the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Algernon Blair, his heirs or personal representatives, against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3833. A bill for the relief of Viola McKinney; with amendments (Rept. No. 2411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4341. A bill for the relief of James B. McGoldrick; without amendment (Rept. No. 2412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4375. A bill for the relief of Charles Martin; with amendments (Rept. No. 2413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4686. A bill for the relief of the estate of Harry Wright; with amendments (Rept. No. 2414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4947. A bill for the relief of Ethel Guenther; with amendments (Rept. No. 2415). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5198. A bill for the relief of Marjorie B. Marable; with amendments (Rept. No. 2416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5261. A bill for the relief of David Weiss, with amendments (Rept. No. 2417). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5372. A bill for the relief of Jessie Wolfington; with amendments (Rept. No. 2418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5414. A bill for the relief of Marie Gorak; with amendments (Rept. No. 2419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5725. A bill for the relief of Sadie Frey and the estate of Marie Hviding; with amendments (Rept. No. 2420). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6248. A bill for the relief of Capital Office Equipment Co.; with amendments (Rept. No. 2421). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6307. A bill for the relief of Francesco D'Emilio; without amendment (Rept. No. 2422). 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. HÉBERT:

H. R. 6909. A bill authorizing the appointment of three additional judges of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, prescribing the qualifications of appointees to the municipal court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 6910. A bill relating to the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange sites at Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., for Coast Guard purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina:

H. R. 6911. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 6912. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 6913. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 6914 A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 6915. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 6916. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 6917. A bill to provide for site acquisition and design of Federal buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 6918. A bill to provide emergency relief for the victims of the seismic waves which struck the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia:

H. R. 6919. A bill relating to the display, along with the flag of the United States of America, of flags, banners, and pennants of certain organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 6920. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 6921. A bill to amend section 7 (c) of the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PFEIFER:

H. R. 6922. A bill to establish a Department of Health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 6923. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, so as to exempt World War II veterans from liability for further training and service in the armed forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 6924. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act so as to provide insurance for certain crops planted for harvest in 1947; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 6925. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act so as to provide for the United States to pay 25 percent of insurance premiums; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia:

H. R. 6926. A bill for the relief of George W. Whitehurst; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 6927. A bill for the relief of Paul C. Juneau; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 6928. A bill for the relief of Dudley Tarver; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEWART:

H. R. 6929. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred H. Gibbons, Chief Clerk, Hugo, Okla., Farm Security Administration, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 6930. A bill for the relief of John Bettencourt, surviving husband of Leona Bettencourt; and for the relief of Nancy Kathleen Bettencourt, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

2043. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of William B. Mawhinney Memorial Post, No. 1593, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Hawthorne, N. J., calling for the deportation of alien enemy persons interned for subversive activities; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2044. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of City Council of the city of Chicago, for dredging an 18-foot channel for North Branch of the Chicago River between North Avenue and Belmont Avenue; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2045. By Mr. ROWAN: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, regarding freedom of those who labor; to the Committee on Labor.

2046. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Berry Campbell, Minneapolis, Minn., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the McMahon atomic energy control bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2047. Also, petition of Francis Jean Reuter, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to case, Air Corps against Francis Jean Reuter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JUNE 29, 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:

O Father of mankind, to whom all souls are dear and whose tender mercies are over all Thy works, as we come our grateful hearts are singing, "This is the day the Lord has made; therefore we will rejoice and be glad in it." Turning to this morning garden of silence from a world so full of tumult and passion, setting our faces toward waiting tasks, we pray for guidance and for strength. Save us, we beseech Thee, from all error, pride, and prejudice. Grant us that candor which is the high courage of the soul. Help us to find in each problem and perplexity but the prelude to those larger understandings which in a desert of denials and betrayals of truth and freedom shall

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

be as trees planted for the healing of the nations. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, June 28, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6885) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H. Con. Res. 151. Concurrent resolution against adoption of reorganization plan No. 2 of May 16, 1946;

H. Con. Res. 154. Concurrent resolution against adoption of reorganization plan No. 3 of May 16, 1946; and

H. Con. Res. 155. Concurrent resolution against adoption of reorganization plan No. 1 of May 16, 1946.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on June 29, 1946, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2341) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 7999.)

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:

Aiken	Capper	Green
Andrews	Carville	Guffey
Ball	Chavez	Gurney
Barkley	Donnell	Hart
Bridges	Downey	Hayden
Brooks	Ferguson	Hill
Burch	Fulbright	Hoey
Bushfield	George	Huffman
Byrd	Gerry	Johnson, Colo.
Capehart	Gossett	Johnston, S. C.
Kilgore	Murdock	Swift
Knowland	Myers	Taft
La Follette	O'Daniel	Taylor
Lucas	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.
McCarran	Overton	Tobey
McClellan	Pepper	Tunnell
McKellar	Radcliffe	Wagner
McMahon	Reed	Wherry
Magnuson	Revercomb	White
Mead	Robertson	Wiley
Millikin	Russell	Willis
Mitchell	Smith	Wilson
Moore	Stanfill	Young
Morse	Stewart	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is necessarily absent.

The Senators from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO and Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business, having been appointed to the commission on the part of the Senate to participate in the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent by leave of the Senate, being a member of a committee designated by the Senate to attend the atomic bombing at Bikini.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are absent on official business, being members of the Commission appointed to attend the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

FULL AND COMPLETE CITIZENSHIP FOR THE AMERICAN INDIAN

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the American Legion, Department of South Dakota, in convention assembled on June 18, 1946, favoring full and complete citizenship for the American Indian.

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

From the time of the discovery of this country the American Indian has been subject to abuse and unjust discrimination, the nature of which is common knowledge to all.

Whereas by his courage and loyalty to his country, the American Indian has demonstrated in both World Wars by actual combat that he is deserving of the admiration of his fellow countrymen; and

Whereas according to official records, more Indians volunteered their services in their country's behalf on a proportionate basis, population considered, than any other group of our citizens; and

Whereas there remains in evidence in this State as well as in other States, unjust discrimination tending to bar returning veterans of the last war from attending social functions and similar privileges accorded their white comrades with whom they served in the fox holes and beachheads of Europe and in the southwest Pacific; to rectify this gross injustice: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Department of South Dakota, the American Legion, in convention assembled on this 18th day of June A. D. 1946, do petition our Government to grant the American Indian full and complete citizenship, including the right of voting, conducting his personal affairs in a manner now exercised by persons of other races; be it further

Resolved, That a copy thereof be sent to each of the four Members of the South Dakota delegation in Congress, and that the national committeeman of the South Dakota Department of the American Legion be instructed to contact the National committeemen of the American Legion representing States having considerable Indian population to the end that proper and suitable legislation be enacted by Congress which will provide the rights and privileges sought herein.

INDIAN RIGHTS

Recommend that funds and loans ordinarily made available to veterans under the GI bill be made more surely available to Indian veterans through the Indian administration or any other governmental agency existing or created for that purpose. This followed discussion revealing that GI loans to Indians on reservations are tossed back and forth between loaning agencies and the Indian Office with neither willing to push them through.

Further recommend that Indian veterans be accorded full rights of citizenship and the social privileges accorded other veterans.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. McCARRAN (for himself and Mr. MURDOCK):

S. 2394. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to make withdrawals of public lands in certain cases," approved June 25, 1910, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2395. A bill to establish the National Elks Scenic Area and Park in the San Juan Range of the Rocky Mountains in Colorado; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6885) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

WOMEN IN POLITICS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Wanted: More Politics in Women," written by him and published in the August 1946 issue of She, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CHEESE AND DAIRY INDUSTRY OF WISCONSIN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Bring Your Own Crackers," written by Phil Drotning, and published in the July 1946 issue of the magazine Holiday, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY FORMER PRESIDENT HERBERT HOOVER ON WORLD FAMINE

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by former President Herbert Hoover on the subject of world famine, at the invitation of the Canadian Government, at Ottawa, Canada, on June 28, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN BY CITY OF CHICAGO—EDITORIAL FROM MONTREAL STAR

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Another Chicago Steal?" published in the Montreal Daily Star of June 12, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

INEQUITIES IN DISCHARGE PROCEDURE IN THE NAVY—LETTER TO CHIEF, BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL FROM RAY S. BROGDON

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated February 27, 1946, from Ray S. Brogdon to Vice Adm. L. E. Denfeld, Chief, Bureau of Naval Personnel, Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNION FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION—STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "The Foreign Policy of the Union for Democratic Action," which appears in the Appendix.]

ACQUISITION OF NON-FEDERAL PROPERTY WITHIN GLACIER NATIONAL PARK—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 230)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith without my approval the bill (S. 1273) to provide for the acquisition by exchange of non-Federal property within the Glacier National Park.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to accept title to any non-Federal property within the boundaries of the Glacier National Park when the acquisition by exchange of such property would in his judgment be in the best interest of the United States. In exchange for the non-Federal property so to be acquired the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey to the grantors of such property, or to their nominees, any federally owned property within the Glacier National Park which is of approximate equal value to the property being acquired.

I am in accord with the general purposes and objectives of the measure. Section 2 of the bill, however, provides that title to all lands, interests in lands, buildings or other property acquired pursuant to the act shall be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior. This provision is highly objectionable and represents a material change in existing law involving an unwarranted deviation from the long-established and manifestly sound practice under which the Attorney General is charged with the duty of examining the validity of titles to lands acquired by the Government. This duty has for more than a century been vested in the Attorney General with respect to the vast majority of acquisitions and I perceive no reason to change this general practice which has proven so satisfactory through the years.

An advantage of this long-standing policy has been that the agency of the Government acquiring the land has the independent checking of the title by a disinterested agency. Moreover, there can be no question that the maintenance in the different departments of the Government of large staffs of attorneys for the purpose of examining title to land will result in duplication, additional expense, as well as less efficient administration. It is to avoid duplication of this character that the Congress passed and I approved the Reorganization Act of 1945.

For these reasons, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 28, 1946.*

APPROPRIATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, 1947

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 6777) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, yesterday, at the direction of the committee, I offered an amendment, which is section 306, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] felt that the amendment should be amended. If they have reached an agreement in that respect I wish they would suggest it.

Mr. TAFT. I had said I felt compelled to make a point of order against the amendment, and insisted upon the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order has been sustained.

Mr. TAFT. In lieu of the committee amendment, I therefore offer two amendments dealing with the whole subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, line 16, after the colon, it is proposed to insert:

The types of programs set forth in the 1947 budget of the Commodity Credit Corporation, within the funds available to it are approved but the subsidy program shall be subject to the provisions of H. R. 6042.

On page 8, line 14, at the end of the paragraph, it is proposed to insert:

Provided further, That the subsidy program shall be subject to the provisions of H. R. 6042.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I shall explain the first amendment. The amendment is on page 20, after the colon in line 16, to insert:

The types of programs set forth in the 1947 budget of the Commodity Credit Corporation, within the funds available to it are approved but the subsidy program shall be subject to the provisions of H. R. 6042.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. House bill 6042 has become a law, has it not?

Mr. TAFT. House bill 6042 has just been vetoed by the President. However, I know of no way to frame the amendment except to refer to House bill 6042 as such for the present. Whether it will become law or not I do not know. If it does not become law, it will be necessary, I think, to pass some other general subsidy legislation. So that for the present I think all we can do is to refer to that bill. It is still in a state of suspended animation.

Mr. FERGUSON. The RECORD will at least show what we are talking about.

Mr. McKELLAR. It will not do any harm to make reference to the bill.

Mr. TAFT. I may explain, Mr. President, that the Byrd-Butler law provides that every corporation must submit a budget, but "the budget program shall be a business-type budget, or plan of operations, with due allowance given to the need for flexibility, including provision for emergencies and contingencies, in order that the corporation may properly carry out its activities as authorized by law. The budget program shall con-

tain estimates of the financial condition and operations of the corporation for the current and ensuing fiscal years and the actual condition and results of operation for the last completed fiscal year."

The budget program shall then be submitted by the President to Congress, and it is provided that "the budget programs transmitted by the President to the Congress shall be considered, and if necessary, legislation shall be enacted making available such funds or other financial resources as the Congress may determine."

The idea was that the Government corporations should set out the general scope of their activities, realizing that we could not hold them down, that we did not know exactly how they may operate.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, in the Budget for the year 1947, has submitted a budget which provides for its major activities, including the supply program, the foreign purchase program, the price support program, the commodity export program, and the subsidy program.

Those items are set out in fairly general terms, and the language which we here propose to adopt provides the general program which they have set forth. That was the only purpose of the Byrd-Butler Act. It was that they could not suddenly develop a brand new program with funds which conceivably might be authorized by some law, or that some law might be stretched to authorize, without having given any notice to Congress. So what we do in this amendment is simply to use the language suggested by the Commodity Credit Corporation itself in the Budget message, that the types of program set forth in the 1947 budget of the Commodity Credit Corporation, within the funds available to it, are approved.

I think that carries out the purpose of the act and gives leeway for every activity of the Commodity Credit Corporation, except something brand new that no one ever heard of. Such an activity could not be engaged in without the approval of Congress.

The last proviso, that the subsidy program shall be subject to the provisions of House bill 6402, I think is necessary, because that bill contains rather specific figures on subsidies. Those figures and the RFC figures total about $2,000,000,000. We have just passed a bill which limits subsidies to $1,000,000,000. I presume that the amount will be still lower than that if the bill does not become a law. I think we should make it clear, in order to resolve the conflict, that this program should be subject to the provisions of the subsidy program which was worked out so carefully. So, Mr. President, I offer the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer the second amendment, which deals with the RFC, on page 8, line 14, adding at the end of the paragraph the words: *"Provided further,* That the subsidy program shall be subject to the provisions of H. R. 6402."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the second amendment is agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I was not present when this bill was taken up. There is an item in the bill of $3,000,000 to build a fertilizer factory. With as many defunct fertilizer factories as there are in the United States, as poor an industry as it is from the standpoint of earning capacity, I wish to place in the RECORD, at least for conference purposes, a brief statement. It had been my purpose to move to reconsider this amendment. I read the following telegram:

> Reported Senate Appropriations Committee has inserted in the corporations appropriations bill an item of $3,000,000 for TVA to build fertilizer plant at Mobile. This item has been rejected several times by the House and is reportedly not approved by the Budget. Mobile geographically not in TVA territory. Even if it were it would be outrageous for the Government to go into direct competition with fertilizer industry who are doing business and paying all forms of taxes both to the State and the Government for their support. * * * The Government can not run without taxes from private business and individuals. If they continue to go into competition from day to day with industry they deprive the Government of taxes and they will ultimately be without sufficient revenue with which to run.

