William R. Harlow
Charles W. Harrison, Jr.
William M. Hawkes
Frederick W. Hinrichs
James T. Hodgson
Franz P. Hoskins
Robert E. Huse
Angus Jacks
Norris A. Johnson
Charles S. Judson, Jr.
Harvey D. Kermode
Frederick N. Klein, Jr.
Norman E. Knapp
Hugh S. Knerr
Robert C. Knowles
Raymond J. LeBer
Hugh H. Lewis
Oscar E. Loeser, Jr.
Julius A. Loyall
Oscar B. Lundgren
Eugene H. Maher
Alfred D. Masters
David H. McCluskey
John A. McKeon
William C. Meyer
Bill A. Miles
Edwin C. Miller
Roger F. Miller
Elmer Moore
Francis P. Moran
Lee P. Morris
Gervis G. Morrison
Glenn W. Okerson
William A. Overton
Leonard A. Parker
Henry L. Plage
Ward F. Powell
William G. Privette, Jr.
Samuel B. Purdie
John A. Quense
James J. Richardson
Leigh W. Sedgwick
Sam L. Silber
Charles F. Skuzinski
Edward C. Spencer
Charles A. Stay
Francis P. Steel
Paul F. Straub, Jr.
Harry K. Stubbs
Crittenden B. Taylor
Edward A. Taylor
Robert H. Thomas
Victor F. Wadsworth
Edward V. Wedell
Frederick Welden
Albert H. Willis
Edgar L. Yates
Curtis T. Youngblood

ENSIGNS

Edwin W. Abbott, 3d
George B. Abbott
George J. Abbott, Jr.
Minor F. Abel, Jr.
Samuel J. Abel
Daniel W. Abercrombie, 3d
George G. Abernathy
William F. Abernathy
William S. Adami
Allan M. Adams, Jr.
Benjamin W. Adams
Clovis L. Adams
Lynn "W" Adams
Paul Adams
Norman O. Adelfson
Joseph W. Ady
Victor C. Agee
John E. Aicken
Henry J. Airey
Cameron W. Albin
Edward H. Albright
Franklin H. Alden
Alfred C. Alder
Delo M. J. Aldridge
Richard F. Alence
Aaron G. Alexander, Jr.
Kent Alexander
Robert H. Alexander
Milton O. Allen
Raymond W. Allen
Leonard A. Alne
Myron Alpert
Leland H. Amaya
William Ammon, Jr.
Andreas P. Anderson
Billie P. Anderson
Charles L. Anderson
Gene C. Anderson
James R. Anderson
John W. Anderson
Joseph C. Anderson
Morris A. Anderson
Paul A. Anderson
Wallace I. Anderson
William H. Anderson, Jr.
Lyman L. Andrews, Jr
Edmund L. Andronik
Albert C. Ansorge, Jr.
Douglas G. Anstett
Arthur R. Argleben
George E. Armistead, Jr.
Richard Aroner
George F. Aroyan
Robert E. Arthur
William A. Arthur
Daniel Arundell
Donald F. Arveson
John R. Ashcom
Walter D. Ashe
Thomas V. Ashton
George A. Aubert
Donald M. Aulick
Erle H. Austin, Jr.
James W. Austin, Jr.
Kenneth B. Austin
William R. Austin
Charles V. Babiarz, Jr.
John W. Bach
Theodore F. Bacheler
Richard T. Bagg, Jr.
John H. Bahlman
Charles S. Bailey
Walter E. Bailey
William F. Bailey
John R. Bain
Alex Baker
Carl W. Baker
George "E" Baker
Howard J. Baker
Robert H. Baker
Thomas M. Baker
Wayne D. Baker
William H. Baker
Stephen F. Balaban
James L. Ball
Robert Ball
William B. Ball
Jesse L. Ballew
Justin G. Ballou
William R. Ballou, Jr.
John E. Balson
Sydney N. Baney
Philip L. Banks, Jr.
Rex L. Bantz
Theodore J. Banvard
George E. Barber
Edwin F. Barker, Jr.
Donald G. Barkett
Alton M. Barlow
Louie W. Barnard
George J. Barnes
Harold "B" "J" Barnes
Jack D. Barnes
John W. Barnes
William F. Barnes
Robert E. Barnhart
Fred Barr
Robert W. Barrie
John E. Barrows
Charles B. Barry
Theodore M. Barry
William F. Barry
Barton W. Bartholomew
Ernest E. Bartlett, Jr.
Thomas H. Barton
William B. Barton
Charles A. Bassett
Edward C. Bateman
Edwin J. Bates
William S. Batey
Omer W. Bauer
Werner K. Bauer
Robert F. Baughman
Edward J. Bauser
Roscoe H. Baxter
Marmaduke G. Bayne
Shelton R. Beacham
Granville A. Beals, Jr.
John H. Beaman
George F. Bean
John H. Bear
Jesse Beasley
Richard M. Beauchamp
Oscar J. Beavers
Arvade L. Becker
Edwin N. Beeby
LeRoy C. Behling
Edward W. Behm
Burton H. Behrens
Walter G. Behrens
Ivan R. Beisel
Roy S. Belcher, Jr.
Vernon V. Bell
Harold H. Bennett, Jr.
Walter N. Benoit
Robert J. Benson
Reuel H. Bentley
William R. Bentley
Kenneth L. Berg
Thorval L. Berg, Jr.
Ward L. Berkey
Franklin V. Bernhard
John R. Berry
Robert M. Berry
Robert S. Berton
Fred S. Bertsch, Jr.
James O. Bess
Donald V. Bierwert
Weldon D. Bigony
Burton L. Bikle
George R. Birney
John M. Black
Robert G. Black
Enoch D. Blackwell
Frank A. Blackwood
Ralph E. Blad
Dale O. Blade
Robert J. Blaisdell
William G. Blake
Eugene D. Blechl
Ben W. Blee
Nelson C. Bliven
Clarence A. Blouin
Andrew Bodnaruk
Nils W. Boe
Richard J. Boerner
Philip "M" Bogdanovitch
Gordon S. Bogusch
Benton P. Bohannon
Robert M. Bollenbacher
Robert R. Bolles
Daryl B. Bolstad
Eugene M. Bolt
Robert B. Bolt
Robert E. Bondy, Jr.
Robert H. Bookhamer
Shelley S. Boone
Warren M. Boozer
Albert N. Bopp
Guy P. Bordelon, Jr.
John C. Borden
Clarence A. Borley
Woodrow J. Borne
Frank Bors
Guacoma A. Bostenero
William R. Bottenberg
George R. Bouffard
Arthur E. Boule, Jr.
John R. Bourchier
Emmett B. Boutwell
Charles J. Bower, Jr.
Robert C. Bownds
Edward A. Boyd
Eugene L. Boyd
William W. Boyd, Jr.
Charles J. Boyle
James E. Boyle
John E. Boyle
Ralph A. Brackett
Richard H. Bradley, Jr.
Harold G. Bradshaw
Robert S. Bradt
Bernard J. Brady
James D. Brady
James O. Brady
Thomas J. Brady
John T. Braithwaite
Roy H. Bramblett
John H. Brandenburg
Robert S. Brandon
Donald G. Brandow
Lucian C. Brandt
William V. Brandt, Jr.
Nicholas Brango
Jack Brannan
Eddie M. Bray
Scott I. Brear
James R. Bremer
Richard H. Brewer
Robert P. Brewer
Stanley E. Brewster
Richard W. Briggs
Rollin W. Brigham, Jr.
George R. Brines
John D. Brink
Charles B. Brinkley
Kenneth F. Brissette
Claude C. Brittain
Burdick H. Brittin
Ernest W. Broadbent
Robert H. Brock
Richard S. Brooks
Sidney Brooks
James J. Brosnahan
Walter T. Broughton 2d
LeRoy R. Broun
William B. Brower, Jr.
Fred W. Brown
Frederick J. Brown
Galen C. Brown
Gordon J. Brown
Keith F. Brown
Leslie E. Brown
Philip F. Brown
Thomas W. Brown
Herschel M. Browne
Paul J. Brownlow
John G. Brozo
Frank C. Brtek
Raymond H. Brubaker
Jack D. Bruce
Lester K. Bruestle
Paul J. Bruneau
Donald E. Brunner
Garland B. Bryan
Leonard G. Bryan
Carleton F. Bryant, Jr.
James S. Bryant
Donald J. Buchanan
Clarence C. Buck, Jr.
Stephen S. Budzianowski
Robert P. Buerger
Herman P. Buergey
William R. Bullard
Charles A. Bunt
Curtis W. Bunting
Hugh Burak
John W. Burchell
Richard A. Burgdorf
Thomas E. Burger
Andrew P. Burgess, Jr.
John C. Burgess
Jerome A. Burke
Charles R. Burnell
James T. Burrill
Joseph J. Burris, Jr.
Melvin E. Bustard, Jr.
William C. Butler
Lawrence H. Butt
John "L" Butts, Jr.
Elliott A. Buxton
James R. Byrd, Jr.
Newton P. Byrd
Joseph A. Byrne
John B. Cabell
John W. Cahill, Jr.
Jack Caldwell
Richard A. Caldwell
Henry H. Calhoun
James E. Callahan
Philip S. Callihan
Arthur B. Campbell
Clyde H. Campbell
Herbert "B" Cannon
James M. Canty
Felix Caracciolo
Vincent Carkhuff
Robert E. Carl
Chester R. Carli
Salvatore Carlisi
Paul G. A. Carlson
Robert E. Carlson
Walton L. Carlson
Cary N. Carpender
Charles R. Carpenter
Charles H. Carr, Jr.
John K. Carr
Billie Carroll
Charles H. Carroll
Edward L. Carroll
Vincent D. D. Carruth
Frank "L" Carter, Jr.
John Q. Carter
Kenneth Carter
Paul S. Carter
Robert M. Carter
Joseph Casco
Daniel H. Case
Robert D. Caserio
Jack N. Casseday
John R. L. Cassidy
Richard M. Cassidy
Clifford E. Caton
Robert M. Cawthorne
William C. Cayot
Ralph S. Cerney
Francis J. Cerwin
Johnnie W. Chalkey, Jr.
William B. Chamberlin
Leonard C. Chambers
Norman D. Champlin
George W. Chandler, Jr.
John C. Chandler
Kendall R. Chapman
Albert S. Chappuis
Nelson R. Charles
Robert P. Chase
Harry D. Chaudoin
Fred J. Childress
Howard W. Childress
Robert D. Chilton
Robert W. Christians
James S. Christensen
Aldo A. Cipolat
Angus K. Clark
Cecil Clark
Henry E. Clark
Leslie A. Clark
Lloyd J. Clark
Robert C. Clarke
John Clarkson
Thomas C. Clay
Sheldon Claypool
Marlow "D" Clements, Jr.
Blair Cleveland
John K. Clifford
Emory V. Clifton
Forest M. Clingan
Harry H. Cloutier
Joseph K. Coates
Robert C. Coats
Lewis M. Cobb
Edgar H. Cocke
Claude C. Coffey, Jr.
James J. Coffey
John "C" S. Coffin
William T. Cogley
Frank G. Cole
George Cole
James W. Coleman, Jr.
Kenneth L. Coleman
Raymond E. Coleman
James W. Collier
Hugh "L" H. Collins
Ralph W. Collins
Walter V. Collins
William R. Collins, Jr.
Robert E. Colopy
Wellington Columbo
Willard A. Comer
John F. Condren
Raymond F. Conklin
Richard Conlan
Thomas P. Connell
Ernest C. Connelley, Jr.
Paul J. Connolly
Robert W. Connolly
Lawton B. Connor
Harold J. Connors
James R. Constantine
Elliott V. Converse, Jr.
Eugene R. Conway
David M. Conwell
Charles D. Conyers
Frederick N. Conye
James L. Cook, Jr.
Aurelian H. Cooledge, Jr.
Homer K. Cooley, Jr.
John J. Coonan
John H. Cooper
Hal E. Copple
James H. Copple
Eduguardo H. Coppola
James L. Corcoran
Jewell G. Corlew, Jr.
Richard Corn, Jr.
Roy S. Cornwell
Gerald P. Corrigan
Adolphus B. Cosby
Paul C. Cottrell
Donald B. Court
Andrew H. Cowart
Jack R. Cowles
Louis L. Cowsert
Allan H. Craig
Clement M. Craig
William B. Craig
Hugh L. Crandall
Jack H. Cranton

Moxie Craus
William H. Cravens, Jr.
Nelson W. Craw
Francis G. Crawford
James T. Crawford
Donald L. Creed
Alfred M. Creswell
John A. Crocker
Arthur E. Crofoot
Chalmers A. Cromer
Francis J. Cronin
Flatus W. Crook
William H. Crosby
James A. Crossman
Carlton E. Crotty
Lawrence C. Crum, Jr.
Robert R. Crutchfield
Roy T. Cuculiu
Eugene P. Cullen
James H. Cullen, 3d
David E. Cummins
Charles D. Cunningham
Williams C. Cunningham
Louis Curra
Nathan E. Curry
Charles S. Curtis
Kent M. Cushman
Frank H. Cutalar
Russell J. Cyphers
Walter J. Czerwinski
Carl C. Dace
Charles R. Dale
Alexander W. Dalgleish
Carl A. Dalland
Kenneth K. Dalquist
George W. Daly
Julius P. Damrow
Charles A. Darrah
Charles B. Darrow
Robert W. Dart
Ezekiel H. Daughtrey
Carl E. Davidson
James V. Davidson
James H. Davies
Bernard W. Davis
Carl M. Davis
Charles E. Davis
Charles R. Davis
Edward P. Davis
George C. Davis
John H. Davis
Paul J. Davis, Jr.
Raymond E. Davis
Robert O. Davis
William H. Davis
Marion V. Dawkins, Jr.
Arthur E. Dean
William H. Dearen
Charles J. Deasy
Calvin H. DeBuhr
Gerald DeClerque
Donald W. DeFay
Armand L. Degroff
Robert N. Delahunt
James F. Delaney, Jr.
Richard D. De Lauer
Lafayette J. Delaware
Thomas M. Delehaunty
Frank L. Delorenzo
Henry F. Dement
William J. Denholm, Jr.
David Denison
Monroe F. Denmark
James M. Dennen
Warren W. Denney
Milton K. Dennis
Donald A. Dertien
Robert H. Desbrow, Jr.
Marcel Desgalier, Jr.
Donald M. Detrick
Willard S. Detwiler
John J. Devine
David M. Dibrell
Robert H. Dicks
Charles B. Dickson
David A. Dickson
John E. Dickson
Alfred H. Diem, Jr.
Robert A. Diepenbrock
Paul A. Dilgren
James R. Dillingham
Dominic J. DiMatteo
Elmer W. Dinger
John H. Dinneen
Thomas W. Dinsmoor
Bertand B. Dionne
John E. Di Pretoro, Jr
Robert C. Doban
Cleo J. Dobson
Robert E. Doell
John H. Dolan
William R. Dolan, Jr
Thomas K. Doles
Seymour Dombroff
Conrad Donahue
Thomas G. Donahue
Gerard M. Donovan
Paul F. Donovan
Grant L. Donnelly
John G. Dooling
William W. Dootson
James B. Doster
John T. Douglas
Jack R. Douglass
Richard B. Douthett
Robert R. Dowd
Richard S. Downey
Arnold E. Downs
Frank "A" Downs
James A. Downs
Richard E. Downs
Thomas R. Drago
Dan T. Drain
Murray E. Draper
George K. Dress
Kenneth R. Dresser
Henry R. J. Drew
Thomas H. Drinkwater
Edward J. Drozdz
William Dubyk
John R. Ducat
Allen "W" Duck, Jr.
Edmund D. Duckett
James H. Duffy, Jr.
John J. Dulhagen
John A. Duncan
Larry E. Dunlap
Charles A. Dunn, Jr.
Bruce B. Dunning
Elbert F. Durfee, Jr.
Harold D. Durham
Jack N. Durio
William N. Durley
Charles C. Dusek
Alexander B. Dusenbury
John E. Dutra
Philip G. Dye
Bradford M. Dyer
August A. Ebel
Edward R. Eberle
Harold L. Eberly
Joseph D. Eckard
Fred L. Eckert
Robert V. Eckert
Sherman J. Edelman
David A. Edgecombe
George H. Edmondson
Irving H. Edwards
John A. Edwards, Jr.
Thomas G. Edwards, Jr.
Edward L. Eeds
Frank A. Eger, Jr.
Lynwood O. Eikrem
William W. Elam
James F. Elgee
Laurence M. Ellefson
James B. Elliott, Jr.
Luther H. Elliott, Jr.
Thomas J. Elliott
Carl E. Ellis
Neil L. Ellis, Jr.
William D. Ellis
George Elmies
Daniel B. Elmore
William J. Emblem
William D. Emerson, Jr.
William S. Emerson
Ralph E. Endicott
Ralph Engleman
Jack R. English
Horace H. Epes, Jr.
Douglas H. Epperson
Robert F. Erdmann
Henry E. Ethier
Edward R. Ettner
Clifton Evans
Herman Evans, Jr.
Jack L. Evans
Keith J. Evans
Samuel C. Evans
William H. Evans
John S. Eversole
Russell G. Exley
Kenneth M. Eymann
William A. Fabrick
John A. Fahey
Robert H. Fahrney
Dale E. Fairchild
John T. Fallon, Jr.
Roy E. Farmer
William D. Farnsworth
Rollo L. Farrell, Jr.
Lawrence A. Farquhar
Elwood B. Faust
John F. Fay, Jr.
Melvin A. Feher
Edward L. Feightner
William E. H. Felchner
Robert E. Felten
John F. Felter
Albert G. Fenley
Naron A. Ferguson
Jennings P. Field, Jr.
Willis M. Fisher
Harry L. Fitch
Omar C. Fitch
Cyrus F. Fitton
Paul D. Fitzgerald
Robert E. Fitzgerald
Donald F. Flathers
Keith G. Fletcher
Edward Flores
James H. Fluhart
David R. Flynn
Reginald S. Fogg
John L. Foil
Daniel M. Foley
Peter J. Foley
Riley T. Folsom
Forrest B. Forbes
John E. Ford
William E. Ford
Levern E. Forkner
Francis C. Forsberg
Walter W. Forsha
Roy E. Forson, Jr.
Edwin J. Forsythe
Kenric S. Fortenberry
Edward L. Foster
Ellis M. Foster
William M. Foster
Wilbur M. M. Fowden, Jr.
Ormond C. Fowler
Frank A. Fox
Arthur E. Francis
Frederick E. Francis
Haldene E. Francis
Ira A. Francis
Billy S. Franklin
James P. Fraser
John R. Fraser, Jr.
Paul W. Frazier
John D. Freed
Berkley I. Freedman
Dewitt L. Freeman
Robert F. Freitag
George W. French
Morrell E. French
Richard Freundlich
Ralph W. Frieden
John W. Fulks
Howard T. Fulton
Leo E. Furtwangler
John J. Gallagher
Paul M. Gallagher
John L. Gallahar
Robert W. Galt
James L. Gammill
Paul T. Gannon
James E. Garlitz
Herman L. Garren, Jr.
William B. Garrison, Jr.
Russell W. Gash
Marshall J. Gates
John E. Gayton
Donald R. Geehring
Gordon Genmill
John R. Gensert
Paul J. George
Omer D. Getz
Robert Giamotti
Julius E. Gibbs
LeRoy C. Gibbs
Jack K. Gierisch
Ross D. Gierke
Ray K. Giffin
George R. Gill
Donald A. Gilles
Alvin E. Gillogly
James W. Gills
Joseph T. Glab
Everett B. Gladding
Clarence J. Glauser
Frank L. Gliottone
Floyd W. Gooch, Jr.
Archer R. Gordon
Grant B. Gordon
William M. Gortney
John R. Gossard
Kenneth L. Gould
William R. Gould
Harry Graber
Philip J. Grace
John C. Graham
Max W. J. Graham
Victor H. Graham
Charles H. Grainger
Wallace G. Gransee
Robert F. Grant
Robert H. Grant
John H. Graves
Joseph L. Gray
William L. Greager
George R. Greeley
Frederic H. Greene
Robert C. Greene
Vincent M. Greene
Marvin W. Greenstein
Martin D. Greenwell
Hayden A. Gregory
Eugene Greider, Jr.
Richard Greve
Peter A. M. Griber
Hadley C. Griest
Warren B. Griffin
Walter B. Griffith
Charles D. Grimmett
Eugene A. Grinstead
Albert R. Groves
Walter J. Gudat
Allan H. Gunderson
William Gundlach
Ernest H. Gunther
Peter T. Gurtler
Mayo A. Hadden, Jr.
Robert H. Hagen
Robert B. Hager
George Hahn
William R. Hahn
Charles R. Hake
Floyd E. Hale
Richard I. Haley
Chester G. Hall, Jr.
Robert W. Hall
Robert L. Hamblin
Arthur W. Hamilton
Billie C. Hamilton
John W. Hamilton
Arthur E. Hammarlund
Elmore M. Hammes
Wayne E. Hammett
James R. Hammond
Monroe P. Hammond, Jr.
William L. Hampel
Clemens F. Hand
John R. Hankey
Frank A. Hanley, Jr.
Ignatius H. Hanneke
Cedric M. Hansen
Howard C. Hansen
Bernard T. Hanson
Donald M. Hanson
Hugh L. Hanson
Richard Hapanowicz
Charles T. Harbin
Edward H. Hard
William A. Hardenstine
Herman J. Harders
William T. Harding
Willis E. Hardy
James C. Hargreaves
Rudolph E. Harkens
Edward L. Harley
Lester "C" Harlow
William J. Harper
John L. Harrington
Eli P. Harris, Jr.
John S. Harris
Richard A. Harris
Walter J. Harris
William C. Harris
Glenn C. Harrison
William E. Harrison
William M. Harrison
Glenn W. Harshman
Clarence M. Hart
William J. Hart 3d
Frederick W. Hartson
William C. Hartung
Donald C. Harvey
Robert S. Harward
George C. Hathaway, Jr.
Samuel H. Hathaway
Robert P. Hatter
Edward M. Haugh
Chester I. Hawkins
Gordon S. Hawkins
Jack H. Hawkins
Ralph G. Hawley, Jr.
George M. Hayes
Kent W. Hayes
Robert W. Hayes
Frank A. Hayler
Robert M. Hayler
Thomas Hazapis
Carlton G. Hazard
Robert G. Hazlewood
Thomas L. Healey
John F. Heaney, Jr.
George A. Hecker
Robert W. Heckman
James E. Heg
Thomas E. Heggerty
Carl C. Heidel
Robert Heiderer
Herbert R. Hein, Jr.
Fred Heller
Lester M. Heller
Samuel R. Heller, Jr.
Lawrence E. Helmuth
Lionel W. Hemphill
James L. Henderson
Pennard Hendler
Nathaniel T. Henley
Alton R. Henson
Saul W. Herman
Walter L. Hermanson
Ralph E. Herrick, Jr.
Kenneth F. Herrington, Jr.
Albert L. Herrmann
Dale R. Hester
Carl B. Hibben
William H. Hibbs
Robert T. Higgins
Reginald Hightower
Don L. Hignite
Don E. Hihn
Ray A. Hilbert
Charles C. Hill
James A. Hill
Lloyd M. Hill
Robert D. Hill
George E. Hilliard
Alvin Hillner
Herbert J. "A" Hillson
John W. Hinkelman, Jr.
Jacob E. Hipp
Beryl R. Hixon
Charles H. Hoblitzell
Nathan G. Hodgkins
Frederick R. Hoeppner
Walter F. Hoffland
Melvin C. Hoffman
Robert F. Hogue
Harry L. Hokanson
James F. Holder, Jr.
Samuel M. Holladay, Jr.
Urcel B. Holloway
Stanley R. Holm
Jack A. Holt
Charles K. Holzer
Norton L. Home
William N. P. Homer
Wayne Hoof
Charles J. Horner
Ernest R. Horrell
Vance E. Horswell
George W. Hoskins
Robert F. Hostutler
Donald W. Hough
James H. Houser, Jr.
Jerome O. Hovland
Edward H. Howard
John L. Howard
Lewis P. Howard
Ralph A. Howard
Robert E. Howard
Seth T. Howard
George B. Howe
John E. Howell
Raymond S. Howell, Jr.
Wilfred M. Howerton
Howard M. Howser
Hugh A. Hoy
Herbert D. Hoyt, Jr.
Joseph Hrabosky
William G. Hruska
Leonard J. Hubble
Don R. Huddleston
Houlder Hudgins
George D. Hudson
William H. Hudson, Jr.
Andrew F. Huff
James H. Huff
Ralph E. Huff
David S. Huggins
Albert P. Hulten
Thomas F. Humphrey
Louis R. Humpton, 3d
Howard B. Hurst
William B. Hussey
John L. Hutchinson
John F. Hutto
Marlin C. Hydinger
John H. Iarrobino
Jack M. Inglis
Bryce D. Inman
Arthur S. Irish
Charles M. Itte
Donald L. Jacka
Lawrence S. Jackman
Arthur C. Jackson
Mercer L. Jackson, Jr.
Donald J. Jacques
Daniel V. Jakomas
Ernest F. James, Jr.
Frank N. James
Robert L. James
John Jan
Robert B. Jarvis