Why it is necessary for the Government to build a fertilizer factory within TVA territory, or without TVA territory, passes my understanding. Anyone familiar with the fertilizer industry knows that it has been a low-earning industry for many years. Anyone knows that most of the fertilizer factories in this country have either got into great difficulty or have gone broke; and yet there is an effort to put the Government into an industry of this kind in competition with the enterprises which are trying to operate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to state why the committee put the item in the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me ask the Senator if it was approved by the Budget Bureau.

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. GEORGE. It was not recommended by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it was not. The reason why it was put in is that the evidence produced by Mr. O'Neal and others representing the American Farm Bureau Federation showed that there was a shortage of fertilizers, and had been a shortage for quite a while. This does not put the Government into the fertilizer business. It extends the Government's fertilizer business. As we all know, the Government has a large fertilizer plant at Muscle Shoals. This item simply adds a plant at Mobile, which is very close to the largest supply of phosphates that we now have, in Florida. The supply is even larger than the supply of phosphates in Tennessee. For that reason it was proposed to place the plant at Mobile, Ala. Mr. O'Neal, of the Farm Bureau Federation, appeared before the committee. He was greatly interested in the project. As we all know, this is one of the things in which the late Senator Bankhead took a very active interest. He succeeded in having the Senate approve the project on three occasions. The House has refused it each time, but the Senate has already approved it three times, and we felt that it should be recommended and approved this time. That is why the committee reported it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I dislike to take issue with the Appropriations Committee, but I should like to make this statement in all kindness: The Appropriations Committee is exercising a very wide jurisdiction in the field of general legislation. It is not fair to the Senate. It is not fair to the Congress. It is not fair to the country to have this kind of thing going on. This is legislation, and if it were approved by the House an appropriation might be made for the project.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is true that during the war many items of legislation have been added to appropriation bills. I think that practice reached the limit during the war. It has been very materially decreased lately. I think it ought to be further decreased. I do not believe that we ought to legislate on appropriation bills if it is possible to avoid it. Whenever it has been done, it has been by unanimous consent, because any legislation on an appropriation bill is subject to a point of order. That has never been better illustrated than in connection with this bill. Yesterday, by direction of the committee, I offered an amendment which was subject to a point of order, and two Senators made the point of order. The amendment went out. On the other hand, the substance of what was proposed by that amendment, which was subject to a point of order, was offered a few moments ago by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and unanimously accepted. That is the way it has been done. It has been done by unanimous consent. I think there is too much legislation on appropriation bills. However, the practice is very carefully guarded. It can be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am not quarreling with my distinguished friend from Tennessee; but what happens is that the Appropriations Committee reports all sorts of legislative proposals. We must do something about them, so we get together, and in lieu of what has been brought in we adopt something by unanimous consent, when nothing ought to have been brought in in the first instance.

I am advised—and I wish to make this statement before the bill is reported—that in the Labor Department appropriation bill, which will shortly be before us, the highly controversial bill to return the employment services to the States is virtually incorporated as it passed the Senate. It has not been agreed to by the House. The House has a different version of that bill. That bill is now, or

should be, in conference. If such a provision is incorporated in the Labor Department appropriation bill I shall not hesitate to oppose it to the limit.

I merely want to emphasize what I am trying to point out as to one of the greatest evils into which we have fallen. Of course when there is placed in an appropriation bill and tied up with a great many other things in which all Members are interested, an item which ought not to be in it, then it becomes necessary to crawl around and by unanimous consent get it out by some means. We are almost powerless to vote it out; we are almost powerless to eliminate it in any other way.

The Appropriations Committee has its proper important function, but its function is not to legislate; and yet I unhesitatingly say that almost every appropriation bill is filled with legislative provisions. That ought not to be, and nobody but the Senate can protect itself.

I know about the fertilizer business, coming back to that. There is a shortage of fertilizer now, and let me tell the Senator from Tennessee why there is a shortage. There is a shortage of sulfuric acid which must be used in order to make a balanced fertilizer. There is a plant at Tuscaloosa, Ala., which was used by the Government to manufacture power and which is now in a stand-by condition and fully equipped to make sulfuric acid. The only people who can operate that plant said they were willing to do it provided they would get a price on sulfuric acid that would enable them to pay the cost. They had to go to OPA to get a price. The Civilian Production Administration said, "O. K.; we are anxious to do it." They were cooperating 100 percent. The persons seeking to operate the plant went to OPA. OPA gave an even better price than they asked, but said that everything must be based f. o. b. on Copperhill, Tenn. That meant that at the other plants where the same company was producing, which plants would be nearer the consuming centers, the freight would be less, but they would have to charge the same freight to the farmers as was charged from Copperhill. Of course, no other governmental agency save the OPA would have been so indifferent to the facts and so blind to the realities as to have attached that sort of condition.

There is a shortage of fertilizer because the present factories and plants cannot be utilized, and therefore the Government must build another plant, take another taxpayer off the tax list, strip the Government more and more year by year of tax revenues, and strip the counties and the States also. If the Federal Government continues to move at the rate it is going, if the Federal Government pursues the course it is now pursuing, the time is near at hand when the great industries of this country will of necessity be federalized, because independent industries cannot compete with the Government, and we will have a system of national socialism.

OPA was appealed to. An effort was made to make plain to them what the facts were, but they still have the problem there. They have had it for some time, and in the meantime the period in which fertilizers should be used is fast elapsing. It will do no good to get fertilizer in the wintertime when the crops that ought to have the fertilizer in the southeastern section have not been able to get it. Every time a Government factory is constructed to do what private enterprise can do, and is doing, it becomes more and more necessary for the Government to do the whole job. We are simply crippling private enterprise and at the same time professing that we are believers in private enterprise. I undertake to say there is no necessity for the building by the Government of a fertilizer plant at any point in Alabama or my State.

There was some reason for the fertilizer plant which was constructed in connection with Muscle Shoals because that plant was equipped to make nitrogen; it was equipped to make certain elements of fertilizer, and it was desired that experimentation should take place and that something be done through the Government that would illustrate whether it would be possible to make fertilizer by new methods and at cheaper prices. But now in this appropriation bill there is a $3,000,000 appropriation which is not recommended by the Budget Bureau, but which the committee has simply reached out and put into it.

I suppose it would be useless to make a motion to reconsider it; but I am making these remarks so that the House committee will know that whatever they do with this item will certainly have some support in the Senate. Furthermore, I am making this statement for the purpose of letting our own Senate conferees know that when the bill comes back here, even in the form of a conference report, I may steadfastly object to it and oppose it, if it has this item in it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I am not going to offer an amendment but this bill carries a large appropriation for administrative expenses of RFC. To the RFC has been transferred the Rubber Reserve Corporation. I desire to point out to the Senate what our situation is in regard to rubber at the present moment.

During the war when the British, French, and Dutch could not defend their Pacific possessions and had great difficulty in sustaining themselves in their homelands, the American people, in their great anxiety, expended a large sum of money to create synthetic rubber plants where there could be produced more than 1,000,000 tons of synthetic rubber a year. When we, at great sacrifice of money and bloodshed, recaptured the possesions in the Pacific of the Dutch, the French, and the British, after we had given them tremendous amounts by way of lend-lease to sustain them, we had a contract with those countries to buy their raw rubber at 18½ cents a pound, but since the recapture of their possessions for them they are now asking us to pay 23½ cents a pound f. o. b. the far eastern ports. The OPA at the present moment—showing another ridiculous situation so far as that agency is concerned—will not allow a price of more than 22½ cents a pound for raw rubber in this country. This means that the American taxpayer has to absorb the difference. Under the 18½ cents purchasing price we can lay it down here at 22½ cents a pound, but under the 23½ cents a pound f. o. b. the Pacific, we will continue to lose money and let these foreign countries that we saved through lend-lease and through our sacrifice of blood and lives and through the recapture of their empire, gouge us further to the extent of over $32,000,000 a year. In that connection, I may say the British are taking the lead.

The other day there appeared in the Times-Herald an article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop outlining and stating that:

> A person who was a member of then Secretary of the Treasury Vinson's original staff for handling the British proposal for a $4,400,000,000 loan discloses that Britain's claims of poverty are false, and recommends the loan be cut back accordingly.

I ask that the entire article be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

A BUM DEAL

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

From within the United States Treasury comes news of official discovery that the British have kidded us again, and about big money.

A person who was a member of then Secretary of the Treasury Vinson's original staff for handling the British proposal for a $4,400,000,000 "loan" discloses that Britain's claims of poverty are false, and recommends the loan be cut back, accordingly.

This analysis has been furnished to top governmental authorities. It is so important that we reprint it here in full without attempting to translate. It's plain enough, anyhow. Here it is, dated June 19:

"The British loan should be re-examined and cut down to size.

"Actual trade developments since VE-day—as distinguished from the guesstimates made by those responsible for negotiating the loan—now demonstrate that the British do not need anything like the sum agreed on by the negotiators.

"As of last August, the British claimed that in the first year following VE-day they would incur a balance of payments deficit of three billions and in the next 2 years a further deficit of two billions.

"The British estimate for the balance of payments in the crucial first year of transition was as follows (Mr. Clayton's testimony, Senate hearings, S. J. Res. 138P118):

[In billions of dollars]

	Imports	Exports
Minimum imports, austerity level	5.2	
Commercial exports		2.6
Net balance on war expenditures	1.3	
Net balance on invisible items		.6
Total	6.5	3.2

Deficit: 3.3 billions of dollars.

"Ten months have now elapsed since VE-day and actual export and import figures are available against which to check the estimates made last August.

"British imports are actually running at a rate $1,000,000,000 less than they estimated. On the other hand, British exports are running at a rate $1,000,000,000 more than they estimated, thus reducing their estimated balance of payments deficit by $2,000,000,000.

"No information is currently available as to the actual developments with respect to the net war expenditures or the net balance

on invisible items, but both these are very probably more favorable than was estimated last August.

"Taking into account the actual flow of commodities it is perfectly clear that the balance of payments deficit in the first year after VE-day will amount not to the three and three-tenths billions assumed in August of last year, but to no more than and probably much less than one and three-tenths billions.

"This conclusion is confirmed by the British holdings of gold-and-dollar balances. During the last 10 months when the British expected a deficit in their balance of payments to cut sharply into their holdings of gold-and-dollar balances, nothing of that sort has occurred.

"According to British figures, their net holdings of gold-and-dollar balances at the end of the war amounted to $1,840,000,000. The latest figures supplied by the British show that 9 months later their net holdings were still $1,750,000,000.

"The decrease is accounted for by settlement of a Canadian account.

"It may be noted that as of April 1941 the British reported a net balance of gold-and-dollar exchange of zero.

"During the war and by reason of lend-lease and troop payments made to Americans throughout the empire their net balance of gold-and-dollar exchange increased to a level of approximately one and nine-tenths billions.

"There can be no doubt that during the war this country made a very powerful contribution to the improvement in the British gold-and-dollar-balance position.

"The loan should be referred back to committee and cut down in size.

"The figures cited above demonstrate the British balance of payments is actually very much more favorable than assumed by the administration when it negotiated the loan. If the loan was proper on the basis of the estimates made in August, it is obviously too large in the light of actual developments.

"The administration has failed to supply the committees of Congress with information showing the actual course of trade developments. This was not the only item on which they have failed to tell the whole story.

"They did not point out that Empire countries during the war enormously increased their holdings of gold and dollar balances. South Africa alone holds nine hundred millions—three times her prewar holdings. Nor did the administration indicate what it knew to be true, that the British liabilities to Empire countries would be substantially reduced.

"The British owe India four and five-tenths billion; Egypt, one and five-tenths billion; and Palestine, five hundred and fifty million. These sums, the administration has been informed, will be settled just as lend-lease was settled, at a small fraction of the nominal indebtedness.

"In the light of these considerations a cut in the British loan is clearly indicated. Indeed, there is reason to believe that quite apart from any loan or gift the British can receive all the assistance they may need in their balance of payment problem through the international fund.

"Through that fund, it may be recalled, the British can get, without any struggle at all, three hundred and fifty million every year to total one and three-tenths billion. If necessary they can, of course, receive much more than that."

There it is. Nobody in his right mind can misunderstand that memorandum. Nobody with the best interests of the United States at heart will ignore it.

The House of Representatives this week begins final consideration of that so-called loan to Britain. The memorandum quoted in full above shows as plain as day why that loan is a bum deal for the United States of America.

Instead of merely cutting it down, Congress will throw the loan out entirely if it wants to serve America first. At any rate, just remember what you read here. If the loan goes through, there will be big trouble to follow—and never let it be said that we didn't know.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I wish to say that either we should not continue to let the British gouge us on the price of rubber, or we should deny the loan. They do not need both. I believe the figures to which I refer are authentic, and indicate that the British do not need $3,750,000,000 at this time, and at the very most they would not need more than $1,300,000,000, which was the figure we discussed during the debate.

In all fairness to the American people, the Treasury, having these figures at the present time, owes it to the American people to disclose them before it succeeds in getting the other House to approve, on the basis of a completely erroneous set of facts and circumstances, a loan to a foreign country, of the size which has been approved by the Senate.

I wish to protect further the closing of the synthetic-rubber plants of this country. We need to keep those plants in running order, so that the American people may be protected for all time to come, or at least until we see some signs of honest-to-God cooperation throughout the world.

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

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

The bill (H. R. 6777) was read the third time and passed.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. GURNEY, conferees on the part of the Senate.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1850) to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, to secure the national defense, to advance the national health and welfare, and for other purposes.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, this is a bill which was introduced by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. It has been referred to as the science bill. I should like to suggest that immediately after disposal of the bill the Senate take up Senate bill 1248, which is the so-called Fulbright bill. I believe that it would be well to have an understanding that both these bills be considered, because the consideration of them would point out the fact that they are two different and separate proposals.

When Senate bill 1248 was discussed by the Senate once before, there was some confusion and misunderstanding on the part of some of the Members because it was assumed at that time that the bills were interrelated, that there was much in common between them, and that the enactment of one or the other might interfere with the progress of the remaining measure. It was suggested that the enactment of both bills would result in a duplication of effort. Therefore, it occurs to me that, in view of the fact that both bills are on the calendar, and that each represents widely separated objectives and has little in common with the other, we should have the Fulbright bill taken up after we have considered and disposed of the pending measure, provided, of course, that there is sufficient time within which to do that without interfering with consideration of the appropriation bills and other important legislative matters.

Mr. President, with reference to the Fulbright bill, which differs from the Kilgore-Magnuson bill in that it relates to applied science rather than to pure basic science, which is the objective of the Kilgore-Magnuson bill, I should like to make a few observations.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Am I to understand that the Senator was asking for unanimous consent that the Fulbright bill be now considered?

Mr. MEAD. No; I was not. I was merely suggesting the possibility of the consideration of both these measures, one as quickly after the other as practicable, in order to point out the fact that they are two different and entirely separate measures. Moreover, the discussion of one might be helpful in connection with the consideration of the other in the event that the Fulbright bill is brought up not too long after the Kilgore-Magnuson bill has been disposed of.

Mr. TAFT. I want to suggest that there are many important bills on the calendar.

Mr. MEAD. When the Fulbright bill was discussed in the Senate on a prior occasion it was pointed out by a number of Senators that there was no other bill which covered the same situation. If it is understood that there are two bills on the calendar, and that they are not related one with the other, but deal with separate objectives and that we should take them up as soon as we can possibly do so, one after another, it will have a tendency to clear up the misunderstanding.

Mr. President, with reference to the Fulbright bill, Senate bill 1248, I wish to leave with the Senate the following observations:

During the war, when we needed the full strength of small business to help win the war, the Congress provided for the creation of a Smaller War Plants Corporation. I believe that the Senate is familiar with the creation, operation, and administration of that Corporation.

Prior to that time the Senate authorized the appointment of a Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises. That committee has, in my judgment, served the Senate and country well. It has been of great service to small business in bringing it into the war effort and in keeping small business in a good wholesome, healthy, and economic condition insofar as it was possible to do so.

Small business came through during the war, and now in these difficult days of reconversion we should help small business get back to peacetime production.

That is one reason for my great interest in the Fulbright bill. This bill would make the fruits of modern science available to American business; it would go far toward insuring the continued vigor of our entire national economy.

This bill is founded on the recognition that is an age of science, American business, particularly small business, will starve at the roots if it cannot make use of the fruits of science. This bill would tap, for the benefit of business, the vast store of technological information now in the possession of the Government. It would put existing Government research facilities to work in the interest of business. It would help business to make use of new inventions, new products, and new processes.

Mr. President, as the result of the strain and stress of the Nation's war effort, there are a great many new processes in a great many fields. In various fields, by reason of the shortage of materials, new provisions were made. New devices were utilized, and new practices and new procedures were inaugurated. All those new developments can be made available to the little businessman and small manufacturer, no matter where he is located, if he has available to him a central headquarters where he can secure the necessary information and service.

Mr. President, as I said, it will help business make use of these new inventions, new products, and new processes.

Under the strain of the war, many new methods and processes came into being all over the world, and many of those processes which came into being in the occupied nations are now being brought into this country. They would be available to small business if we had the particular set-up which is proposed in the Fulbright bill. Many of them would improve small business in this country and make it more efficient.

The Fulbright bill, S. 1248, presents the first real attempt at this session of Congress to help the small businessman, and also the large businessman and the medium-sized businessman, through the maze of new scientific developments which can be applied to their business. The Fulbright bill is practical; it is sound and workable. It presents no conflict with the pending bill or with any other bill, and it has developed no real opposition.

The Fulbright bill recognizes that in this age of scientific complexity only a few of the largest corporations have the research facilities necessary for national and international leadership. Dr. Condon, the new Director of the Bureau of Standards, who previously was associate director of Westinghouse laboratories, has testified that even in an organization as large as Westinghouse "the problem of adequately marshaling and bringing to bear all the available scientific and technical knowledge is extremely difficult."

If corporations as great in size as Westinghouse cannot marshal and bring to bear all the available scientific information, imagine the difficulties of the small businessman, the man without such laboratory facilities. I think it is an understatement, Mr. President, to say that the small businessman is confused and that the small businessman is handicapped. Even large corporations simply cannot afford to maintain the large laboratories and corps of technicians necessary to keep up with the pace of modern science; they often contract out their work. But work so handled is mostly inadequate and incomplete.

The Fulbright bill creates in the Department of Commerce an office of Scientific and Technical Services which will meet this problem and will be the agency of government which will collect and furnish technical information for the use of the businessman. It will not concern itself with pure science and its development. That will be taken care of by the pending bill, the so-called Kilgore-Magnuson bill. I wish to repeat that the Fulbright bill will not concern itself with pure science and its development. It will not concern itself with creative science and its activities. That is the function of the National Science Foundation which is created by the Kilgore-Magnuson bill, S. 1850, a bill which I favor, but which deals with an entirely different subject.

I wish to state definitely and categorically, Mr. President, that the Kilgore-Magnuson bill, S. 1850, is entirely different and apart from the Fulbright bill. The Fulbright bill has twice been brought up on the unanimous consent calendar in the Senate but both times it was sidetracked, due to misunderstanding and belief that it duplicated the Kilgore-Magnuson bill or dealt with the same subjects. The Kilgore-Magnuson bill, now being called up, establishes a National Science Foundation to coordinate and stimulate basic scientific research—and I stress the word basic—to be carried on by a number of Government agencies, by universities, and by private research laboratories. It will also provide scholarships and fellowships for training a larger number of young scientists. It will not concern itself in any way, in any shape, or in any form with the technical, applied, scientific problems of American businessmen.

Mr. President, during the war we developed a great deal of the lighter metals techniques. Aluminum and magnesium and lighter steel products were developed. All these techniques will be made available to the small manufacturers all over the United States if the Fulbright bill is enacted and if this agency to disseminate the information is created.

The National Science Foundation, Mr. President, which is provided for in the other bill, the Kilgore-Magnuson bill, will do no research of its own. It will operate entirely by means of research contracts. It will delegate to the Army the job of working on such new weapons as guided missiles and rocket ships. It will encourage the Navy to improve its ships and ordnance. It will foster basic research on the causes of cancer and other diseases. It will encourage and facilitate basic research which will contribute to scientific agriculture. In brief, the Kilgore-Magnuson bill will stimulate the progress of pure science and creative science in this country by research contracts and by training more young scientists.

The Fulbright bill, on the other hand, provides an entirely different program which stands on its own. It provides a program which is dependent on no other bill. It provides a program to give business the kind of practical assistance it wants and needs. It creates in the Department of Commerce an office which will be a businessman's office—an office to which the businessman can go with his technical questions. He will be able to go to the present field offices of the Department with his technical problems and he will be able to get some practical help. He will not be referred to a half dozen different agencies, as he now is. He will not be told that if he goes to Washington he may or may not find an answer.

The relation of the Fulbright bill to the National Science Foundation bill was very carefully considered by the Senate Commerce Committee, and the committee found no duplication or overlapping. This point is clearly and specifically covered in the Commerce Committee report on Senate bill 1248. It is report No. 908, and it has been available since January 29 of this year.

Mr. President, the Office of Technical and Scientific Services set up by the Fulbright bill will collect, analyze, compile, and maintain complete records and information regarding the latest scientific developments which are useful to business. Through publications and personal contacts that Office will make this information available to businessmen all over the country. For example, a small businessman in North Carolina, New York, or Nevada who needs a good metal corrosive will need only write or call on the Office or at the local Department of Commerce office and ask for the information. By return mail he will receive the information, together with all the information that is known to the Government about corrosive agents. With light metals now being used extensively in manufacturing, more and more of this information will be required, and it will be available.

The Office will also be the place where independent inventors can bring their inventions for evaluation, and at the Office, which will have adequate safeguards, they will be able to get assistance for the development of worthy inventions. One hears too many stories of inventors who have ideas who have been held up from 10 to 20 years because they had no one to whom to go who would evaluate their inventions and furnish suggestions as to where to go to get assistance in their development.

Finally, Mr. President, the Office will promote wide use in private business of the very great number of publicly owned patents which have resulted from Government research and development. The Commissioner of Patents, Casper Ooms, has testified that the bill does not involve any changes in the patent laws. It is not patent legislation, but it would make our patent system more effective. No objection to the bill has been made by the Association of Patent Attorneys.

Thus we see that the Kilgore-Magnuson bill and the Fulbright bill are entirely different bills—entirely different in purpose—entirely different in provisions—entirely different in function. Both bills are needed, but each bill stands entirely on its own merits. Neither bill depends on the passage of the other.

One thing I want specifically to mention is the fact that the Fulbright bill—to help the small businessman, and all businessmen, in their applied scientific problems—is not a revolutionary program, and is not a new program. Many of the functions under the bill are already being carried on by the Office of Declassification and Technical Services of the Department of Commerce. This office, which includes the National Inventors Council, was created by Executive order of the President under wartime powers. The President has also transferred to this office the functions of the Office of Production Research and Development of the old War Production Board and the Technical Advisory Service of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. In short, this present office in the Department of Commerce is doing much of the job of giving technical services to business and industry which the Fulbright bill provides, but most of these powers spring from wartime authority. It is our responsibility to make these functions a peacetime basis, so as to insure that the businessman, particularly the small businessman, gets a break. If we do not, we will be telling small business that we were willing to help them to get war production, but we are not interested in the welfare of small business in time of peace.

The services called for under the bill are not new ideas in American economy. Farmers for years have been receiving the benefits of the latest information in scientific agriculture through similar facilities in the Department of Agriculture.

Another important point to which I wish to invite attention is the cost of operations under this bill. Simply stated, the enactment of S. 1248, the Fulbright bill, would only cost this Government some $2,750,000 more than is now being expended for this work. The reason for this low figure is that many existing facilities and personnel of the Department of Commerce, particularly the National Bureau of Standards and the field offices, as well as the present Office of Declassification and Technical Services, will be fully utilized to provide this service to the American businessman.

I think it is clear, therefore, that this bill does not provide a hastily drawn, untried plan; instead, it provides a carefully drawn, tried, practical, and realistic plan, which will be of tremendous assistance to all businessmen in the United States, and is a "must" as far as the smaller businessman is concerned. It authorizes a continuance in peacetime of the tested and proven technical service which was provided during the war.

It is clear to me that every type of small and large businessman will benefit by the work of the Office of Technical and Scientific Services. It will cover most of the different fields of interest to business. A recent survey which I requested the Department of Commerce to make shows the range these projects might cover. Proposed projects include the assembly and publication of existing technical data on new metals and alloys for electrical equipment, weights and measures used in foreign trade, materials used in air conditioning, fire-retardant treatments for textiles, new paints and finishes, structural adhesives, waterproofing of concrete, cleaning of masonry, welding fluxes, and plastics molding. These are only a few examples of hundreds of fields where information of value to small business is waiting to be published and disseminated. This type of research into the scientific applied problems of businessmen can only aid and assist them. For this reason we should, we must, consider the Fulbright bill at a very early date.

I am confident that two facts will stand out during consideration of this bill. In the first place, there is no sound opposition to the bill, because it does not prejudice the interests of any group. In the second place, the bill is one of the most useful and practical small business measures yet proposed.

Mr. President, it occurs to me that it is high time the Congress seriously considered the plight of small business. The number of casualties resulting from the reconversion effort in the field of small business is alarming, and unless we maintain small business in this country in a strong, healthy, wholesome condition, I fear that our failure will have an effect upon our democracy itself.

All over the world new scientific developments have taken place and have been applied. Those scientific developments, the new processes, the new procedures, would improve the lot of the businessmen of this country. They would help keep our economy ahead of the developments in other countries. Encouraging them is one of the measures vitally necessary to our security. Therefore it occurs to me that after we consider and make our decision with reference to the Kilgore-Magnuson bill, which applies to pure and basic creative science, we should follow that by taking up the Fulbright bill as quickly thereafter as is practicable, because that bill pertains to another field, the field of applied science in the developing and in the spreading of information to the businessmen of our country with regard to the new techniques and new procedures which have resulted from the Nation's war effort.

I wish to make clear the point that the so-called Fulbright bill was under consideration heretofore on two different occasions, and it was set aside, in my judgment, through a misunderstanding. That misunderstanding rooted from the fact that there was another bill, the Magnuson-Kilgore bill, and if both bills could be considered within a reasonably short time of each other misunderstanding would not develop, because the bills are separate measures, their objectives are entirely different, they are not related, and we can be for one without being against the other. There is no duplication of effort, and in my judgment both the bills will prove very helpful.

Mr. President, I wanted to make clear that the Fulbright bill, reported by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Commerce, is separate and distinct from the Magnuson-Kilgore bill, and pertains to a different field, the field of applied science, and that it will be of great benefit to the business interests of the United States, particularly the small businessmen.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish first to endorse what the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] has said about the objectives of the bills. While the bills do not duplicate each other, I think they are complementary in the sense that if we are to get full advantage out of the scientific progress which has been made in pure science, it is necessary to have some medium through which to bring the new knowledge to businessmen, especially the small and medium-sized businessmen, or to large business, for that matter, because there is no practical process or machinery by which such information is made available to the business people of the country. If Congress should pass the Kilgore-Magnuson bill and fail to pass a bill similar to the bill referred to by the Senator from New York, we would have gone only half way. We would not have brought down to the levels where it could be used the knowledge developed under the Magnuson bill.

Mr. MEAD. My colleague is quite correct. If, as a result of the passage of the Kilgore-Magnuson bill new scientific developments result, then the agency proposed to be set up by the Senator's bill would more quickly bring such developments to the attention of the businessmen of the country. So there is a relationship, in that one complements the other. But the point I wanted to make was that the bill which the Senator is sponsoring does not duplicate the work provided for in the Kilgore-Magnuson bill; on the other hand, the Kilgore-Magnuson bill does not duplicate the work provided for in the Senator's bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is quite true. They have different functions, but they both contribute to the same end to a great extent.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And I think both are necessary to an effective, well-rounded program.

Mr. MEAD. As I pointed out, I favor both bills. One will prove invaluable in the field of basic science. The other will prove very helpful to the business interests of the country in the field of applied science.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, one other matter. I came in, unfortunately, after the Senator had begun his remarks. Did the Senator state that he was going to move to take up my bill

after completion of the Kilgore-Magnuson bill?

Mr. MEAD. No. It was suggested that we act on the Kilgore-Magnuson bill, and then I took the floor to point out the possibility of considering the Fulbright bill as quickly after the disposition of the Kilgore-Magnuson bill as practical for us to do, having in mind the appropriation bills and such other matters as might take precedence over it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Since several Members have previously stated that they did not want the so-called Fulbright bill considered until the other bill has been considered, I think notice should be given now that it is our intention to bring up the so-called Fulbright bill as soon as possible after the disposition of the Kilgore-Magnuson bill.