Willard G. Jarvis
William Jeffers
Edward W. B. Jeffes, Jr.
Joseph D. Jeffords
George W. Jenings
Henry C. Jenkins
Lewis W. Jenkins
Raymond T. Jennings
Samuel B. Jensen
Seth A. Jensen
George W. Jewett
Salvador Jimenez
Bror R. L. Johnson
Clark W. Johnson
Donald H. Johnson
Elbert B. Johnson
Gerald Johnson
Mortimer C. Johnson
Perry W. Johnson, Jr.
Russel C. Johnson
Thor W. Johnson
Waldo P. Johnson
William H. Johnson
Robert J. Johnston
Jon B. Jolly
David M. Jones
Edward D. Jones
Franklyn L. Jones
George B. Jones
Harris P. Jones
Ira L. Jones
Jimmie C. Jones
Raymond "C" Jones
Robert T. Jones
Theodore R. Jones
Edward V. Jordan
Floyd Juillard
Otis K. Julian
Richard R. Justice
Edward L. Kahre
Stanley G. Kalemaris
Morris I. Kalin
Richard H. Kallies
Robert F. Kanze
Elton S. Katzenstein
Jack G. Kaye
Francis X. Kearney, Jr.
Gordon L. Kearsey
"C" "L" Keedy, Jr.
John P. Keegan
William K. Keen
William W. Keichner
Andrew G. Keleher
Lewis F. Kellerman
Emerick S. Kelone
Clair J. Kelso, Jr.
Henry C. Kemnitz
Robert R. Kemp
Andrew A. Kemper
Jack D. Kendall
James R. Kennedy
Robert F. Kenney
Howard B. Kenton
Arthur B. Kenworthy
Arthur W. Kershner
George E. Kerstein
Christopher J. Kerstiing
George P. Kessler
George W. Kimmons
Ira M. King
John W. King, Jr.
Myles C. King
Richard P. King
Leland M. Kirkemo
Robert H. Kistler
Robert E. Kittel
George R. Klein
Herbert S. Klenk
Philip H. Klepak
Richard P. Knapton
Malcolm J. Knebel
Frederick D. Knoche
Negus W. Knowlton
Kenneth "B" Knox
Albert L. Kobey, Jr.
John L. Koepsell
Karl B. Kohler
Roman Kolakowski
Steve G. Kona
John F. Koons
Edwin M. Koos
William J. Kostik
Philip T. Krell
Ira K. Kruger
Leo Krupp, Jr.
George F. Kube
Charles A. Kuhl
Roger C. Kuhn
Robert D. Kunkle
Raymond E. Kuntz
Karl W. Kunz
Harry P. Kwasny
Alfred F. Kwisinsky
William B. Kyle
Toivo V. Kyllonen
Carl A. LaBarre
Howard G. Labo
Dalton E. Lackey
Frank W. Laessle
Arland W. Lafferty
Thomas J. Laforest
Don E. Laird
Herbert T. Lake
Robert H. Lake
George L. Lakey
Joseph H. Laliberte
William Laliberte
Carl R. Lambert
William B. Lambert
Norman M. Lambertsen
Clarence L. Lambing
Lester B. Lampman
Calvin D. Landis
Frederick E. Lane
Gene L. Lane
Virgil V. Lane
Ralph R. Lang
Earl B. Lange, Jr.
Bernard R. LaPlante
Everett W. Large
Edward J. Larkin
Jack A. Larsen
James C. Larsen
Leif W. Larsen
Ray I. Larson
Richard Larson
Vernon H. Larson
Perry A. Laser
Frank J. Last, Jr.
Charles L. Latimer, Jr.
Robert A. Latka
Robert W. Laughead
Philip R. Lauriat
John T. Law
Edward J. Lawrence
Eston D. Lawrence
William Leary, Jr.
Cyrus "S" Lee
Donald E. Lee
Kent L. Lee
Norman I. Lee, Jr.
Frederick L. Leib
Calvin R. Leish
Dee L. Leland
Gideon R. Lemire
Albert F. Lemmel
Ernest Leonard, Jr.
George S. Leonard
Warren E. Leonard
Herbert A. Leonhardt
Robert K. Lesher
John K. Lesniak
Joseph R. E. Le Tourneau
Burna D. Levi, Jr.
Aaron A. Levine
Herbert A. Levitt
Francis A. Lewis
Frederick G. Lewis
Lawrence E. Lewis 2d
Mayland P. Lewis, Jr.
William A. Lewiston
Edwin Lieuwen
Robert C. Light
Ernest F. Lilek
Walter F. Lilly
Earl L. Lindgren
Albert E. Lindsay
William A. Lindsay
Edgar L. Lindsey, Jr.
Rowland G. Lindsey
"J" "A" Linn
Robert B. Linn
Sylvester J. Linn, Jr.
Cloyd A. Linville
James C. Linville
Grant N. Lipelt
Clyde D. Little
Wesley H. Lizotte
Thomas E. Lloyd
Emmanuel J. Lobato
Ralph F. Loche
James W. Logan, Jr.
Andrew W. Long, Jr.
Albert E. Longwill
Paul F. Lorah
David A. Lord
Herbert T. Losch
"L" "B" Loudermilk
Eugene H. Louis
John J. Love, Jr.
William R. Love
Robert W. Lowman
George M. Luebke
Raymond W. Luke
David Lumsden, Jr.
Archy L. Lupin
Robert N. Lyberg
John G. Lyman
Francis Lynch
Clarence D. Lynn
Hugh P. Lyon
John T. Lyons
John T. Lytle
Lewin A. Maberry
Everett J. Macartney
Robert A. MacGregor
Neil B. MacIntosh
Lawrence J. Mack
Dougal D. MacKay
Harding C. MacKnight
Donald L. MacLane
Harold R. MacMillan
Duncan S. MacRae
Arthur D. Maddalena, Jr.
Howard L. Madden
James J. Madden
John Madden 3d
Joseph F. Madden
Stephen P. Madden
Edmund J. Maddock
Frank E. Maddocks, Jr.
John F. Maddox, Jr.
Robert J. Maggass
Thomas I. Magill, Jr.
William T. Mahoney
Robert T. Makinson
Samuel H. Mallicoat
Walter J. Malone
Martin M. Manger, Jr.
Raymond J. Manhart
Marion E. Mann
William E. Mann, Jr.
Roman V. Maraszek
Dwight L. Marchand
Henry J. Marciniak
Joseph Maressa
George W. Markert 3d
Marvin A. Maroun
Jerrold P. Marsh
John A. Marsh, Jr.
James M. Marshall
Leo J. Marshall
Jack D. Martin
James A. Martin
Paul T. Martin
Anthony J. Martinelli
Walter Marusa
William Masek, Jr.
Charles M. Mason
James M. Mason
William T. Mason 2d
Victor H. Mastaglio
Francis N. Masuen
Walter J. Mathews
Harold K. Matthes
George H. Matthiesen
Byron H. Matthews
Herbert S. Matthews, Jr.
Joe E. Matthews
John A. Mattison
Elmer Maul
James J. May, Jr.
William R. May
Lucas B. Mayer
Damon C. Mayes
Shuler H. Mayes
John F. Maynard
Dixie J. Mays, Jr.
Clarence F. Mazurkiewicz
Francis W. McCabe
Arthur O. McCarroll
William H. McCarty
Merl L. McClain
Bert R. McClelland, Jr.
Willis C. McClelland
William R. McClintick
Michael McClintock
Nathaniel D. McClure 3d
Robert G. McCollough
Gordon H. McCormick
William F. McCullough
Donald McCutcheon
Nolan H. McDade
Jerry F. McDaniel
Noel W. McDaniel
James J. McDonald
Joseph F. McDonald
Joseph L. McDonnell
Lawrence J. McDonnell
Wilfred O. McDowell
Edwin B. McEnery
John P. McFadden
Howard L. McFann
Earle T. McFarland
Thomas I. McFarland
Alan R. McGarry
Charles E. McGeorge
Dwight R. McGinnis
George P. McGinnis
Richard H. McGlauflin
Charles T. McGrath
Ronald K. McGregor
Robert H. McHenry
William R. McIntyre
Colin McKay
Robert A. McKercher
John McLaughlin
William O. McLean
John L. McMahon, Jr.
Raymond J. McManaman
Donald W. McMaster
Alfred N. McMillian
Charles A. McMurray, Jr.
Richard B. McNees
Robert K. McNeil
John S. McNulty
Wymard B. McQuown Jr.
Harry R. McRae
Richard J. McRostie
Robert J. McVicker
Robert J. Mead
William W. Meadors
James T. Meadows, Jr.
Addison E. Medefind
Richard B. Medler
William J. Meehan
Henry R. Meenen
Clarence R. Meissner
Earl B. Melicher
Robert W. Mellish
Lewis B. Melson
Edwin S. Memel
Ellsworth O. Mercer
James Mercer
Carl E. Meredith
Edward W. Merkt
John L. Merrick
Charles F. Merrill, Jr.
Emile F. Meyer, Jr.
Herman E. Meyer
Milton Meyer, Jr.
Rudolph Meyer
Robert W. Meyers
Walter J. Michael
Vernon L. Michael
William J. Middlemiss
Roderick O. Middleton
Roderick M. Miele
Nicholas Mikhalevsky
Elwood C. Mildahn
Lyman C. Millard, Jr
Glen G. Miller
Harold R. Miller
Harry R. Miller
Joseph S. Miller
Kermit N. E. Miller
Robertson L. Miller
Edward D. Milligan
Archie L. Mills
Jared W. Mills
Terry Mills
William S. Mills, 3d
Clyde W. Minnear
David H. Minton
Don R. Minton
Robert B. Minton
John E. Mishanec
Clifton E. Mitchell
Howard R. Mitchell
John C. Mitchell, Jr.
John C. Mlasofsky
Phillip F. Mohr
Kenneth E. Moll
Richard A. Montfort
Frank G. Moody
Francis B. Mooney
Francis E. Mooney, Jr.
Carl I. Moore
Edwin C. Moore
Horace N. Moore, Jr.
Jack L. Moore
Paul Moore
Robert A. Moore
Robert E. Moore
Robert H. Moore, Jr.
Truman O. Moore
William V. Moore
Henry S. Morgan, Jr.
Lawrence P. Morgan
Milton J. Morgan
Robert L. Morgan
Walter N. Morgan
Ernest L. Morgon
George F. Morin
Frank G. Morris, Jr.
James B. Morris
Lester Morris
Philip C. Morris
John A. Morrison
Jack L. Morrissey
Henry S. Morton
Jackson L. Morton
Richard T. Mosman
Elmo L. Moss
Richard N. Moss
John L. Mote
Arthur W. Motley, Jr.
Howard J. Mott
Tom R. Mott
George O. Motter
Frank R. Moulton, Jr.
Willard M. Mound
Dalton C. Mounts
Ralph E. Moyer
Robert L. Moyer
Seymour A. Moyl
Jack E. Mudd
Ford F. Mudgett
James R. Mulholland
John A. Mullen
Theodore W. Mullen
Chester L. Mullins, Jr.
Arthur H. Munson
John B. Muolo, Jr.
Thomas J. Murnighan, Jr.
John W. Murph
Samuel B. Murphey
Frank M. Murphy
Morton B. Murphy, Jr.
William C. Murphy
John T. Murray
Philip A. Murray
Leonard W. Murrell
Jerome L. Murtaugh
Joseph S. Musial
Emerson W. Myers
Thomas R. Myszkowski
Charles L. Nagle, Jr.
Donald E. Nash
Alfred E. Nauman, Jr.
Milton L. Neighbors
John S. Neil
Victor J. Neil
Arnold P. Neiswender
Harlan M. Nelson
Joseph W. Nelson
Marvin J. Nelson
Robert A. Nelson
Robert R. Nelson
Sol Neman
Clifford I. Nettleton
Roy E. Neufeldt
Edmond J. Newbould
Eric G. Newburg
James W. Newhall
Paul A. Newlove
Augustus Newman, Jr.
James B. Newman
Raymond C. Newman
Fred B. Newton, Jr.
Lewis Newton
Kenneth C. Ney
Benjamin F. Nicholls
Ramon B. Nichols, Jr.
William J. Nichols
Marshall W. Nicholson
William M. Nicholson
Jerome W. Nickerson
Gordon K. Nicodemus, Jr.
James M. Nifong
Earl H. Ninow
Guy E. Noble
Bernard J. Nolan
Henry S. Noon, Jr.
Hiram D. Noonan
Robert A. Norin
Francis F. Norris
Clyde D. Norton, Jr.
Gerald S. Norton
LeRoy G. Norton
Gilbert C. Nowak
Hendrik W. T. Nyland
Francis N. Oberle
Edward F. O'Brien
Eugene P. O'Brien
John T. O'Brien
William C. O'Brien
Robert P. Oehaner
Henry J. O'Day
Wilbur F. Offtermatt
Edwin E. Ogren
Harrison J. Olingy
Donald C. Oliver
Ray E. Oliver
Stephen Oliver
William B. Oliver
John S. Oller, Jr.
Lester D. Olson
Robert C. Olson
Theodore W. Olson
William B. Omohundro
Raymond C. O'Neil
William R. O'Neil
Harold J. O'Neill
John L. O'Neill
John W. O'Neill
Jordan P. Onorato
Leonard J. Opeil
Eugene E. Ordway
Ray M. Orem, Jr.
Vernon H. Osburn
Sterling Osmon
John A. Overn
Edward T. Owens, Jr.
Donald E. Packard
Howard S. Packard
Ethan A. Painter
Richard M. Palkovic
Edgar P. Palm
Charles A. Palmer, Jr.

Robert N. Palmguard
Michael E. Panciotti
Richard D. Panther
Robert J. Pape
John Paradiso
Warren F. Paris
George A. Parker
Ralph Z. Parks
Arthur Parris
Joseph J. Paskoski
Byron H. Patek
Dee P. Patterson
Leo D. Patterson
Reid E. Patterson
William H. Pattillo
David B. Patton
Clayton A. Paulding
James A. Paulick
Eugene B. Pauli
Paul Pavlow, Jr.
Daniel N. Payne
William T. Peale
Charles H. Pearce
James W. Pearson
Lloyd M. Pearson
Arthur Peck
Henry R. Pedneault
Ferdinand B. Peik, Jr.
Charles F. Peksa
Isaac N. Pell, Jr.
Albert J. Pelletier, Jr.
Robert J. Penney
Romeo Perez
Terrance F. Perkins
Warren R. Person
Gabriel V. Pesce
Richard L. Petersen
Albin H. Peterson
George D. Peterson
Harry E. Peterson, Jr.
James V. Peterson
Melvin F. Peterson
Robert B. Peterson
Anthony M. Peyou
Joseph W. Philippbar, Jr.
Cass E. Phillips
Charles C. Phillips
Chester G. Phillips
Joseph S. Phillips
Harvey R. Phillips
Robert B. Phillips
Walter L. Pickering, Jr.
David A. Pickler
Robert L. Pierce
Raymond G. Pierre
Wayne J. Pike
Frank J. Pittelli
Milan L. Pittman, Jr.
Charles R. Pitts
Carlo R. Pizzano, Jr.
Arthur Plaut, Jr.
Leonard H. Plog
David C. Pohrman
Francis T. Polack
Thomas M. Pole
Josiah A. Polhemus
Lachlan B. Popplewell
Austin M. Porter
Ebenezer F. Porter
Loran R. Porter
Floyd H. Poteete, Jr.
Rodney A. Potolicchio
John C. Powell
John F. Powell
William W. Powell
George P. Powers
Horace S. Powers
William J. Pressler, Jr.
Roger G. Preston
William R. Preston
Charles E. Price
Ogle W. Price, Jr.
Melvin M. Prichard
Mortimer J. Prince
Cyril H. Probst
Clement R. Prouhet
John B. Pruden
Samuel W. Pryor
Harry M. Pugh
David F. Purinton
Thomas J. Quarton
Richard C. Quinlan
Richard T. Quinlan
Frank N. Quinn
William J. Quinn
Henry J. Racette, Jr.
Jesse H. Radcliffe
Raymond V. Raehn
James P. Ragan
Roy J. Ragland
Gerald W. Rahill
Adolphus G. Raht
Charles W. Rainwater
Percy W. Rairden, Jr.
John Ralston, Jr.
John B. Ramsey
Fred H. Rand
Robert G. Randal
Clinton H. Randall
Merle J. Randleman
Charles A. Rankowski
Bruce C. Rasche
Jonathan Q. Rasmussen
Frank T. Ratchford
Jack J. Ratcliffe
Paul W. Rathron, Jr.
Inman C. Rawls
Glenn E. Ray
Prentis R. Ray
Leon T. Raynor
Donald A. Reader
William L. Reardon, Jr.
Earl F. Rectanus
John J. Reddy
John P. Reed
Leland M. Reed
Sidney V. Reed
Joseph "S" Reedy
Frank G. Reese
Carl E. Reeve
Richard P. Regester
Paul A. Reh
George J. Rehe
Charles J. Reidl
William J. Reiley
Max C. Replogle
Jay J. Reynolds, Jr.
Norvan E. Reynolds, Jr.
Thomas W. Rhodes
Eugene J. Rice
Jack L. Rice
Robert C. Rich
George E. Richards
Harold E. Richter
Robert H. Richter
Calvin I. Ricketts
Colin J. Ricketts
John R. Riediger
Warren Riffel
William P. Riley, Jr.
James A. Riner, Jr.
Harry Risch
James Ritchie
Francis E. Rivers
James W. Roach
Walter Roach, Jr.
Earl J. Robb
Edwin H. Roberts
Owen A. Roberts
Paul D. Roberts
Thomas L. Roberts
David Robertson
Joseph R. Robertson
Wilson B. Robertson
Walter C. Robey
Benjamin M. Robinson
Earl L. Robinson
Rembrandt C. Robinson
Joseph H. Roche
Clifford "T" Rock
Charles W. Rockett
George M. Rodgers
Robert R. Rodgers
Chester D. Rogers
Walter H. Rohrich, Jr.
George M. Rooney
Harry E. Rorman
Joseph S. Rose, Jr.
Warren M. Rosengrant
Albert J. Ross
Jack W. Ross
John T. Ross, Jr.
William H. Ross
Edward F. Roth
George L. Roth
William F. Rothamel
William H. Roundtree
Robert A. Rowe
Ira M. Rowell, Jr.
Kenneth F. Rowell
Ernest Roycraft
Laddie M. Royster
Fred C. Rucci
Darrel D. Ruebsamen
William H. Rumberg, Jr.
Theodor W. Runk
William J. Runnels
Roy W. Rushing
James C. Russell
Patrick E. Russell
Thomas B. Russell, Jr.
Robert T. Rutzel
John W. Ryan
Henry S. Ryder
Leo M. Sabota
William C. Sadler
Bernard R. Sagan
Frank Samota
William R. Sams
Bernard L. Samuels
Richard W. Sanborn
Nelson W. Sanders
Orville W. Sanders
Roy N. Sanders
James R. Sanderson
Pierre N. Sands
Ernest E. Sanford
Robert D. Sante
Jere J. Santry, Jr.
Channing C. Sargent
Stanley D. Saska
Joe M. Saasman
Howard A. Sauer
Leonard S. Sauer
Lawrence Savadkin
Homer D. Savage
John E. Savage
Richard A. Savage
William A. Savage
Donald K. Sayner
Frank A. Sayre, Jr.
Norman C. Scaife
Harrell H. Scales
Harry C. Scarborough
William E. Scarborough
Perry H. Scarlatos
Albert G. Scatolini
Waldo W. Scheid
Albert Schellenberg
Carl L. Scherrer
Clyde H. Schindler
Lavon G. Schmidt
Thomas H. Schmidt
Paul R. Schneider
Vernon E. Scholer
Walter E. Scholz
William Schubert
Harry E. Schulze
Ralph A. G. Schulze
William A. Schwem
Raymond E. Schultz
Harold F. Scott
Ivan "J" Scott
Julian F. Scott
Meredith L. Scott
William A. Scott
Edward C. Scully
Richard H. Seacord
Philip N. Searles
Martin H. Seaver
Samuel D. Seay
Thomas S. Sedaker
James J. Seelig
Robert A. Seelinger
Robert E. Seguin
Charles W. Sellars, Jr.
Lloyd E. Sellman
Warren H. Sells
William L. Sells
Joseph Seltzer
Richard E. Selvitz
Julian D. Serrill
Paul T. Sessions, Jr.
Walter M. Sessums
Lester E. Setser
Ben W. Sevier
George O. Sewall, Jr.
Gilbert R. Shacklette
Charles N. Shane
William H. Shawcross
John Shea
John D. Shea, Jr.
Stewart S. Sheckells
Edward D. Sheffe, Jr.
Herbert C. Shellhouse
Lewis C. Shepley
Cedric W. Sheppard
John B. Sherfy, Jr.
Vining A. Sherman
John E. Shinners
Harold L. Shipley, Jr.
Robert A. Shirley
John W. Shong
Merton D. Short
Keith T. Shortall
Andrew K. Schreve
William A. Shryock
Thomas W. Shuford, Jr.
Charles W. Shuler
George M. Sidenberg 3d
John H. Sieckenius
Donald J. Siegel
John J. Sigafoos
Warren I. Signell
Colin B. Sillers
Israel H. Silvert
Hugh S. Simcoe, Jr.
Charles T. Simmons, Jr.
Robert L. Simmons
Harold W. Simon
William H. Simpson, Jr.
John H. Sims
Andrew M. Sinclair
William C. Singletary
Richard G. Sipe
Frank Sistrunk
Michael Skees
Ellis D. Skidmore
Wesley E. Skill
Charles A. Skinner
Roger E. Skjei
Jack B. Sledge
Allen W. Slifer
Denver C. Sliger
John P. Slowiak
David B. Small
James D. Small
Robert H. Small
Robert Smiegocki
Walter P. Smiley
Bryant G. Smith
Carl E. Smith
Carl M. Smith
Coleman H. Smith
Edwin P. Smith, Jr.
Howard H. Smith
Jacob P. Smith
Lewis O. Smith
Richard Smith
Russell L. Smith
Sheldon D. Smith
Wayne F. Smith, Jr.
Theodore M. Smyer
Robert H. Smyth
George W. Snediker
Joseph C. Snodgrass
Edward L. Snopkowski
Claire E. Snow, Jr.
John W. Snowden
Harold F. Snowden
James G. Snyder
Richard J. Soike
Donald T. Sollenberger
Leo S. Soltys, Jr.
Marvin P. South
William A. Spalding Jr.
John Sparger
James Spargo
Warren G. Sparks
Paul H. A. Spears
Billie C. Spell
Paul E. Spencer
Ray A. Spenser
Stanley S. Sperry
Richard H. Spindler
Marco P. Spinelli
Charles "G" Spoerer
Wade R. Squire
Carlos B. Stafford
Peary D. Stafford
Vernon D. Stanford
Carleton W. Staples
Carlton B. Starkes
James M. Stauffer
LeRoy V. St. Cyr
William S. Stebbins
Albert A. Steinbeck
Charles H. Stephens
Sidney B. Stephens, Jr.
Jean B. Stevens
Nevin J. Stevenson, Jr.
Robert J. Stevenson, Jr.
Clell Stewart
George B. Stewart 3d
Hal B. Stewart
Loren R. Stiegelmar
Norris O. Stieler
Leonard E. Stilwill
Harry E. Stirling
Archie P. Stockebrand
Elmer T. Stonecipher
John F. Stose
Ben H. Stough, Jr.
Burke W. Stout
LeRoy Stram, Jr.
Robert L. Straub
Harold Strawhorn
Lawrence B. Streiff
Lloyd L. Stromberg
Riter M. Stuart
George W. Stubblefield, Jr.
Roy M. Sudduth
Howard "A" "I" Sugg
James M. Sullenger
Clifford W. Sullivan
Francis J. Sullivan
Kenneth M. Sullivan
Patrick L. Sullivan
Russell H. Sullivan, Jr.
William H. Sullivan
William P. Sullivan
George H. Sult
William B. Sumpter
Robert S. Sutherland
John H. Suttner
LuReign Sutton
Gustav F. Swanson
Ralph W. Swearingen, Jr.
Albert L. Sweeney
William L. Sweeney, Jr.
James B. Sweeny, Jr.
Edward T. Swientek
Robert E. Swigart
Ray A. Szedziewski
Thomas L. Tabor
Wallace L. Talbot, Jr.
Edwin "M" Talbott, Jr.
Carson R. Tallent
Humphrey L. Tallman
William Tarbox
George L. Tarleton
Ben R. Tate, Jr.
Benjamin C. Tate
Donald C. Taylor
Donald W. Taylor
Goodwin R. Taylor
Martin E. Taylor
Russell S. Taylor
William O. Teague, Jr.
Thomas W. Teal
Thomas W. Tearney
James Tenety, Jr.
Hubert A. Ten Eyck, Jr.
Ernest Tennes
John H. Terry
Charles P. Tesh
William G. Thatcher
Lee A. Thercux
William W. Therriault
George F. Thibeault
DeWitt O. Thomas
Edwin S. Thomas, Jr.
John M. Thomas
Sylvester A. Thomas
Warren J. Thomas
Cecil W. Thompson
Guy E. Thompson
Harley F. Thompson
John L. Thompson
John R. Thompson
Joseph E. Thompson, Jr.
Robert A. Thompson
Robert L. Thompson
Samuel M. Thompson, Jr.
Thomas A. Thompson
Thomas N. Thompson
Wilbert L. Thompson
William Thompson
Daniel W. Thornhill
Ralph M. Thudium
Edward A. Thuesen
Norman E. Thurman
Paul A. Tickle
Howard W. Tindall
Bruce E. Tippie
Richard G. Tobin
Homer Tolivaisa
Andrew A. Tonkovich
Stanley C. Popolski
William T. Toran
Francis C. Tormollan, Jr.
Stephen R. Towne
Herbert L. Townes, Jr.
Walter F. Toy
Bill C. Trapp
Edward P. Travers
Max J. Travis
John M. Traynor
Charley F. Treadaway
Jack H. Tripp
Orville W. Trohanov
James E. Troupe
Alfred G. Trube, Jr.
Ross R. Truesdale
George T. Tuffanelli
Robert Tull
Claude I. Tully
Charles J. Turner
Clemons C. Turner
Russell Turner
Thomas J. Turner
William R. Turner
Wendell V. Twelves
Francis D. Tyler, Jr.
Alfred L. Ufer
John F. Uncles
John H. Underwood, Jr.
Richard L. Underwood
Benjamin F. Uran
Michael E. N. Vallario
Benjamin J. Van Blake
Arthur J. Vanek
Charles A. Vasey
Vie J. Vaughan
Howard T. Vaum
William H. Veit
George M. Veling
Earl A. Venstrom
Eugene F. Verdery 2d
Paul A. Veres
Merriwell W. Vineyard
Vinton C. Vint

Paul L. Vissat
Robert L. Voight
Sherman L. Voiler
Robert W. Vollenweider
Matthias J. Vopatek, Jr.
William D. Wade
James W. Waggoner
Adrian D. Wagner
Harry M. Wagner
Edwin J. Walasek
Ray F. Walburg
Clarke B. Walbridge
Donald P. Walker
Earl P. Walker
Gordon D. Walker
Grant J. Walker
Herbert P. Walker, Jr.
John P. Walker, Jr.
John S. Walker
Robert A. Walker
William F. Walker
William O. Walker
Roger M. Wall
Wilfred G. Wallace
John Wallat
Marion C. Walley
Samuel C. Walls
Carroll A. Walsh
Nelson C. Walton
Lyttleton T. Ward
Rudolph L. Ward
William A. Warde
Robert L. Warner
Robert D. Warren
Samuel B. Warren
Orval J. Washburn
Robert J. Watkins
Earl E. Watson
Edward L. Watson
Guy "B" Watson, Jr.
Robert S. Watson
William S. Watson
Harry J. Watters
Thomas F. Wattle
John M. Watts
Martin V. Watts
Jack E. Weatherford
Charles D. Webb
Warren W. Webb
William L. Webb
Boyd Y. Weber
Robert W. Weber
John A. Webster
John F. Weidling
Jack W. Weidner
George Welch, Jr.
Robert E. Wiegand
Walter H. Weimer
Eugene J. Weinbeck
LaVerne L. Weiss
Carl Weisse
Glenn E. Welch
James M. Welles
Daniel C. Wells
George R. Wells
Roland A. Wells
Howard C. Wellsman
Egon H. Werdelman
Paul F. Werner
Donald E. S. Westby
Lewis O. Westcott
Billy G. Westerfield
Franklin G. Westfall
William H. Westray
Wilbur L. Wetherill
Elwood C. Wheat
Chester H. Wheatley
James F. Wheeler
Roy S. Whitcomb
Carl C. White
Dorsey M. White, Jr.
Gerald T. White
Horace R. White
Joseph E. White, Jr.
Roy C. White
Donald D. Whitney
Loren C. Whitney
Harold E. Wibberley, Jr.
Thomas E. Wiggins
Frank J. Wikenheiser
Joseph H. Wilberding
Charles C. Wilbur
James F. Wilbur
James H. Wilder
Howard F. Wiley
Eugene P. Wilkinson
Edward L. Willey
James L. Willhide
Cassius A. Williams, Jr.
Donald R. Williams
Joe Williams, Jr.
Joe W. Williams, Jr.
John K. Williams
Malcolm W. Williams
William H. Williams, Jr.
Laurence B. Williamson
Merritt A. Williamson
Charles H. Willis
Robert S. Willis
Albert R. Wilson
Ernest E. Wilson
Jennings B. Wilson, Jr.
Oscar M. Wilson, Jr.
Robert G. Wilson, Jr.
Alonza R. Windley
David "J" Winn
George H. Winslow
Henry E. Winter, Jr.
Homer A. Winter
Charles L. Winters, Jr.
James H. Wirth
Eugene R. Wiseman
Maurice E. Witting
Fred W. Woessner, Jr.
Francis D. Woidich
Martin L. Wolf
George Matlack Wolfe
George Michael Wolfe
Theodore "E" Wolfe, Jr.
Alan S. Wolff
Leonard C. Wolff
Cleo B. Wood
Harry W. Wood
James Wood
John W. Woodall, Jr.
LaMar L. Woodward
Leonard S. Woodward
William B. Woodward
Stephen R. Woolard
Amos L. Wooten
Benjamin F. Worcester 2d
Charles E. Works
Curtis C. Worley
Robert A. Wright
William Alexander Wright
William Austin Wright
Alfred H. Wunderli
John F. Wunderlich
Waldemar Yatchmenoff
Carl H. Yeagle
Clifford R. Yelley
Harold Yeremian
Laurens W. Youmans, Jr.
Robert S. Young
Donald K. Youngblood
Leslie L. Youngblood, Jr.
Leonard W. Zaborski
Walter F. Zartman
William H. Zeigler
William H. Zellers
Max A. Zesiger
Frederick W. Zigler
Roy W. R. Zimdars
Irving Zolo
Gerard P. Zornow
Clarence J. Zurcher

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

MEDICAL INSPECTOR WITH THE RANK OF COMMANDER

Page O. Northington.

SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Greydon G. Boyd
James M. Brown
Harold J. Chapman
Asa G. Churchill
Walter A. Crist
Donald E. Dement
Percy B. Gallegos
Charles Gartenlaub
Robert L. Gilman
Ashton Graybiel
John K. Hawkes
Verden E. Hockett
Charles J. Hutchinson
Everett B. Keck
Robert F. Legge
Harold E. List
Robert Mazet, Jr.
Arlo A. Morrison
Eugene H. Moyle
Raymond W. Murray
Paul G. Richards
Charles G. Robertson
John W. Rogers
Hilton W. Rose
Shelton P. Sanford
Robert V. Schultz
Beryl C. Shearer
Lloyd B. Shone
Walter J. Shudde
Leonard E. Skilling
Van C. Tipton
James D. Viecelli
James H. Walvoord
Hugh Warren
James N. Williams
Leonard L. Wilson

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT

Theodore H. Armstrong
Lawrence L. Bean
John J. Brown
Virgil L. Cameron
Nelson B. Combs
Roy E. Crowder
George H. Davis
Wesley Fry
Carl C. Carver
Frank B. C. Geibel
Harold D. Giddings
Walter W. Gilbert
James H. Gillen, Jr.
Rexel Goodman
Lewis Gunther
John S. Hanten
Matthew J. Hantover
William Heatley
Robert E. Henderson
Edward A. Hynes
Graham R. Johnston
Morris H. Jones
Bernard "I" Kahn
Silas A. Keim
LeRoy L. Kenney
Dunne W. Kirky
Ernest S. V. Laub
William S. Lawler
William K. Livingston
Leslie K. MacClatchie
Frank R. Philbrook
Nathan L. Robbin
Thomas P. Rogers
William F. Roth, Jr.
Robert B. Shepardson
Arthur B. R. Smith
Fred B. Smith
Eugene T. R. Stone
Stephen D. Sutliff, Jr.
Charles C. Terry, Jr.
John C. Traugh
Jack Warren
Ross W. Weisiger

ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Hubert L. Anderson
Albert C. Barber
Bruce B. Barnhill
Harry L. Barton
Harold L. Baxter
Jerome J. Bergida
Ross P. Black
Charles G. Bratenahl
Warren C. Breidenbach
Robert M. Carr
Henry R. C. Chalmers
Loren E. Conner
Frederick W. Cottrell, Jr.
Tracy D. Cuttle
Percy W. Demo
James R. Dineen
John J. Durkin
Paul G. Ecker
Eugene J. Ellis
Montgomery N. Estridge
Claude C. Farley
Robert J. Fleischaker
Edward L. Foote
Frederick G. W. Gugenbuhl
Byron L. Hawks
Edward B. Hopper
Robert E. Huie, Jr.
Ernest H. Joy
Philip D. Klinefelter
Stanley J. Klyza
Francis P. Knight
Thomas R. Lehan
Nathan Lieberman
Morton L. Lillie
Allen H. Long
Donald H. MacDonald
Malcolm W. Mason
John A. O'Donoghue
John L. Pearce
Robert Penington, Jr.
Michel Pijoan
John T. Sill
Alan G. Simpson
Hugh D. Stites
Ralph G. Streeter
Robert E. Stutsman
Hardy E. Thompson, Jr.
Samuel V. Thompson
Walter S. Thompson, Jr.
Louis I. Tyler, Jr.
Frank B. Voris
Lawrence A. Whoolery
William M. C. Wilhoit
Elwood L. Woolsey

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

PASSED ASSISTANT PAYMASTER WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT

Theodore D. Gatchel

ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Frederick A. Allis
Stanford F. Brent
Edgar N. Brown
Forrest P. Brown
Pierre D. Collins
Herman R. Fahlbusch
Frederick A. Fielding
Charles C. Hiles
William H. Howland
Carl M. Jordan
Robert H. Kuppers
Harry W. Leiser
Leslie T. Meiman
Jack M. Page
Edgar D. Vestel, Jr.
Roy C. Voils
Charles M. Waidner
Everette M. Williams
Frank G. Winiecki

ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Fred T. Adams, Jr.
Robert N. Adams
Walter B. Adams
Roger J. Adrian
George B. Aker
Ernest P. Allen, Jr.
James V. Allen
Eugene M. Amos
Clayton L. Anderson
John C. Angelopoulos
Thomas J. Anketell
John D. Arn
Charlie B. Aycock, Jr.
Richard J. Bacon
Conway C. Baker
Henry G. Baker
Robert J. Baldwin
Conrad A. Barger
Angelo J. Barsanti
John J. Barton
Robert S. Bebbington
Raphael Belkov
George E. Bell
Gerald R. Blosser
Paul F. Borden
Roland H. Bouchard
Cyrus L. Brainerd
Edwin E. Bramhall
George J. Braun, Jr.
Frederic C. Brehm
Marvin L. Brooks
Daniel W. Brown
Bernard "S" Browning
Lester L. Buchart
Hubert E. Burke
Hugh D. Byrd
Robert A. Carl
Whitney A. Chamberlain
Gordon L. Chamberlin
John E. Cifranic
Grover V. Clark
Earl G. Clement
Herbert G. Cocke
Paul W. Cook
Rufus G. Cook
Leon C. Covell, Jr.
Donald L. Crutcher
Owen S. Davies
Roger L. Davis
Thomas H. Dawson, 3d
John A. Donehoo
Lawrence L. Dowell
Lee "N" Duncan
Brownlow W. Dunlap
Ralph L. Eaton
Vincent C. Ecoffey
Thomas J. Emmett, Jr.
Charles E. Emrick
Allwyn B. Erickson
James B. Ericson
Clayton W. Ernst
Houston H. Evans
William J. Fallon
Walter O. Fawcett
David E. Fay
William O. Foulkes
Raymond G. Frey
Alfred H. Gabriels
Olen R. Garrett
Foster I. Gilbert
James E. Grey
James E. Griffith
Darrell E. Grow
John A. Hagan
Louis Hansley
Norman R. Harbaugh
Robert B. Harris
John W. Haskell
Rolland A. Heisel
Earl F. Hilderbrant
Joseph F. D. Holcombe
Leonard R. Honnold
Frederick E. Hopkins
Donald J. Hos
Harvey F. Humphreys
John T. Hundley
John S. Huntington
Frank L. Jenne
John W. Jewett
Lloyd O. Johnson
Mark C. Jones
Ernest M. Joyce
Andrew J. Keating
David B. Keers, Jr.
Jack F. Kimball
Robert W. Kirby
Don H. Kleinhammer
Gordon L. Koppert
Maurice H. Kramer
David G. Lamborne
Harvey R. Lampshire
Elmer S. Landers
Jay E. Larson
John C. Leach
Arthur C. LeClert
Charles R. Lee
Louis W. LeForge, Jr.
Harold C. Lemon
William J. Leonard
Joseph H. Lillis
Frank E. Locke
Arnold E. Lohnes
John J. Long
James R. Longon
William G. MacMaster
Frederick M. Mansfield
Thomas C. Mason
Merlin L. McCulloh
Houston W. McGlothlin
Robert H. McIntire
William J. McKenna
Gerry N. McLeod
John C. Marshall
John E. Moeller
William A. Mosteller
Robert W. Mullins
John H. Nuck
Frank F. Oliver
Melvin O. Parrish
Rudolph M. Peterson
Orvill "L" Pilgrim
Ward J. Rafferty
Benjamin A. Rhoades, Jr.
William C. Richardson
David H. Ripper
Henry A. Robertson, Jr.
Dale M. Robison
Charles R. Ruark
DeAlton Russell
Thomas H. K. Russell
Thomas J. Ryan, Jr.
Lawrence W. Sadd
Keeler Sargent
Charles H. Schmeder
Melvin E. Sharp
James J. Shelton

Charles H. Skirvin
James B. Strait
Alphonse D. Suslick
Fordham D. Tabor
Richard M. Taylor
Homer C. Thiele
Walter L. Tholl
Ned L. Thomas
Leonard A. Vickers
Guy P. Waddell
Aredus B. Wade, Jr.
Darrel M. Walker
William Ward
Ralph C. Watts
William M. West
Ollie Z. Whitt
Sidney W. Williams, Jr.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

ACTING CHAPLAINS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Arthur R. Anderson
Ernest R. Barnes
Henry J. Beukema
John J. Burns
Cecil D. Ewell
John P. Forsander
George J. Hall
Carl W. Herrick
James D. Hester
William H. Hoffman
William M. Kirkland
Bernard J. McDonnell
Peter R. McPhee, Jr.
Arthur F. McQuaid
Paul C. Morton
Karl G. Peterson
Charles G. Pfeiffer
Oswald B. Salyer
Adam J. Schutz, Jr.
Edward A. Slattery
George E. Vanderpoel
Robert A. Vaughan

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEERS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Howard L. Mathews
Virgil A. A. Powell

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEERS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT

Earl R. Bennett
Arthur H. Castelazo
Charles S. Daily
George E. Fisher
Henry J. Fitzpatrick
Pinckney M. Jeffords
Robert D. Thorson

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEERS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Millard H. Aubey
Nelson R. Anderson
Robert B. Atkins
John K. Batchellor
Tom W. Beck
Perry M. Boothe
Greer A. Busbee, Jr.
Deane E. Carberry
Wayne J. Christensen
John F. Clarke
Harold E. Cobb
John W. Cook, Jr.
Frederick A. F. Cooke
James F. Cunniff
Edward A. Daday
John M. Daniels
John R. Denny
Edward T. Diberto
Jack G. Dodd
Rudolph F. Duelfer
Leslie R. Fleming
Edmund R. Foster, Jr.
Jacob P. Frankel
George M. Gans
Samuel C. Gill, Jr.
Joseph W. Gorman
Norman M. Green
John P. Grogan
Milton J. Harper, Jr.
Harold L. Haworth
William M. Heaman
Tulon L. Jackson
Ralph C. Jensen
Edwin E. Johnson
Willis O. Klotzbach
John Koleszar
Leo Liberman
Maurice C. Lipp
Howard M. Lloyd
Joseph L. Mahoney
Eugene F. Martiny
Ogden J. Martyn
Thomas B. McGlashen
Clifford E. McGrail
William W. Moore, Jr.
Albert C. Morris
John F. Mulgrew
Joseph C. Nelle
Stephen H. Payton
Cushing Phillips, Jr.
Carl H. Plumlee
Edward J. Quinn
Lattimer W. Reeder
Arthur T. Roth
John P. Roulett, Jr.
Harold R. Sandberg
William L. Sawyer
Harold M. Semple
Paul J. Simmons
William E. Sinclair
Richard E. Slattery
Richard W. Smith
Victor G. Stevens
John T. Stokes, Jr.
Gerald Q. Thacker
William E. Thompson
Frank C. Tyrrell
Jacob W. Updegrove
Charles K. Urlass
Kenneth M. West
Thomas J. White
Harry R. Witt
William R. Yankey

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

DENTAL SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Larry J. Dupuy
Francis C. Snyder

PASSED ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT

Joseph R. Horn
Max A. Moon

ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Philip A. Canalichio
Robert J. Condon
Harry O. Copher
Wade E. Couvillon, Jr.
Silas D. Cunningham
George S. De Shazo
Irwin G. Edwards
Louis N. Heller
Richard W. Hughes, Jr.
John J. Lauten
Donald D. Miller
Ward M. Mortell
Aaron Pargot
Samuel Sturm
Clyde H. Walsworth

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 10, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Edward A. McDonough, Chief of Personnel, Division Chaplaincy Service, Veterans' Administration, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, we stand humbly at Thy feet and return thanks for the gifts and favors we have received from Thy divine mercy.

We thank Thee for the many blessings of nature that bring pleasure and happiness to those whose tasks in life give little opportunity for rest and relaxation.

Bless this week that lies before us. Take from our hearts all pride and self-sufficiency that we may always be conscious that Thou alone art the source of all wisdom and knowledge. Enlighten our minds that we may cope with the great problems that come to us for consideration and solution. Teach us to turn to Thee for inspiration and assistance.

Continue Thy blessings to these United States that we may always be an example of the blessing of Christian civilization. Let each of us be conscious of his obligations to our country and fellow man that flow from the rights we enjoy by reason of our citizenship.

Direct us, we pray Thee, to a true and lasting peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 7, 1946, 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 joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 360. Joint resolution to provide for United States participation in the Philippine independence ceremonies on July 4, 1946.

MEETING OF EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JUNE 7, 1946.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I regret to inform you that it will be impossible for me to serve as a member of the House congressional delegation to the Bermuda Conference, which is to meet in Bermuda beginning June 10, 1946.

I regret that circumstances compel me to give you this notice.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE H. SMITH.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 58, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMBAUGH] to fill the vacancy on the committee appointed on the part of the House to attend the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association, to be held in Bermuda, beginning June 10, 1946.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. CANNON of Missouri, which appeared in yesterday's Washington Star, together with certain statements in connection therewith.

Mr. ALMOND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by him in Roanoke, Va., on June 3.

Mr. RYTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post of June 8, 1946.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include editorials from the Lorain (Ohio) Journal.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HUBER) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KERR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement recently published in the Philadelphia Record under the name of John M. Cummings, in reference to the great Democratic leader, James Farley.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an essay written by a young schoolboy.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech delivered to the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. MCKENZIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include a speech with regard to the terminal-leave pay bill and in the other an address by Major General Erskine to the graduating class of Louisiana State University.

Mr. SAVAGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a newspaper item.

Mr. BULWINKLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article by Mr. Ben E. Adkins.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter and also a decision of the Supreme Court of Arkansas in the case of Davis against State.

THE HONORABLE FRED M. VINSON

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, not only the people of Kentucky, his native State, but I am sure the whole Nation will rejoice at the appointment of Fred M. Vinson as Chief Justice of the United States.

His remarkable career, which has few if any parallels, has given the American people an idea of the character and diversity of his ability. For 14 years he was a Member of the House of Representatives, where he was an exceedingly prominent member of the Ways and Means Committee. He resigned to accept the appointment as United States Circuit Judge of the District of Columbia, in which position he made a splendid reputation as a jurist of great ability and sound judgment; and he was also appointed Chief Justice of the Emergency Court of Appeals, where he rendered valuable service. He resigned to become the Director of Economic Stabilization. He resigned this position to become Federal Loan Administrator. He was thereafter appointed Secretary of the Treasury. He has now been appointed to the chief judicial position in the United States.

In the various and comprehensive duties of all the positions he has held he demonstrated great capacity and a high order of administrative ability. He has a keen, analytical mind, an infinite capacity for work, a character above reproach, and every qualification that should make him a great Chief Justice. He has always followed the Biblical injunction, "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might." We are sure that he will measure up to the full responsibilities of the great position to which he has been appointed and will bring great honor to himself.

Kentucky feels proud that one of her native sons should have conferred upon him such a distinguished honor.

THE PRESIDENT'S ACTION ON THE CASE BILL

Mr. COX. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, it is being freely predicted this morning that the President is going to veto the Case bill. I hardly see how this would be humanly possible, for it is a long, long way from his recommendation for emergency labor legislation to a veto of the bill. If he does veto it, it will constitute the fastest retreat in history.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE PURPOSES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMASON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 752) to amend the act of June 7, 1929 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, relating to the acquisition of stocks of strategic and critical materials for national defense purposes, for printing under the rule:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 752) to amend the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, relating to the acquisition of stocks of strategic and critical materials for national defense purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'That the natural resources of the United States in certain strategic and critical materials being deficient or insufficiently developed to supply the industrial, military, and naval needs of the country for common defense, it is the policy of the Congress and the purpose and intent of this Act to provide for the acquisition and retention of stocks of these materials and to encourage the conservation and development of sources of these materials within the United States, and thereby decrease and prevent wherever possible a dangerous and costly dependence of the United States upon foreign nations for supplies of these materials in times of national emergency.

"'SEC. 2 (a) To effectuate the policy set forth in section 1 hereof the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Interior, acting jointly through the agency of the Army and Navy Munitions Board, are hereby authorized and directed to determine, from time to time, which materials are strategic and critical under the provisions of this Act and to determine, from time to time, the quality and quantities of such materials which shall be stock-piled under the provisions of this Act. In determining the materials which are strategic and critical and the quality and quantities of same to be acquired the Secretaries of State, Treasury, Agriculture, and Commerce shall each designate representatives to cooperate with the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

"'(b) To the fullest extent practicable the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Interior, acting jointly, shall appoint industry advisory committees selected from the industries concerned with the materials to be stock piled. It shall be the general function of the industry advisory committees to advise with the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Interior and with any agencies through which they may exercise any of their functions under this Act with respect to the purchase, sale, care, and handling of such materials. Members of the industry advisory committees shall receive a per diem allowance of not to exceed $10 for each day spent at conferences held upon the call of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Interior, plus necessary traveling and other expenses while so engaged.

"'SEC. 3. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall direct the Secretary of the Treasury, through the medium of the Procurement Division of his Department, to—

"'(a) make purchases of strategic and critical materials with due regard to the objective set forth in section 1 of this Act and pursuant to the determinations as provided in section 2 hereof, which purchases (1) shall be made, so far as is practicable, from supplies of materials in excess of the current industrial demand and (2) shall be made in accordance with title III of the Act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1520), but may be made without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes. A reasonable time (not to exceed one year) shall be allowed for production and delivery from domestic sources and in the case of any such material available in the United States but which has not been developed commercially, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may, if they find that the production of such material is economically feasible, direct the purchase of such material without requiring the vendor to give bond;

"'(b) provide for the storage, security, and maintenance of strategic and critical materials for stock-piling purposes on military and naval reservations or other locations, approved by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy;

"'(c) provide through normal commercial channels for the refining or processing of any materials acquired or transferred under this act when the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy deem such action necessary to convert such materials into a form best suitable for stock piling, and such materials may be refined, processed, or otherwise beneficiated either before or after their transfer from the owning agency;

"'(d) provide for the rotation of any strategic and critical materials constituting a part of the stock pile where necessary to prevent deterioration by replacement of acquired stocks with equivalent quantities of substantially the same material with the approval of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy;

"'(e) dispose of any materials held pursuant to this act which are no longer needed because of any revised determination made pursuant to section 2 of this act, as hereinafter provided. No such disposition shall be made until 6 months after publication in the Federal Register and transmission of a notice of the proposed disposition to the Congress and to the Military Affairs Committee of each House thereof. Such notice shall state the reasons for such revised determination, the amounts of the materials proposed to be released, the plan of disposition proposed to be followed, and the date upon which the material is to become available for sale or transfer. The plan and date of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss on the sale or transfer of the material to be released and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets: *Provided*, That no material constituting a part of the stock piles may be disposed of without the express approval of the Congress except where the revised determination is by reason of obsolescence of that material for use in time of war. For the purposes of this paragraph a revised determination is by reason of obsolescence if such determination is on account of (1) deterioration, (2) development or discovery of a new or better material or materials, or (3) no further usefulness for use in time of war.

"'SEC. 4. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the Congress, not later than 6 months after the approval of this act, and every 6 months thereafter a written report detailing the activities with respect to stock piling under this act, including a statement of foreign and domestic purchases, and such other pertinent information on the administration of the act as will enable the Congress to evaluate its administration and the need for amendments and related legislation.

"'SEC. 5. The stock piles shall consist of all such materials heretofore purchased or transferred to be held pursuant to this Act, or

hereafter transferred pursuant to section 6 hereof, or hereafter purchased pursuant to section 3 hereof, and not disposed of pursuant to this Act. Except for the rotation to prevent deterioration and except for the disposal of any material pursuant to section 3 of this Act, materials acquired under this Act shall be released for use, sale, or other disposition only (a) on order of the President at any time when in his judgment such release is required for purposes of the common defense, or (b) in time of war or during a national emergency with respect to common defense proclaimed by the President, on order of such agency as may be designated by the President.

"'SEC. 6. (a) Pursuant to regulations issued by the War Assets Administration or its successor, every material determined to be strategic and critical pursuant to section 2 hereof, which is owned or contracted for by the United States or any agency thereof, including any material received from a foreign government under an agreement made pursuant to the Act of March 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 31), as amended, or other authority, shall be transferred by the owning agency, when determined by such agency to be surplus to its needs and responsibilities, to the stock piles established pursuant to this Act, so long as the amount of the stock pile for that material does not exceed the quantities determined therefor pursuant to section 2 hereof. There shall be exempt from this requirement such amount of any material as is necessary to make up any deficiency of the supply of such material for the current requirements of industry as determined by the Civilian Production Administrator or its successor. There shall also be exempt from this requirement (1) any material which constitutes contractor inventory if the owning agency shall not have taken possession of such inventory, (2) such amount of any material as the Army and Navy Munitions Board determines (i) are held in lots so small as to make the transfer thereof economically impractical; or (ii) do not meet or cannot economically be converted to meet, stock-pile requirements determined in accordance with section 2 of this Act. The total material transferred to the stock piles established by this Act in accordance with this section during any fiscal year beginning more than twelve months after this Act becomes law shall not exceed in value (as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of the fair market value at the time of each transfer) an amount to be fixed by the appropriation act or acts relating to the acquisition of materials under this Act.

"'(b) Any transfer made pursuant to this section shall be made without charge against or reimbursement from the funds available under this Act, except that expenses incident to such transfer may be paid or reimbursed from such funds, and except that, upon any such transfer from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any corporation organized by virtue of the authority contained in the Act of January 22, 1932 (47 Stat. 5), the Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and sums due and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the fair market value as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury of the material so transferred.

"'(c) Effective whenever the Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel any notes pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, the amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of existing law shall be deemed to be reduced by the amount of the notes so canceled.

"'(d) Subsection (b) of section 14 of the Act of October 3, 1944 (58 Stat. 765), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'"(b) Subject only to subsection (c) of this section, any owning agency may dispose of—

"'"(1) any property which is damaged or worn beyond economical repair;

"'"(2) any waste, salvage, scrap, or other similar items;

"'"(3) any product of industrial, research, agricultural, or livestock operations, or of any public works construction or maintenance project, carried on by such agency;

which does not consist of materials which are to be transferred in accordance with the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, to the stock piles established pursuant to that Act."

"'(e) Section 22 of the Act of October 3, 1944 (58 Stat. 765), is hereby repealed.

"'*Provided*, That any owning agency as defined in that Act having control of materials that, when determined to be surplus, are required to be transferred to the stock piles pursuant to subsection (a) hereof, shall make such determination as soon as such materials in fact become surplus to its needs and responsibilities.

"'SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, through the Director of the Bureau of Mines and the Director of Geological Survey, is hereby authorized and directed to make scientific, technologic, and economic investigations concerning the extent and mode of occurrence, the development, mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and other mineral substances found in the United States or its Territories or insular possessions, which are essential to the common defense or the industrial needs of the United States, and the quantities or grades of which are inadequate from known domestic sources, in order to determine and develop domestic sources of supply, to devise new methods for the treatment and utilization of lower grade reserves, and to develop substitutes for such essential ores and mineral products; on public lands and on privately owned lands, with the consent of the owner, to explore and demonstrate the extent and quality of deposits of such minerals, including core drilling, trenching, test-pitting, shaft sinking, drifting, cross-cutting, sampling, and metallurgical investigations and tests as may be necessary to determine the extent and quality of such deposits, the most suitable methods of mining and beneficiating them, and the cost at which the minerals or metals may be produced.

"'(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to make scientific, technologic, and economic investigations of the feasibility of developing domestic sources of supplies of any agricultural material or for using agricultural commodities for the manfacture of any material determined pursuant to section 2 of this Act to be strategic and critical or substitutes therefor.

"'SEC. 8. For the procurement, transportation, maintenance, rotation, storage, and refining or processing of the materials to be acquired under this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as the Congress, from time to time, may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. The funds so appropriated, including the funds heretofore appropriated, shall remain available to carry out the purposes for which appropriated until expended, and shall be expended under the joint direction of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy.

"'SEC. 9. Any funds heretofore or hereafter received on account of sales or other dispositions of materials under the provisions of this Act, except funds received on account of the rotation of stocks, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"'SEC. 10. Strategic materials purchased from foreign sources for stock piling pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall be admitted into the United States free of any tariff duty, import tax, or other impost applicable to importations. If any such imported strategic material is disposed of pursuant to section 3 of this Act, and if such disposition is made at a price based on the cost to the Government of such strategic material rather than the market price current at the time of sale, there shall be added to such price the amount of any tariff, duty, import, tax, or other impost which would be due were such strategic material imported at the time the sale is made.

"'SEC. 11. This Act may be cited as the "Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act".'"

And the House agree to the same.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. EWING THOMASON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,
DEWEY SHORT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
LISTER HILL,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 752) to amend the Act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, relating to the acquisition of stocks of strategic and critical materials for national defense purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

Except for the differences noted in the following statement, the conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

The House amendment authorized the Secretaries of State, Treasury, and Commerce to designate representatives to cooperate with the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Interior in carrying out the provisions of the act. The conference agreement adds the Secretary of Agriculture to those authorized to designate such representatives.

The Senate bill provided that purchases of strategic and critical materials for the purposes of the act be made with due regard to the objectives set forth in section 1, and further provided that such purchases might be made without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes relating to competitive bidding. These provisions were omitted from the House amendment, but are restored under the language of the conference agreement.

The House amendment authorized the appropriation of $360,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and the same amount for each of the following four fiscal years. The conference agreement authorizes the appropriation of such sums as the Congress

may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Section 9 of the Senate bill required that funds received on account of sales of materials be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. The House amendment provided that such funds should remain available for expenditure under the stockpile program. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

The House amendment deleted section 10 of the Senate bill which provided duty-free importation of materials purchased from foreign sources for stock-piling. The conference agreement restores this provision.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. EWING THOMASON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,
DEWEY SHORT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes today following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN AND THE CASE BILL

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, when President Truman asked for emergency legislation the other day he gave us a promise. At least, he implied that he would veto the Case bill.

Mr. Speaker, President Truman is not going to retreat. He told us he would not use his powers against labor.

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I was much interested last week when we had up for consideration the rivers and harbors bill, for the reason that I have heard many Members of the House during the last few months say that they were for economy in the operation of our Government. It was interesting to me to observe whether they were going to practice what they preach or not. We have the record on that.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to have a request for the British loan up here next week, perhaps. We are going to be asked to spend money that will not be for the benefit of this country. I wonder whether the Constitution of the United States grants power to levy taxes on our constituents for the benefit of a foreign government. If you want to spend money for the benefit of Americans, that may be all right. It is something to consider.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LINK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. M. S. Szymczak, member of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include certain excerpts.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial from the New York Times and in the other to include a statement from the Governor of North Dakota.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain testimony offered before the Banking and Currency Committee. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $160, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a speech by Dr. Capen, of Buffalo University, and in the other to include quotations.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any other special orders, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONKMAN. 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. JONKMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the appendix.]

GENERAL MIHAILOVICH

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today General Mihailovich, to whose loyalty some 500 American fliers owe their lives, goes on trial for his life before a so-called "court" completely stacked against him. Were this not so the request from our Government that these fliers testify in his behalf would not have been refused and ignored. Such a refusal permits of but one conclusion: The Belgrade court intends to permit no defense witnesses, because the case against the general would not stand in the face of such testimony.

I have here the précis of the testimony of these American airmen. This is an historic document, Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

As a nation, we can in all honor do no less than to insist, as these airmen do, that this brave man be given an honest trial in an international court. We have insisted upon fair trial for German and Japanese war criminals; shall we not insist upon equal fairness for this man who is responsible for giving life to literally hundreds of our own men? Shall we not insist upon trial in a United Nation's court, for the charges against him include crimes against the United Nations?

It is my urgent hope that the President, through the State Department, will not let the matter rest until such an agreement is reached. Less than this, in all honor, we cannot do.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution adopted by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McDONOUGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

OPA MEAT ALIBI

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the OPA has announced its weekly alibi for the disappearance of meat from the stores. They are claiming that the meat is being held back in anticipation of meat price control being lifted. I have the answer to that claim this morning from Omaha, the second largest livestock market in the world.

A large commission man writes me:

Each month there are more cattle going through the black market. Last week I was out to see one of my customers who had 52 head of 800-pound heifers on feed. I told him they would sell anywhere from $16.25 to $16.50. The second day after I was there a butcher from one of the nearby towns offered him $16.50 for these heifers and a bonus of $15 a head.

Last week I was out to see another one of my customers who had 125 head of very

choice cattle on feed that would sell on the market around $17.25. This customer told me that he was bid $20 per hundredweight on these cattle by a little butcher who wanted them five at a time.

If OPA continues to regulate the meat business for another year, I would venture to say that 50 to 75 percent of the cattle on feed will be bought up by black marketeers and there will be a very small percent of these cattle that will come to legitimate markets and go through legitimate channels.

To enforce its impossible meat regulations the OPA would have to have a gestapo large enough to police every back room and barnyard in America. A second gestapo would be required to police the corruption of the first army and so on, ad infinitum and ad nauseam.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three articles by Mark Foote on Communism.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the time for extending my remarks and including an address delivered by Secretary of the Navy Forrestal, at the three hundredth anniversary of Andover, has expired. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include that address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL and Mr. RIZLEY asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a communication.

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Mr. Baker.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech recently delivered by Judge Daniel J. Gillen on I Am an American Day, and further to extend his remarks and include a speech recently delivered by Gen. Carl Spaatz on the subject of this American idea.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, though neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, when last I looked in the crystal ball there appeared a picture of the OPA showing it to have been killed, or perhaps more accurately, the so-called crippling amendments had been adopted and prices were going up as we all know they will for a time go up. Prices have been going up notwithstanding OPA, which has itself, because it decreased production, been forced to increase prices in order to enable the people of the Nation to purchase anything—black market or otherwise.

No doubt prices, because of a scarcity created by OPA's orders and regulations, will continue to go up and OPA's Chester Bowles and his satellites may be able to say, "I told you so."

The administration will continue to ship abroad food, clothing, and building materials, thus inflation will increase, the cost of living will rise, the people will be without the necessities of life and the apparent need for a dictator be brought ever nearer.

Rule or ruin seems to be the motto of this administration. Apparently if it cannot bring chaos one way, it will another. Shipping everything out of the country is just as effective a way of creating an emergency as limiting production creating a scarcity. Without an emergency to frighten the people the New Deal is lost.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN AND THE CASE BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALLAGHER] I desire to say that President Truman in his recent address to the joint session of the two Houses left no impression on me that he intended to veto the Case bill, if we passed the emergency legislation he asked for. Besides that legislation never got through the Senate.

If the President carries out the policies the announcement of which raised him to great heights of popularity when he came before the House and asked for emergency legislation to stop this racketeering at the hands of a little group of alleged labor leaders; if he follows out the policy he announced then, he will sign the Case bill and put a stop to such Communists as Joe Curran and Harry Bridge's and these other racketeers' harassing the American people with their treasonable activities.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, Saturday morning I was in the Reading Terminal Market in Philadelphia. I saw thousands and thousands of women, and men too, in line at the stands trying to buy meat, but there was no meat. It was the same way with bread. The only bread I saw on the market was unwrapped bread or hard bread, pumpernickel bread. The same thing applies to the stands where butter should have been sold. Is this the America we used to know? The shortage has been caused by the black market produced by the OPA. Food supplies would be greatly increased if the administration would give the farmers a green light and encourage them by supplying equipment, labor, and fair prices at the farm.

Then I saw in the headlines of one of the larger papers that some of the bureaucrats on the inside of the OPA say that if the OPA is weakened the consumer will pay $8,000,000,000 more for his food. If the prices go up, the blood will be on the head of the OPA, those unscrupulous rascals who are trying to force the price up to make the country want the OPA back. There are forces in the administration that will take us into inflation or depression in order to justify their continued existence. Is this America?

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help saying a few friendy words to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It comes as a little bit of a surprise to find him saying that he anticipates that prices will rise, and that it will be the fault of the OPA. I had the idea that sharp price rises had something to do with our passing some crippling amendments in this House, and the imminence of their being concurred in by the other body. Stripping the OPA of its powers will have that disastrous effect. I hope the record will impress the gentleman in the same way as it has me and that he and his colleagues on that side will modify their former positions.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE, UNITED STATES PARK POLICE, AND THE FIRE DEPARTMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5060) to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, approved May 27, 1924," with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 20 and 21, and insert:

"SEC. 2. This act shall be effective as to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia as of the effective date of said act of May 27, 1924, and shall be effective as to officers and members of the United States Park Police force upon its enactment."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARITABLE, EDUCATIONAL, AND RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 5970) to permit the members and stockholders of charitable, educational, and religious associations incorporated in the District of Columbia to vote by proxy or by mail, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of chapter 6 of title 29 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia (act of March 3, 1901, ch. 854, sec. 601, 31 Stat. 1284, as amended by the act of June 10, 1930, ch. 439, 56 Stat. 538) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 29-603. Trustees—quorum: Such incorporated society may elect its trustees, directors, or managers at such time and place and in such manner as may be specified in its bylaws, who shall have the control and management of the affairs and funds of the society, and a majority of whom shall be a quorum for the transaction of business, and whenever any vacancy shall happen in such board of trustees, directors, or managers the vacancies shall be filled in such manner as shall be provided by the bylaws of the society: *Provided*, That any society formed only for religious or missionary purposes may provide in its bylaws for a less number than a majority of its trustees to constitute a quorum. The bylaws of a society incorporated under the provisions of this chapter may provide that stockholders, if the same be a stock corporation, or members or delegates, if the same be not a stock corporation, may vote by proxy or by mail. The bylaws may restrict such method of voting to the election of trustees, directors, or managers, or to other matters specified in the bylaws, and may prescribe the form or forms of proxy or of mail ballot to be used and the procedure to be followed in the casting and recording of such voter."

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5970 was introduced by a colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

The purpose of this bill is to permit charitable, educational, and religious associations incorporated in the District of Columbia the right to state in their bylaws that members or stockholders of such organizations shall have the right to vote by proxy or by mail.

Under a recent act of Congress, such organizations do not at the present time have this right here in the District of Columbia.

The House District Committee feels that it was an oversight on the part of the authors of the original act as a clause of this nature was not included at the time the act became a law.