Mr. MEAD. So there will be no possibility of misunderstanding the situation, I leave the thought with the Senate that so soon as possible after the disposition of the Kilgore-Magnuson bill I shall move consideration of the Fulbright bill.

THE SHORTAGE OF MATERIAL TO CARRY ON THE VETERANS' HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the veterans of the country, along with a great many other homeless citizens, are vitally concerned with the progress of the housing program. Some time ago the Senate and the House of Representatives passed certain legislation to expedite the construction of homes which would be within the means of the veterans. The other day there appeared in the Washington Post a full page advertisement describing a new business center which had been recently constructed, including a new theater and various other commercial establishments I think that no fair-minded person doubts that in building homes for veterans it is, of course, necessary to have certain other buildings which go to make up a community, including, of course, schools and churches and certain essential commercial activities. But it seemed to the veterans of this city, and particularly one of their national organizations, that a great many of these buildings did not fall within that essential classification, particularly so at a time when they have been unable to secure the necessary building materials in order to construct the homes which, after years of service to their country overseas or in the United States, they so sorely need.

The situation, Mr. President, was so serious, that the president of one of the new national veterans organizations, the Amvets, addressed a letter to Mr. John D. Small, Civilian Production Administrator, and, because I believe the situation is of such importance and the problem facing the veteran is so serious, I am going to take a few moments of the Senate's time to read the letter written by Mr. Jack Hardy to Mr. Small. The letter follows:

JUNE 27, 1946.

Mr. JOHN D. SMALL,
Civilian Production Administrator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SMALL: The veterans of World War II and the Members of Congress must have been as startled and shocked as I, to see in today's issue of the Washington Post a full-page advertisement by the Shirlington Corp., of Washington, D. C., stating that there had been constructed and were currently in operation, 23 stores at Shirlington on the Shirley Highway, 2½ miles from the Pentagon Building, and that the most beautiful unit of a large restaurant chain was under construction there, as were 5 clothing stores, a shoe store, a jewelry store, and a picture frame shop.

This full-page ad further states that a woman's specialty shop of 18,000 square feet and a large department store will be "soon under construction" and that "other stores to come" include an auto agency and accessory store, a bowling alley and furniture, candy, hardware, optical, and ice cream stores.

Within 2 miles of Shirlington are vacant lots where builders who already have permits to build veterans' homes have put in foundations and are unable to continue because not a brick nor foot of lumber is available for residential construction. At the same time a mountain of brick and other critically needed building materials continue day after day to go into commercial construction for private profit, while millions of veterans and their families are virtually homeless.

The veterans of World War II and the many other deserving homeless Americans are full to the teeth and sick to death with excuses, double talk, evasion, softsoap, and delay. Official explanations to date are entirely unsatisfactory. They add nothing, and make not one foot of lumber or one brick available where it is most critically and urgently needed—in residential construction for the veterans of this war and their families and the many other needy Americans.

As national commander of the Amvets and on behalf of all veterans we demand immediate action to stop all nonessential commercial construction and that the material now going into construction of the type be made available immediately for veterans and other essential housing construction.

Mr. Administrator, the "chickens are coming home to roost" on the doorstep of those charged with responsibility for the national home building program for the particular benefit of the veterans of this war as determined by the President and the Congress of the United States.

The commercial building situation in Washington is not different than those which can be observed in dozens of other cities and smaller communities throughout the Nation. This situation borders on a national scandal. We are faced—and there are none who can outface us in our position—by a situation to which the will of Congress is being thwarted by local groups of selfish individuals, who are taking advantage of the loopholes in the laws and regulations to push construction which is for their selfish gain.

One of the big loopholes is the present composition of the CPA construction committees in the 71 CPA districts throughout the country which advise the district construction managers of CPA on the "essentiality" and nondeferability of nonhousing building, alteration, and repair projects.

These committees, set up for the most part while the members of this and other veterans' organizations were serving their Nation actively in the armed forces, do not include those most directly concerned with and interested in residence construction—veterans of World War II. It is urged that such committees be reorganized at once and that World War II veterans be placed thereon so that the interests of the veterans may be protected and the will and intent of the Congress followed to the letter.

In a national press release on Tuesday of this week the Civilian Production Administration points with pride to the fact that CPA "was able to turn back approximately 450,000 projects before they reached the formal application stage by persuading the applicants either that their projects were not essential or that they could be deferred." That is an imposing figure. The fact remains, however, that the approach was negative rather than positive, as shown by the figures for the remaining 10 percent. "From the remaining 10 percent nearly 50,000 who were convinced that their projects were essential and nondeferable or where stoppage would have resulted in extreme hardship, CPA sifted out 31,457 for approval and denied 14,971, Mr. Small said," the press release continued.

There we have in your words the fact that 31,457 applications for nonhousing construction were approved during the first 11 weeks of CPA control. Construction cost of these projects totals $1,370,751,048.

"A good part of the approved construction will not begin to draw on the building materials market until 4 to 6 months after the projects were approved, and hence it is not having immediate effect on housing," you are quoted, says the press release of CPA. That weak and vacillating administration of commonly established rules, even though they were written with firm determination, can result in equivocation and frustration is evidence in the building field today. We have agency pitted against agency and legal opinion buffetted against legal opinion. This situation cannot long continue without detrimental effect on the morale of the people, the faith of whom in orderly government must be maintained."

A Government agency must not only follow the letter of the law, but also must be guided by the full spirit of the law. There are none who can truthfully say that it was not the will of the people through the Congress that the green light be given fully to the home-construction program and that it be given first priority. In our opinion, now is the time to get back to fundamentals and to put the building materials where they belong—for the construction of homes for veterans and other homeless people. The chickens have truly "come home to roost" on the doorstep of official Washington. It is time to act. We ask that you fulfill your duties under the law now.

Sincerely,

JACK W. HARDY,
National Commander.

Mr. President, I think the national commander of that organization has put his finger on a very critical situation facing the country. I hope that the Administration, Mr. Wyatt, and Mr. Small will take immediate steps to investigate the charges made by Commander Hardy and his organization, and will do whatever is necessary to expedite the channeling of building materials into homes for veterans, until that problem can be met and solved.

AMENDMENT OF EMERGENCY FARM MORTGAGE ACT AND FEDERAL FARM MORTGAGE CORPORATION ACT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to report favorably, with the amendment, House bill 6477, to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, and section 3 of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; and I submit a report (No. 1634) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have talked with the majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY] and the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and they have agreed to the consideration of

the bill at this time unless there is objection on the part of some other Senator. I now ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, may I ask what the bill is? I do not recognize it by the number.

Mr. MURDOCK. The purpose of the bill is to extend the authority for 1 year to make Land Bank Commissioner loans. We have been making such loans for a number of years, and it is thought by those who are administering the law that the authority should be extended for an additional year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments, in section 3, on page 2, line 19, after the name "Federal", to insert "Farm"; and on page 3, line 1, after the word "on", to strike out "Agriculture and Forestry" and insert in lieu thereof "Banking and Currency."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXTENSION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency reported Senate Joint Resolution 156, Calendar No. 1545, to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It is necessary to obtain action upon this measure. There is no opposition in the committee. I may say that another appropriation bill will soon be reported, but the report has not yet arrived. It is expected soon. While we are waiting for it, I thought we might dispose of this measure.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the joint resolution has the approval of the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. BARKLEY. It has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 156) to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, on page 2, line 2, after the numerals "1952" and the semicolon, to insert "and"; and in the same line, after the word "section", to strike out "5 (d)" and insert in lieu thereof "5d", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That, (a) the first sentence of section 4 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out "for a period of 15 years from the date of the enactment hereof" and inserting in lieu thereof "through June 30, 1952"; and the first sentence of section 14 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out "at the expiration of the 15 years for which the Corporation has succession hereunder" and inserting in lieu thereof "prior to July 1, 1952"; and (b) section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, the act approved January 26, 1937 (50 Stat. ch. 6, p. 5), as amended, and the act approved February 11, 1937 (50 Stat., ch. 10, p. 19), as amended, are hereby further amended by striking out "January 22, 1947" wherever appearing and in each instance inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, is this a measure extending the Reconstruction Finance Corporation?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For the purpose of the RECORD, I should like to state that unfortunately I was absent attending a conference in Bermuda on the day this measure was considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency. I realize that the RFC will be extended in spite of my views, but I wish to express my own opinion that it is time to consider the liquidation of this agency. I feel that in view of its history and the reasons for its organization in the midst of a depression, it would be entirely proper for us to provide for its liquidation under present conditions. As I have said I was not present when the committee met, and did not register any opposition at that time. However, I feel that it would be a very reassuring gesture to the country if the activities of this agency which should be continued were returned to the Treasury Department and to the Department of Agriculture, and the agency itself discontinued. This would go far to disprove the often repeated statement, that we can never rid ourselves of a bureau or agency, even when the conditions which called it forth have passed. If we should need the RFC again in the future it would be easy to recreate it. In view of the enormous growth of bureaus and the necessity for some curtailment in Government expenditures, it does seem to me that it would be a good thing to liquidate this agency, not only because of its psychological effect but also because it would return to the Treasury substantial assets which are no longer needed for the purposes of the original RFC. This would demonstrate to all that our democratic system is sufficiently flexible to meet emergencies and at the same time is able to avoid the dead hand of an ever-expanding bureaucracy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 156) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for an hour.

There being no objection, the Senate (at 12 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) took a recess for 1 hour.

On the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

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 report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6496) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 59 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 19, and 62 to the bill and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, 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:

Aiken	Hayden	Overton
Andrews	Hill	Pepper
Ball	Hoey	Radcliffe
Barkley	Huffman	Reed
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Burch	Kilgore	Russell
Bushfield	Knowland	Smith
Byrd	La Follette	Stanfill
Capehart	Lucas	Stewart
Capper	McCarran	Swift
Carville	McClellan	Taft
Chavez	McKellar	Taylor
Donnell	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	Magnuson	Tobey
Ferguson	Mead	Tunnell
Fulbright	Millikin	Wagner
George	Mitchell	Wherry
Gerry	Moore	White
Gossett	Morse	Wiley
Green	Murdock	Willis
Guffey	Myers	Wilson
Gurney	O'Daniel	Young
Hart	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6739, making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6739) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6739), which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the amount of the bill as passed by the House was $1,136,500,238. The amount of the net increase by the Senate committee was $14,928,127. The amount carried by the bill as reported to the Senate is $1,151,428,365. The amount of the appropriations for 1946 was $1,202,631,586. The amount of the regular and supplemental estimates for 1947, is $1,178,075,900. The bill as reported to the Senate is under the estimates for 1947 by $26,647,535, and is under the appropriations for 1946 by $51,203,221.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The first amendment of the committee will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of Labor—Office of the Secretary," on page 2, line 4, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$862,000" and insert "$937,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 8, after the word "services", to strike out "$925,000" and insert "$979,645."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 3, after "$2,000)", to strike out "$695,528" and insert "$727,104."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 5, after "Department of Labor", to strike out "$3,137,033" and insert "$3,170,981."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 15, after "Department of Labor", to strike out "$652,410" and insert "$65,782."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Labor Statistics", on page 5, line 19, after the word "laws", to strike out "$4,772,000" and insert "$5,043,587"; in line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,050,000" and insert "$3,113,654"; and in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$685,913" and insert "$857,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Children's Bureau," on page 7, line 17, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "$438,535" and insert "$501,664."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "United States Employment Service," on page 13, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$10,417" and insert "$62,500"; in line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$149,200" and insert "$895,220"; and in line 11, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$17,129,250" and insert "$34,258,500, and, without limitation upon the availability of other funds for the same purposes, $11,000,000 for the liquidation of unrecorded and contingent obligations, including the payment of accrued annual leave, arising in connection with the transfer of employment office facilities and services to State operation; in all, $45,258,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 8, to strike out:

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT OFFICES

For payment to the several States, beginning October 1, 1946, in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933, as amended to January 1, 1942 (29 U. S. C. 49–491), and for carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, the sum of $51,387,750: *Provided*, That no State shall be required to make any appropriation as provided in section 5 (a) of said act of June 6, 1933, as amended to January 1, 1942, prior to July 1, 1948.

And insert in lieu thereof:

For grants to States (including Alaska and Hawaii) beginning January 1, 1947, to finance the proper and efficient administration of State-wide systems of public employment offices, in accordance with standards and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor as necessary to carry out this act, title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 and the purposes of the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933, as amended (excluding section 5 thereof), and, upon the request of any State, for the payment of rental for space made available to such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, $34,258,500, of which $288,500 shall be available to the United States Employment Service for all necessary expenses, including personal services, in connection with the operation of employment office facilities and services in the District of Columbia.

On December 31, 1946, the Secretary of Labor shall transfer, to the State agency in each State designated under section 4 of the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933, as amended, as the agency to administer the State-wide system of public employment offices in cooperation with the United States Employment Service under said act, the operation of State and local public employment office facilities and properties which were transferred by such State to the Federal Government in 1942 to promote the national war effort. The Secretary of Labor may also provide for the transfer and assignment to such State, without reimbursement therefor, of any other public employment office facilities and properties, including records, files, and office equipment: *Provided*, That as a condition to such transfer and assignment of Federal properties, the Secretary may require the recipient State to waive any claim which may then exist or thereafter arise out of the use made by the Federal Government of, or for the loss of or damage to, property and facilities transferred to the Federal Government as hereinabove described.

The Secretary of Labor shall withhold or deny certifications of funds for a State system of public employment offices unless he finds that the State—

(1) (a) has made provision for the transfer to and retention in the State-wide system of public employment offices of employees of the Federal Government who (on the day preceding the effective date of the transfer of the employment offices to the State under this act) have been employed in State or local employment service functions in such State, in the positions occupied by them under the Federal service or in reasonably comparable positions, except that individuals so transferred may be separated or terminated for good cause as determined in individual cases under the applicable State merit system, or separated or terminated under the applicable State merit system by reason of reductions in force found necessary in the interests of efficient operations, and may be separated (A) if they have failed to acquire eligibility for continued employment in the State-wide system of public employment offices under the State merit system in the positions occupied by them under the Federal service or in reasonably comparable positions, after having been given a reasonable opportunity to acquire such eligibility, or (B) if the Secretary has determined that it is impracticable for them to be given an opportunity to acquire such eligibility; and (b) has made provision for the extension to employees of the Federal Government who left employment-service positions in such State in order to perform training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States or service in the merchant marine as defined in Public Law No. 87, Seventy-eighth Congress, of the same employment rights and privileges as those provided for Federal employees transferring to State employment in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph; or

(2) has requested the detail of the employees referred to in clause (1) (a) of this paragraph to the State agency under the following provisions: So much of the funds appropriated for State-wide systems of public employment offices as may be necessary shall be available to the Secretary of Labor, in lieu of any portion of the grant to the State, for the payment of compensation (under the salary scales applicable to such employees prior to the effective date of the transfer of the employment offices to the State under this act) to employees of the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor, who, upon the request of the State, and for the purpose of permitting continuity in their employment pending an opportunity to acquire eligibility for State employment in accordance with clause (1) (a) of this paragraph, may be detailed by the Secretary of Labor to the State agency for service in the State-wide system of public employment offices.

Notwithstanding any other provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, any person who was appointed to a position in the Social Security Board under Executive Order 8990, of December 23, 1941, and who shall have returned to employment with the State at any time prior to the end of 1 year after the return to State operation of the employment offices in such State, shall, if he so elects, be paid a refund of the total amount of his deductions and deposits under this act, together with interest to the date of termination of his service with the Federal Government; and such person shall not receive any annuity benefits under said act based on the service covered by the refund unless he is subsequently reinstated, retransferred, or reappointed to a position coming within the purview of said act and redeposits all moneys, except voluntary contributions, so refunded to him, together with interest at 4 percent compounded on December 31 of each year, except that interest shall not be required

covering any period of separation from the service.

In carrying out the provisions under this heading, the Secretary shall assure that each State agency operates under such methods of administration relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, as are found by the Secretary to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this heading (except that the Secretary shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods), and has made reasonable provision for facilitating the free movement of workers seeking employment and employers seeking workers, and for the replacement of any funds appropriated by the Congress for State systems of public employment offices which, because of any action or contingency, have been lost or have been expended for purposes other than or in amounts in excess of those found necessary by the Secretary for the proper and efficient administration of the State system of public employment offices.

The Secretary of Labor is authorized to expend in any State, after January 1, 1947, so much of the funds appropriated for State systems of public employment offices as may be necessary to operate a State-wide system of public employment offices under the control of the Secretary if no State system of public employment offices exists in such State or if, and for so long as, the State is not eligible for Federal funds for such purposes. Except to the extent that a system of employment offices under the control of the Secretary is operated within a State either (1) pursuant to the specific request of the governor of such State, or (2) with funds specifically appropriated by the Congress for the operation of such system under the control of the Secretary, the Secretary shall not expend more than $1,000,000 in any fiscal year for the purposes of this paragraph or operate a system of employment offices in any State pursuant to this paragraph for more than 3 months in any fiscal year.

Whenever funds are paid to the same State agency for the purposes of this act and of title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, (1) such State agency may, if it so elects, submit to the Secretary and the Social Security Board a joint budget covering both the function for which grants are made under this act and the functions for which grants are made under such title III; in such case, the Secretary of Labor shall, if the State agency so elects, certify to the Social Security Board the amounts to be paid to the State for the purposes of this act and upon receipt of such certification, the Social Security Board shall certify such amounts to the Secretary of the Treasury, in addition to the amount, if any, payable by said Board under the provisions of section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended. Any additional amounts so certified by the Social Security Board shall be paid to the State by the Secretary of the Treasury out of the appropriation herein made available; and (2) the State agency may commingle such funds and account therefor by such accounting, statistical, sampling, or other methods as may be found by the Secretary of Labor and the Social Security Board, respectively, to afford reasonable assurance that the funds paid to the State agency for the purposes of this act and the funds paid to the State agency under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, are expended for the respective purposes of this act and such title III.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I draw the attention of the Senator from Georgia to the amendment just stated.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to be heard on this amendment. I have been in conference with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] who I understand has been interested in the insertion in the bill of substantially the bill recently passed by the Senate, and on which I understand also from the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, the House has declined a conference, and has therefore stopped action upon the bill as it left the Senate.

My objection to this particular phase of the new language inserted in the bill is that it goes a shade beyond the original power of the Secretary to make rules and regulations and to prescribe standards which the States must meet in setting up their employment services.

I think the Senator from Minnesota is willing to accept an amendment which I have discussed with him which will obviate this difficulty so far as I am concerned.

When the United States Employment Service Act was before the Senate, it was repeatedly stated that the Federal Government was paying all the cost and the State governments none of it, and that, therefore, the Secretary of Labor, who now has jurisdiction in the premises, should fix the standards and the regulations. That is a misconception of the facts. Actually when we provided for the State employment system it was on a basis of joint State and Federal action. The Congress levied a tax, but the Congress gave to the States the right to recapture all but three-tenths of 1 percent of the tax, provided the States would come in with their own plans for a joint State and Federal employment service. When the States came in with their plans, they had to sit down with the Secretary and had to square the plans with certain minimum standards fixed by the Secretary. But to talk about the Federal Government furnishing all the money is not a realistic approach to the problem at all. The Federal Government has no money except what it gets out of the taxpayers of the States, and we were desirous of setting up a joint State and Federal employment service. So we levied a tax, and said to the States, "If you will pass your act setting up this service, you may recapture or have a credit for all but three-tenths of 1 percent of the tax levied by the Federal Government. Then the three-tenths is to be repaid for the purpose of bearing the administrative costs of the joint State and Federal program."

Therefore, Mr. President, it is not a case of the Federal Government furnishing the money. It is a case of the Federal Government having levied a tax, but saying in the same breath, "We are levying this for a joint State and Federal purpose. Now we ask the States to cooperate, to pass acts, to take back 2.7 percent of the money which we are taking out of the taxpayers of the States and passing it back in this way."

Under that system the State and Federal Government sat down together and established a joint plan. We did say that the Secretary would have the authority to fix certain minimum standards which the State must meet. But in this language, and in the bill which the Senate passed a few days ago, the Secretary is given the absolute right to make of every State official administering the employment service nothing but a mere clerk to carry out the dictates of the Department of Labor here in Washington. Every day he would have to get a directive, every night he would have to change his course if he got another directive. That is what I do not want to have happen.

If these employment services are to go back to the States at all, they should as a matter of good faith go back to them just as we took them away from the States, or as they voluntarily turned them over to us. If they are not to go back, and we wish a completely federalized system, that is a totally different question, but it is now proposed that we turn them back.

I have no objection to the provision giving the Secretary of Labor the power to fix standards and regulations to carry out title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, which he must have anyway, since that service has been transferred to him, and to issue rules and regulations and to prescribe standards for the purposes of the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933. But the two are altogether different, when we consider that, in the first instance, we were setting up a joint system, and now it is proposed that we give to the Secretary of Labor this broad, general authority to fix the standards and regulations as the condition on which the State shall get back its service, with the further provision that if the State does not comply with such standards, if it fails to meet the standards and regulations, then the Secretary of Labor may recapture the State system and bring it back into the Federal system.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BALL. I discussed this provision with the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and I am in accord with him that we do not need in this bill to expand greatly the power of the Secretary of Labor. I agree with the Senator that it is not wise normally to put this much legislation, such lengthy provisions, in an appropriation bill. But the substantive legislation which the Senate passed earlier this week has been bottled up in the Rules Committee of the House, with no indication that it will ever even get to conference, and in order that the transfer back to the States of the services may be made in an orderly manner, and that the Federal employees may at least be given a chance to qualify for State employment, it is necessary to include some provisions, particularly from title III of the bill which we passed earlier last week, in the pending appropriation bill.

I agree with the Senator from Georgia about the language on page 15 in the committee amendment, and I move to amend by striking out on lines 21, 22, and 23, the language "in accordance with standards and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor as necessary to carry out this act," and to insert in lieu thereof the words, "to carry out," so that it will read, "to carry out title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield for the offering of the amendment?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Minnesota from what page he has been reading?

Mr. BALL. From page 15 of the bill, lines 21, 22, and 23.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, that amendment at that point in the bill is satisfactory to me. Of course, I am not speaking for anyone else, but it does meet the objection which I had in mind, and which seems to me to be entirely valid if we are to have a joint State and Federal system.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, before accepting the amendment, I should like to know whether there are other amendments to the italicized language.

Mr. GEORGE. There is one other amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wonder if we may not have the other amendment discussed, then accept both of them together.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is one on page 20, as the Chair recalls.

Mr. BALL. The other amendment is on page 17, in line 21, after the word "employment", to insert the following language: "superior to that of any war veteran competing for appointment." The effect of that, Mr. President, is simply to make sure that if the Federal employees transfer, and if they are not war veterans, they take a competitive examination, but if a war veteran gets a higher eligibility rating the war veteran gets the appointment. That was our objective all along.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection to the amendment. I accept the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. That is the amendment I wanted to have incorporated in the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed amendment on page 15 has not been agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. I accept that amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to speak to this matter before the amendment is acted on, because I want to be sure that I know what it does.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I yielded to the Senator from Georgia, who in turn yielded to the Senator from Minnesota. Does the Senator from Georgia have any amendment to propose?

Mr. GEORGE. No. Those are the two amendments which I said are necessary and proper. In view of the fact that the bill which was passed earlier in the week has not been sent to conference, and therefore there is no opportunity in connection with that bill to iron out the differences between the two Houses, I readily accede to the proposal made by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota and the distinguished Senator from Nevada that it is necessary to have something in the bill so that the conferees may be able to act intelligently.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Minnesota for the amendments which I have accepted.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to go along with the proposal made by the Senator from Minnesota, if the amendment means what he says it means; but for the record I desire to make perfectly clear that it does protect the standards which were fought for on the floor of the Senate last Tuesday. If this is a way of reopening the controversy that took place on the floor of the Senate last Tuesday, on which we had a series of record votes, and which I think settled the issues by rather a preponderant majority of the Senate, I want to know it before I vote on the question. Therefore I wish to read a brief statement, and to ask the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Nevada, when I get through, if the situation is as presented by this statement is a correct statement of fact:

As I understand, these provisions were included in the Labor appropriation bill as a substitute for substantive legislation inserted as a rider in the Labor bill by the House. These are the significant factors: (1) The House is attempting to effectuate the return of the Employment Services to the States by substantive legislation attached as a rider to the Labor appropriation bill. This substantive legislation is the provision which would modify the Wagner-Peyser Act requiring the States to match Federal funds granted and instead provide for 100 percent Federal financing. (2) The Senate passed substantive legislation (H. R. 4437) on June 25, 1946, which would have returned the Employment Services to the States in an orderly manner, but the House has refused to appoint conferees to consider the bill. Thus, the Senate has been balked by House action in its efforts to return the Employment Services to State operation under H. R. 4437. (3) The Senate must either accept the House rider in the Labor appropriation bill, which constitutes substantive legislation wholly inadequate to accomplish the return of the USES in an orderly manner, or must substitute the necessary provisions to effectuate an orderly return.

The following provisions from H. R. 4437, as passed by the Senate, are contained in the Labor appropriation bill:

1. Return of the Employment Services to the States and authority to transfer property and records needed to operate the Employment offices.

2. Transfer of personnel to State employment until they can be given an opportunity to take an examination for permanent employment.

3. Authority to return to such employees the deductions to their credit in the Federal Civil Service Retirement fund.

4. Requirement for States to maintain a merit system governing the employment in the States of these personnel.

5. Requirement that States refund misspent moneys.

6. Guarantee of operations of local offices clause.

7. Requirement for Secretary to certify funds through the Social Security Board where States submit a single budget unemployment compensation and employment service.

I should like one of the pages to take the memorandum to the Senator from Nevada so that he may have it before him as we carry on this discussion.

I may say to the chairman of the subcommittee that if this so-called rider language in the Labor appropriation bill accomplishes the purposes set forth in the memorandum which I have sent to the Senator from Nevada, in that event I do not find myself in disagreement at least with the objectives of the language in this bill, but I should like to have an answer to this question: Am I correct in my understanding, after listening to the Senator from Minnesota, that if this language is adopted, along with the amendment to which he has agreed with the Senator from Georgia, the Secretary of Labor will have the continued authority in a specific State case to insist that the State meet the decent minimum standards which he will prescribe for the operation of the State's employment service? In other words will the failure on the part of a State to set up minimum standards result in no Federal money going to the State until minimum standards are set up? Further I ask does the Secretary of Labor under the rider have the authority to function under the so-called guaranty-of-operations clause?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota, as the question is addressed to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I will say in reply to the Senator from Oregon that a great many of the substantive changes—in fact, most of the substantive changes which we made in the Wagner-Peyser Act in H. R. 4437, are not in this language.

We confined ourselves in this language primarily to provisions which we felt were absolutely necessary for an orderly transfer of the services back to the States. It is my contention that the amendments suggested do not at all affect those provisions which relate primarily to the right of the employees at least to be given an opportunity to acquire eligibility in the State service. The Secretary still has, of course, his basic authority to issue regulations and fix standards under the Wagner-Peyser Act. We do not change that at all. He has the authority delegated to him by General Bradley of the Veterans' Administration, under title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, to require that there be maintained an employment service for veterans. I do not think the language which we would strike out by this amendment was necessary, and it could be interpreted as perhaps broadening the authority which the Secretary has under the existing law.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to ask the Senator from Minnesota two or three further questions on this subject, because, as we pass upon this bill, I think it of great importance, so far as the intent of the Senate is concerned. Let us suppose that the State of Minnesota sets up an employment service, which in the opinion of the Secretary of Labor, under the rules and regulations as they have been administered heretofore, does not meet the minimum standards the Secretary of Labor believes ought to be met in order to justify the expenditure of Federal money for an employment service by the State of Minnesota, and he so notifies the authorities of the State of Minnesota. Assuming that this rider is the legislation which will be passed, will the Secretary

have the authority then to withhold from the State of Minnesota Federal funds, and, under the guaranty-of-operations clause of the bill which was passed by the Senate last Tuesday operate, for example, a Federal service for at least 90 days?

Mr. BALL. For 90 days only.

Mr. MORSE. For 90 days only. And within that 90-day period until such time as Minnesota and the Federal Government can iron out their differences?

Mr. BALL. Yes; he would have that authority. He has that authority under the basic Wagner-Peyser Act. He has to give the State opportunity for a hearing. As a matter of fact, I do not know of any case in the history of that act of funds having been withheld. They have a hearing and they eventually get together on operations. The recapture clause for the 90-day period is in this bill. Frankly I do not think it would ever go into effect, because in this Federal-State relationship, what happens is that they iron out their differences and get together on a mode of operation. It does assure continuity of service, as the Senator from Oregon says.