Mr. Speaker, I offer several committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments offered by Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

Page 1, line 3-6, strike out the following: "section 3 of chapter 6 of title 29 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia (act of Mar. 3, 1901, ch. 854, sec. 601, 31 Stat. 1284, as amended by the act of June 10, 1930, ch. 439, 56 Stat. 538)" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "section 601 of the act entitled 'An act to establish a code of laws in the District of Columbia', approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code 1940 ed., title 29, sec. 603)."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the words "SEC. 29-603. Trustees—quorum" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "SEC. 601. Trustees."

Page 2, line 4, insert after the word "business," the following: "unless a less number be specified as a quorum in the bylaws."

Page 2, line 8-10, change the semicolon after the word "society" to a period and strike out the following: "*Provided*, That any society formed only for religious or missionary purposes may provide in its bylaws for a less number than a majority of its trustees to constitute a quorum."

Page 2, line 12, strike out the word "chapter" and insert in lieu thereof the word "subchapter."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

COMMUNICABLE AND PREVENTABLE DISEASES

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 4410) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as a Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1408), be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking the period at the end of said section and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "including the authority and power to provide for the isolation, quarantine, and restriction of the movements of persons affected by or believed, upon probable cause, to be affected by communicable disease and of persons who are or are believed, upon probable cause, to be carriers of communicable disease."

SEC. 2. That section 2 of the said act approved August 11, 1939, be stricken out and in lieu thereof and by way of addition the following sections be inserted:

"SEC. 2. The words 'communicable disease' when hereinafter used shall mean such communicable diseases as the Commissioners by regulation shall denominate as such.

"SEC. 3. Whenever the health officer has probable cause to believe that any person is affected with any communicable disease or is a carrier of communicable disease and that the continuance of such person in the place where he may be is likely to be dangerous to the lives or health of other persons, or that by reason of the noncooperation or carelessness of such person the public health is likely to be endangered, the health officer may by written order direct the removal by any designated officer or employee of the Health Department or by any member of the Metropolitan Police force of such person to and the detention of such person in any place or institution in the District of Columbia designated by the Health Officer, or any institution located without the District of Columbia which may be designated by the Health Officer and which is under the supervision of the government of the District of Columbia or any agency thereof. Such officer, employee, or member so designated in such order shall take such person into his custody and shall remove such person to such place or institution as may be designated in such order. Such officer, employee, or member shall immediately make known to such person the contents of such order, and also shall deliver to such person a true copy of such order.

"SEC. 4. A copy of the order provided for in section 3 hereof shall be delivered to the person in charge of such place or institution to which the person taken into custody may be removed and shall constitute the authority for the detention of such person in such place or institution until such order expires or until such person is discharged in the manner set forth in this section or section 5 of this act. Such order shall expire 48 hours (exclusive of Sundays and holidays) after such officer, employee, or member shall take into his custody such person as provided in section 3, unless it shall be continued in force and effect by a judge of the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, or unless such detained person shall stipulate in writing that the order be continued in force and effect. Such order shall be continued in force and effect if it shall appear to said judge by affidavit that the probable cause, required by section 3, exists. If the judge continue in force and effect the order of the Health Officer, the judge at that time shall set a date for a hearing upon the question of whether the person detained is at the time of such hearing affected with any communicable disease or is a carrier of communicable disease and, if so affected, upon the further question whether his release would be likely to endanger the lives or health of any other person. If such person be not sooner discharged such hearing shall be had within 10 days of the date of the order of the court continuing in force and effect the order of the health officer unless such hearing be continued by the court, or unless the detained person shall, in writing, waive such hearing, which waiver shall be filed with the court. Such hearing shall be in or out of the presence of the detained person, in the discretion of the court. If, after such hearing, the court shall find that the detained person is not affected with any communicable disease and is not a carrier of communicable disease, or that the discharge of such person, even though affected with, or a carrier of, a communicable disease is not likely to endanger the lives or health of any other person the court shall order such detained person to be discharged, otherwise the court shall continue in force and effect the order of the health officer until such person be discharged in the manner set forth in section 5 of this act. If a minor is detained pursuant to this section or section 7 hereof, or is found guilty and sentence is suspended as provided in section 10 hereof, and such minor is in need of treatment for the communicable disease with which he is affected or of which he is a carrier, the court is empowered to authorize the health officer to administer such treatment or cause the same to be administered.

"SEC. 5. It shall be the duty of the Health Officer to make or cause to be made by a physician such examination or examinations

of such person as may be necessary to determine the existence or nonexistence of such communicable disease in such person or whether such person is a carrier of communicable disease. The diagnosis resulting from such examination or examinations shall be reduced to writing and signed by such examining physician within 10 days after the removal of such person to such place or institution and a copy thereof shall be filed in the office of the person in charge of such place or institution and a copy in the office of the Health Officer. If such diagnosis does not disclose that such person is affected with such communicable disease or that such person is a carrier of communicable disease, such person shall be discharged from such place or institution forthwith. If the diagnosis does disclose that such person is affected with such communicable disease or that such person is a carrier of communicable disease, the person in charge of the place or institution to which the infected person has been removed shall, subject to the provisions of section 4, detain such person for such reasonable time as may be fixed by regulation under the authority of this act as is deemed necessary in the interest of public health and safety for the isolation, quarantine, and restriction of movement of persons affected by the particular communicable disease or of persons found to be carriers of the particular communicable disease, unless sooner discharged by the Health Officer or the municipal court. A person so detained, however, may apply at any time to the person in charge of such place or institution for his discharge, and the person in charge of such place or institution shall deliver the application for discharge to the Health Officer, who shall give to such person an opportunity to be heard before the Health Officer. If after hearing held by the Health Officer, the Health Officer be of the opinion that such person is not affected with such communicable disease and that such person is not a carrier of communicable disease, then such person shall be discharged. If denied his discharge such detained person may apply to the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia for such discharge and the hearing on such application shall be in or out of the presence of the detained person, in the discretion of the court. Only such persons as have a direct interest in the case and their representatives shall be admitted to any hearing held pursuant to this section or section 6 of this act: *Provided*, That if the detained person shall request a public hearing then the general public shall be admitted thereto.

"SEC. 6. It shall be unlawful for a person detained in a place or institution pursuant to an order of the Health Officer to leave said place or institution unless discharged in the manner provided in section 4 or 5 of this act.

"SEC. 7. (a) In aid of the powers vested in the Health Officer to cause the removal to and detention in a place or institution of a person who is affected or is believed, upon probable cause, to be affected with any communicable disease or is or is believed, upon probable cause, to be a carrier of communicable disease as provided in this act, the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, or any judge thereof, is authorized to issue a warrant for the arrest of such person and his removal to a place or institution as defined in section 3 of this act, which warrant shall be directed to the Major and Superintendent of Police. When such person has been removed to such place or institution under authority of a warrant issued pursuant to this section, such person shall not be discharged from such place or institution except in the manner provided in section 5.

"(b) No such warrant of arrest and removal shall be issued except upon probable cause supported by affidavit or affidavits particularly describing the person to be taken, which said affidavit or affidavits shall set forth the facts tending to establish the grounds of the application or probable cause for believing that they exist.

"(c) A warrant may in all cases be served by the Major and Superintendent of Police or by any officer or member of the Metropolitan Police, but no other person, except in aid of the officer on his requiring it, he being present and acting in its execution.

"(d) The officer may break open any outer or inner door or window of a house, or any part of a house, or anything therein, to execute the warrant, if, after notice of his authority and purpose, he is refused admittance.

"(e) A warrant must be returned to the court within 10 days after its date; after the expiration of this time the warrant, unless executed, is void.

"(f) It shall be the duty of the said court to maintain and keep records of all warrants issued and the returns thereon.

"SEC. 8. The Health Officer may, without fee or hindrance, enter, examine, and inspect all vessels, premises, grounds, structures, buildings, and every part thereof in the District of Columbia for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act and the regulations issued hereunder. The owner or his agent or representative and the lessee or occupant of any such vessel, premises, grounds, structure, or building, or part thereof, and every person having the care and management thereof shall at all times when required by any such officer or employee give them free access thereto and refusal so to do shall be punishable as a violation of this act.

"SEC. 9. It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to obstruct, resist, oppose, or interfere with any person performing any duty or function under the authority of this act or any regulation promulgated thereunder.

"SEC. 10. Any person who violates any of the provisions of section 6, 8, or 9 of this act shall be punished by a fine of not more than $300 or by imprisonment for not longer than 90 days, or both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have power to prescribe penalties of fine not to exceed $300 or imprisonment not to exceed 90 days, or both, in the discretion of the court for the violation of any regulation promulgated under this act. All prosecutions for violations of this act or the regulations promulgated thereunder shall be in the Criminal Division of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, in the name of the District of Columbia upon information filed by the corporation counsel of the District of Columbia or any of his assistants. The court may impose conditions upon any person found guilty under the aforesaid provisions and so long as such person shall comply therewith to the satisfaction of the court the imposition or execution of sentence may be suspended for such period as the court may direct; and the court may at or before the expiration of such period vacate such sentence or cause it to be executed. Conditions thus imposed by the court may include submission to medical and mental examination, diagnosis, and treatment by proper public health and welfare authorities or by any licensed physician approved by the court, and such other terms and conditions as the court may deem best for the protection of the community and the punishment, control, and rehabilitation of the defendant. The Health Officer of the District of Columbia, the Metropolitan Police force, and employees of the Board of Public Welfare are authorized and directed to perform such duties as may be directed by the court in effectuating compliance with the conditions so imposed upon any defendant.

"SEC. 11. Wherever the term 'Health Officer' is used in this act it shall mean the Health Officer of the District of Columbia and his duly authorized agents.

"SEC. 12. Each and every provision of this act shall be construed liberally in aid of the powers vested in the public authorities looking to the protection of the public health, comfort, and welfare and not by way of limitation."

SEC. 3. That section 3 of the said act approved August 11, 1939, be renumbered as section 13.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 5, line 7, after the word "administered" insert "No person under 18 years of age detained under sections 3, 4, 5, or 7, shall be detained in a room in which a person over that age is so detained."

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I introduced H. R. 4410 last year at the request of the District Commissioners and the District Health Officer.

I was advised by the Commissioners and the health officer that the number of cases of communicable diseases had increased here in the District to a great extent since VE-day and they did not have sufficient authority under present law to control the existing situation.

The House District Committee held exhaustive hearings on this bill and added several amendments which would protect the rights of the private citizens and give them all the protection granted under our constitution.

I cannot see why there should be any objections to the passage of this bill as it only gives the Commissioners and the health officer authority to properly protect the health of the private citizens here in Washington. It does not apply to any person who is willing to cooperate and take advantage of the free treatment for all communicable diseases.

We reduced the time for confinement under the original bill from 72 to 48 hours as we felt that this gives ample time for the health officers to grant relief under the rapid treatment program.

I would like to state that this treatment will be given free of charge to all persons. In my opinion, any person infected with a communicable disease should submit, without any objection whatsoever, to such free treatment since it is for their benefit and for the good of the general public.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

METROPOLITAN POLICE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6516) to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a

question with reference to this bill, about the retirement feature.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. I expect to offer an amendment regarding the retirement.

Mr. BLAND. To take some out of it; to exclude them or to put them in?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. To exclude them all except the ones physically unable to work. I will withdraw the amendment if there is any objection.

Mr. BLAND. Yes, I will object to that.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. I will not offer the amendment then.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to conform with the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia," approved July 14, 1945 (Public Law 151, 79th Cong.), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "plus 14 percent of such annual basic salary as increased by the foregoing percentages."

SEC. 2. Nothwithstanding the amendment to such act of July 14, 1945, made by the first section of this act, no officer or member of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall, by reason of the enactment of this act, be paid with respect to any pay period basic salary, or basic salary plus additional compensation, at a rate in excess of $10,000 per annum.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on July 1, 1946.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I introduced H. R. 6516 for the purpose of assisting the police and firemen of the District of Columbia to take care of the increase in the cost of living here in Washington.

The members of the District Committee feel that the police and firemen in Washington are called on to do extraordinary service that is not required of police and firemen of any other State. They are required to protect the lives of thousands of people who come to Washington on Government business and also for the purpose of sightseeing, in addition to their duty of protecting the property and lives of the citizens of Washington.

I feel that we should pay the police and firemen here in Washington a decent-living salary so that they would not be tempted to accept a bribe in order to properly feed and clothe their families.

I believe that Washintgon has one of the finest Police and Fire Departments in the United States, and we should see that their living conditions at home are protected so that they could give their entire thought to enforcing the laws of the District of Columbia and to protect the lives of our citizens.

The House District Committee, on the request of the Commissioners, have directed me to offer an amendment which would limit increases only to retired officers considered physically unable to work. I personally believe that all retired officers should be entitled to this increase. However, since the District Commissioners and the Budget Officer feel that the finances of the community are inadequate to take care of all the retired officers, I am offering the amendment.

I honestly believe it will cost as much or more to enforce the provision of the proposed amendment as the small increase to all retired officers would cost.

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.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, that finishes the business from the Committee on the District of Columbia for today.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACTS

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 635 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That 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. 1362) to amend the Railroad Retirement Acts, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes, and all points of order against any provisions of the bill and committee amendment thereto are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 5 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question as shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

At this time I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution was reported by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], chairman of the Committee on Rules, but he is unavoidably absent for the moment. Hence I call up the resolution for present consideration.

The resolution simply makes in order consideration of the bill amending the Railroad Retirement Act which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has spent many months in putting together. The one question that arose in the Rules Committe in respect to procedure was as to the division of time. There were those on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce who were not satisfied with the provisions of the bill reported and who wished full and free opportunity to discuss it and to offer amendments. By agreement on the part of all present that question was satisfactorily settled. I have no desire to discuss the bill and no requests for time.

Does the gentleman from Indiana wish to use his time?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to burden the Speaker or the membership with any undue discussion of this matter, but in view of some of the things that have been said about the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, its attention to this matter, and particularly having regard for the tremendous importance of the proposal before us, I want to say a few words about it. I trust that those who are not present and do not hear what I have to say may examine the RECORD and read what I have to say about it in order that they may be appraised of the situation as I see it.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal seeks to bring about amendment of what is known as the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance Acts. At this time it might be well for us to go back a little into the history of these measures in order that we may better understand the proposals now before us. The older Members will recall that the Congress originally undertook to enact this legislation, and did enact it. Subsequently thereto the legislation was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Another effort was made to enact the legislation. It was again enacted and again declared unconstitutional. Thereafter the management and the men in the railroad industry got together in what I believe was primarily a matter of collective bargaining and agreed upon the terms of a railroad retirement act. As a part of that agreement it was understood that there would be no challenge of the constitutionality of the act in the courts by any of the railroad managements party to that agreement. There have been no challenges of the constitutionality of the act and it has been on the books and has functioned.

In the last Congress a very lengthy, complicated, involved bill was offered to bring about amendment to these acts. That bill was offered late in the spring of 1944. Some reference has been made to the action of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on that bill. The fact is that that bill was not reported in spite of some pressure that was exerted at the time, and no action was taken in the last Congress.

At the opening of this Congress another bill was introduced, the bill now before us, H. R. 1362, and I think it is fair to point out that probably some evidence of the lack of satisfaction with the previous bill can be found in the fact that the bill introduced this year differs very substantially from the bill that we had in the last Congress. After that bill was introduced it became apparent that there had been no action looking to agreement between management and men as to the terms of the proposal for what was sought to be done and

I think it is fair also to say, as the RECORD will disclose, that no effort was made to bring about a meeting of minds as between management and men following the pattern that had been used when the legislation was first drafted to bring about such an agreement. Of course, in the original enactment of the legislation the Congress was in the position of simply placing its stamp of legislative approval upon the agreement that had been arrived at. That was a fortunate situation.

The Congress is not in that fortunate situation today. There are many responsibilities that flow from that lack of agreement. Certainly one of the first would be in setting up of a program or enlarging the program or changing the program to pay additional benefits, the sole responsibility is upon the Congress of the United States to establish a rate that will pay for those benefits, because this fund is not financed out of the public Treasury. It is financed out of the payments made by the employers and employees and is designed to operate as a sound basis actuarially.

There was another difficulty that confronted the committee. Those in charge of the agency administering this operation would normally be expected to maintain themselves in that impartial attitude under which a committee of Congress and the Congress itself could seek of them advice as to this proposition or that proposition, and particularly advice as to the amount of taxes that might be necessary if the additional benefits were to be provided in a fund actuarially sound.

The committee found when we got into this matter and began our hearings that Mr. Latimer, of the Retirement Board, was an extreme partisan in behalf of the bill as originally introduced. He came before the committee, and I think it is fair to say was more vigorous in his support of it than anyone else who appeared before that body. So the committee necessarily found and felt and believed and knew that instead of the agency being in an impartial position to advise us as to what the costs might be and what the effect of this extension or that extension might be, it was deprived of that unbiased advice. That is the reason that after a subcommittee was appointed to begin the actual detailed consideration of the measure, the subcommittee in its wisdom found it necessary to direct the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], to employ an actuary to make an independent, unbiased study of this whole program and these various proposals to the end that our committee might be apprised as to the cost of the various suggestions and make such levies as might be necessary to meet such extensions as we might see fit to write into the bill.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Myers is the actuary who was employed by the committee.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right.

Mr. NEELY. Did he ever testify before the committee and, if so, was his evidence printed?

Mr. HALLECK. No; he did not testify before the committee, but his findings were written up. They were given to every member of the committee, and I am quite sure that everyone and anyone who wanted to find out what his recommendations and his findings were, had access to that report.

Mr. NEELY. Does the gentleman know any reason why Mr. Myers should not have been subject to cross-examition by members of the committee?

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, he might have been subject to cross-examination, and he might have been called before the committee. The fact of the matter is that he was not called before the committee, but careful consideration was given to his report. It was open to the criticism of anyone who wanted to see it.

Now then, suggestions have been made about the dilatory tactics of the committee. Let me point out to the Membership that this is a highly involved and complicated matter. As a matter of fact, most of the things that come before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce are involved and complicated matters. In the circumstance that I pointed out. No. 1, lack of any agreement reached between management and labor following the previous pattern, and, No. 2, the extreme biased position adopted by the agency, which is the agency of the Congress to administer this act, there was placed upon the committee a great responsibility to proceed with caution and care in order that a sound proposal could be submitted to the House for action.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman might wish to add as a factor that further complicated the matter before the committee was the fact that in the original hearings at least two of the major brotherhoods also were opposed to the bill at that time, and we had some opposition from the employee groups themselves.

Mr. HALLECK. That is exactly correct. Sometimes legislative committees make reports that are quite perfunctory and do not tell much about the bill, but I commend to the membership the reading of the committee report on this measure. The report, at the top of page 3, says that there were 37 sessions of hearings before the bill was reported to a subcommittee, and the subcommittee, of which I was a member, held 22 meetings on the bill in executive session, and after the subcommittee reported, the full committee held a number of executive meetings, lengthy and extensive, in the consideration of this whole proposition.

There is a little of the chronology that I would like to recite because of the fact that the gentleman from West Virginia put a discharge petition on the Speaker's desk. I have heard varying stories about some of the representations that were made to Members as that petition was being signed up. I have heard it suggested that the committee was refusing to act and had refused to act and was not going to do anything about the bill. Let me give you the facts, because I think this question goes to the integrity of the committee system and has to do with our whole method and manner of approach to matters of this sort, again, as I point out, in a highly complicated and involved field.

The committee held lengthy hearings and gave the matter extensive consideration. At one time the chairman of the committee, who was chairman of the subcommittee, was ill and could not be present, and the author of the bill was ill and could not be present. Those things operated to delay final action on the bill. All of the time, however, the committee gave close and diligent attention to the matter. I think an examination of the record would disclose that to this legislation the committee has devoted probably more actual time than to all the other matters before the committee.

On April 11 the subcommittee had reported and the full committee had considered this proposal, and had agreed on the various sections and parts that we wanted in the bill. The only job that remained to be done was for the legislative drafting service to put that into form. You who serve on legislative committees understand and know that that is the usual practice and procedure. When you reach that stage, everyone knows what the position of the committee is. The matters of policy have been determined.

On April 11 that point had been reached, and by a vote of 16 to 8 what is now the committee bill, the committee amendment to the original bill, was adopted in the committee. Five days thereafter, on April 16, the discharge petition was put on the Speaker's desk and signatures were sought. What for? The committee had concluded its action on the bill except, as has been pointed out, that we wanted it put into shape to be available as a clean bill, an expression of what we had determined should be the committee proposal.

The discharge petition was signed up after that time. It has been suggested that the committee reported the bill only because the discharge petition was signed up. That just is not true. The committee had reached the point where its labors in the committee had been concluded subject only to the drafting of the various proposals and then the formal reporting of the committee bill to the House.

As I say, the petition was put on the desk on April 16 and was signed up in 2 days. Subsequent to that time, after the bill was reported, the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce appeared before the Rules Committee exactly as they would have appeared had there been no discharge petition, and asked the Rules Committee for a rule to bring the matter to the floor.

I am supporting the rule. As far as I am concerned, I have cooperated, many times to the exclusion of other important matters demanding my attention, to bring this matter to the floor for consideration and determination.

I do not propose to go into lengthy discussion of the merits of the two proposals at this time. As I take it, when we get

into the reading of the bill for amendment, the first vote will come on the question of whether or not the Members will substitute the committee amendment for the bill as originally introduced. The bill as reported out as a substitute by the committee was voted out by a vote of 15 to 6, and that vote involved a vote on the substitution.

We are told now that the provision which would have extended the coverage of this act to employees of ice companies and such is going to be taken out. Well, as we went along, the proponents of the bill took the position that you could not cross a "t" or dot an "i"—you just had to take the bill as it was written. It is said we are not going to have that coverage. Just let me tell you how extensive that would be. Logansport, Ind., is in my district. There is a city ice company there. As a small part of their operations, they ice certain railroad cars. Under the provisions of the Crosser bill as introduced and fought for down to this very moment, on that section every employee of that ice company would have been brought in under the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Acts. I always felt that the railroad employees did not want that sort of thing. They did not want all of those people in their program. But a fellow in the agency downtown running it would probably like to have it just as broad as it could possibly be made and get just as many people in as he could.

With reference to another section, we are told today that the payment of so-called maternity benefits is to be taken out. That is another proposition that has been under fire ever since we had the bill.

I would just like to say in conclusion, here is a committee that has given careful and diligent attention to a very difficult problem, trying to work it out and bring out a good bill that would give the men what they want within any reasonable limits and which would recognize the rights of all parties—a bill that the membership of the House could look at and say, "I would have to study it for a month myself to be informed of all this detail. I shall rely upon the committee and its members, who have given such careful and close consideration to this whole proposition to the end that sound legislation might be put on the books."

If discharge petitions are to be used in this manner and if the work of legislative committees, after they have given careful consideration to all of the arguments pro and con and after they have labored for days, weeks, and months to draft proper legislation, is to be thrown out the window and the proposal taken as introduced, then we might as well fold up the committee system and just forget about it. I would feel that way about it in respect of the action that ought to be taken. I have tried to be fair about this whole matter, and I have been fair. It may be that part of that 47 million will be turned loose on me. I do not know. If it is, I just cannot help it because I have done my level best to discharge my responsibility to the railroad men of my district and my State and in the Nation, as well as the people whose money is invested in the railroads—yes; and to our economy generally—because I think there must be some consideration of the interlocking of all the segments of our people in all of our industries to the end that we bring about some harmonizing of the benefits that each is to receive. I say I have done my level best on this and sincerely hope that when the test comes the membership of the House in committee will feel that the majority of the members of our committee have achieved such a fair result as will justify them in supporting the position of the committee.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. In view of the litigated history of railroad retirement legislation, the fact that it has been twice declared unconstitutional and is now in force only by reason of having been approved by the two groups, management and the men, I should like to have the gentleman discuss his views as to whether either the committee recommendations or the bill as originally introduced or any changes in the present railroad retirement system could be supported in law that was not agreeable to both parties.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the constitutional questions involved in those former decisions are found in precisely the same situation in the law that we now have and in any amendments that may be enacted. Of course, I do not know what management would do. I have quit predicting what the Supreme Court will do. I know what they did on two occasions before. As I say, I cannot be sure what management would do, but it has been suggested in one or two places that action that was taken independent of agreement might be considered as outside the original agreement and might result in the challenging of the constitutionality of the act.

Mr. COLE of New York. And that would be true, then, both as to the committee recommendations and as to the original bill?

Mr. HALLECK. I think that is correct.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow. The final vote on the terminal-leave-pay bill will come up then. There is also the probability of a conference report on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. I submit the request, having those two matters in mind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACTS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. COX. 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.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, under the agreement made before the Rules Committee, in order that we wish to show the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] every consideration, I agree to yield from my side 1 hour of the time allotted to me.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it was the understanding when we were before the Rules Committee that each of us would yield 1 hour of the time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]. I am not certain, however, as to how that time is to be utilized. It was my understanding that the hour which I would allot to him would be subject to his control, so far as indicating the speakers was concerned. Do I understand from the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] that we are expected to yield 1 hour's time to Mr. CROSSER?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina could put that in his request, that he yield 1 hour out of which the gentleman from Ohio might yield to whom he pleases. The gentleman from New Jersey could do the same thing. Is that the request from the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, my recollection was that I stated in the committee that I would allow the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] to have 1 hour, and retain 1½ hours for myself. Rather than fool with it, I was willing to give him 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman includes in his request that he yield 1 hour of his time to the gentleman from Ohio and that the gentleman from Ohio may in turn yield that time. Does the gentleman make that request?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I am perfectly willing to yield 1 hour of the time that is allotted to us to such speakers as may be indicated by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] to me.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am sure our friend wishes, and all of us wish, to live up to the understanding had in the Rules Committee. I probably am responsible more than any other member of the committee for the agreement that was made.

It is my understanding that the agreement was that the gentlemen handling the bill for the majority and minority sides would each yield an hour to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], to be reyielded by him in turn as he saw fit. I hope the gentleman will find it agreeable.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The Chair is going to put the request of the gentleman from North Carolina, then will consider the request of the gentleman from Ohio.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina that he yield 1 hour to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], to be reyielded by him as he sees fit?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly willing in accordance with the agreement as I understood it before the Rules Committee to yield 1 hour of time on this side to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], but with the understanding that he submit his list of speakers to me and I will call them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that is a condition that would vitiate the request.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. The purpose of the agreement, Mr. Speaker, was to enable the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] to have 2 hours of time for the benefit of those who wished to speak in opposition. I am perfectly willing to yield an hour of time to such speakers in opposition as may be indicated by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. CROSSER. There is absolutely no doubt but what the agreement was as stated by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]. That was my understanding

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I made a correct report to the House of the understanding had in the Rules Committee, and I trust that the gentlemen in control of this bill will cooperate to the extent of making it possible for that agreement to be effective.

The SPEAKER. Such request on the part of the gentleman from North Carolina has already been agreed to.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I do not know who has the floor, but I wish to avail myself of whatever process is necessary to obtain it briefly.

The SPEAKER. The gentlemen from Indiana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I was present at the Rules Committee meeting. As far as I am concerned, every time we try to make one of these arrangements we get into misunderstandings. It has always been my feeling that we should stick by the old rule of the time being equally divided between the majority and minority sides, trusting to those in control of the bill to be fair in the disposition of that time. I do not think it makes a lot of difference whether the time yielded from the minority side is controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CROSSER], or whether the minority preserves its rights and recognizes for 1 hour such persons as the gentleman from Ohio may designate.

My recollection of the Rules Committee agreement, most of which necessarily was in executive session, was not that there was any rigid agreement as to the actual yielding of the time to the gentleman from Ohio to be in turn yielded by him; that was not my understanding or recollection of what was done. It, however, makes no particular difference.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I will submit the same unanimous consent request as did the gentleman from North Carolina, that is I yield 1 hour of time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] to be in turn yielded by him as he sees fit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to yield 1 hour to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] such time to be in turn yielded by the gentleman from Ohio as he sees fit. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. 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. 1362) to amend the Railroad Retirement Acts, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code; 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. 1362), with Mr. PATMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 40 minutes.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I take it if there are any requests on the minority side for time to speak in opposition to the committee bill those Members may look to the gentleman from Ohio for their time?

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CROSSER. What is to be done about the 1 hour that is supposed to be in neutral hands? Who is going to handle that?

Mr. BULWINKLE. What neutral hands? The gentleman has 2 hours.

Mr. CROSSER. I am asking a question.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that the chairman of the Committee on Intrastate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] is not present here today. I felt it was right unfortunate for the bill to be on the calendar for debate today. I understand that the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] will be present tomorrow.

Before proceeding I think it might be a good idea to give a little history of this bill, H. R. 1362, and the two or three bills which preceded it. In 1944 the gentleman from Ohio introduced some two or three bills on the retirement question.

Those bills were introduced, and hearings were held, and never, despite what I read in a letter today, was any amendment ever offered in the committee. H. R. 1362 then was introduced in January during the first session of this Congress. We had quite extended hearings. We had quite extended discussions in the subcommittee, and I want to say here and now, because so much false information has been given out, that not a single member of the committee on either the Democratic or the Republican side attempted to delay this bill one particle. We were told that unless you took it like it was without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t" it would not be satisfactory. We were told that, notwithstanding that there came before the committee representatives of two of the brotherhoods who opposed it in its present form. We were told that, even though it was admitted by the proponents that the present railroad fund was actuarially unsound. Day after day I say to you upon my responsibility as a Member of this Congress not a single Member attempted in any way to delay or defeat the passage of the bill. But even if we were in executive session just a few days, if I shall propose an amendment, someone from my district connected with one or the other brotherhoods would come up and say, "I understand you are fighting the bill in the committee." There was one gentleman who wrote down everything that we said, or purported to write it down, even though we were in executive session. When I explained the bill and what it accomplished, I have yet to find a single man connected with any of the brotherhoods who approved this bill as it was originally introduced.

What are the outstanding differences between the two bills? The first, I would say to you, is coverage. Look at the original Crosser bill, or look at the sections which are stricken out, and I challenge anyone to tell me what it covers. If you read it you will see that it covers icing plants that ice the cars, who are employed by private concerns, and not by any railroad, if you please. It would cover creosoting plants. Over 50 percent of their work is creosoting ties and telegraph poles. So no one could tell, neither the proponents nor even Mr. Latimer, who proceeded to draft the bill that the gentleman from Ohio introduced, and who wanted to make the social security out of the railroad retirement bigger than the social security paid down at the end of Independence Avenue.