Mr. MORSE. In order that I may be perfectly clear about it, I further understand from the Senator from Minnesota that this so-called rider language will in no way destroy the rights of present Federal employees in the Employment Service if they meet the requirements of the examination on merit which would have to be given by the States under their own State civil-service regulations. Or, to put it this way: If a present Federal employee in Minnesota takes the merit examination in Minnesota on the return of the service to the State and is within the top three, would he have his so-called preference rights under the language of this rider?

Mr. BALL. Yes. In further reply I will say he would have a preference right unless he was not a war veteran and a war veteran was higher than he was on the eligible list.

Mr. MORSE. That was our agreement the other day, too.

Mr. BALL. Yes. And the language simply makes that clear.

Mr. MORSE. That is protected by the pending amendment. My next question is this: The Senator says that what is sought by this rider language is to return the service to the States in an orderly manner, but it does not contain all the substantive provisions of the bill which we agreed upon by majority vote last Tuesday.

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Minnesota tell the Senator from Oregon in what major aspects this rider language differs from the bill which the Senate passed the other day and which is now resting in the House of Representatives with a refusal on their part to appoint conferees?

Let me express a fear which is entertained by the Senator from Oregon. I assume that there must be some major differences between the language of the rider and the bill which the Senate passed, or that bill would be going through the House, and would not be blocked by a refusal to appoint conferees. I wish to know if what I am voting for involves a major difference as compared with the bill for which I voted the other day, and which I took an active part in trying to get through this body.

Mr. BALL. In House bill 4437 we rewrote the Wagner-Peyser Act completely. We somewhat broadened the purposes of that act. We eliminated the requirement for a plan, and gave the Secretary somewhat broader authority—although not as broad as some of the opponents of the bill contended—to set the standards and issue regulations by which the States would have to abide; and we included in it referral standards. None of those things are in this amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] who had charge of the other bill on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware, who had the floor leadership in connection with the employment service bill last Tuesday, whether he is satisfied from the language of the so-called rider to this bill that the major objectives of the bill for which we fought on the floor of the Senate last Tuesday, which bill we succeeded in passing, are protected?

Mr. TUNNELL. I think they are protected. I should like to read a telegram which will show the objectives of those who were opposing House bill 4437. This telegram was sent on June 24:

> H. R. 4437, DIRKSEN, covering return of employment service to States as amended by Education and Labor Committee, does not provide bona fide return. Repeals Federal recapture and control features opposed by all State unemployment administrators and the Governors Conference. House appropriations bill H. R. 6739 scheduled for consideration Senate next week will accomplish genuine return of employment service to State control October 1. Separate legislation covering transfer of personnel can follow later. Your opposition to H. R. 4437 as reported sought.

So this comes a long way from meeting the requirements of those who were opposing House bill 4437. I believe that it accomplishes the main thing sought to be accomplished by House bill 4437. I believe it is worth accepting.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Has the Senator from Oregon concluded?

Mr. MORSE. I have one further question. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada, now that he has had an opportunity to look over the memorandum which I have submitted to him if he agrees that the points listed, which set forth my understanding of what is accomplished by this rider language, are an accurate statement of the effect of the rider?

Mr. McCARRAN. The language of the rider accomplishes each and every one of the seven points raised by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Nevada. I wish to make clear both to the Senator from Nevada and to the Senator from Minnesota that the primary objective of these questions is to lay a legislative foundation for any future court interpretation which may be called for on the basis of the intent of the Senate at the time the bill was passed.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. If the Senator does not mind, I should like to have read the several points raised by the Senator from Oregon. I was not in the Chamber when they were read.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I shall read the seven points raised by the Senator from Oregon. His question was whether or not the following provisions from House bill 4437 are contained in the rider:

> 1. Return of the employment service to the States and authority to transfer property and records needed to operate the employment offices.

That is accomplished by the rider.

> 2. Transfer of personnel to State employment until they can be given an opportunity to take an examination for permanent employment.

That is accomplished by the rider.

> 3. Authority to return to such employees the deductions to their credit in the Federal Civil Service Retirement fund.

That is accomplished by the rider.

> 4. Requirement for States to maintain a merit system governing the employment in the States of these personnel.

That is accomplished by the rider.

> 5. Requirement that States refund misspent moneys.

That is also accomplished by the rider.

> 6. Guaranty of operations of local offices clause.

That is accomplished by the rider.

> 7. Requirement for Secretary to certify funds through the Social Security Board where States submit a single budget Unemployment Compensation and Employment Service.

That is accomplished by the rider.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. STEWART. The fourth point is as follows:

> Requirement for States to maintain a merit system governing the employment in the States of these personnel.

The Senator says that that is accomplished by the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. By the rider.

Mr. STEWART. By the provision in the so-called rider, or the amendment reported by the committee. Will the Senator point out that language?

Mr. McCARRAN. On page 17 of the bill——

Mr. BALL. If the Senator will yield, it is the paragraph at the top of page 20.

Mr. McCARRAN. The language is as follows:

> In carrying out the provisions under this heading, the Secretary shall assure that each State agency operates under such methods

of administration relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, as are found by the Secretary to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this heading.

Mr. STEWART. Down to that point, that accomplishes approximately what I wished to inquire about. Does that mean that there shall be in each State a uniform merit system, or may one State have one kind of merit system, and another State another kind?

Mr. McCARRAN. Each State may have a merit system of its own.

Mr. STEWART. Suppose they are not uniform?

Mr. McCARRAN. They may not be uniform, but if they are acceptable to the Secretary, that is the standard.

Mr. STEWART. The point I am making is, Can the Secretary require that they be uniform?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not so construe the language.

Mr. STEWART. The Secretary must approve them.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; but in approving them he does not necessarily require that they be uniform.

Mr. STEWART. Suppose he refuses to approve them unless they are uniform?

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that the only reason for that language is that in 1941, when these services were operated by the States, they were operated under two acts, the Wagner-Peyser Act and title III of the Social Security Act. At that time the President had transferred the Employment Service to the Social Security Board. Under title III of the Social Security Act the Social Security Board had exactly the same authority, in identical language with that contained in this bill, to require a merit system. As a matter of fact, the same language now applies to the administration of unemployment compensation. So when the employment offices were taken over by the Federal Government in January 1942, the States were operating under that identical language. But in this instance we make the appropriation solely to the Department of Labor, because since then the USES has been transferred to the Department of Labor, and the operation is entirely under the Wagner-Peyser Act, which contains no such clause. Merely to retain the same identical set-up which we had in 1941, we placed that language in the bill. It does not require a uniform system in all States. It merely requires that the appointments shall be made on some kind of merit basis. The Secretary has nothing to say about who is appointed, what he is paid, or how long his tenure shall be.

Mr. STEWART. If there is a requirement for a uniform merit system, as it is called, the system in my State or in the Senator's State may be under fire at some time or other because it does not accomplish what the Secretary desires to have accomplished. If the requirements of the Secretary as to the merit system are not met, what recourse does the State have?

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I invite the attention of the Senator from Tennessee to the following language:

In carrying out the provisions under this heading, the Secretary shall assure that each State agency operates under such methods of administration relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis as are found by the Secretary to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this heading.

Under the language of that provision I do not think the Secretary will have any authority to go any further and say that systems have to be uniform.

Mr. STEWART. Then, looking beyond that, and skipping over some of the language, we find the provision:

Operates under such methods of administration * * * as are found by the Secretary to be necessary.

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes. That has been practically in effect under the Social Security Act for years.

Mr. STEWART. Then let me ask this question, and then I shall not bother the Senator very much more. On the same page, page 20, in line 9, after the parenthesis and the comma, we find the following words:

And has made reasonable provision for facilitating the free movement of workers seeking employment and employers seeking workers.

What does that mean?

Mr. TUNNELL. That is the very purpose of the act; namely, to try to enable those seeking employment to find employers, and to try to enable employers who are seeking help to find the employees.

Mr. STEWART. Was a similar provision contained in the bill which the Senate passed a few days ago?

Mr. TUNNELL. I think it is the exact language.

Mr. MORSE. It is the exact language.

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes; I am told that it is the exact language.

Mr. STEWART. Is there hidden in any of this rider or amendment any effort, so far as the Senator knows, to reinstate the so-called FEPC which was so obnoxious to a good many of us a few months ago?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], because this language was largely in his charge.

Will the Senator from Tennessee state his question again, please?

Mr. STEWART. I asked whether there is hidden within the words of the amendment or the rider, or within it, whether hidden or not hidden, an effort to reinstate the FEPC provisions pertaining to employment, particularly the employment of minority groups, which were so obnoxious to so many Senators a few months ago.

Mr. BALL. I say to the Senator, absolutely not.

Mr. STEWART. I am satisfied with that statement.

Mr. TUNNELL. I say to the Senator that that was in paragraph 11 of 4437, which came in under the Advisory Council.

Mr. STEWART. It was deleted from this?

Mr. TUNNELL. It was deleted from this.

Mr. McCARRAN. I say to the Senator that I am very sure there is none of it in this bill.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The question is on the adoption of the two amendments of the Senator from Minnesota to the committee amendment. Without objection, the two amendments will be considered en bloc.

The amendments to the committee amendment were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the adoption of the committee amendment as amended, striking out lines 9 to 17 on page 15, and inserting other matter, ending on page 22, in line 11.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, were both the amendments to the committee amendment adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Both the amendments to the committee amendment were adopted.

The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Federal Security Agency—Food and Drug Administration," on page 25, line 17, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "$800,000" and insert "$869,300"; in line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "35" and insert "85"; and in line 22, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "$3,037,181" and insert "$3,631,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 26, line 17, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$113,202" and insert "$133,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Freedmen's Hospital," on page 27, line 6, after the word "special", to strike out "intruction" and insert "instruction"; and in line 14, before the words "of the", to strike out "establishment" and insert "establishments."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Education," on page 29, line 15, after the word "among", to strike out "the more scholarly"; and on page 30, line 2, after the word "same", to strike out "$991,990" and insert "$1,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Health Service," on page 34, line 20, after the word "automobiles", to strike out "$14,565,000" and insert "$15,565,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 6, after the word "automobiles", to strike out "$1,950,000" and insert "$1,985,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, in line 21, after the word "regular", to insert "and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 25, after the words "purchase of", to strike out "two" and insert "twenty"; and on page 39, line 3, after "(5 U. S. C. 118 (a))", to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$2,061,813."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Saint Elizabeths Hospital," on page 41, line 12, after the word "residence", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That not exceeding $200 additional may be paid to two employees to provide mail facilities for patients in the hospital."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Social Security Board," on page 44, line 8, after the word "herein", to strike out "$3,250,000" and insert "$3,497,535."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 20, after the word "automobiles", to strike out "$2,900,000" and insert "$3,028,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 19, after the word "and", to strike out "compenstion" and insert "compensation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Administrator, Federal Security Agency," on page 46, line 4, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$190,044" and insert "$195,659."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses, Office of Community War Services, Federal Security Agency," on page 47, after line 6, to insert:

Salaries and miscellaneous expenses, social protection: For all expenses necessary to enable the Federal Security Administrator to carry out the provisions of Public Law 163, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended by Public Law 381, Seventy-ninth Congress, and the provisions of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in matters relating to social protection, and for other purposes" (S. 1779, 79th Cong., or H. R. 5234, 79th Cong.), when and if such act is enacted into law, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $15,000 for the temporary employment of persons by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the civil-service and classification laws; acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; maintenance, operation, and repair of passenger automobiles; to accept the cooperation of the authorities of States and their counties, districts, and other political subdivisions, in carrying out the purposes of the acts; $460,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 2, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$109,885" and insert "$126,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 5, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$270,235" and insert "$289,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 19, after the word "employees", to strike out "by" and insert "of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 8, after the word "journals", to strike out "$900,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—National Labor Relations Board," on page 54, line 23, after "(50 U. S. C., App. 1501–11)", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used in connection with investigation, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed in whole or in part of agricultural laborers as that term is defined in the Social Security Act in section 409, title 42, United States Code."

And on page 55, after line 4, to insert:

No part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used by the National Labor Relations Board in any way in connection with any petition or complaint by or on behalf of any individual having authority, in the interest of an employer, to hire, transfer, lay off, recall, promote, demote, discharge, assign, reward, determine the amount of wages earned by, or discipline not less than five employees of the employer, or to adjust their grievances, or to effectively recommend any such action.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think this amendment should have further consideration at the hands of the Senate. I think the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] might well explain the item.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, first let me ask whether the amendment striking out the proviso beginning in line 23 on page 54 has been adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been adopted. Both parts of the amendment have been read, but no action has been taken.

Mr. McCARRAN. What was the action on the amendment striking out lines 23 and following on page 54?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question will be put on that amendment.

All in favor of the adoption of the amendment——

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Minnesota should explain the item.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I think the first part of the amendment relates to striking out the provisio in reference to packing-shed workers. That amendment begins in line 23, on page 54.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

Mr. BALL. I do not know whether there is any contest in regard to that item. I do not think there is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment striking out the proviso beginning in line 23 on page 54 and ending in line 4 on page 55.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning in line 5, on page 55, inserting certain new matter.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on the committee amendment in line 5 on page 55.

A week or two ago both the Senate and the House passed the so-called Case labor bill, section 9 of which provided that supervisors, as defined in that section, should no longer be considered employees for purposes of the Wagner Act. That section grew out of the fact that the National Labor Relations Board had rendered several conflicting 2-to-1 decisions. At first the decisions excluded supervisors from the definition of employees; but later, by another 2-to-1 decision, the Labor Board included them, and held that under the National Labor Relations Act the employer could be forced to bargain with a union of foremen or could be forced to permit his foremen to join a union, even a union of production workers.

The issue was discussed fully on the floor when that specific amendment to the Case bill was before the Senate. To my mind it is simply a question of divided loyalty. Under the court interpretations of the Wagner Act and the Board decisions, an employer may be cited and found guilty of an unfair labor practice on account of an act performed by a supervisor. The Board has now taken the position that the employer also may be required to recognize and deal with a production worker's union or an independent union of foremen. Particularly when they are in a production worker's union, they are in the position of having their loyalties divided. They are required to abide by the rules and constitution of the union, and at the same time they must represent the employer in the most important contact between management and the production workers.

It was the overwhelming opinion of both Houses of Congress that that situation did not make sense, and therefore they adopted that particular section of the Case bill, which did not deny the supervisory employees the right to join unions, but simply said that the Government, through its laws and this enforcement agency, would not force the employer to bargain with such a union, and would not require him to retain in his employ a foreman who joined the union against the employer's wishes.