One of the greatest faults I found in it, and it is admitted by Mr. Latimer, is that the present retirement fund is actuarily unsound. He said it would take 1½ percent to make it sound. The Crosser bill provided for 1½ percent but—and I will go into that later more fully—the railroads said it would take 3 percent.

We were not willing, I was not willing, and I know there is not a man within the sound of my voice who would have these railroad employees contribute every year to a fund which was not actuarily sound. There is not a man that would want a condition like that. Yet when we attempted to employ an independent actuary, we had a fight on our hands, and it was weeks before we could get it through. The independent actuary said it would take 3 percent. The Crosser bill does not provide enough. If the railroad employees of the United States felt that their fund was not sound and they knew it was not sound, they would support our bill at once without any equivocation.

As to disability benefits, Mr. Latimer concocted a new scheme of things, disability benefits for injuries resulting any time within 12 months after a man left the service of the company. No matter how he was injured, no matter what happened, with the employer having nothing whatsoever to do with the disability, the company would have to pay under the Crosser bill.

Further, it was especially provided in the Crosser bill, maternity benefits for any woman giving birth to a child within 12 months after leaving the service of the railroad company. Talk about bills being monstrosities. Think of that.

Another difference is in the unemployment compensation. Unemployment compensation is paid for by the railroads alone. The employees do not contribute. The railroads paid 3 percent until the fund today reaches a magnificent sum of over $750,000,000. The committee sought, and I think wisely, to reduce the amount paid by the railroads. I say to you there is not a railroad employee who would not, after a thorough study of what the amended bill does, support it. Let me give you an idea before I get too far in this because there is so little idea about the cost of all of this. The total railroad pay roll in 1945, subject to pay-roll tax for these purposes, was $4,333,333,333. The figures below are based on a pay roll of this amount:

	Per year
Present pay-roll tax for retirement:	
On railroads (3½%)	$152,000,000
On employees (3½%)	152,000,000
Total	304,000,000
Present pay-roll tax for unemployment: on railroads (3%)	130,000,000
Grand total	434,000,000
Committee bill proposals:	
Pay-roll tax for retirement:	
On railroads (6%)	260,000,000
On employees (6%)	260,000,000
	520,000,000
Pay-roll tax for unemployment: on railroads (½%)	22,000,000
Total	542,000,000
Crosser bill provisions:	
Pay-roll tax for retirement:	
On railroads (6¼%) (5¾%) $249,000,000	271,000,000
On employees (6¼%) (5¾%) $249,000,000	271,000,000
	542,000,000
Pay-roll tax for unemployment and sickness: on railroads (3%)	130,000,000
Grand total	672,000,000
Crosser bill with adequate tax rates:	
Pay-roll tax for retirement:	
On railroads (6¾%)	293,000,000
On railroads (6¾%)	293,000,000
	586,000,000
Pay-roll tax for unemployment and sickness: on railroads (4%)	173,000,000
Grand total	759,000,000
Summary of tax increases over present tax	
Committee bill (2½%)	$108,000,000
Crosser bill provisions (5½%)	238,000,000
Crosser bill with adequate tax rates (7½%)	325,000,000

This was some of what we had to go through within the committee. Complicated? Yes. Complex? Yes. I want to add one thing at this point. On the 11th day of April, I moved in the committee that the amendments agreed to by the full committee as to existing law be drafted as a clean bill and be brought back to the committee for final disposition. That was 2 days before I was told by members who signed the petition that they were told that the committee had done nothing at all in the 2 years. My motion was passed. The bill was brought back.

I want to say one thing regarding the committee report on H. R. 1362, as it refers to freight forwarders. It was stated therein that the introduced bill proposed extension of coverage to freight forwarders "not controlled by the railroads." It has been called to my attention that this brief statement regarding the proposed extension of coverage is inaccurate to the extent that it implies that it is the committee's opinion that freight forwarders which are controlled by railroaders are at the present time covered as "employers" under the Railroad Retirement Act and related laws. The facts are, as I understand it, that it has never been held by the courts that any freight forwarder, out of approximately 100 doing business, is an employer under these provisions of law. In the case of two such forwarders the contention has been made because of their alleged relationship to rail carriers and rail transportation that they are covered under the present law, and litigation is now pending in the Federal courts which, in due course, should result in the final determination of this controverted question. It was positively not the intention of the committee in its report on H. R. 1362 to take a position or express a view on this question which is now pending in the courts.

Now, let us go back to the whole railroad-retirement system and go into that. If you will pardon me, I will read it.

RAILROAD SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS—LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

It will aid to a better understanding of what is involved in this proposed legislation to review briefly the history of the statutes which it is proposed to amend.

In 1934 Congress made its first attempt to set up a compulsory retirement system for railroad employees—or, for that matter, for any employees in private industry—by the enactment of the Railroad Retirement Act of that year. That measure was supported by the railway labor organizations. The railroads, which had unsuccessfully opposed its enactment, brought suit in court challenging its validity on constitutional grounds. They were successful in that litigation, the Supreme Court holding the act to be unconstitutional—*Railroad Retirement Board* v. *Alton R. R. Co.* (295 U. S. 330).

Following the decision of the Supreme Court in that case, Congress made another attempt to set up a statutory railroad retirement system. That time, in the hope of circumventing successful attack upon it in court, the legislation was embodied in two separate statutes, one dealing with the matter of retirement annuities and the other dealing solely with the taxes designed to support the system. The railroads, however, also attacked this new legislation in court, and it was held to be invalid on constitutional grounds by the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia—*Alton R. R. Co.* v. *Railroad Retirement Board* (16 F. Supp. 955).

In December 1936, while that second case was pending on appeal in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, President Roosevelt, by letters addressed to representatives of the railroads and the railway labor organizations, urged that railway management and railway labor enter upon conferences in an effort to reach agreement upon mutually satisfactory legislation setting up a plan for retirement pensions for railway employees. His request met with favorable response from both sides. After extended conferences, representatives of the railroads and of the railway labor organizations were able to reach agreement upon the retirement plan which is now embodied in the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Carriers Taxing Act of the same year. Both acts were enacted in the precise form agreed upon and recommended by railroad labor and railroad management through the process of collective bargaining. Many Members of Congress were loud in their praise of both men and management for their conduct in the matter, which was characterized as industrial statesmanship of the highest order.

In the meantime, the Social Security Act had been enacted, setting up a Federal old-age insurance system and providing for a general plan for State unemployment-insurance systems. The railroads and their employees were exempted from the old-age provisions of that act, but were subject to the provisions relating to unemployment insurance.

In 1938, at the urgent solicitation of representatives of railway labor and over the strong objections of the railroads, Congress enacted the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. That act contained provisions removing the railroads and their employees from coverage by the unemployment insurance provisions of the Social Security Act and required that funds accumulated from taxes previously paid by the railroads under the various State unemployment insurance systems should be transferred to the credit of the railroad unemployment insurance fund.

The proposed legislation now under consideration would make drastic and fundamental changes not only in the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, which was enacted without any agreement between the railroads and their employees, but also in the Railroad Retirement Act, which, as has been stated, was enacted as the result of an agreement between them. The agreement which formed the basis of that legislation contained the following provisions:

> It is further agreed that the principals of the conferees, when the plan has been submitted and approved, shall support the legislation as agreed to and will not question in the courts the authority of Congress to enact the law or laws putting the plan into operation.

It is further agreed that the principals of the "employee conferees," when this plan has been approved, shall not make any requests or demands upon the Congress for any modification of the law which shall depart from the principle of equal tax burden upon employers and employees with respect to taxes contemplated herein.

In the hearings before the committee on this bill, the railroads insisted that the labor organizations were violating the clear spirit and intent of the 1937 agreement, if not its strict letter, in sponsoring the amendments proposed in the Crosser bill without first conferring with and attempting to reach agreement with the railroads with respect to them. They say that the enactment of the proposed amendments would release them entirely from all obligation not to attack the validity of the railroad retirement legislation. While they did not indicate whether or not they would in fact challenge the validity of the legislation in the event the proposed amendments were enacted, they have clearly indicated their view that they would feel perfectly free to challenge its validity, if so minded. They say that they went no further in the 1937 agreement than to commit themselves not to challenge in court the validity of the law or laws putting into effect the plan embodied in that agreement; that, in other words, their commitment in that regard relates only to the legislation as agreed to and certainly does not extend to such legislation radically modified over their objection.

Of course, whatever may have been the intent of the agreement reached between the railroads and their employees in 1937, that agreement could in no way be binding on the Congress. In other words, whether or not the railway labor organizations which are sponsoring the proposed amendments are doing so in violation of that or any other agreement made by them has no bearing whatever upon the power of Congress to legislate in the matter. I think it most unfortunate, however, in view of the origin of the existing legislation, that changes therein as important as those now under consideration have been proposed by one of the parties to the agreement on which it was based, without any effort whatever to consult with the other party to the agreement in an effort to reach further agreement as to desirable changes therein. The whole subject of social security is at best a most difficult one, with many highly controversial angles, and I think it exceedingly desirable that every effort be made by the parties most deeply concerned in it to reach agreement so far as possible before seeking action thereon by Congress.

Lacking the background of any agreement such as formed the basis of the original railroad-retirement legislation, the committee to which the Crosser bill was referred felt that it had no alternative but to enter upon full and complete hearings on the measure. It held hearings, extending over a period of 3 months, following which it referred the bill to its Subcommittee on Transportation, composed of 10 members, and that subcommittee held numerous conferences, giving consideration to every feature of the bill.

One of the most important features of the bill, and one with respect to which the parties disagreed most widely, was that concerning the cost of the present system and the additional cost that would be imposed by the adoption of the various proposed amendments. Finding itself unable to reach a satisfactory conclusion on that aspect of the matter from the testimony adduced at the hearings, the committee arranged with an experienced actuary of high standing, Mr. Robert J. Myers, to make a complete study thereof and report his conclusions. He made his report on March 14, 1946, which has been printed by the committee. After studying the Myers report and considering every other feature of H. R. 1362, the subcommittee made its recommendations to the committee in April. Those recommendations were approved by the committee and are incorporated in the bill as reported by it.

The bill as reported by the committee represents its best judgment as to changes that may safely and appropriately be made at this time in the present legislation. It is the result of painstaking effort on the part of the committee to secure all the facts necessary to enable it to reach a sound conclusion on this important matter. In my judgment, no piece of legislation has ever had more thorough and sympathetic consideration than this measure has received at the hands of the committee. I am convinced that the conclusions reached by the committee are fair and just and provide the soundest results that could be reached with respect to this important legislation.

RETIREMENT COSTS AND TAX RATES

Before taking up the details of the proposed legislation, I think it well to say something about one aspect of the railroad-retirement system that gives everyone interested in it the most serious concern. I refer to the important matter of its costs and the method of financing those costs.

The testimony before the committee shows that in the conferences between the representatives of the railroads and their employees which resulted in agreement on the present railroad-retirement system, nothing received more serious consideration than the matter of the costs involved in connection with each suggested feature of a retirement-pension plan as it came up for consideration. Nothing had more to do with shaping the plan as finally agreed upon. The conferees first reached agreement on the maximum cost above which they felt it unwise to go and sought to formulate a plan that would come within that figure. The figure at which they aimed was an ultimate cost not in excess of 7 percent of the pay roll, to be borne by a pay-roll tax of 3½ percent each. They were unwilling to start off with taxes at that high a figure, however. They proposed to start off with a tax of 2½ percent on each to be raised one-fourth of 1 percent at 3-year intervals until it reached a maximum of 3½ percent on each in 1949. After agreement had been reached and bills prepared in line therewith, they were advised that, according to estimates made by experts in the Treasury Department, the taxes originally proposed would be inadequate; that a total ultimate tax of 7½ percent, instead of 7 percent, would be required to finance their plan. After further negotiation, they agreed upon such an increase. As a result the Carriers Taxing Act of 1937 established the initial tax at 2¾ percent on each instead of 2½ percent, which was stepped up one-fourth of 1 percent at 3-year intervals until reaching a final rate of 3¾ percent on January 1, 1949. It is now 3½ percent.

In recognition of the importance of insuring the solvency of the retirement system for which it provides, the Railroad Retirement Act contains a provision requiring a survey of its operations by a committee of three actuarial experts at least once in every 3 years, for the purpose of determining the past and probable future cost of the system and the adequacy of the income derived and expected to be derived from the prescribed tax rates. Two such surveys have thus far been made by an actuarial committee created in conformity with those provisions of the act. This committee, called the Actuarial Advisory Committee, consists of one skilled actuary nominated by the railroads, another nominated by the labor organizations, and the third appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury. Both surveys disclosed the present system to be actuarially unsound; that is, that the taxes as now provided are insufficient to finance the present retirement system. The second survey found the deficiency to be 3 percent of the annual pay roll and the actuarial committee recommended that the prescribed tax rates be increased by that amount, divided equally between the railroads and the employee.

That was the situation with which the committee was confronted when called upon to consider the Crosser bill proposing to add new features to the railroad retirement system which even the sponsors of the bill estimated would increase its cost to the extent of a least 3½ percent of the annual railroad pay roll, or about $150,000,000 a year on the basis of last year's pay rolls. The sponsors of the bill also admitted the insolvency of the present system, but did not think the present taxes to be deficient to the extent found by the Actuarial Advisory Committee. They proposed a total added tax of 5 percent, or about $215,000,000 per year, to be divided equally between men and management, to take care both of the added costs of the proposed changes and of the existing deficiency. It was because of this extremely serious question as to the costs both of the existing system and of the proposed changes, that the committee felt it necessary to seek the assistance of a disinterested expert.

The committee feels that the first obligation of Congress is to insure the solvency of the existing retirement system. It decided, on the basis of the report made to it by Mr. Myers, and in view of somewhat larger railroad pay rolls that may be expected in the future, an added tax of 3 percent, or about $130,000,000 per year on the basis of last year's pay rolls, will probably prove sufficient for that purpose. It also felt that a total

tax on both employees and employers aggregating 12 percent of railroad pay rolls is as high as might reasonably be imposed for retirement purposes. Such a tax of 6 percent on the railroads and 6 percent on employees will yield over $500,000,000 per year on the basis of last year's pay rolls. It is six times the rate of tax now paid by other industries and their employees for the support of the old-age pensions provided under the Social Security Act. It is twice the maximum of 3 percent on each that is provided under the latter act. In all good conscience, the discrimination against the railroads and their employees in the matter of taxes for the support of retirement pensions should not be carried further than that. To avoid carrying them further than that, while at the same time insuring the solvency of the railroad retirement system, simply means that some of the proposals contained in the original Crosser bill must either be eliminated or considerably modified. It is with that fact in mind that I ask you to consider the bill as reported by the committee.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR CHANGES AS PROPOSED IN THE ORIGINAL BILL AND IN THE BILL AS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE

While the original bill contained almost innumerable amendments of the existing legislation, many of the changes related to more or less minor procedural and administrative matters. So far as concerns the present railroad retirement system, it proposed six major changes, all but one of which have been incorporated, in whole or in part, in the committee bill. Those six major changes are as follows:

First. A proposal to provide for the payment of annuities to the widows, children, and other survivors of deceased railroad employees and pensioners similar to those now available under the Social Security Act, but on a basis averaging about 25 percent higher. The committee bill incorporates this proposal, but fixes the survivor annuities at substantially the same level as those accorded under the Social Security Act instead of making them 25 percent higher as proposed in the original bill.

Second. A proposal to liberalize the provisions of the present act with respect to granting annuities on account of disability. The committee bill incorporates this proposal, with certain minor modifications.

Third. A proposal to change the provisions of the present law with respect to minimum annuities, with the effect generally of raising the minimum materially. The committee bill adopts this proposal in full.

Fourth. A proposal to reduce the retirement age for women employees from 65 to 60. The committee bill also adopts this proposal without change.

Fifth. A proposal to increase the taxes levied for the support of the railroad retirement system to the extent of an added 5 percent pay-roll tax, to be divided equally between the employers and employees. The committee bill adopts this proposal with but minor modification.

Sixth. A proposal to change and greatly enlarge the coverage of the present act so as to include a vast number of persons who are not railroad employees and who have no connection with railroad operations. The committee bill omits this proposal in its entirety.

The biggest difference between the original bill and the bill as reported by the committee is with respect to changes in the present railroad unemployment insurance system. Aside from a proposal to make the same enlargement of the coverage of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act as it proposed for the Railroad Retirement Act, the major changes which the original bill proposed in the Railroad Unemployment Insurance System were:

First. It is proposed to increase the present maximum weekly benefit from $20 to $25 and to increase the present maximum period for the duration of benefits from 20 weeks to 26 weeks.

Second. It is proposed to provide additional benefits to be payable in the case of inability to work because of sickness—including confinement incident to childbirth—or accident from whatever cause. These added benefits would be payable in the same amounts and for like periods as the benefits payable for unemployment.

The committee bill does not adopt either of those proposals. The first is in line with changes which have heretofore been proposed in the general Social Security System and which Congress has refused to adopt. The second is completely lacking in precedent. No unemployment insurance system now in existence provides benefits at the expense of the employers for sickness or other form of disability having no connection with the employment.

The committee bill, on the other hand, contains one feature which was not proposed in the original bill. It incorporates provisions making changes in the present flat tax of 3 percent of pay rolls levied upon the railroads for the support of unemployment insurance, so as to provide for a graduated tax ranging from ½ to 3 percent, depending upon the amount of the reserve carried in the unemployment insurance account. The committee bill thus proposes to give railroad companies the benefit of a sliding tax scale for the support of unemployment insurance similar to that accorded other industries under nearly all the State unemployment insurance systems, but on somewhat less liberal terms than are accorded employees under many of the State systems.

That is a general summary of the differences between the bill as originally introduced and as reported by the committee. I shall now discuss the principal differences in somewhat greater detail.

SURVIVOR ANNUITIES

Under the present Railroad Retirement Act each employee has the option either of retaining his right to a full annuity payable to himself alone or of converting it into a so-called joint and survivor annuity. This arrangement provides for the payment of a somewhat reduced annuity to himself for life and thereafter to his widow, or, in the case of a woman employee, to herself for life and thereafter to her widower. The joint annuity is actuarially of the same value as the single annuity from which it is converted. That is the only extent to which the present act provides for annuities to survivors of deceased employees or pensioners.

The Social Security Act orginally contained no provision for survivor annuities. In 1939, however, it was amended so as to provide them, not only for widows, but also for minor children and, in some cases, dependent parents, of deceased employees and pensioners. In making provision for them, however, that act went about, in principle, in the way the joint and survivor annuities are taken care of in the Railroad Retirement Act. It first reduced the basic pensions previously provided under the Social Security Act by an amount sufficient to cover, and perhaps more than cover, the added cost of the survivor pensions. The pensions provided under that act were already much less liberal than those provided under the Railroad Retirement Act. With the reduction made to take care of the added feature of survivor annuities, they became far less liberal. For example, the maximum aggregate of all pensions that may be paid under that act for account of one employee is $85 per month. The maximum annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act is $120 per month. The average pensions actually being paid under the two acts show just as wide a difference in favor of the Railroad Retirement Act.

Although the supporters of the Crosser bill cite the survivor-annuity provisions of the Social Security Act in support of the proposal to incorporate a similar feature in the railroad-retirement system, the Crosser bill, as originally drawn, departed entirely from the Social Security Act both as to the method of covering the costs of such new feature and as to the amounts of the survivor pensions. It proposed not only to provide such annuities in amounts averaging about 25 percent higher than those granted under the Social Security Act but it proposed to make no change whatever in the single annuities now provided for under the Railroad Retirement Act. The committee bill goes along with the original proposal in making no reduction in the present annuities but departs from it with respect to the amounts in which the survivor annuities are to be allowed. It proposes to make them substantially the same as those provided under the Social Security Act. That will leave railroad employees still far ahead of employees in other industries in the matter of retirement pensions. On that point I quote from an article which appeared in the May 20, 1944, issue of Labor, a weekly newspaper published by 15 of the standard railway labor organizations. In comment upon bills introduced in the last Congress containing provisions similar to those in H. R. 1362, that article stated:

> Furthermore, the Railroad Retirement Act has from the beginning been much superior in every particular to the Social Security Act, except for the widows' benefits added to social security several years ago.
>
> The amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act will make it possible to catch up and surpass that feature of social security,

thus restoring by a wide margin the superiority of the Railroad Retirement Act.

I am convinced that the committee bill goes as far as it is wise to go in this matter of survivor annuities. This new feature will at best add greatly to the cost of the railroad-retirement system, the already high cost of which, both to the employees and the employers, is a matter of most serious concern.

DISABILITY PENSIONS

The present railroad retirement system is essentially an old-age retirement system and not a health or accident insurance system. It was purposely so designed by the men and management when they agreed upon it in 1937. One reason for that was the matter of cost, to which I have already referred. Another reason, perhaps the main reason, is that the conferees felt that when a man is disabled for any reason connected with his work he has a right under the general law to collect damages to compensate him for whatever degree of disability he has sustained. On the other hand, if a man's disability is not connected in any way with his employment, they doubted whether his employer or the industry in which he was employed could properly be made responsible for it. In any event, under the plan as agreed upon, only limited provision was made for disability pensions.

In order to be entitled to a pension under the present act on the ground of disability, a man must be totally disabled from all gainful occupation and must either have at least 30 years of service or be 60 years old. If he has as much as 30 years of service, he is entitled to his full pension at once, regardless of his age. If he has less than 30 years of service, he cannot get a pension unless or until he is 60 years old, and then his pension will be reduced to some extent, depending on the number of years he lacks of being 65. The Crosser bill proposes to require only 10 years instead of 30 years of service as a condition to the right to a disability pension, regardless of age, and would eliminate any reduction in a disability pension when granted at an age between 60 and 65 to a person with less than the required number of years of service. In any instance where a man has as much as 20 years of service or is 60 or more years of age, instead of limiting disability pensions to cases involving disability from all gainful employment, it would allow them to persons who are merely disabled from conducting their regular railroad occupation. The committee bill adopts all these proposals, except that in order for a man under 60 years of age and less than 30 years of service to be entitled to a disability pension, it requires that the disability must be the result of occupational injury or disease. I do not see how anyone can regard that as other than a reasonable requirement.

COVERAGE

As I have said, the committee bill rejects in full only one of the major changes which the original bill proposed to make in the railroad retirement system. The committee bill adopts in full the proposal with respect to minimum pensions and the proposed reduction in the retirement age for women employees. It adopts in principle the proposal with respect to survivor pensions, differing only as to the amounts in which they are to be granted. It also adopts, with only minor modification, the proposal with respect to disability pensions. It rejects in full only the proposal to expand the coverage of the present act to include persons whose only connection with the railroad industry is that they happen to work for some concern which has a contract to supply certain materials or services to the railroads.

The coverage of the present act is that which was agreed upon by the railroads and their employees in 1937. They agreed that the act should have the same coverage as the Railway Labor Act, and the present coverage provisions were in large measure copied verbatim from the Railway Labor Act. No feature of the Crosser bill met with more universal opposition than its proposal to extend the coverage so as to include a vast number of persons having no connection with railroad operations. The proposed amendment would have the effect of bringing into the railroad retirement system the employees of any transfer company which happens to have a contract with a railroad to perform pick-up and delivery services for it. It would also bring in the employees of an ice company under contract to furnish ice to a railroad and make delivery of it in the bunkers of its refrigerator cars. It would probably have the effect of bringing into the railroad retirement system the employees of a laundry which performs laundry work for the Pullman Co., inasmuch as the Pullman Co. to a large extent does its own laundry work and sends its laundry to outside concerns only where it finds that to be convenient and economical.

All that was presented in support of this radical extension of the coverage of the present act was that it was for the purpose of discouraging railroads from farming out any of their work. No evidence whatever was offered, however, to show that the railroads are engaged in the practice of farming out any of their work to an extent that it is improper or undesirable. Still less was there any showing that this matter is one which should properly be dealt with by legislation rather than being left, like practically all other matters at issue between the railroads and their employees, for handling through the orderly processes of collective bargaining under the provisions of the Railway Labor Act. Obviously, Congress should not legislate upon a matter of this sort without a much more convincing showing than was made in support of this proposal.

RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

As previously stated, the principal difference between the committee bill and the original bill is in the changes which they propose to make in the present railroad unemployment insurance system.

As I have said, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act was enacted in 1938 because of the desire of railroad employees to be taken out from under the various State systems of unemployment insurance, set up under the Social Security Act. It provided benefits which were generally more liberal than those then available under the various State systems. It went into effect July 1, 1939. It had hardly become effective before it was amended so as greatly to increase the benefits for which it provided.

The present act provides for the payment of benefits on account of unemployment due to inability to secure suitable work. The benefits are based upon a man's earnings in his previous railroad employment and range from $1.75 to $4 per day or from $8.75 to $20 per week, being payable for only 5 days in a week. They are payable for a maximum of 100 days, or 20 weeks in a single benefit year. The weeks in which he receives benefits do not have to be consecutive but may be scattered over the year.

All unemployment benefits are furnished at the sole cost of the railroads. For that purpose the act imposes a tax upon the railroads equal to 3 percent of all wages up to $300 per month. From the beginning that tax has proven to be far higher than was necessary to finance the system. Even during the early years of the operation of the system, which were years of depression both in the railroad industry and in industry in general, the receipts from the tax far outran the unemployment benefit payments. The result is that the railroad unemployment insurance fund carried in the Treasury Department now has a reserve of well over $700,000,000 and for the past several years the interest alone on that fund has been far more than enough to meet all expenditures.

Unlike practically all the State unemployment insurance acts, the present railroad act makes no provision for any reduction of the tax when experience shows it to be excessive. The committee bill proposes to remedy that deficiency by substituting for the present flat tax of 3 percent a sliding scale of tax rates ranging from ½ percent to 3 percent, the effective rate for a given year to depend upon the balance to the credit of the Insurance Fund on September 1 of the preceding year. That change will place the railroads more nearly on a parity with other industries with respect to unemployment insurance taxes.

On the other hand, the committee has not seen fit to incorporate in its bill any of the changes which the original bill proposed to make in the railroad unemployment insurance system. Both in the measure and duration of the benefits for which it provides, as well as in the conditions on which its benefits are payable, the system already compares most favorably with any or all the various State systems of unemployment insurance. The effect of the proposed changes would be to create a pronounced and wholly unwarranted discrimination in favor of railroad employees and against the employees in other industries in the matter of unemployment insurance. The effect also would be so greatly to increase the cost of the present system as to make impossible any reduction in, and perhaps even to require an increase in, the present tax rate of 3

percent on the railroads for the support of unemployment insurance, thus perpetuating or even increasing the gross discrimination to which they are now subjected.

Railroad employees already enjoy special and favored treatment in this matter of unemployment insurance, and the effect of the proposed amendments which the committee rejected would simply be to increase that favoritism enormously. On that point, I think I might read from the article from which I have already quoted which appeared in the brotherhood newspaper, Labor:

The railroad unemployment insurance law—

Says the article—

has also been far in advance of the unemployment compensation laws for industrial workers in the States. Under the amendments, it will be improved still further.

I can think of no stronger argument that could be made in support of the committee's action in the matter.

CONCLUSION

The solution reached by the committee of the numerous extremely troublesome questions presented by this proposed legislation impresses me as a most wise one. The committee was faced with the fact that the present railroad retirement system is admittedly underfinanced and that the proposed amendments would add greatly to its costs. To take care both of the deficiency in the present tax rate and of the added costs of the changes proposed in the original bill would require an added tax of at least 6½ percent of railroad pay rolls. Added to the present combined tax on employers and employees of 7 percent, and divided equally between the two, that would require a total tax on each of 6¾ percent, or a tax on each of almost $300,000,000 per year. There was also the fact, however, that the tax of 3½ percent each now imposed upon the railroads and their employees for the support of the present system, although admittedly inadequate for that purpose, is over three times the tax now being paid by other industries and their employees for like purposes under the Social Security Act.

There is, of course, a limit somewhere to the amount of taxes that may be imposed upon the railroads for the purposes of social security, or for any other purpose, particularly since, if the railroads are to remain solvent, whatever increased taxes are imposed upon them must ultimately be paid by those who ship and travel by rail. The committee decided, most wisely, I think, that the total tax upon both employers and employees for the support of the retirement system should not reasonably be more than 12 percent, meaning a tax of 6 percent on each. In order to conform to that conclusion and at the same time insure the solvency of the retirement system, it found it necessary to modify to some extent certain of the proposals contained in the original bill, although adopting all the major proposals in principle.

To increase the tax on the railroads for retirement purposes to 6 percent, with no change in the present 3 percent tax for unemployment insurance, would add about $110,000,000 per year to their operating costs, ultimately to be passed on to the shippers of the country. It would make the total tax on the railroads for both retirement and unemployment insurance 9 percent, amounting to nearly $400,000,000 per year, as compared with an average tax of less than 3 percent now being paid for both purposes by other industries, including competitors of the railroads. By substituting a sliding scale of tax rates for the present flat 3-percent tax imposed on the railroads for unemployment insurance, the committee was able to avoid an immediate increase in the combined tax rate of 6½ percent now being paid by the railroads for both purposes. At the same time, the provisions under which the sliding scale is to operate will insure the solvency of the unemployment insurance system. At this proposed combined tax rate of 6½ percent proposed by the committee, the railroads will have to pay well over $275,000,000 per year for the support of the two systems of railroad social insurance. I think all will agree with me that that is a pretty stiff tax for any purpose.

This statement in brief, because it would have taken me another full half hour to go into the matter completely, gives you a picture of what happened in the committee and the differences between the two bills.

I say to you again that if every railroad man had had this bill before him and there had not been the misrepresentation about it that has gone out, he would gladly have accepted it. They call it a monstrosity, and every type of adjective is applied to it. We heard that in our committee, and we heard that in executive session. But I say to you that many people, even many Members of Congress, did not realize the full import and meaning of these two bills which are before you, or the bill and the committee amendment.

It is no easy matter, it is no pleasant matter, to sit down day after day and figure out these actuarial costs. It is easy for someone to get up afterwards and say, "Thus and so could have been done." Even men on the committee, many of them who did not attend the hearings, and who know nothing about it, are attempting to say this bill is not worth the paper it is written on. The case will lie in the hands of every man here shortly this week to decide what to do. Remember this, that when costs are piled up on transportation companies there is only one way they can get them back, and that is from increased freight rates.