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

Mr. BALL. I wish to continue my statement first, please.

Mr. President, that bill was vetoed by the President; but in his veto message the President, in discussing this particular section, specifically said that he believed that that line must be drawn in legislation. He objected to the way the Congress had attempted to draw it, but he admitted there was a need for legislation on the subject. So it is clear that early in the next session of Congress we shall attempt to deal with this situation.

But now we are faced with the possibility or probability, I may say, that there will be a terrific drive on the part of both the CIO and the A. F. of L. to

organize foremen, with the full backing and support of the National Labor Relations Board, under their present interpretation of the act.

So when Congress reconvenes in January and attempts to deal with this question, we may find ourselves facing a fait accompli, namely, the fact that a great number of foremen have been organized into the unions, under the impetus and protection of the Wagner Act; and then it will be too late or at least much more difficult to deal with the subject legislatively. It is in an attempt to hold that situation in status quo until Congress and the President, both of whom have recognized the need for legislation on the subject, can agree on what is a proper remedy, that I have offered this limitation on the appropriation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, before I yield to the Senator from Oregon, I wish to say that, as regards this amendment, it grieves me very much to disagree with my young friend, the Senator from Minnesota. I was very much interested in his presentation of the amendment. I voted against it in the committee and I shall vote against it on the floor, because I do not believe it represents a proper method to employ in bringing about the result which the Senator from Minnesota desires. I believe that the result should be achieved by a legislative bill. However, the matter has been submitted to the Parliamentarian and it has been held that the proposal is a limitation, and it is not subject to the rules. As I have said I voted against the amendment in the committee, and when the amendment comes to a vote in the Senate I shall again vote against it.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks just made by the Senator from Nevada. I say to my good friend, the Senator from Minnesota, that I have great admiration for him. One of his qualities which I admire most of all is his absolute frankness and integrity of statement. I believe that he has just made a statement which is characteristic of statements made by him, whether on the floor of the Senate or off the floor of the Senate. He never leaves one in doubt as to where he stands on any issue or as to his motives. I admire that characteristic. It is one which I believe is highly desirable in all men.

The Senator has told us this afternoon, honestly and frankly, that the purpose of the language of the amendment is to seek to accomplish what, after all, he was not able to accomplish as one of the sponsors of the Case bill which was vetoed by the President.

Mr. President, it is true that the President of the United States did just exactly what the Senator from Minnesota has said he did, namely, to point out that a line should be drawn between rank-and-file workers and supervisory employees. However, there is nothing in the veto message which would support any conclusion, and I am sure the Senator from Minnesota did not imply it that the line which the Senator from Minnesota seeks to draw in this amendment and the type of line the President referred to. However, in order to avoid any danger of such an interpretation being made, I may point out that there is nothing in the language of the veto message on the Case bill which would support the conclusion that the line of this amendment is the line that the President of the United States thinks should be drawn when we draft legislation covering this subject.

The Senator from Minnesota is also quite correct in his statement that, in the next session of Congress, we will have before us the problem of adopting a labor code. I shall not consume the time of the Senate on this occasion to express my views as to the desirability of such a code. I have referred to it in other speeches on this floor. But what the committee amendment does seek to accomplish is that, by the proposed rider, we will now pass substantively on the whole question of organizing supervisory employees. I believe there to be only one place where that should be done. It should not be done in an appropriation bill but in the form of a bill for a labor code which I think will come before the Senate at the beginning of the next session of Congress.

What the Senator from Minnesota is trying to do—and I make no criticism of it—is to obtain what will amount to a legislative handicap favorable to those who seek the type of legislation affecting supervisory employees which the record of the Senator from Minnesota shows that he favors. I assert that the place to fight out that issue on the merits will be in the next session of Congress, next January and February, when we shall face head-on the question of what type of labor legislation substantively this body should pass. I think it is most unfortunate to seek to accomplish that objective this afternoon by way of an amendment to the pending appropriation bill.

Mr. President, I wish to make one more comment and then I shall be through. I assert that it is not fair for us at the present time, without due consideration which should be given to this matter in a committee, to say that we will vote for this proposal for the reason, among others, which the Senator from Minnesota advances, namely, the fear that between now and next January there may be a great organizational drive to bring about the organization of supervisory employees. Whether that will take place or not will have no bearing on what we should or may do on this issue in January or February next year. But until the matter can be handled in accordance with the ordinary procedure for the passing of substantive legislation, I do not believe this body should try to handle it by way of a rider to the pending bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, I may say that before we take a vote on this matter, it is the intention of the junior Senator from Oregon to suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask for a roll call vote on the rider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 54, beginning in line 23.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hayden	Overton
Andrews	Hill	Pepper
Ball	Hoey	Radcliffe
Barkley	Huffman	Reed
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Burch	Kilgore	Russell
Bushfield	Knowland	Smith
Byrd	La Follette	Stanfill
Capehart	Lucas	Stewart
Capper	McCarran	Swift
Carville	McClellan	Taft
Chavez	McKellar	Taylor
Donnell	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	Magnuson	Tobey
Ferguson	Mead	Tunnell
Fulbright	Millikin	Wagner
George	Mitchell	Wherry
Gerry	Moore	White
Gossett	Morse	Wiley
Green	Murdock	Willis
Guffey	Myers	Wilson
Gurney	O'Daniel	Young
Hart	O'Mahoney	

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

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I wish to say a few words in opposition to the amendment. It seems that from a parliamentary standpoint it is permissible to attach such an amendment as this to an appropriation bill. I understand that it is a limitation instead of a substantive amendment, according to the precedents of the Senate. It is, however, just as much a violation of the spirit of the rule as can possibly be written. To each appropriation bill we now find antilabor amendments attached. On the very last day, supposedly, when appropriation bills can be passed, the very last week day before the end of the fiscal year an appropriation bill comes before the Senate containing what is generally recognized and what is intended to be an antilabor amendment.

Mr. President, is that to be a regular course of procedure? At the close of the fiscal year each time an appropriation bill comes before the Senate must we have a controversial amendment attached to be held as a club over the Senate and the Executive, since the bill must be passed at this time, to force the acceptance of these objectionable and controversial amendments? Is it a club over the people of the Nation?

I object to the spirit, I object to the principle of attaching such amendments, which are known as and which are in fact intended to be antilabor amendments, appropriation bills, and particularly at this time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I insist that I have a right to the floor in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thought the Senator from Minnesota had risen to obtain the floor. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress gave consideration to the ever growing practice of appropriation committees attaching legislative riders to appropriation bills in the guise of limitations on expenditures. I wish to read a paragraph or two from the report filed on March 5, 1946, on that bill:

> The practice of attaching legislation to appropriation bills is often destructive of orderly procedure. Riders obstruct and retard the consideration of supply bills. Sometimes they contradict action previously approved in carefully considered legislation.
>
> In most cases such legislation is adopted under the parliamentary guise of "limiting provisos," avoiding points of order that would be raised against them by purporting to restrict the spending of Government funds. These practices, when used for purposes other than to effect real economies, should be prohibited by a tightening of the rules.
>
> Otherwise the regular jurisdiction of the standing committees of the House and the Senate will continue to be impinged upon by the appropriating committees.

Mr. President, I concur whole-heartedly in that conclusion of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

During the period I have been a Member of this body I have seen this practice grow until today there is hardly an important appropriation bill brought up for consideration which does not contain in fact substantive amendments to existing law disguised in the terms of limitations on the expenditure of funds.

I do not quarrel at all with the interpretation of the rules and the precedents made by the Parliamentarian informally on this amendment. It is certainly drawn in the guise of a limitation on the expenditure of money. But there is not a Senator present who does not know that this makes a very substantive change in existing law, and violates the spirit, although not the letter, of the rules and precedents of the Senate.

Mr. President, I think the practice should be curtailed, and the bill for the organization of Congress which passed the Senate and is now awaiting action in the House includes a proposed amendment to rule 16 of the Senate, which makes an effort to limit and curtail the practice of obtaining substantive change in existing law in the guise of a limitation on the expenditure of funds.

Mr. President, the particular item under consideration has created a great deal of controversy before the National Labor Relations Board. Cases have come up and been argued and decided in one way, and the Board has heard other cases and has made decisions recently which look in another direction, so far as this problem is concerned.

I have no doubt that, if and when the concurrent resolution which has passed the House and is now in the Committee on Education and Labor, scheduled for consideration on Monday, is agreed to, creating a joint committee to study the whole question of labor relations and labor laws, that committee will give very serious and earnest consideration to the question which is involved in the pending amendment.

I do not think this is a wise or the sound way in which to legislate. I think a continuation of this practice as stated by the report of the joint committee will, if carried to its ultimate and logical conclusion, result in the impairment of the functioning of the standing committees of the Senate.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the committee amendment which is pending begins with the language starting on line 5, page 55 of the bill.

I listened with great interest to what the Senator from Wisconsin said. I notice, however, that the argument about legislation on appropriation bills seems to depend on whose ox is gored.

There are half a dozen other limitations in the bill to substantially the same effect. Just a few moments ago we adopted the committee amendment relating to the United States Employment Service, which was clearly legislation on an appropriation bill, merely because we found ourselves in such a situation that that was the only way by which the Senate had a chance to get into conference its view on the question raised.

In the matter of the organization of supervisors, I may say that I was not in Congress when the Wagner Act was passed, but I would wager that in the minds of nine-tenths of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives who voted for that act there was never the slightest idea that foremen, who have the power to hire and fire and discipline employees, who are responsible agents of the employer, would ever be considered employees under the act. Yet, the National Labor Relations Board, in a series of 2-to-1 decisions, has so held. I think it is an impossible situation, if we want responsible management to continue in this country.

Congress passed substantive legislation by overwhelming majorities in both Houses. The bill was vetoed by the President, but in his comments on that particular provision he stated there should be legislation on the subject. It was just that we could not quite agree on a particular form.

When Congress returns next January to consider the permanent legislation which we and the President agree is needed, what if for 6 or 8 or 10 months there has been a terrific drive to organize foremen into unions, with the backing of the National Labor Relations Board, which can put an employer in jail if he does not bargain collectively with a union of foremen, or if he does not permit a foreman to join a union? If we find the foremen organized, then our legislative task will be ten times more difficult in dealing with the situation.

The pending amendment would not prohibit any foreman from joining a union. It merely provides that if he does, and if the employer does not think he can operate effectively as the employer's agent when he is in a union, the employer can discharge him, and the foreman cannot go to the National Labor Relations Board and cite the employer for an unfair labor practice.

Mr. President, that is the effect of the amendment. It freezes the situation for the next fiscal year, until Congress may have a chance to try to get together again with the President on proper legislation in this field.

I may add that in the most recent case before the National Labor Relations Board, the Jones-Laughlin case, it was held by two to one that the employers would have to bargain collectively with foremen who joined the United Mine Workers. Recently the coal mines were taken over by the President, and Secretary Krug is about to sign, if he has not signed already, an agreement forcing the foremen to join the United Mine Workers' Union.

What that particular decision does is to deprive the employer in that case of any chance ever of getting that decision into court, and that is the best decision to take to court. This whole question has never been decided by the courts. It is entirely an interpretation made by the NLRB. But once the employer signs a contract—and he will have to sign it to get his mines back—he is foreclosed from ever getting the matter into court, because the only way to do so is to defy the NLRB order, the union complains to the court, and the employer is brought into court. I think this proposal is the only fair way of holding the situation until we get another chance to consider it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this proposal, offered in committee and adopted by a majority of the committee, is undoubtedly presented in the bill with the idea of preventing the organization and establishment under law of foremen's unions. I do not think it will accomplish the result which my good friend, the able Senator from Minnesota, seeks to have accomplished. He says that during the absence of Congress there will be set up foremen's unions, and such unions will have so established themselves that it will be impossible for Congress to deal with them when it reconvenes. The amendment would not prevent the establishment of foremen's unions. The establishment of foremen's unions could go on notwithstanding the adoption of the amendment. The only thing the amendment would do would be to prohibit the application of Federal money for use with respect to any trouble arising in such unions or between them and the National Labor Relations Board. That is one thing. The amendment would not accomplish the result of retarding the organization, the existence of or the growth of unions composed of foremen if such unions are in the making now.

The question is so close, and it has been regarded as being so close, that groups and legislative committees have dealt with it in various ways. Are we now in an appropriation bill under consideration, which must be passed on this last working day of the fiscal year, going to deal haphazardly with a matter which

deserves long and careful study at the hands of legislative committees? It seems to me Mr. President, and I so stated in the committee, that this is not the time and this is not the bill on which to accomplish legislation of this kind. I hope the yeas and nays will be granted on this question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered on this question, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. ANDREWS voted "yea" when his name was called.

Mr. McCARRAN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. A vote for the committee amendment, that is to retain the committee amendment in the bill, is a vote "yea," is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. And a vote to reject the committee amendment is a vote "nay"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there has been no answer to the roll call, has there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; there has been a vote "yea." The clerk will proceed with the calling of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], who if present would vote "yea" on this question. I am therefore free to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is necessarily absent.

The Senators from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO and Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business, having been appointed to the Commission on the part of the Senate to participate in the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State. He has a general pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

I also announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State. He has a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent by leave of the Senate, being a member of a committee designated by the Senate to attend the atomic bombing at Bikini.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are absent on official business, being members of the Commission appointed to attend the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—31

Andrews	Gurney	Revercomb
Ball	Hart	Smith
Bridges	Hoey	Stewart
Brooks	Knowland	Swift
Burch	McClellan	Taft
Bushfield	Millikin	Wherry
Capehart	Moore	Wiley
Capper	O'Daniel	Wilson
Ferguson	Overton	Young
George	Radcliffe	
Gerry	Reed	

NAYS—34

Aiken	Huffman	Morse
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Murdock
Carville	Johnston, S. C.	Myers
Chavez	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Donnell	La Follette	Pepper
Downey	Lucas	Russell
Fulbright	McCarran	Taylor
Gossett	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Green	McMahon	Tunnell
Guffey	Magnuson	Wagner
Hayden	Mead	
Hill	Mitchell	

NOT VOTING—31

Austin	Connally	McFarland
Bailey	Cordon	Maybank
Bilbo	Eastland	Murray
Brewster	Ellender	Robertson
Briggs	Hatch	Saltonstall
Buck	Hawkes	Shipstead
Butler	Hickenlooper	Stanfill
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Tobey	Walsh	Willis
Tydings	Wheeler	
Vandenberg	White	

So the committee amendment on page 55, lines 5 to 13, inclusive, was rejected.