The committee bill is fair both to employers and employees, it is a just one, and it should be passed as the committee reported it out.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. The gentleman said the original Railway Act was under-financed. Do both of these proposals take care of correcting the under-financing?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No. The committee proposal does. The Crosser bill does not. The Crosser bill retains the 1½ percent, ¾ percent taken from the pay roll of the men and ¾ percent from the employers.

Mr. KUNKEL. What was the cause of the original under-financing?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Experiment. We have a board which was to pass upon this question for us, and the board passed upon it. The board said along in 1942 and 1943 that the rate should be increased to 3 percent.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The gentleman has stated that the first two bills prepared and passed were held to be unconstitutional.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes, one in the Supreme Court and one in the District Court.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I wonder if the gentleman would tell us on what ground those bills were held to be unconstitutional.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I would have to get the decision. It was held unconstitutional.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The reason I ask is because the gentleman has said that the representatives from the railroads who appeared before his committee stated they now would feel free to contest the validity of this law. I wonder if this bill as reported out by the committee has been considered in connection with those two decisions to determine whether or not this bill if passed will be constitutional.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I can say this to the gentleman: In my own judgment, speaking for myself, with the reduction in the unemployment compensation taxes, the railroads will pay out very little more; therefore, I do not think they will contest the committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, we should now like to hear from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

Mr. CROSSER. I am going to use my time when I feel like it.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one additional minute.

Mr. Chairman, under the usual procedure in the House, I take it that when there are three sides to be heard they should come along when the Chairman recognizes them and not that the gentleman from Ohio should reserve all of his time until the last. He should take it as it comes. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from New Jersey and I have been very liberal, extremely liberal. We gave him more time than we took, with only five members of the committee who favor his proposal. I am asking that the gentleman from Ohio be recognized.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HENDRICKS. As I understand, this time was not given to the gentleman from Ohio by the Committee on Rules, but was given to him by unanimous consent of the House. Therefore, I feel that the gentleman is within his rights to use

it when he pleases and he should not be forced by anyone to use it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there are three Members controlling the time on this bill. If none of the three desire to use their time or to yield time, the Chair will direct the Clerk to read.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one additional minute.

Mr. Chairman, I call this to the attention of the Committee because I heard the remark that the gentleman from Ohio intended to hold up his time until after everybody else had spoken. That is the reason I wanted the Committee to know that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] will be permitted to close debate, he being in charge of the bill.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOREN. There being three gentlemen controlling the time, as the Presiding Officer calls for any one of the gentlemen, if at that point he does not desire to use his time he can pass it up; and if all three of them do not desire to use time, of course, the debate would be closed. But in the event one of them does not desire to use time at that point and, following that, if any one of the three uses time, then he can come back and use his time later, can he not?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct, reserving the right, of course, for the committee to close.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one additional minute.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to recount to the membership just the sort of situation we have gotten ourselves into. The author of the bill which has been reported is the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]. The proposition that is here before us against that original bill is the committee bill about which the gentleman from North Carolina has just spoken. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] is not yet back from California. The presentation in behalf of the committee bill has been made by the gentleman from North Carolina. In order to be perfectly fair, arrangement has been made by which the gentleman from Ohio is to have under his direct control 2 hours of the 5 hours of time. It is known by all that the gentleman from New Jersey, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, favors the committee substitute. Now, then, Mr. Chairman, are we to be put to the necessity of closing debate at this time or is it fair to suggest that the opening argument having been made for the committee position by the ranking majority member of the committee favoring that proposal that we should not now be permitted to hear from the other side when the author of the bill, as I understand it, insists that his measure should prevail against the measure reported by the committee? It seems to me that is not a fair way to proceed and that the fair way would be for the proponent of the original bill now to address the committee in order that the committee may be apprised of what the views on that side are.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to use some time?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HENDRICKS. It seems to me that ever since I have been here the procedure was that first the majority had control of the time and then it was passed to the minority and then to the Member who controlled the third amount of time. That is the procedure we have followed in the past and I see no reason why it should not be followed today. The time yielded to the majority and the minority could be used and they could yield to someone as they pleased.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. If we can make any kind of a speech under a parliamentary inquiry, the fact of the matter is the way this rule is being handled I do not believe has happened in my time in this House of Representatives in 12 years. In order to be perfectly fair the minority asked unanimous consent to let the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], who sits on the majority side, have an hour of our time. Now, certainly that is a departure from usual procedure. If I had my way, and I said so in the Rules Committee, that situation would not have prevailed, because in my opinion the minority should protect the control of the time allocated to the minority. But, to be perfectly fair, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] asked unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] have directly under his control 1 hour of the time. Now, are we further to be put in a disadvantageous situation by having it said that out of the hour and a half now remaining we shall now put on speakers?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will reiterate there are three gentlemen controlling time under the rule. The Chair would like to inquire of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] if he desires to use time now.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I will take 1 minute in order to answer the Chair. When the discussion on the rule was being had, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] stated exactly what I understood to be the situation in the Rules Committee, namely, that I was to have 2 hours, to use as I saw fit; not to be used as might suit the fancy of the opposition. That was clearly what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] said and what I understood to be the case. I can use some time unless the gentleman from New Jersey uses some time now.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule agreed upon in the House, the gentleman can use such time as he sees fit, reserving the right to the committee to close debate.

Does the gentleman from New Jersey desire to use some time now?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the situation that now confronts the committee is no different than what I had anticipated as a possibility. I think those who are present and heard the remarks I made at the time will bear this out. With a desire to be fair, I yielded 1 hour of the time allotted to me to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]. Never did it occur to me, however, that he would take advantage of that generosity to the point of refusing to utilize time in an orderly way.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I will in just a moment.

Mr. COX. I want to support the view the gentleman is taking, if he will permit me.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I trust I have not been responsible for the making of an agreement that is going to produce misunderstanding and discord on the floor. Of course, in urging that members of the committee who would have control of the time be generous in yielding of time I did not have in mind that anyone other than the committee would claim the right to close debate. I thought the time would be used as is customary here on this floor. Agreement has been made before that one group controlling one part of the time would use such of the time as it wished, then the other, and it would alternate all around. I trust my friend from Ohio will find it agreeable to cooperate to the extent that the debate may be carried on in the usual and customary manner. I did my best for him, and I hope now that he will not let me down.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New Jersey yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I sat as a member of the Rules Committee through all these proceedings and discussions. I did not like this arrangement that was being worked out for the reasons that I have stated; but, be that as it may, it has been worked out this way, and while there is the usual responsibility for the division of the time in support of the committee's position there is a single responsibility for the division of the time in support of the original bill and against the committee opposition. The other method would alternate the time between them until the full exposition had been made of the committee position, then the necessity of yielding time would swing to the other side and at this point in the debate following the customary procedure of the committee argument would be heard from the other side.

Mr. COX. I agree with that viewpoint, of course.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe we are making a mountain out of a molehill on this issue. I cannot

see that it makes a great deal of difference as to when one speaker shall come on and when another shall come on.

This of course is a rather unusual situation in that there are three different persons controlling the time, but I do not believe it has ever been a rule of the House or of the Committee of the Whole that speakers shall be heard exactly in the order of their standing on an issue. We know that the customary way of yielding time is from the majority to the minority, and there have been instances where third parties have been allotted a certain amount of time to yield as they saw fit, but I believe that in every instance the rule has been for the majority to have time first, then it passes to the minority and then to the third person. I see no objection to this method being carried out at this time. I have spoken to the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. CROSSER], and he tells me that he is perfectly willing to abide by such an arrangement, and it seems to me that if we are to carry this out in an orderly manner it would be to follow that plan. The majority has used such time as they wish. It seems to me the use of time now logically passes to the minority to use such time as they see fit, and then it passes to the third person, the gentleman from Ohio, for him to proceed as long as he sees fit within the time limit set provided always that the right of closing the debate shall belong to the majority.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, it is most unfortunate from the standpoint of proper consideration of this legislation that the gentleman from Ohio should take the position of refusing at this time to utilize any of the time which was so generously given to him by myself as well as by the gentleman from North Carolina. It is perfectly apparent that, if the Committee is to have a clear understanding of the legislation and the issues at stake, it would be proper now for the gentleman from Ohio to make a presentation of his views and give an explanation of his bill at this time.

The gentleman from North Carolina has spoken extensively, utilizing some 40 minutes of his time, in presenting the viewpoint of the committee on the bill it has recommended for passage to this Committee and which in some particulars is in conflict with the bill which was introduced by the gentleman from Ohio. The membership of the House could better understand the situation that brings about these differences if the gentleman from Ohio, or someone who shares his views, would utilize time at this point in the debate and explain to the membership their understanding of the difference between the bill recommended by the committee and the one which the gentleman from Ohio is supporting.

Mr. Chairman, it is my desire in the first place to explain to the Committee something of the legislative history of railroad retirement and unemployment legislation. I do not think it is necessary for me to take any considerable time to emphasize to the membership that my support has been given from the beginning to the present time to all legislation that has sought to provide benefits to the workers on our railroads. Not only has my feeling of friendship always been extended to our railroad workers by supporting the legislation they have sought at one time and another, but I think it can be said without fear of contradiction that there has been no one either on the Democratic side or on the Republican side who has more consistently supported beneficial labor legislation on this floor than myself. I emphasize that thought for the reason that I want it to be understood that when I give my support to the committee bill I do not think for a moment that I am doing anything contrary to the best interest of the railroad workers. On the other hand, I am distinctly of the opinion that the views some of us have with respect to the type of legislation that should be passed at this time are working in the interest of the railroad workers.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT LEGISLATION

I will now bring to your attention a situation in connection with the existing railroad retirement legislation that should have the most careful consideration of every Member of this House. It is because of this situation that I counsel caution in what we do.

The present Railroad Retirement Act is the result of collective bargaining between railroad management and labor. It was passed by the Congress in 1937 upon the basis and faith of an understanding between the railroads and their employees, reached after cooperative colelctive bargaining and long negotiations, entered into at the earnest instance of the President of the United States, after two previous legislative attempts to set up a general retirement system for railroad employees had been held unconstitutional.

In 1934 the Congress of the United States enacted railroad retirement legislation. The railroads contested that legislation in the courts, the United States Supreme Court ultimately holding that the laws were unconstitutional. The railway labor organizations then undertook to develop legislation which in their judgment would cure the defects in the previous laws. They submitted bills to Congress in 1935, which were later in that year enacted into law. Again the railroads challenged that legislation, and a decision was rendered by the District of Columbia Supreme Court holding that the act imposing the retirement taxes were invalid. The court restrained the Bureau of Internal Revenue from collecting the taxes from the railways, and restrained the Railroad Retirement Board from requiring the railways to furnish information concerning the records of service of the employees. However, the court did not restrain the payment of benefits under the Retirement Act of 1935. The Government filed notice of appeal.

In the fact of this constant uncertainty and controversy over railroad retirement legislation, the President of the United States wrote a letter to the president of the Association of American Railroads and the chairman of the Railway Labor Executives' Association early in December of 1936, suggesting that the interested parties get together and undertake to work out an agreement on retirement legislation which would remove the uncertainty and permit railway workers to enjoy the benefits of a Federal system of retirements. Both groups agreed to follow the suggestion of the President, and conferences were held in Washington during January and February of 1937, culminating in an agreement upon the basic principles of railroad retirement legislation. Legislation was drafted by the attorneys for the employer and employee associations, and was ratified early in March by the individual railroads and by the principal railroad labor organizations.

During the conferences between the representatives of labor and management careful consideration was given at all times to the necessity of maintaining the financial soundness of the plan by keeping the annuities and benefits provided within the limitations of the tax contributions which were to be made equally by the employees and the carriers.

This cooperative collective-bargaining procedure that culminated in the present Railroad Retirement Act was highly praised by Congress at that time. My remarks upon the floor of the House, which I quote below—volume 81, part 6, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, at page 6084—are typical of the commendatory expressions of numerous Members of Congress:

> The circumstances under which this legislation is presented to the House are of such a character as to deserve special emphasis. Never during my experience in this House has legislation of such widespread importance been presented under more favorable conditions. First and foremost is the fact that it represents absolute and complete unanimity of thought and desire between management and men. There is no feature of this bill that presents any controversy or disagreement as between these two parties. Every provision has the support of both without any reservation upon the part of either. It represents a united effort to produce legislation that will be satisfactory and mutually beneficial, and comes before the House with the united support of railroad management and all the standard brotherhoods.

The agreed upon retirement plan, consisting of a bill providing for taxes and another specifying benefits, was introduced in Congress and was hailed as a significant example of legislative cooperation by employers and employees in solving a mutual problem. These bills were passed and approved in June, becoming the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Carriers' Taxing Act of 1937.

To date, there have been no material changes in those laws, with the exception of the amendments to the Retirement Act in 1940 and 1942, which provided for credits under the Retirement Act for military service in time of war, the increased cost of annuities based on military service credits to be paid from the Treasury of the United States.

It should be understood by the Members of the House, and I hope I make this point crystal clear: The formal agreement between the railroad companies and their employees included a promise on the part of the companies in exchange for certain promises on the

part of the employees that the companies would not contest the constitutionality of the law resulting from the agreement.

This promise was demanded by the Brotherhoods and agreed to by the companies because both realized that it was not only difficult but very likely impossible to write legislation that would stand up under a test of constitutionality in the light of the previous court decisions setting aside the two prior enactments.

There are some who are still doubtful that the present laws on railroad retirement are constitutionally valid in all respects. But the companies are bound not to make such a test on existing laws. However, from the strong opposition that the carriers made in the hearings before our committee and from the knowledge that their agreement cannot be held to bind them as to a changed law—a law changed without any attempt to consult the companies—I am fearful that if we should pass the original Crosser bill instead of the committee amendment that we would be placing the entire Railroad Retirement Act in jeopardy of an attack on its constitutionality. We may, in short, be taking everything the employees have gained away from them under the guise of helping them to further benefits. I hope not. Certainly it would be a great disappointment to me if such should result.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. Did the act as originally passed contain any of the provisions which were the basis for the Supreme Court's declaring the previous act unconstitutional?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I am of the opinion that it contained provisions which, if the same attack had been made on it, might have resulted the same. Of course, I am not in a position, as the gentleman knows, to speak with the authority of the Supreme Court on the matter. I can only say that the principles involved were such that it might have had that result.

During the years that have intervened there has been no contest of the constitutionality of the existing law due to the understanding that its constitutionality would not be contested. The result has been that the railroad workers have had the benefit of this legislation through all the years that have intervened. There is now presented to the Congress a new basis of benefits. The Crosser bill, as drawn, varies greatly in some respects from the original legislation which resulted from the joint action of the workers and management. I do not mean merely from the standpoint of increasing benefits or changing the basis of benefits, I mean also in the type and character of the bill.

The original legislation was passed under two separate acts. One act provided for the benefits, the other was known as a taxing act. It went to the Committee on Ways and Means and came from that committee, and was passed as part of the program of legislation. At that time we were distinctly told that it was necessary to do it in that particular way. I never fully understood the reason for it, but I am well aware that the demand was insistent that it be in two different, separate bills.

This bill has the features of those two original bills combined in one. I do not know what the effect of that will be, but I do say this, that there is no one in this House whose heart beats with more natural sympathy for the man who works than my own. I have pride in the record I have made in this House in my support of labor and in my opposition to measures which I believed to be detrimental to labor. That has continued throughout the 20 years I have been in this House and exists at the present time. So when I speak in opposition to certain provisions of the Crosser bill, or to the suggestions that may be made by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, it is not with any less desire to be helpful than he is and always has been. But there are situations that must in fairness to the workers themselves and the public in general, be given consideration.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have tried to look at this bill rather carefully. What worries me is that it involves one segment of industry alone attempting to place itself in an entirely different category than other segments. The social benefits that are being asked for should be included, of course, in the general social security legislation. It was patterned, was it not, in the first place, after the civil retirement bill and that is why it would probably receive the sanction of the Supreme Court. But in your committee, was an attempt made or any suggestion made for the social benefits to be included in the regular Social Security Act?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. It is perfectly apparent that presently existing law is far more beneficial in its treatment of railroad labor than the provisions of the Social Security Act covering those who are engaged in industry in general.

Mr. GIFFORD. That is true under the retirement act, of course. But I am talking about maternity and survivors' benefits and other features that seem to be desired which would be better provided in the social security legislation which has already been passed.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. If the gentleman is aware of any instance in which social security provides better benefits than the Railroad Act does, I am not aware of them.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have it here but I will not take the time to read it—anyone can read it. The social-security law is now before the Committee on Ways and Means and I have looked rather carefully into the differences between that act and the Railroad Retirement Act. I am as anxious as you or anybody else that these railroadmen receive as much as we can possibly give them inasmuch as in the last few days we do not feel as good as we did before. I have no prejudice whatever and am glad to give them what we can, but I do want to call attention to the fact that this is one segment of industry being treated entirely apart and differently than others and that the Social Security Act which has taken months of our time on the Committee on Ways and Means this year could better provide for them. The Committee on Ways and Means has been trying to study and amend the Social Security Act. I call to the attention of the Committee that this is an unusual request. Am I right about that or am I not?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. You are right about it in the general estimate that you have made. Personally, I am of the opinion that there is a basis for distinction as to the benefits given to railroad workers beyond those applying to industry in general. In my own mind, that difference arises because the railroads must provide safety in transportation. Continuity of employment promotes safety in operation, and continuity of employment is increased by liberal benefits to those who work in the railroad industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

In other words, if railroad employment is made attractive, not only from the standpoint of wages but from the standpoint of benefits that come over a period of years in the service of the company, it would have a tendency to keep employees in the railroad industry. With that continuity of employment, in my opinion, safety is greatly advanced; and that is in the public interest. So I am not critical of the additional benefits that are given under the special legislation that has been passed in behalf of railroad workers.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I think it would be unfortunate and unfair for labor to attack the gentleman and try to make it appear that he is unfriendly to labor. I was a Member of this House when the gentleman came here about 20 years ago. If there has been one Member of the House in all those 20 years who has been a consistent supporter of legislation helpful to the workers of this country, it is the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] himself. In fact, I know of no one who has had a better record through the years in support of labor. I consider myself one of those who has been friendly to labor through the years. I have observed the gentleman's conduct and speeches and record, and the gentleman has well stated his position when he says that through the years he has been a real, genuine friend to the working people and to the railroad workers of this country.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, especially as they come from one who

likewise has made an enviable record in behalf of whose who labor.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. There is another very good reason for the Railroad Retirement Act. I spent 14 years in railroad work and I know from experience it is one of the most hazardous occupations that we have in the United States. It is a line which, to follow, you must be cut in all kinds of weather. It is a line that has many casualties. For that reason I can readily understand and urge the need for this type of legislation.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. By way of illustration, may I just indicate one of the features where preferential treatment is given to railroad workers. That is with reference to the unemployment-compensation fund. Every cent that goes into the railroad unemployment-compensation fund is contributed by the railroads. Not 1 cent is contributed by the workers. I think you will agree with me that is not true of our State laws on that subject with respect to industrial workers.

While I am speaking on that, let me indicate what the committee has tried to do. This is entitled to your most serious consideration. In the first place, it was definitely made known to us by the report of the Railroad Retirement Board that the present fund, without adding any additional benefits, is actuarially unsound. I think you will agree with me that those of us on the committee who insisted that the fund be made sound, were standing upon solid ground and working in the interest of the railroad workers. From the time these hearings opened I made it plain that so far as I was concerned, my first consideration would be the making of the present fund sound.

I know of nothing more unfair or unjust than to have workers over a period of years paying into a fund that is not actuarily sound. In the fixing of those rates in the beginning we followed the advice of one whose heart was in the cause and we believed his head and judgment were right, but unfortunately over a period of time it developed that the original tax was not sufficient to make it actuarilly sound.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I have heard the distinguished gentleman who reported this bill say that this was actuarily unsound. I believe the other Members who spoke likewise were the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and yourself. Who confirms such statements?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. As I said, the Railroad Retirement Board itself made that report. They have charge of this fund for the benefit of the workers and I assume their estimate would be in the interest of the workers when they made that report.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. There is no question but what the Board and the man in charge of it are friendly to this legislation and to the railroad workers, is there?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Not at all.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Is there anyone who claims that it is sound?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I do not believe anybody can take that position.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, may I answer the gentleman?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. In just a moment.

The bill corrects that situation. We provide a tax that will make the fund actuarily sound. We consider that of primary importance and it is a part of our committee bill.

I yield now to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I believe the Crosser bill carries 1½ percent; and Mr. Latimer, of the Retirement Board, said in his opinion 1½ percent would make it actuarily sound; but the Board itself said it would take 3 percent and our private actuary said it would take 3 percent.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. GALLAGHER. We have had some experience with actuaries in the city of Minneapolis. Is it not a fact that if you have to use actuaries, you absolutely increase the cost to a great extent?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I am not able to follow the gentleman either in the conclusion he has come to or the reasoning that prompts him to take that view. I am of the opinion that in a matter as technical as fixing disability compensation, casualty insurance, life annuities, and so forth, that we should have the aid of the best actuarial experience, and not bring legislation to the House that did not have the consideration of actuaries who were well versed in their subject.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Is not this about the situation? The bill was put on the books by reason of an agreement between management and men, and after actuarial studies given rates were set up in the hope they would meet the benefits payable under the act. Experience thus far has disclosed that the retirement fund is not actuarily sound; in other words, the rate as fixed and agreed upon is not high enough. Some think that 1½ percent more would take care of it, but the better judgment of the committee was, certainly, if there were to be additional benefits that that would not be enough. It seemed important that the fund as presently constituted should be made actuarily sound and that is the reason the committee voted for the additional 3 percent.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. The gentleman has stated the situation correctly.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. In view of the reference I made a few moments ago I wish to read into the RECORD just a line. As I said, the Committee on Ways and Means, of which I am now a member, has spent considerable time studying these matters.

It reads as follows:

> Certainly it is also of national value that social benefit plans shall apply to railroad workers and their families. But a more satisfactory staff pension plan can be developed for railroad employees if the social benefit function is transferred to OASI; and the social benefit function can be handled to greater advantage if separated from the staff pension objectives and unified with the same function for other employments.

I do not want to prevent these people from getting what they desire, but it is not advisable to put it in the bill, according to the committee. I tried to find out whether they had made any inquiry or attempt to cover themselves under the Social Security Act and not be a separate segment of industry entirely.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Of course, the gentleman must realize that the study which is being made by the Ways and Means Committee is the result of action by the House that sent that particular subject to that committee for study. I think it showed good judgment in doing so. On the other hand, when this legislation now under consideration was introduced, it was sent to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and that committee had no right to consider the general subject of social insurance but only the particular legislation it had before it and that is what the committee is reporting today to the House.

A few moments ago I was speaking of the unemployment charge which is paid entirely by the railroads. The committee bill changes that situation, but not to the extent of requiring any contributions on the part of the workers. That fund has grown until at the present time it has $722,000,000 in it. In the last 5 years since the fund was set up there has only been approximately $50,000,000 paid out of the fund. It is perfectly apparent to anyone who gives the matter study in connection with the possible rate of unemployment that the fund is far beyond what would be necessary to tide over in a period of depression similar to what we have had in the past.

What did the committee do? I think the committee used the judgment that a careful businessman would use. There was a desire on the part of the committee, not merely of the sponsor of the Crosser bill but of the whole committee without exception, to grant to our railroad workers increased benefits and correction of some situations growing out of the present law that seemed to us needed correction in justice to the workers and their families.

Mr. Chairman, you never get anything worth while in this life without paying for it. The benefits that are given have to be paid for. The cost of those benefits is divided between management and workers. To give the increased benefits asked for in the original bill, of course, would have required a considerable increase in the payments from each worker.

It came to the attention of the committee in many different ways that, although the workers were desirous of receiving increased benefits, they did not want all the frills that appear in the original bill, nor were they anxious to be saddled with a great additional cost to get additional benefits. Therefore we sought out what was most necessary and most desirable. That is what the committee bill has provided for.

Now, then, as to the payment. The railroads were paying the full unemployment tax, and the fund had reached a point where it was not necessary, in the opinion of those who gave it careful study, that it should be continued. The fund itself produced $14,000,000 in interest. As I have said, there were only $50,000,000 drawn out of it in the last 5 years. So the committee did this: They provided a sliding scale of payment into the unemployment fund, not dissimilar to those that are in effect in the several States of the Union, except that we put no charge on the worker. Bear that in mind. What we provided was a scale that, until the fund would be reduced to $350,000,000, the railroads should be charged one-half of 1 percent. If the fund went down to $300,000,000, then they would be taxed 1 percent. If it went down to $250,000,000, they would be taxed 1½ percent. If it went to $200,000,000, then 2 percent. If it went to $150,000,000, then 2½ percent. If it went below that, then they would be taxed 3 percent, the amount which they are now paying. Thus the security of the fund would be kept intact at all times.

That is on the same basis and with the same idea that our State legislatures have passed their bills, except that in many of them, when a fund reaches a certain point, there is no further contribution to be made by the employer as long as that fund remains at the proper level. What further did we do? We increased the benefits to the men. The money that was saved to the railroads is now contributed by them to the increased benefits that the men receive as the result of our committee bill. In other words, we saved where it was possible to save without doing any harm or injury either now or in the future to the railroad worker, and then we turned it over by increased benefits so that the employees will have those increased benefits through the years instead of it being piled up into an unemployment fund that is not necessary. In other words, we gave the men the benefit of the saving that we made by transferring that charge from one side of the ledger to the other whereby they would get increased benefits for themselves and their families.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Will not the able gentleman tell the committee the amount of the benefits the railroad men are receiving under existing law and what they will receive under the committee bill if it is enacted?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I would like to answer that question for the gentleman, but it would take such considerable time that, with the time I have already used, I would not feel free to do it now, but I will see that the gentleman has that information in the most detailed form. I will see that he has a statement of what the present benefits are, what the Crosser bill would provide, and what the committee bill provides.

I am certain that if the membership of this House had the time and the willingness to study this question as our committee studied it, you would find that the committee bill recognized the best interest of the workers. We have been so generous that no one who is fair and just can say that we have done one thing that is unfair to him.

I have read some of the information that has been given out by those who advocate the Crosser bill, and I have been astounded at its character because it was so unfair, so unjust, and so untrue. I ask the Members of this House who have the interest of the railroad workers at heart, as I have, and as every member of our committee has, to give the consideration to this bill that its importance entitles it to have.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from West Virginia inquired as to what the committee bill might do in the way of increased benefits to employees. Without undertaking to go into detail—because if the gentleman will read the committee report he can find out all about that—may I say that the railroad employees, for instance, said, "We want our widows and dependents to have pensions as a matter of right." The committee bill gives those pensions and those protections as a matter of right. The original Crosser bill wanted a schedule of payments 25 percent over the general social security scale. The committee bill gives the pensions but gives them at the social-security scale. The Crosser bill and the committee bill both increase the annuity provisions.

One thing the Crosser bill undertook to do was to provide retirement pay or disability pay, whatever you want to call it, when a man became permanently and totally disabled after he had given a number of years of service. The committee bill makes provision for that. The only difference between the committee bill and the Crosser bill in that regard is that the committee bill holds that the disability must arise out of an injury or illness connected with the employment and not be just any disability that might arise by reason of any cause apart from that.

Clearly, if anyone will study it, the committee bill seeks to do those things and reach those very propositions that I think the men who work on the railroads have been insisting on.

CONCLUSION

It is unfortunate that H. R. 1362, the original measure introduced by the gentleman from Ohio on January 11, 1945, does not have a background of cooperative collective bargaining between the companies and the brotherhoods that marked the original railroad-retirement legislation. That bill proposes drastic and fundamental changes in the agreed legislation represented by the present Railroad Retirement Act. It proposes, also, radical changes in the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, which was enacted by the Congress in 1938 and became effective on July 1, 1939. Furthermore, H. R. 1362 is a unilateral bill, introduced and pressed for enactment solely at the instance of railroad labor organizations, without ever having so much as discussed the proposal with the railroads, without even having approached the railroads for a discussion of the matter. This was certainly a complete abandonment of cooperative collective-bargaining process which produced the original agreed railroad-retirement legislation Congress so highly praised in 1937.

Lacking the collective-bargaining process that preceded the original railroad retirement legislation, it became the duty of Congress to submit the unilateral proposals of H. R. 1362 to full and complete hearings. Only by this course could railway managements and other interests affected be afforded the opportunity to express their views with respect to the fundamental changes proposed by the bill. Only by this course could Members of the Congress be enabled to appraise the merits of the proposed changes in the railroad social-security system, and determine the extent to which the present system should at this time be modified.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has made careful and paintaking efforts to secure the views of all parties concerned in the legislation and to resolve the various issues presented. It held extensive hearings on H. R. 1362, beginning on January 31, 1945, and ending on April 26, 1945. These hearings are printed in three volumes, comprising an aggregate of 1,186 pages.

Following the close of the hearings, the committee referred the bill to its Subcommittee on Transportation, consisting of 12 members, and the subcommittee devoted much study to and held numerous conferences including 22 meetings in executive session, regarding every feature of the bill.

It became clear, in the course of these studies and conferences, that the cost of the present system, and of the proposed amendments, required further investigation. This factor, so vital in connection with any system of social security, received much attention in the course of the hearings, but proved also to be a subject on which various parties who appeared at the hearings disagreed widely. The committee recognized the highly technical nature of any determination of costs, and accordingly obtained an expert and unbiased opinion on the matter. It requested such an opinion from Robert J. Myers, an actuary of standing formerly identified with the Railroad Retirement Board. He made a study at the request of the committee, in the course of which he analyzed the records

of the Railroad Retirement Board at their offices in Chicago. He submitted his findings on March 14, 1946, which have been printed by the committee, and have been of great assistance in the preparation of its own bill.

Mr. Myers not only calculated the cost of each element in the present railroad social security system, including both railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance, but also the cost of the changes proposed in H. R. 1362. The committee thus had before it expert testimony regarding all elements of cost involved.

After studying the Myers report, and considering every other feature of H. R. 1362, the subcommittee made its recommendations to the committee in April. These were approved by the committee, and are incorporated in the committee amendment.

The bill reported by the committee and here under consideration is the result of its earnest efforts to obtain all the facts necessary for a decision regarding the appropriate changes to be made at this time. Certain of the proposals contained in the Crosser bill as introduced are incorporated in full in the committee amendment, others are incorporated with modifications, and some are omitted. Certain new provisions have been added. All have been considered with regard to the development of a sound program, in the light of the independent, impartial, actuarial analysis which has been described.

No piece of legislation has had more careful, sincere, thoughtful study than this bill has received at the hands of the committee. It is my considered opinion that the amendments reported by the committee represent an eminently fair and just disposition of the issues involved. A brief analysis of its several features will support this viewpoint. It will show that the bill is fair to railroad employees, fair to the railroads as employers of 1,500,000 American workers, is as generous in its provisions as a reasonable system of payroll taxes on railroads and their employees will justify, is a distinct advance over the railroad social insurance system now in effect, and will place that system far in front of the system provided for other industries by the Social Security Act.

On the basis of the report of the actuary and of the recommendations of the subcommittee, the full committee amended the bill as proposed in such a way as to render the retirement system sound on the basis of an additional payroll tax of 5 percent over the present total payroll tax of 7 percent for retirements.

The amendments as approved by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House eliminate some of the features proposed in the original bill and modify other features. The broadened coverage of the proposed bill was eliminated. The committee did not feel that the coverage of the bill should extend beyond those actually enjoyed when in railroad industry. A modified version of the proposed survivor benefits, disability benefits and increased minimum annuities under the Retirement Act were approved. None of the changes proposed in the original bill, with respect to the Unemployment Insurance Act, were approved by the committee. However, the committee did propose amendments to that Act establishing a sliding scale system for the payment of unemployment insurance contributions by employers.

A comparison of the principal amendments proposed in the bill as originally introduced and the amendments as approved by the committee and reported to the House on May 9, 1946, are as follows:

H. R. 1362 As Originally Introduced	H. R. 1362 As Amended by Committee
COVERAGE	
Would specifically add freight forwarders and railroad-controlled motortruck companies to present coverage; would include many independent activities having no relation to the railroad industry.	Proposes no changes in coverage provisions of the present act.
RETIREMENT BENEFITS	
AGE RETIREMENT	
Same as present act except retirement of women at age 60 with no reduction would be permitted.	Same as H. R. 1362 as originally introduced.
DISABILITY RETIREMENT	
Individuals disabled (occupational or otherwise) for work in any regular employment after age 60 or with 10 years of service—no reduction. Individuals disabled (occupational or otherwise) for work in regular railroad occupation after age 60 or with 20 years of service, and who have a "current connection" with the railroad industry (not less than 12 months' service during last 30 consecutive calendar months).	Reduction provision of present act for disability for employment for hire at age 60 with less than 30 years of service is eliminated. In addition, H. R. 1362 amendments as originally introduced are adopted except that disability must be related to employment.
COMPUTATION OF RETIREMENT ANNUITIES	
Same as present act.	Same as present act.
MAXIMUM RETIREMENT BENEFIT	
Same as present act.	Same as H. R. 1362 as originally introduced, except it continues provision of present act for a minimum annuity if he was an employee when he attained age 65 and has completed 20 years of service.
MINIMUM RETIREMENT BENEFIT	
Three dollars multiplied by the number of years of service, or $50, or the monthly compensation, whichever is the least. Individuals must have a "current connection" with the railroad industry and not less than 5 years of service.	Would eliminate joint-survivorship option of present act, but retain cash death-benefit refund of present law, so far as it has accrued to an individual up to January 1, 1947. Would provide survivor annuities to the same persons who would receive those benefits under H. R. 1362 as originally introduced, but computed, according to the formula of the Social Security Act, i. e., about 25 percent less than provided by H. R. 1362 as originally introduced.
SURVIVOR AND DEATH BENEFITS	
Would eliminate both option of joint-survivorship annuity and cash death-benefit refund of present act. Would substitute in lieu thereof a system of benefits to surviving widows, dependent children, and dependent parents, similar to such benefits now provided by the Social Security Act, but increased by 25 percent above those provided by that act and a lump-sum death benefit about 50 percent greater than provided by the Social Security Act.	On compensation not in excess of $300 per month.
RETIREMENT TAX RATES	
On compensation not in excess of $300 multiplied by months of service in calendar year.	

	Railroad	Employee	Total
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1946	5¾	5¾	11½
Jan. 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948	5¾	5¾	11½
Jan. 1, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1951	6	6	12
Jan. 1, 1952, and thereafter	6¼	6¼	12½

Rates after January 1, 1946, include an estimated total tax of 1½ percent of pay roll to make solvent the present act.

	Railroad	Employee	Total
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1946	3½	3½	7
Jan. 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948	6	6	12
Jan. 1, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1951	6	6	12
Jan. 1, 1952, and thereafter	6	6	12

Rates after January 1, 1947, include an estimated total tax of 3 percent of pay roll to make solvent the present act.

RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	
Maximum benefit period 26 weeks.	Same as present act (20 weeks).
Maximum weekly benefit $25.	Same as present act ($20).
Minimum weekly benefit $8.75.	Same as present act ($8.75).

H. R. 1362 As Originally Introduced—Con.	H. R. 1362 As Amended by Committee—Con.
SICKNESS AND MATERNITY BENEFITS	
Would change concept of unemployment as embodied in present law by expanding it to include individual unemployment by reason of sickness or accident in no way caused by or related to railroad employment. Disability from pregnancy and maternity would be included. These benefits would be paid in the same amount and for the same duration as the liberalized benefits for occupational unemployment. Both unemployment and sickness benefits could be drawn in successive periods of the same benefit year.	Same as present act (no sickness or maternity benefits provided).
On compensation not in excess of $300 multiplied by months of service in calendar year—3 percent.	On compensation not in excess of $300 per month.

If the balance to the credit of the account as of the close of business on September 30 of any year as determined by the Secretary, is:	The rate with respect to compensation payable to employees for services rendered during the next succeeding calendar year shall be:
	Percent
$350,000,000 or more	½
$300,000,000 or more but less than $350,000,000	1
$250,000,000 or more but less than $300,000,000	1½
$200,000,000 or more but less than $250,000,000	2
$150,000,000 or more but less than $200,000,000	2½
Less than $150,000,000	3

I trust that the membership will give close and careful consideration to the provisions of the committee bill. It has been drawn so as to give to railroad workers and their families all possible benefits to the end that workers in the railroad industry will feel that degree of security that makes satisfied workers. I ask for your wholehearted support of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS].

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, when there has been so much heat engendered we must know that there are some sincere differences of opinion. I am a member of this committee, which has been considering this bill for some 2 years. I respectfully submit that there have been some delays, there have been some real heated discussions. Whether or not the bill has been brought to the attention of the House in time may be a matter of difference of opinion. I also call to your attention that your decision will be made on whether or not you are going to accept one version or the other. The differences in these two bills are so fundamental, they are so involved and so interlocked, that it will be necessary for you to accept either the Crosser version or the committee bill. Then after you have accepted either one version or the other you are at liberty to amend either one of those versions. There are some things about both of these bills with which I do not agree. However, I am supporting the Crosser version because I think that it meets my idea of what the working men need.

I am going to make my remarks here today more or less to the unemployment insurance angles of this bill. Other remarks will be made in respect to other parts of the bill.

Fundamentally, I would say I do not particularly agree with the provisions of the bill which would make maternity benefits available to women employees who had left the employment of the railroad within 1 year. I understand if the Crosser bill is accepted amendments will be offered to strike those provisions.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Had you heard of any desertion of the insistence on that provision until today?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I have heard a great deal of debate about that. I know in committee we debated it. I have never been for it. I do not know when the decision was made to drop this provision, but I understand a statement has been made by Mr. CROSSER, or someone else, that the amendment will be offered—and that other amendments would be offered. As a matter of fact, regardless of which version of the bill is accepted, I understand that amendments will be offered.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Can the gentleman enlighten us as to why in the course of the work of the subcommittee and the entire committee, suggestion was not made by the proponents of the Crosser bill that amendments like that would be acceptable?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. The gentleman from Indiana will recall that it came down to a question of whether or not we would accept one version of the bill or another version of the bill.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman remembers that we took the bill up section by section and we decided on certain fundamental policies and it was not a question of taking up one version or the other.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I answer that by saying that when we were in committee we did take the bill up section by section. There are some parts of the Crosser bill that I think even those who support the Crosser bill here today are not in accord with. That is, with respect to some minor features of it. But I reiterate, you fundamentally have to accept one version or the other and then go ahead and make your amendments and express yourself as you wish to express yourself here in the votes on the amendments.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I wish the gentleman would explain the difference in these two measures. You gentlemen on the committee are fully familiar with it but the rest of us are not so fully familiar with it. We fail to understand why one version or the other must be accepted when apparently the gentleman feels either version could be amended. I would think amendments to either version would cause a change in the whole actuarial set-up. Can the gentleman explain that?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. It depends on what features you amend. If you take the committee report, you will find a form there more or less like a balance sheet which sets up the benefits under the various plans. If I were to attempt to go into that to explain it, it would take at least half an hour or an hour. You can study it very carefully and get the difference and the advantages or disadvantages as you may perceive them. That would save a great deal of detailed explanation. The report carries that explanation very thoroughly. I am going to take up one feature of it. After I have taken up that particular feature, other members of the committee will take up other features. I am going to apply myself to the unemployment insurance angle. Then you can see the differences as to this particular part of the bill.

The Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act as originally adopted in 1938 provided for contributions to be paid by the employers at the rate of 3 percent of the taxable pay roll. This rate was fixed when the law was enacted, as I said, in 1938. It was made to correspond to the combined State and Federal unemployment insurance tax rate applicable to other industries under the general Federal-State system.

The committee now proposes that this rate be reduced one-half of 1 percent so

long as the balance in the railroad employment insurance account is $350,000,000 or more. The rate would rise by one-half percent for each $50,000,000 by which the account is depleted under that amount.

According to the present 3 percent rate, only if the balance in the account as of September 30 of any particular year is found to be less than $150,000,000. Those of us who support the Crosser bill are vigorously opposed to any such reduction, and I shall point out in my discussion why we cannot accept the committee bill.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. During the time this act has been in operation, how much money has been spent annually for unemployment insurance?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. The unemployment fund has grown a great deal. As a matter of fact, it is very large now.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The unemployment fund is $750,000,000. There has been spent an average of fourteen or fifteen million dollars a year.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. In other words, fourteen or fifteen million dollars a year has been spent for unemployment insurance during the time the act has been in effect?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, if I may proceed, I have all those things explained in my remarks. I have to reach them as I come to them.

As a matter of fact, it was during the inflationary period when almost one-third more employees have been employed than would be employed during ordinary times, when wages have been higher that this fund accumulated. You are going to reduce the rate during that time, and during depression time you will have to increase it.

In discussing this proposal of the committee, it is important first of all to have firmly in mind what the issues are. There is no desire on the part of the supporters of the Crosser bill to have the railroads pay unnecessarily high taxes, because the employees also have to pay those higher taxes, and they are imposing taxes on themselves when they increase those taxes.

Nor is there any disagreement about the fact that the present rate of contribution is more than adequate to finance the present benefit provisions of the act. But there is also no disagreement about the fact that if the benefits payable from the unemployment-insurance account are to be improved as the Crosser bill provides, no reduction is warranted. At least, not the reductions set forth by the committee. The issue, therefore, becomes one of whether the present favorable condition of the account is to be utilized to improve benefits, or whether or not you are going to reduce them and endanger the unemployment benefit funds.

In passing on this issue it is important to recall the process by which unemployment insurance in this country was developed. At the time plans were made for unemployment insurance we were still in the midst of the depression of the thirties. All standards were based on that. Billions were appropriated each year for relief and work relief. Unemployment was heavy. Prospects of a high level of industrial employment were gloomy. Under those conditions it was impossible to set up a system of benefit payments that would constitute an adequate system of unemployment insurance and then appraise the cost of the system. Everyone assumed that if such an approach were followed, one would arrive at costs that simply could not be supported, and the possibility of large percentages of pay-roll tax would be required and would be out of reach. That is what we might run into again if we have another depression.

Consequently the problem was approached from the other end. It was first determined that 3 percent of pay roll would be an appropriate proportion to devote to the purpose and then studies were made to determine what benefits could be supported with the resulting funds. These studies were made under the most difficult conditions. One could not anticipate with confidence that industrial activity would rise to high levels and consequently high pay rolls yielding large revenues from the 3-percent tax. Also we had no experience from which one could judge what the cost of any given benefit plan might be on any assumed pay-roll level. Hence allowance had to be made for very large margins of error in the calculations. Under these conditions even minimum caution required that benefit plans be so framed as to reduce costs.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The present unemployment benefits under the Railway Act are $20 for 20 weeks, are they not?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. That is right.

Mr. HALLECK. And that is the schedule the Congress set for the veterans, and that is the program the Senate set in a bill that body acted on. The Congress refused to go along with $25 for 26 weeks. Does the gentleman favor in this measure going to $25 for 26 weeks in spite of the other actions taken?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I believe that eventually the gentleman will find that Congress will give to all employees $25 for 26 weeks; maybe not soon, but that will come ultimately.

Benefit rates were made very low, substantial waiting periods were required before benefits could be drawn, qualifying and disqualifying conditions were made stringent, and annual maximum benefits were fixed at amounts which could make no pretense to adequacy under conditions of protracted unemployment. I know of no one who defended those arrangements as constituting adequate unemployment insurance. The sole justification was that we were at least making a start in the field and were going as far as we could safely go with our limited experience and with reasonable assurance of staying within the limits of costs considered proper. It was felt that at least there would be some cushioning of the shock of unemployment; with this assistance many individuals might be able sufficiently to supplement their resources so as not to become recipients of relief before finding reemployment; and those whose resources and benefits did become exhausted before they could find reemployment and who would then be dependent upon relief would at least not go on the relief rolls immediately after losing their jobs; furthermore, the unemployment insurance benefit rolls would afford a gage from which to forecast what future relief requirements might be—they would afford an opportunity to identify prospective candidates for relief and thus permit some planning to be done to meet the relief requirements. These minimum purposes would at least be served and if experience showed that revenues would be sufficient to accomplish more, the benefit formulas could be progressively liberalized to accomplish the maximum protection against unemployment within the limits of the funds available That has been the underlying plan ever since.

Experience has demonstrated that it is possible to achieve more adequate protection within the limits of costs that were initially fixed and have since been observed. There has been a constant improvement and liberalization of benefit payments under the State plans. When the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act was enacted in 1938, its benefit formulas were worked out so as to correspond in liberality to the more liberal of the State plans. But by 1940 it was apparent that more liberal benefits could be supported and the act was then amended to liberalize benefits. This same process has also been going on with respect to the State laws. Notwithstanding the 1940 amendments it was testified at the hearings last year on H. R. 1362 by the Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board that the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act was then probably less liberal than the average of the State plans; since the formulas vary greatly and numerous elements go into the determination of comparative liberality, it is impossible to make exact comparisons. But it certainly cannot be denied that during the period from 1940 to 1945 when the railroad plan remained static the various State plans were being progressively liberalized and hence by 1945 the railroad plan was necessarily relatively less liberal in comparison with the State plans than it was in 1940. In the year that has elapsed since the hearings were held, many of the State laws have been further liberalized, and I am now informed that as of the present time the railroad plan is probably as much as 20 percent less liberal than the average of the State laws.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made comparisons between benefits under State laws and those proposed by the Crosser bill. May I invite his attention to the fact that the average weekly benefits under the Railroad Employment Act for January of this year were $16.25 a week and that for the same month the average benefits under the

State laws of the Nation were $19.15 a week?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. That is the average. About 20 percent less.

Mr. NEELY. The Crosser bill, if it had been in effect would have increased the $16.25 approximately 5 percent. That would have made the benefits under the railroad law, plus the Crosser bill's augmentation in this instance, $17.06 a week.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. It would still be less.

Mr. NEELY. Yes; more than $2 a week less than the average paid under State laws.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I know the gentleman does not mean to make an erroneous statement. He spoke awhile ago about what the workers were paying in on unemployment compensation.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. In what respect was I in error?

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman said they made payments on unemployment compensation.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. They make contributions in their employment. I want to clarify that.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Contributions to what?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. To their retirement.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Well, that is correct, but retirement and the unemployment compensation fund are two distinctly different things. The gentleman made the statement that they contributed to the unemployment compensation fund.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I will make that correction.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I have asked the gentleman to yield in order that I may have some clarification made of the statement made by the gentleman from West Virginia with reference to the average unemployment. Would the gentleman be willing to inform me just how he arrived at that average?

Mr. NEELY. The averages stated were obtained from a source which, in my opinion, is thoroughly reliable.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Will the gentleman kindly explain the basis?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further. The two gentlemen can get together, discuss it, and clarify it later.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute to answer the question.

Mr. NEELY. If the gentleman denies that the figures are correct, I shall endeavor to produce my authority.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I am not denying anything the gentleman said except I would like to know the basis for them. I am not certain that the basis is correct.

Mr. NEELY. Neither am I, but I nevertheless do not doubt its correctness.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Would the gentleman care to state the authority?

Mr. NEELY. I shall seek permission to disclose to the gentleman the name of the official who supplied me with the information upon which my statement was based.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Of course, I will appreciate having that. I think the gentleman has been misled. I attribute no ulterior motive to the gentleman in making the statement, however.

Mr. NEELY. If I find that the figures I have given are incorrect, I shall certainly correct them in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has again expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from West Virginia to the fact that while the States do pay more, yet the carriers pay longer. The average is larger and longer.

Mr. SAVAGE. How long do the carriers pay?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Twenty weeks.

Mr. SAVAGE. In my State of Washington they pay for 26 weeks.

Mr. BULWINKLE. We are talking about the average.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further because I have certain things I want to get in the RECORD.

The committee proposal would reverse all that has been accomplished. Although 6 years have elapsed since there has been any improvement in railroad unemployment benefits while State laws have been continuously liberalized, the committee throws out all proposed improvements in unemployment insurance and proposes that the accumulated reserves be diverted to the advantage of the employers through tax reduction. These reserves have accumulated in part because we have had very favorable employment conditions and in part because we have been inattentive to our obligation to make progressive liberalizations as experience has demonstrated the availability of funds. I want to remind the House that for the past 2 years—One-third of the period that has elapsed since the last amendments—the railroad employees have been pressing for the adoption of the improvements now before the House and this is the first time that their proposals have even come to the floor for consideration.

Apparently the committee draws some justification for its action from the operation of so-called merit-rating or experience-rating provisions in the State laws. When the State unemployment insurance systems were being framed there were numbers of people who felt that some provision should be made to encourage individual employers to reduce unemployment by stabilizing employment in their establishments and that the possibility of being allowed some tax credit for such an achievement would be a good inducement. This thought was apparently suggested by casualty insurance practices particularly with respect to workmen's compensation insurance. In that field it is the general practice that an employer who succeeds in reducing accidents in his establishment can attain a lower insurance premium rate. Many students of social insurance felt that this analogy had no application to unemployment insurance because in the first place unemployment unlike accidents is not primarily the result of conditions in the particular establishment but of general economic conditions over which the employer has no control. In the second place it was pointed out that since individuals must have a substantial period of qualifying employment before being entitled to benefits employers might be tempted to achieve a favorable merit-rating position by releasing employees before they had the necessary amount of qualifying employment, thus creating conditions the exact opposite of those that merit rating was intended to encourage. And in the third place it was pointed out that the tendency of such schemes would be to reduce taxes when business conditions were good and to increase taxes when conditions were bad and the employers could least afford the increase. Finally it was suggested that in times of very favorable employment conditions these schemes would give tax reductions to all employers regardless of their individual merit and thus counteract the plan for progressively more liberal benefit payments if experience showed that the financing could support them.

It is not my purpose to go into any detailed appraisal of the extent to which experience has shown these objections to State merit-rating systems to be valid. Notwithstanding these objections, merit-rating schemes have gained fairly widespread acceptance in the States. On the other hand, when the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act was adopted and when it has been before us for amendment the Congress considered these objections to merit rating to have sufficient validity so that we did not consider it proper to adopt any such scheme.

The tax reduction plan proposed by the committee is in any event subject to condemnation on several of these grounds irrespective of whether the same may be true of the various merit-rating schemes under State laws. The committee's proposal departs completely from the basic concept on which merit-rating schemes gained their acceptance. It abandons all pretext of rewarding meritorious practices of the individual employer. It provides for tax reductions in which all employers participate equally and which come into operation solely by virtue of the balance in the unemployment insurance account. An individual employer may follow the best possible practices for stabilizing employment and have his efforts completely counteracted so far as its effect on the employment insurance account is concerned by the unstabilizing practices of other employers. Thus it

is in any event clear that regardless of what beneficial effects merit rating as practiced in the States may have on the stabilization of employment any pretense of duplicating that effect in the railroad industry is completely lacking in the committee's proposal.

I do not know to what extent the operation of State merit-rating provisions to bring about general reductions in taxes may have counteracted the plan of progressive liberalization. We know that in consequence of the very favorable employment conditions of the past several years these merit-rating schemes have brought about some degree of general tax reduction. On the other hand, it is nevertheless also unquestionably true that during this period the State laws have been progressively improved and liberalized. Whatever the effect of State systems may have been we need not speculate about the effect of the committee's proposal here. We could have no more dramatic demonstration of it than the committee itself gives when its proposal for tax reduction is conjoined with its recommendation that all proposed improvements in unemployment insurance benefits be eliminated from the bill notwithstanding the fact that 6 years have elapsed since any such improvements were made and the Railway Act has fallen behind State legislation in liberality.

Finally, the fact that the committee's proposal would operate to reduce taxes in times of prosperity and to increase them in times of depression has a particularly odious application to the railroad industry. It may be that with respect to outside employers it is not the function of government to concern itself too much about this factor. Perhaps it is proper to say that the individual employer must deal with this consideration on his own responsibility. If he is foresighted enough he can make provision in times of prosperity for meeting the increased taxes which he knows will occur when periods of depression impair his favorable merit-rating position; and if he is not sufficiently foresighted to determine these effects and to provide for them, perhaps the Government has no obligation to concern itself over whether he stays in business or not. I express no opinion on those questions, but whatever the Government's obligations in this respect may be toward outside industry, it is undeniably clear what the Government's obligations are with respect to the railroad industry. It is unthinkable that Government should ever be indifferent to whether railroads stay in business. We have not felt any such indifference in the past and it is unthinkable that we could in the future. During the last depression we not only enacted emergency railroad legislation and revised the bankruptcy laws to facilitate the solution of the critical financial problems in the railroad industry but through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation we devoted many millions of dollars of public funds to bailing out the railroads. If we now permit railroads to deplete the unemployment insurance reserves by reducing their contributions to one-half of 1 percent until half the reserve has been consumed as the committee proposes to do, and then during a future period of depression those rates will have to be increased as the committee proposes they would, there can be no doubt that the Public Treasury would be called upon again to ease the railroads out of their financial difficulty.

It is thus clear that irrespective of whether State merit-rating schemes are justified (and this is still a highly controversial question notwithstanding the widespread adoption of the schemes) at least the proposal recommended by the committee warrants our condemnation. It makes no gesture toward achieving stability of employment. It is part and parcel of a plan to foreclose any liberalization of unemployment insurance benefits and it would call upon the Public Treasury to underwrite in future years the replenishment of the reserves which the committe now proposes to deplete in tax reductions.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that during most of this period you have had war-inflated times, and if you permit the unemployment compensation fund to be reduced to $150,000,000, with a possible depression coming on, you will not be able to meet the demand that will come upon the fund. I respectfully submit to this committee that this is one of the major issues, and you would have to supplement the entire committee bill with the Crosser provisions, otherwise you could not meet the provisions of the Crosser bill by amending the committee bill in this respect.

I submit that the Crosser bill should be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I find no fault with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I am sure they did the best they knew how with the light they had. I may find some fault with that light—the statistician. I favor and feel that this committee should consider H. R. 1362 as introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]. This with such amendments as the committee may adopt under the 5-minute rule.

I was a Member when the original Railroad Retirement Act was passed. I was a Member when that act was held unconstitutional. I was also a Member when the present Railroad Retirement Act was passed. I do not recall that there was any agreement between management and the rail organizations. As I recall it was passed in the closing days of the Congress. It was passed because an overwhelming majority of the House had signed a petition that they would not consent to adjournment until that bill was acted upon. I was one of those signers.

We knew at that time, as we know with any bill that we pass, that it was not perfect. No legislative body has yet reached perfection. No legislative body is infallible. It is perhaps well that that is so. Otherwise there would be no need of future sessions of Congress and the Nation would become stagnant.

Therefore, I suggest that we act on the Crosser bill in place of the committee bill. The railroad and coal strikes are over. There must be a solution to these disastrous strikes. But so far the public and the Congress have been dealing only with the effect—not the cause—of these strikes. This bill deals with the cause.

The public is entitled to transportation service, but the railroad employees are also entitled to security—security from want after they have given the best part of their lives serving the public. There can be no rational objection to that position.

In considering this legislation we must remember that the laboring man's dollar has only 50-cent purchasing power as compared with 1937 and 1938. In fact, it buys less. His dollar is as depreciated as yours. His cost of living has doubled the same as yours. No one has a right to expect labor to produce below a decent living wage and security from want after retirement, after a life well spent serving others.

We are here dealing with the cause of strikes. Give the employees security and that will reduce strikes. I am not asking the railroads to do the impossible and operate at a loss, but that loss, if any, must not be made up at the expense of their employees. The human side—the employees—of our transportation system must be put on an equality with dividends. It must be put on a basis of security. No one has a right to expect cheaper transportation at the expense of security to the employees, security from want, and by that I do not mean merely a subsistence but a sufficient retirement compensation to afford an American standard of living.

The hostility toward organized labor by the paid propaganda over the radio and the metropolitan press and theaters should be ignored. Organized labor, I am informed, with its families and relatives, consists of 48 percent of our population. Whether we like it or not, they have 48 percent say about the government under which we live, 48 percent say about the laws that we enact.

Railroad labor did a marvelous job during the war. At best they got a raw deal from the New Deal. They, too, are tired of being regimented—of government by bureaucracy. May I suggest that if we have good sense we will cooperate with labor? If we are going to abolish government by bureaucracy we must have some of labor's support. If we are going to clean house of some of the obnoxious alphabetical set-ups, then we must have sense enough to give a square deal—security—to labor.

We must never forget that this is their Government as much as ours. To ignore labor's just demands injures all of us. It creates disunity when our Nation needs, in the words of the President, "to get to work."

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, the able gentleman from North Dakota has observed that the purchasing power of the dollar has depreciated approximately 50 percent since 1937 when the Congress enacted the law which we are seeking to amend. The gentleman's deduction has my unhesitating concurrence. Upon the basis of that deduction, would it not be necessary for the benefits provided by the present railroad-retirement and railroad-unemployment legislation to be in-

creased a hundred percent in order to provide railroad employees purchasing power equal to that which they enjoyed under the the law during the year immediately following its enactment in 1937?

Mr. LEMKE. That is absolutely correct. If we are ever going to pay our public debt it will be necessary to recognize that we have a depreciated dollar which is worth only 50 cents. Labor cannot be expected to produce the new wealth with which to pay the indebtedness on a 50-cent subsistence dollar without an increase in salary, wages, and retirement income.

Mr. NEELY. Does the gentleman find that the Crosser bill provides any 100-percent increases for railroad men?

Mr. LEMKE. I do not. I think the Crosser bill is very conservative.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the laboring men of the country had gotten a raw deal from the New Deal?

Mr. LEMKE. I say the railroad men have. I think they got a very raw deal the way their increase in wages was juggled under the Director of Economic Stabilization, now Chief Justice Vinson.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thought the gentleman said that the laboring men of the country had gotten a raw deal under the New Deal.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman would use some of his time since I only have 45 minutes remaining?

Mr. CROSSER. Well, both of you gentlemen had 45 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina, the gentleman from New Jersey, or the gentleman from Ohio seek recognition to use time?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PATMAN, 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. 1362) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ORLANDO, FLA.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud of the Queen City of Florida—Orlando. I do not hesitate to say that Orlando is the most beautiful inland city in the State of Florida, and I cannot say too much for the citizenship of Orlando and Orange County. They are excellent people. This, of course, leads up to the main point of my discourse.

On the Saturday before Easter 1946 Mrs. Margaret Bowe, a secretary in Orlando, told a reporter of the Orlando Morning Sentinel staff that she had an idea that might make a good feature story and might also be the beginning of a fine project.

The Easter Sunday issue of the Sentinel carried her idea. It was that parents adopt children, relatives adopt other relatives, families adopt families occasionally. Why, then, could not Orlando adopt a city in Europe with a population comparable to that of Orlando to aid in supplying it with food during the period to ensue before the harvest in that European area was ready?

The Orlando Junior Chamber of Commerce picked up the idea the following day, April 22. Clem Brossier, managing editor of the Sentinel, was appointed over-all chairman of a committee to set the project in motion. By nightfall Brossier had set up subcommittees to contact chain grocers, independent grocers, schools, churches, women's clubs, and so forth. He had gotten in touch with UNRRA officials and they had enthusiastically endorsed the project. On Tuesday, April 23, the announcement of the Orlando plan, so dubbed by a reporter assigned to the coverage of the project, reached the citizens of central Florida via the Sentinel. The townspeople took to the plan like a duck to water. A special meeting of the Women's Community Council was called. The council's 37 members are representatives of every woman's organization in the city. They took the plan back to their separate organizations.

The big idea was to have bins installed in every grocery store in the city. As customers paid for their purchase they could deposit in the bins extra cans of food they had bought to contribute to the adopted city. When the plan had been in operation 3 days, the junior chamber of commerce decided on Volos, Greece, as the city it wanted to adopt. Greece has never been at war with the United States, and was one of the countries hardest hit by the invading Nazi and Fascist hordes. Volos, with a population of about 48,000, compared favorably with Orlando in size. It, like the central Florida metropolis, is surrounded by 24 villages and small communities, making it the hub of that section of Greece. Its climate compares favorably with that of central Florida as well, and there is some production of oranges. As the plan gained momentum, the Orange County Ministerial Association got behind it. They preached special sermons, exhorting their congregations to support the drive. The schools fell in line. More than 50 posters were painted by members of the Orlando High School art classes. Bins were placed in schools and students brought cans of food with them. The 800 students at the Negro high school collected 5,000 cans in 1 week. Restaurant keepers joined the drive. They set up displays of canned food at their cashiers' booths and offered the food at wholesale prices for contribution to Volos. One restaurateur, George Camichos, is a native of Zagaros, Greece, just 12 miles from Volos, and his two brothers and many other relatives live in Volos. He wept when he heard that Volos had been selected for adoption. George Berke, operator of a cold-storage plant, donated two steers, which he slaughtered and dressed down to 600 pounds of boned meat. The meat was put into cans by volunteer women workers, which included members of the Red Cross Canteen Corps. On Mother's Day several churches asked their members to bring cans of baby food or food especially adaptable to mothers of small babies, as a gesture to the mothers of Volos. Thousands of cans of precious food piled up in the church lobbies. UNRRA pledged itself to exert every effort to see that the food goes directly to Volos, but because of prior commitments, transportation difficulties, and other obstacles, the Government agency could give no ironclad guarantee. Angelo Tsimas, a naturalized American citizen who was born and brought up in Volos, and who now is one of the leading citizens of Stuart, Fla., has gone to Volos to visit his aged mother there. He carried with him letters from Mayor William Beardall, of Orlando, to the mayor of Volos, and two letters from Cliff Cashion, junior chamber of commerce president, to the people of Volos and the Premier of Greece, explaining what Orlando is trying to do for the city. The Orlando Army Air Base, commanded by Maj. Gen. Donald Wilson, is supplying warehouse space for the thousands of cans of food being poured into the stock pile. The first carload, some 50,000 cans was expected to be ready for shipment to a port of embarkation on May 18.

As the drive progressed, many persons asked if they could donate cash. At first this was refused, because, as UNRRA Director LaGuardia had said, "Those people can't eat money." However, a decision was made to accept cash donations, and I. A. Mayfield, an official of the First National Bank of Orlando, was named treasurer of the Orlando Plan Committee. Immediately checks ranging in size from $5 to $100 started to come in. Much credit is due to the women of Orlando for their untiring efforts, but the moving force behind the project was Clem Brossier, the dynamic young managing editor of the Sentinel. This 27-year-old ex-coast guardsman barked orders at his subcommitteemen in the same manner that he does at his reporters. Without his driving force and genius for coordination, the Orlando plan might never have been the success that it was.

Mr. Speaker, this plan was aided greatly by the Orlando Morning Sentinel and the Reporter-Star, and I suggest to other cities and newspapers throughout the country that they adopt such a plan.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, to include a speech in one instance and newspaper articles in the other two.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from

Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE PROPOSED LOAN TO BRITAIN

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, there is, in and out of the Government, today much talk of foreign loans, and for the past 8 months I have been studying this question from all angles. Almost every nation in the world is looking toward the United States for some sort of financial assistance in order to rehabilitate itself.

This is the country of wealth and plenty; at least many people think so. We have been wealthy—prodigiously so—in comparison with our neighbors, but that wealth has been exploited by the few and not distributed to the many on an equitable basis. That wealth has been spent lavishly and with very little thought of the future. Our natural resources have been stripped to such an extent that it is time we stop, take an inventory of what remains, and proceed from there.

To date we have been muddling toward a loan policy with foreign nations. We have been cast in the role of the paternal parent with a heart, a mind, and a purse full of gold which we hand out just for the asking. We have been so generous that we have earned the contempt of some nations, the fawning of others, and the respect of a few.

Our money and our wealth have been distributed lavishly during the course—I should say curse—of two world wars. In the First World War it was loaned on what many of us thought to be a sound business basis. We expected to get it back, but with the exception of Finland all the other debtor powers have failed to meet their commitments. We have requested payments from them, but all we receive any more is a polite acknowledgment of our requests and a promise to discuss them at some future date.

The result has been that many of our people feel we have been taken for a ride. These loans came out of the pockets of our people and any future commitments must come from the same source.

I have received a statement from the Treasury Department showing the total indebtedness of foreign governments to the United States as of January 1, 1946, and based on loans made during and immediately following the First World War, which I am inserting at this point in my remarks.

Statement showing total indebtedness of foreign governments to the United States as of Jan. 1, 1946

Country	Principal unpaid	Interest unpaid	Total indebtedness
Funded debts:			
Belgium	$400, 680, 000. 00	$107, 057, 077. 60	$507, 737, 077. 60
Czechoslovakia	165, 241, 108. 90	12, 124, 970. 11	177, 366, 079. 01
Estonia	16, 466, 012. 87	8, 311, 952. 94	24, 777, 965. 81
Finland	7, 743, 589. 51	707, 872. 16	8, 451, 461. 67
France	3, 863, 650, 000. 00	781, 508, 529. 40	4, 645, 158, 529. 40
Germany (Austrian indebtedness)	25, 980, 480. 66	44, 058. 93	26, 024, 539. 59
Great Britain	4, 368, 000, 000. 00	2, 123, 614, 782. 58	6, 491, 614, 782. 58
Greece	31, 516, 000. 00	5, 575, 455. 10	37, 091, 455. 10
Hungary	1, 908, 560. 00	865, 563. 13	2, 774, 123. 13
Italy	2, 004, 900, 000. 00	49, 804, 284. 34	2, 054, 704, 284. 34
Latvia	6, 879, 464. 20	3, 355, 124. 84	10, 234, 589. 04
Lithuania	6, 197, 682. 00	2, 974, 242. 37	9, 171, 924. 37
Poland	206, 057, 000. 00	104, 023, 634. 20	310, 080, 634. 20
Rumania	63, 860, 560. 43	11, 973, 279. 13	75, 833, 839. 56
Yugoslavia	61, 625, 000. 00	1, 925, 786. 28	63, 550, 781. 28
Total	11, 230, 705, 458. 57	3, 213, 866, 608. 11	14, 444, 572, 066. 68
Unfunded debts:			
Armenia	11, 959, 917. 49	15, 529, 449. 47	27, 489, 366. 96
Russia	192, 601, 297. 37	260, 181, 336. 39	452, 782, 633. 76
Total	204, 561, 214. 86	275, 710, 785. 86	480, 272, 000. 72
Grand total	11, 435, 266, 673. 43	3, 489, 577, 393. 97	14, 924, 844, 067. 40

Then came the Second World War and, before our entrance into it, the Lend-Lease Act was passed on March 11, 1941. Under the terms of this act, aid and assistance was to be given to our allies and favored neutrals. This finally amounted to $46,040,000,000, as of October 1, 1945. On August 17, 1945, President Truman issued a directive relative to the termination of lend-lease aid and a transitional program was developed by the Foreign Economic Administration and offered to the lend-lease governments. The responsibility for the completion of their transitional negotiations has now been assumed by the State Department pursuant to the President's Executive order of September 27, 1945, in which the functions of the Foreign Economic Administrator, under the Lend-Lease Act of March 11, 1941, were ended.

In the twenty-first report to Congress on lend-lease operations for the period ending September 30, 1945, the total lend-lease aid, by countries, was as follows:

Lend-lease aid, by country, March 1941 to October 1, 1945

COUNTRY AND AMOUNT	
British Empire	$30, 269, 210, 000
U. S. S. R.	10, 801, 131, 000
France	1, 406, 600, 000
China	631, 509, 000
American Republics	421, 467, 000
Netherlands	162, 157, 000
Greece	75, 416, 000
Belgium	52, 443, 000
Norway	34, 640, 000
Turkey	28, 063, 000
Yugoslavia	25, 884, 000
Other countries	43, 284, 000
Aid not charged to foreign governments	2, 088, 249, 000
Total lend-lease aid	46, 040, 054, 000

In the same report the total reverse lend-lease aid received by the United States to July 1, 1945, by countries, was as follows:

COUNTRY AND AMOUNT	
United Kingdom	$4, 220, 299, 000
Fiji Islands	10, 277, 000
Nigeria	2, 877, 000
Gold Coast	6, 924, 000
Other colonies	762, 000
Total from United Kingdom	4, 241, 139, 000
Australia	$835, 004, 000
New Zealand	204, 566, 000
India	639, 443, 000
Union of South Africa	885, 000
Total British Empire	5, 921, 037, 000
France (to Feb. 1, 1945)	200, 615, 000
French Africa	70, 358, 000
France—New Caledonia	1, 171, 000
Belgium	55, 647, 000
Belgian Congo	182, 000
Netherlands	1, 133, 000
Netherlands — Curaçao and Surinam	917, 000
China	3, 672, 000
U. S. S. R.	2, 139, 000
Total	6, 256, 871, 000

Adding all this up, we arrive at the following financial statement:

First World War loans made, $11,781-822,099.86.

First World War loans collected, $2,-751,406,272.55.

First World War loans owing, $14,924,-844,067.40, principal and interest.

Lend-lease expenditures, $46,040,054,-000.

Reverse lend-lease aid, $6,256,871,000.

Total United States expenditures, $54,-707,973,067.40.

This means that over 54 billions of American dollars have been loaned or lend-leased in two world wars exclusive of First World War loans repaid and reverse lend-lease. In addition to our other sacrifices and to the expenditures listed above, we have allocated or contemplate allocating additional billions of dollars t the Export-Import Bank in the sum of $3,353,000,000; the International Bank, $5,925,000,000 and UNRRA, $2,-700,000,000. There have also been strong indications that the USSR will approach us for a loan of six billions, France for two and one-half billions, China for three billions, and others for smaller amounts. The question naturally arises: where is all this money coming from and where is the backing for it?

What has happened to date is now past, but I do want to see this proposed loan to Britain and any future loan negotiations carried on in a sound and businesslike manner and the United States given something in return besides empty promises and polite acknowledgments. Friendship cannot be bought; it must be earned.

On the question of loans I do not think we should deal with one nation at a time—as we are now doing—but with all the applicant nations at the same time. Let them state how much they want to borrow, and let us set up a budget and see how much we have. We cannot afford to negotiate with each nation singly because the favorable terms which our negotiators give to one will be asked for by all and, in some cases, even more

favorable terms will be desired. Let all loans be considered together, and a sound, practical, businesslike basis for repayment be arranged. Obviously we cannot expect to be paid in cash, but just as obviously we should expect good collateral for these loans, based on such factors as equal trade rights and the stock piling of resources which we need but do not have, that is, tin, rubber, tungsten, antimony, chrome, and other materials. Surely the "have" countries and the others could agree to a transaction of this kind in the negotiations now taking place or likely to be considered.

For more than a year, the United States was the only major power to ratify the Bretton Woods Pact—the organization which was set up to finance the transition from war to peace. We were told Bretton Woods had to be rushed through Congress, so we ratified it in the spring of 1945. Since then, our allies have taken their time on this measure and indications point to the possibility that this procedure has been adopted to make us amenable to loans as a prerequisite to signing. We are not on the defensive in this matter, and I think it is a poor business to allow ourselves to be maneuvered into a position where other nations can hold a club over us.

The proposed loan to Britain was conducted behind closed doors without either the Congress or the people having any idea what the terms were until the negotiators had agreed among themselves. This was not in the public interest because our people were kept in ignorance of what was transpiring and consequently could not exert any direct influence on the negotiations.

When the Anglo-American negotiators reached an agreement on the proposed loan in December 1945, it was brought up in Parliament for its consideration. It is to be noted that Britain delayed ratifying the Bretton Woods agreement until they had a chance to know what the loan entailed, and only after they knew this did they vote for the pact and eventually for the loan. Furthermore, on May 21, 1946, Mr. Will Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State, made the statement that Britain would withdraw from Bretton Woods and other international agreements if she fails to get the loan. It is pertinent to ask if the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is holding back on its agreement to Bretton Woods for the same reason. It is my understanding that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics agreed to furnish a statement of its gold reserves immediately after the Bretton Woods Conference, but to date it has not been forthcoming. Why?

The proposed British loan is for $3,375,000,000 and is to be repaid in annual installments over a period of from 5 to 55 years. During the first 5 years no interest is to be paid and thereafter the rate will be 2 percent per annum. On this basis—considering the first 5 years as interest free—the average interest rate amounts to only 1.62 percent per annum providing interest is paid every year after the first 5 years.

However, there is a provision in the agreement that no interest will be charged in any year that the United Kingdom has an unfavorable international exchange position. When that occurs not only is interest waived, but it is also not accumulative. If this were to happen in one-half of the 50 years, the average interest rate would be less than 1 percent.

In this respect it is worth while to note that during the past few years the United States Government, when it borrows money from the American people, pays an average interest rate of 1.92 percent. This means that the money we borrow from our own people to loan to foreign governments is negotiated on a basis that, in effect, means a loss to us. We are not only loaning the money but we are also paying part of the interest. It is interesting to note, too, that money loaned to our returning veterans under the GI bill of rights draws interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum.

Under the terms of the proposed British loan we also agree to accept the United Kingdom's note for $650,000,000 as full settlement for the unpaid balance on lend-lease and all our investments, material, and surpluses in the United Kingdom. This is a gift, pure and simple.

In return the United Kingdom has agreed to eliminate the dollar pool within the British Empire 1 year after Congress ratifies the loan agreement. This would mean that the countries comprising the British Empire could then use their current dollar receipts without restriction in world trade channels. There is nothing in the agreement to show that we will receive anything in the nature of foreign bases, raw materials, communications, or other concessions. The British will, in return for this loan, cooperate in working out world agreements covering trade, but this is a costly procedure and we can only wonder what the price will be to get the cooperation, on this basis, of the other members of the United Nations.

Furthermore, the Johnson Act, which prohibits the sale in American markets of securities of nations in default to the United States Government, is now virtually nullified. The reason is that the Bretton Woods Act, as passed by Congress last July, says that it is not to apply to any government belonging to the Bretton Woods Reconstruction Bank and Currency Stabilization Fund. This means that England, France, Belgium, Russia, and all the other countries which have defaulted on their World War I loans and all of whom, except Russia, have become charter members of the Bretton Woods Bank and Fund, will have their legal obligations or debts already owed to us wiped out. This means, then, that all debts owed the United States resulting from the First World War and the rehabilitation period following would be nullified by any nation joining the Bretton Woods Reconstruction Bank and Currency Stabilization Fund.

All of this makes me wonder at the wisdom of the course we are taking. In my opinion we cannot keep on making huge expenditures, increasing the national debt, and at the same time expect to balance the budget and reduce taxes. I could not see my way clear last year to vote to reduce taxes for our own people by almost $6,000,000,000 when we owe, as of February 15, 1946, $279,496,766,104.49—an average of $1,991.52 for every American—face a $30,000,000,000 deficit this year, and continue to borrow money from our own people for the expenses of government. Why not use this money we are asked to loan, to take care of our housing needs, our veterans, and to help balance the budget? While there is a great deal that I do not know about matters financial, I do recognize such things as debts, deficits, taxes, and rates of interest. One thing I cannot coordinate in my think is the logic of an interest rate of 1.62 percent, and possibly less, on a loan to a foreign government as compared with an interest rate of 4 percent for a veteran and a rate of 5 to 6 percent for a citizen who borrows from a bank and who has to offer 100-percent security besides.

While what I have said applies to only one nation, I feel that questions of a like character might apply to other nations. Therefore, we should consider all nations' applications at the same time and on terms that would constitute good, sound business. There cannot be too much forgiveness because what the nations of the world do not repay, our own people will have to.

We are not the richest Nation on earth. In this war we have lost more than a million men in killed and wounded and our natural resources have been blasted, burned, and shot away.

Between 1941 and 1945 we used up oil equivalent to about one-fourth of present proved petroleum reserves. We shot away about 7 percent of our commercial iron-ore reserves; one-fifth of our commercial copper reserves; one-fourth of our lead reserves; and one-fourth of our zinc reserves.

We still have immense reserves of coal and submarginal iron ore but only scanty resources of manganese and chrome. We must rely heavily on imports for antimony, tin, nickel, tungsten, vanadium, mica, and other minerals vital both in peace and in war.

Modern-day conditions and unprecedented wartime depletion of resources call for a new look at our natural resources policy. As a result of a Bureau of Mines study of 33 mines we find that 9 minerals—salt, magnesium, bituminous coal and lignites, phosphate rock, potash, iron, anthracite coal, and molybdenum—are ample enough in commercial reserves to last more than 100 years.

Natural gas reserves were available, it is estimated, for 48 years; sulphur, 45; fluorspar, 40; copper, 34; zinc, 19; petroleum, 18; cadmium, 16; gold, 14; lead, 12; silver, 11; bauxite, 9; vanadium, 7; and antimony, 4.

Commercial tungsten reserves were estimated to be good for 4 years, platinum, 4; mercury, 3; asbestos, 3; manganese, 2; chromite, 1; and nickel and tin less than 1 year. No industrial reserves were shown for industrial diamonds, quartz crystals, or flake graphite.

Stock piling from abroad is the answer to our need of strategic minerals that are in short supply or totally lacking in this country. England and other nations now seeking loans from us have many of these, which we should receive in return for any commitments made.

In this category should be included tin, antimony, nickel, industrial diamonds, platinum, asbestos, and other minerals which we do not have or are in exceedingly short supply as well as commodities such as rubber, cocoa, tea, silk, kapok, hemp, and the like.

Harold Ickes, the former Secretary of the Interior, stated in an article in the American magazine for December 1945 that due to the depletion of our natural resources—

> We no longer deserve to be listed with Russia and the British Empire as one of the "have" nations.

Continuing, he states:

> Between January 1, 1940, and January 1, 1945, we tore from the earth 5,000,000,000 tons of minerals. To prevent the decline of the United States as a major military and industrial power and to maintain our high standard of living, we must begin at once to stock-pile minerals; to explore our country more extensively than ever before; to hunt for better methods of reconverting metals from scrap.

The statement has been made that the United Kingdom, on the basis of resources considered, contributed more to the defeat of the Axis than did the United States. Perhaps this is true because no one disputes that the United Kingdom's resources are less than those which we possess. But, the real question is, What are the British Empire's resources? That Empire covers one-quarter of the habitable globe and encompasses more than 13,000,000 square miles—more than four times the area of the United States.

Britain has claimed a 20-percent decline in the United Kingdom's national wealth as a result of the war. As I have tried to point out our losses were likewise as heavy and, on an actual basis, far more colossal. While the British talk in terms of the United Kingdom's resources—leaving out the huge, almost untapped resources of their Empire—we must consider our resources here in the United States as pretty much all that we have.

Britain also states that she needs a loan because she owes $15,000,000,000 abroad—mostly within the Empire and its dependencies. This is a far lesser sum than the $25,000,000,000 contributed by us in lend-lease which we are not going to get back. Why, then, does not the sterling area treat its contributions to Britain more or less the same way?

Britain also compares the respective drains on manpower as a reason for special consideration. What this has to do with a loan I do not know, but let us take a look at the record. Britain asserts men and women employed in the armed services or war industries were 55 percent of the total compared with only 40 percent in the United States. This, however, applies only to the United Kingdom and does not include the Empire with its 557,000,000 inhabitants against our 140,000,000 inhabitants. Altogether, the Empire provided 10,000,000 men for the armed services whereas our total has been approximately 15,000,000.

What they did or did not do in the war has no relation to this proposed loan. We do not have to be sold on what Britain and our other allies did in the war because we know and appreciate their efforts. We would like to be helpful to all our deserving allies, but we should do so on an over-all group basis and in line with our own solvency, resources, needs, and our taxpayers' interest.

All these factors should be considered before we embark on a policy of large-scale lending abroad. We should, in the words of Bernard Baruch, draw up a national balance sheet showing this country's present obligations and the resources and productive capacity on hand to meet them. I am afraid that no one knows accurately, at this time, what our assets are or our real debt is.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I cannot in good conscience vote for this proposed loan at this time. We know that once it is approved, France, the U. S. S. R., Poland, China, and other countries are going to approach us for loans. It is time, now, to call a halt and to realize that a day of reckoning is at hand. To continue a policy such as contemplated is unsound and unwise, and the sooner we get down to earth the better it will be for our own country and the world. In the interest of good relations between Britain and America—not ill-feeling and ill will—this loan proposal should be defeated. My reasons, in summary, for voting against this loan are:

First. Before we give consideration to proposed loans, we should take a survey of our own resources and assets so that we would have an approximate idea as to what we have; set up a budget; see how solvent our country is, and how far we can go.

Second. We should deal with all nations applying for loans at the same time and on the same basis.

Third. Our loans should be secured in the form of ocean and air bases and products which we lack entirely or have in extremely short supply.

Fourth. No country should hold up ratification of the Bretton Woods Pact as a means of obtaining a loan.

Fifth. The loan was negotiated in secret and ratified by the British Parliament before the United States Congress had the terms referred to it.

Sixth. The interest rate is too low in comparison with loans to our own soldiers under the GI bill and to our citizens in everyday life.

Seventh. We have our own debt to pay and we owe twice as much as all our allies combined.

Eighth. We face continued heavy taxation and deficit Government financing.

Ninth. We are not the richest nation on earth.

Tenth. If Britain could not pay her First World War debt how could she pay this one?

Eleventh. If Britain puts up no real security, other nations will not expect to give adequate guaranties in asking for loans.

Twelfth. I feel the credit or loan to Britain could be more adequately financed by the British Empire in the form of debt forgiveness.

Thirteenth. The loan will help further inflation in this country by making scarce goods more scarce.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. STIGLER, indefinitely from June 10, 1946, on account of official business in his congressional district.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON (at the request of Mr. THOMASON), for 1 week, on account of official business, to attend the Bermuda Foreign Conference.

To Mr. RICHARDS (at the request of Mr. RILEY), for 1 week, on account of official business.

To Mr. GRANT of Indiana (at the request of Mr. SPRINGER), for 1 week, on account of official business.

To Mr. HARRIS, indefinitely.

To Mr. BRUMBAUGH (at the request of Mr. TIBBOTT), for 1 week, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6343. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to lend certain property of the War Department to national veterans' organizations for use at State and national conventions; and

H. J. Res. 347. Joint resolution to correct a technical error in the act approved April 18, 1946 (Pub. Law 347, 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION 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 and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6343. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to lend certain property of the War Department to national veterans' organizations for use at State and national conventions.

H. J. Res. 347. Joint resolution to correct a technical error in the act approved April 18, 1946 (Pub. Law 347), 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 11, 1946, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES

Beginning at 10:30 a. m. each day, the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources will hold hearings on Monday, June 10, Tuesday, June 11, and Wednesday, June 12, in the committee room, 448 House Office Building.

The purpose of the hearings will be to receive reports from the various Federal

agencies engaged in wildlife conservation activities and from State game and fish departments, to hear testimony concerning migratory-bird shooting regulations for the coming season, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, in executive session, on Tuesday, June 11, 1946, at 10 o'clock a. m., in the committee room 356, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

There will be an executive session of the Committee on Invalid Pensions in room 247, House Office Building, on Tuesday, June 11, 1946, at 10:30 a. m.

The purpose of the executive session will be to review public bills pending before the committee and to determine which bills will be scheduled for hearings.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Wednesday, June 12, 1946, Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold a hearing on the bill (H. R. 6143) to incorporate the Amvets, American Veterans of World War II. The meeting will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building, and will begin at 10 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1378. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1379. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed rescissions and provisions as set forth in the letter of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, pursuant to the provisions of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 645); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1380. A letter from the Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting a first supplementary report with respect to Government-owned synthetic rubber plants and facilities; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

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. PACE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 5958. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, without amendment (Rept. No. 2236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PACE: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 359. Joint resolution relating to peanut-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, without amendment (Rept. No. 2237). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 1460. An act to fix the salary of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, with amendment (Rept. No. 2238). Referring to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 1392. A bill for the purpose of renewing and increasing forage and improving watershed conditions on range lands, forests, or Indian lands, or other public owned and controlled land of the United States; authorizing the sowing operations by airplane, machinery, or other means, for conducting experiments to improve methods of reseeding, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2239). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 2423. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, Oregon, for the purpose of consolidating holdings therein, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2240). Referred to the Committee 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. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 5128. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to G. D. Lammers; with amendment (Rept. No. 2241). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 6718. A bill to include consequential damages as part of just compensation in taking private farm property for public use; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 6719. A bill to incorporate the Amvets, American Veterans of World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUNKER:

H. R. 6720. A bill to eliminate the restriction on the number of lots which may be acquired by settlers in the town site of Wadsworth, Nev.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 6721. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to accept gifts and bequests for the benefit of the library of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 6722. A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers for veterans in a free competitive economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 6723. A bill to regulate the review of judgments of conviction in certain criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 6724. A bill to increase the retired pay of officers who served on the active list of the Navy in the grade of admiral at any time between December 7, 1941, and June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 6725. A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers for veterans in a free competitive economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Municipal Council of Caramoan, Camarines Sur, Philippines, protesting the amendment to the Tydings-McDuffie independence law; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6726. A bill for the relief of Frank A. Ahyoovik; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6727. A bill for the relief of Charles M. Peterson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH:

H. R. 6728. A bill for the relief of William Henry Spanogle; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 6729. A bill for the relief of Ray Glenn and his wife, Elfriede Glenn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 6730. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Breinig Bros., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6731. A bill for the relief of Melaine Sbarbori; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6732. A bill for the relief of Anthony Perfetti; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6733. A bill for the relief of Emil Sbarbori; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6734. A bill for the relief of Edna Perfetti; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 6735. A bill for the relief of William M. Graham and Mrs. Mary M. Graham; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 6736. A bill for the relief of the Miami Herald, the Key West Citizen, and the Miami Daily News; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROE of New York:

H. R. 6737. A bill for the relief of Robert Machado; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1945. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of John Garrahy and 149 other residents of Rhode Island, protesting against the present 30-percent reduction and any future reduction in grains available for the manufacture of beer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1946. Also, petition of Amedeo D'Amario and 172 other residents of Rhode Island, protesting against the present 30-percent reduction and any future reduction in grains available for the manufacture of beer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1947. Also, petition of W. M. Horgan and 173 other residents of Rhode Island, protesting against the present 30-percent reduction and any future reduction in grains available for the manufacture of beer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1948. Also, petition of W. A. Brinkley and 126 other residents of Rhode Island, protesting against the present 30-percent reduction and any future reduction in grains available for the manufacture of beer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1949. Also, petition of Myron Lewis and 126 other residents of Rhode Island, protesting against the present 30-percent reduction

and any future reduction in grains available for the manufacture of beer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1950. Also petition of Edmond Gouin and 175 other residents of Rhode Island, protesting against the present 30-percent reduction and any future reduction in grains available for the manufacture of beer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1951. Also, petition of W. J. Rock and 121 other residents of Rhode Island, urging passage of House bill 5893; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1952. Also, petition of George Fontaine and 93 other residents of Rhode Island, urging passage of House bill 5893; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1953. Also, petition of Anthony P. O. Connors and 118 other residents of Rhode Island, urging passage of House bill 5893; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1954. Also, petition of John Kane and 118 other residents of Rhode Island, urging passage of House bill 5893; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1955. Also, petition of Henry A. Theroux and 104 other residents of Rhode Island, urging passage of House bill 5893; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1956. Also, petition of Joseph A. Savage and 111 other residents of Rhode Island, urging passage of House bill 5893; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1957 By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 50 residents of the Twenty-fifth District of Pennsylvania, requesting the Congress to reinstate to the people of our country the right to work, the right to drive a car or truck, and the right to enter any building or place regardless of any union; to the Committee on Labor.

1958. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of the Wisconsin Swiss & Limburger Cheese Producers' Association, Monroe, Wis., recommending a 6-cent-per-pound increase on limburger and swiss cheese; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1959. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of Mrs. Wilbur S. Smith and 322 other citizens of the United States, urging passage of legislation by Congress (H. J. Res. 325) which would authorize the President and the Secretary of Agriculture to issue directives preventing the use of grain for beverage purposes until the world's food shortage is relieved; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 11, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

God over all, blessed forevermore, amid the seething strife which has marred the earth and still sadly separates the sundered peoples of the world, this white altar reared at the gates of the morning speaks to us ever, whate'er vexatious problems we face, of our final reliance on those supreme spiritual forces, faith and hope and love, which alone abide and on which our salvation in the end depends. On these strong strings trembles the music on the harp of life. O Divine Musician, the strand of Thy hope has not snapped, Thy fingers still sweep over the chords of destiny; only Thou canst make our days a melody of redemption and our lives a hymn of praise. So tune our hearts this day to the infinite that all perplexed meanings may be linked into one perfect peace. 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, June 10, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

POSITION OF SENATOR McFARLAND ON BILL TO REORGANIZE CONGRESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I was called to Arizona on official business in regard to reclamation problems in my State and was, for that reason, absent when the vote was taken yesterday on the bill to reorganize Congress, S. 2177. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 10, 1946, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1605. An act to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires which occurred at various Navy and Marine Corps shore activities; and

S. 1854. An act to establish civilian position of Academic Dean of the Postgraduate School of the Naval Academy and compensation therefor.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. 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:

Andrews	Hawkes	Murray
Austin	Hayden	Myers
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Hoey	Overton
Bridges	Huffman	Radcliffe
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Burch	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Knowland	Stanfill
Byrd	La Follette	Stewart
Capehart	Lucas	Taft
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McFarland	Tobey
Donnell	McKellar	Tunnell
Downey	McMahon	Tydings
Eastland	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ellender	Maybank	Wagner
George	Mead	Walsh
Guffey	Millikin	Wherry
Gurney	Moore	White
Hart	Morse	Wilson
Hatch	Murdock	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE] and the Senators from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT and Mr. TAYLOR] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate as members of the committee appointed by the United States Senate to attend the Empire Parliamentary Conference in Bermuda.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5060) to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia," approved May 27, 1924.

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

H. R. 4051. An act to grant to enlisted personnel of the armed forces certain benefits in lieu of accumulated leave;

H. R. 4410. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939;

H. R. 5970. An act to permit the members and stockholders of charitable, educational, and religious associations incorporated in the District of Columbia to vote by proxy or by mail; and

H. R. 6516. An act to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5060) to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia,"