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

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title V—National Mediation Board—National Railroad Adjustment Board," on page 57, line 8, after the word "services", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That compensation for any referee who is a public official of any Federal, State, or local government shall not be paid from this appropriation for any period of time during which any such referee is receiving compensation for his employment in any such Federal, State, or local government."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title VII—General provisions," on page 59, after line 10, to strike out section 801, as follows:

SEC. 801. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 6, to change the section number from "802" to "701."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 12, to change the section number from "803" to "702."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. I am authorized by the committee to offer the amendment.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 50, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

Civilian war benefits: For all expenses necessary, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and travel, to enable the Federal Security Administrator, in order to continue during the fiscal year 1947 the civilian war benefits program heretofore financed from the emergency fund for the President, to provide medical and hospital care (including prosthetic

appliances and medical examinations) by contract without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, and money payments, to (a) civilians within the United States who have been injured as a result of enemy attack or of action to meet such attack or the danger thereof, or who have been injured while in the performance of their official duties as civilian defense workers; (b) civilians disabled as a result of illness, injury, or disease which occurred during detention by the enemy; and (c) the dependents within the United States of individuals injured or killed under circumstances described in clause (a) or (b) or reported as missing as a result of enemy action, $158,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I believe that this amendment should be called to the attention of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], who wished to be heard on it. I do not see him in the Chamber at present. I wonder if we can postpone action on the amendment until he has an opportunity to be present.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be temporarily passed over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. I am authorized by the committee to offer this amendment.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 50, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

Civilian war assistance: For all expenses necessary, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, to enable the Federal Security Administrator, in order to continue during the fiscal year 1947 the Civilian War Assistance program heretofore financed from the emergency fund for the President, to provide (a) temporary aid (including medical care by contract, transportation, and other goods and services without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, and money payments) to citizens of the United States or their children under 18 years of age who have been interned or stranded, and returned to the United States, or who have been evacuated from any area under the direction of the civil or military authorities of the United States, and (b) for the return of civilians evacuated from the Philippine Islands or Hawaii to the United States under the direction of the civil or military authorities of the United States during the period from December 7, 1941, to September 15, 1945, $5,495,000, which amount may be expended by advances or grants of funds or otherwise, to such Federal or other agencies as the Administrator may designate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 48, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "$575,000" and insert "$649,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to return to the amendment which was passed over temporarily. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] does not seem to be in the Chamber. I am advised by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] that the Senator from Tennessee would have no objection to the amendment if there were in it the language "citizens of the United States or their children under 18 years of age." That language is already in the amendment which has been offered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may the amendment be read again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be again read:

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 50, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

Civilian war benefits: For all expenses necessary, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and travel, to enable the Federal Security Administrator, in order to continue during the fiscal year 1947 the civilian war benefits program heretofore financed from the emergency fund for the President, to provide medical and hospital care (including prosthetic appliances and medical examinations) by contract without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, and money payments, to (a) civilians within the United States who have been injured as a result of enemy attack or of action to meet such attack or the danger thereof, or who have been injured while in the performance of their official duties as civilian defense workers, (b) civilians disabled as a result of illness, injury, or disease which occurred during detention by the enemy, and (c) the dependents within the United States of individuals injured or killed under circumstances described in clause (a) or (b) or reported as missing as a result of enemy action, $158,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is some confusion as between the two amendments. The other amendment is the one referred to by the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The other amendment has already been adopted.

Mr. McCARRAN. I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that the language to which he refers is in the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada on behalf of the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to be clear in my own mind as to the other amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator permit the Senate to dispose of the pending amendment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, when the item on page 50 was before the Committee on Appropriations for consideration several members of the committee objected very strenuously to the use of the words "to civilians." On my motion there was inserted, instead of the language "to civilians", the language "to citizens of the United States or their children under 18 years of age." What the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and I, and other members of the committee, would like to make sure is that that language is in the amendment adopted by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment heretofore adopted by the Senate will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 50, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

Civilian war assistance: For all expenses necessary, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, to enable the Federal Security Administrator, in order to continue during the fiscal year 1947 the civilian war-assistance program heretofore financed from the emergency fund for the President, to provide (a) temporary aid (including medical care by contract, transportation, and other goods and services without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, and money payments) to citizens of the United States or their children under 18 years of age who have been interned or stranded, and returned to the United States, or who have been evacuated from any area under the direction of the civil or military authorities of the United States, and (b) for the return of civilians evacuated from the Philippine Islands or Hawaii to the United States under the direction of the civil or military authorities of the United States during the period from December 7, 1941, to September 15, 1945, $5,495,000, which amount may be expended by advances or grants of funds or otherwise, to such Federal or other agencies as the Administrator may designate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment has already been adopted.

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

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

The bill (H. R. 6739) was read the third time and passed.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MEAD, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. WHITE, Mr. BALL, and Mr. BRIDGES conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 6042) entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was

Resolved, That the said bill do not pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives not agreeing to pass the same.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6837) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KERR, Mr. MAHON, Mr. NORRELL, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. TIBBOTT, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL BANKRUPTCY ACT

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 6682, Calendar No. 1663. The bill was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary yesterday and is on the calendar today. It is an emergency measure. The law will expire at midnight on the 30th of this month.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6682) to amend sections 81, 82, and 83, and repeal section 84 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution to extend the effective period of the emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. O'DANIEL. I object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish Senators would withhold their objections for a moment, in order to see if we cannot reach an understanding. I realize that, the Senate being in session following a recess, the joint resolution could not be introduced without unanimous consent. If it were introduced and objection were made to its present consideration, that would, of course, postpone action on it so far as today is concerned. The joint resolution would go to the the Committee on Banking and Currency, where it would be subject to consideration and amendment, and to the same procedure as applies to any other bill or joint resolution.

If objection were made to the mere introduction of the joint resolution now, of course that would necessitate an adjournment of the Senate until the following day or until some future day, at which time we would have a morning hour, when the introduction of bills and resolutions would be called for. The joint resolution could then be introduced. If any Senator then objected to its introduction, it would have to lie over a day, and that would postpone it one more day.

I have talked to the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee and to other members of the committee. Some of them seemed to be fearful that if the Senator from New York were permitted to introduce his joint resolution today, an immediate call would be sent out to the members of the committees to hold a meeting of the committee, and they would meet and would try to report the joint resolution to the Senate today.

I can assure all Senators that the Senator from New York, the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, has no intention of calling a meeting of the committee before Monday, at which time the joint resolution would be subject to all the rules and regulations which apply to any other measure.

Therefore, it would seem to me that no point would be gained by objecting to the introduction of the joint resolution today, because at best the joint resolution could not be adopted today. I have frankly stated to everyone concerned that there is no human possibility of the Senate enacting any legislation on the subject between now and midnight tomorrow night, so the OPA law would lapse, anyway. Regardless of whether it lapsed for 1 day or for 2 days or for a week, new action on the part of the Congress would be required, the time when that action would be taken would be a matter of conjecture, and would make no serious difference.

So, Mr. President, I hope Senators will not object to the introduction of the joint resolution today. If the Senator from New York were to seek immediate consideration of the joint resolution, I realize that objection would be made.

But I hope Senators will permit the joint resolution to be introduced today and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and thus let the committee on Monday take whatever action it may see fit to take.

I may say that I have urged that no snap judgment be taken by the committee today, because with so many members of the committee out of town it is felt that no fair judgment would be obtainable.

So I hope no objection will be made to the introduction of the joint resolution today.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I have the greatest respect and admiration for our majority leader. From what he says, and I believe him unqualifiedly, it appears that no action would be taken before the OPA Act expired on Sunday at midnight on the joint resolution proposed to be introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

Mr. BARKLEY. I say to the Senator from Texas that no action could be taken on it before Monday. It is just a question of timing, a question as to when it could be taken up.

But there is no use for us to "kid" ourselves, and I have no desire to "kid" either the Senate or the country. There is no humanly possible way by which action could be taken by Sunday night.

So, under the circumstances, I see nothing much to be gained by objecting to the introduction today of the joint resolution of the Senator from New York, and to letting it go to the Banking and Currency Committee. The only difference would be the time when the joint resolution could be introduced.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I think I have made it plain that I am against the OPA.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I got that impression the other night. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'DANIEL. I saw very little opportunity to cause the OPA to expire, but I hoped and prayed that it would expire, and I did everything I could do to bring about that result. Now, with the help of the President, it looks as if it has come about.

However, I am inclined to believe that we have had help from on high; we have had help from God, as well as from man, on this matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Bible says that the prayers of the righteous availeth much. But we might enter into a long debate here as to who is or who is not righteous. [Laughter.]

I hope, however, the Senator will not object to the introduction today of the joint resolution, because by objecting he will not gain any time or advantage.

Mr. O'DANIEL. All I would lose would be the honor of objecting to the introduction of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The joint resolution would provide, would it not, for a continuation of the present OPA Act?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. If objection is made, that will mean that the OPA Act will die at midnight tomorrow. But if before that time a continuing joint resolution is introduced, that will be before the Banking and Currency Committee, and it might be amended so as to continue in force the present OPA Act. Otherwise a new act will be required.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say that the mere introduction of a joint resolution continuing a law does not continue it. The joint resolution has to be acted upon by the Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. But it holds out to the President and to those who favor the OPA the hope that there will be a continuation of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not think it holds out any hope of any kind.

Mr. WHERRY. I do.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no use in trying to see spooks which do not exist. There is no way to prevent the introduction of the joint resolution either today or Monday. If it is introduced on Monday, it still will have to be referred to the committee, and in the meantime the OPA law will have expired at midnight on the previous Sunday. If the joint resolution is introduced today, it will have to go to the committee, and the OPA law will expire at midnight on Sunday, anyway.

So I see nothing to be gained by objecting to the introduction of the joint resolution today.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. What particular advantage would there be to the opponents of the joint resolution as between objecting now or objecting later to the introduction of the joint resolution?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is hard to say whether there would be any advantage or disadvantage to either side.

There is this to be said: If permission is given for the introduction of the joint resolution today and its reference to the Committee on Banking and Currency, the committee could be called into meeting on some day next week, not earlier than Monday.

Mr. MOORE. It could be called into meeting today.

Mr. BARKLEY. It could be, but it will not be.

Mr. MOORE. Well, I object.

Mr. BARKLEY. A meeting of the committee will not be called today. If the Senator cannot rely upon my assurance on that subject——

Mr. MOORE. No; I do not want to deceive anyone at all. I wish to see this thing die. The Senator from Kentucky knows that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I gathered that impression also from the Senator. But it will die. It will be just as dead on Monday morning if this joint resolution is introduced today, as it will be if the joint resolution is not introduced until Monday. That is the truth about it.

Mr. MOORE. That may be perfectly true, but I still have not had an answer to the question why it would be a favor to allow the joint resolution to be introduced today.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then it would be pending before the Banking and Currency Committee, so that the chairman of the committee could call a meeting of the committee for Monday, if he wished to have the committee meet on Monday, or he could call a meeting for Tuesday. I imagine he would try to call the meeting for Monday.

If the joint resolution is introduced on Monday, the Senator from New York could still call a meeting of the committee that afternoon, if he saw fit to do so. But I will say to the Senator that it would be more convenient to permit the introduction of the joint resolution now and let it be referred to the committee, rather than to have to adjourn the Senate from now until Monday in order to have a morning hour, and then have the Senate spend 2 hours in the morning hour, in order that the Senator from New York might introduce his joint resolution on Monday. That is about the only difference.

I say to the Senator that regardless of whether the joint resolution is introduced today or is introduced on Monday, he will lose no advantage which he would have after the expiration of the OPA law.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, the majority leader said before, and I noticed it carefully and I read it in the RECORD again, that if the extending joint resolution is introduced, then it will be open to amendment and there can be attached to it the conference report or any other provision which it may be desired to attach to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is absolutely correct, and that is true either as to the committee or as to the Senate. In other words, the joint resolution is a simple joint resolution continuing the operation of the OPA Act. If the joint resolution never is enacted, of course the OPA Act never is revived, and it remains dead.

But the joint resolution could be amended in the committee. A majority of the committee could add to the joint resolution the bill which the President has just vetoed. The committee could make it even worse, if a majority of the committee preferred something worse. Or it could make it better.

But no matter what the committee did, the joint resolution still would be open to amendment in the Senate, and it would be up to the Senate to decide what sort of joint resolution it would pass, or whether it would agree to pass any.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I take it that the real question which confronts us is whether we shall now by unanimous consent permit the introduction of the joint resolution, or whether the Senator from New York as a matter of right will introduce the joint resolution on Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct; that is really about all there is to it.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The OPA Act is now in effect.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is; yes.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Therefore, a resolution known as a continuing resolution would be properly named.

If the OPA Act expires at midnight on Sunday night, how could a continuing joint resolution be introduced on Monday?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, that is what an old colored man down in my section of the country called a "technimicality. [Laughter.]

Of course, the Banking and Currency Committee could correct that by saying it was a reviving joint resolution, instead of a continuing joint resolution. But that is not very important.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure that when the Senator from Kentucky said there was no human means or no technical way by which the joint resolution could be passed today, he meant if objection were made. But I think we should let the country know, and I think the Senate should indicate, that it is aware that we could handle this joint resolution in the same way we handled the draft joint resolution a little while ago. All of us remember that when the draft law was about to expire, a joint resolution providing for its continuation for a limited time was introduced on the floor of the Senate; and in a matter of minutes the Senate passed the joint resolution continuing the Selective Service Act.

If no objection were made, the rules of the Senate would not prevent us from taking up this matter immediately and debating it and discussing it for as long as we chose to do so, and then having a fair and full vote on it in the Senate.

So I am sure the Senator from Kentucky meant to say that if objection were made we could not take up the joint resolution today, but if objection were not made we could take up and pass the joint resolution this very afternoon by having a fair and full vote on it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I am fully aware of the possibility which the Senator from Florida has pointed out. When I said it was not humanly or, perhaps, practically possible to pass the joint resolution today or by midnight tomorrow night, I took into consideration the practical situation. I knew that Senators would object to immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

I am only seeking to have the joint resolution introduced and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. No Senator will lose any right he possesses by not objecting to the introduction of the joint resolution at this time.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator please explain the reason, if any, why the joint resolution could not be referred to the committee and the committee act on it this afternoon?

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no reason why, if the committee were called and the majority of the committee were willing to pass on the resolution, it could not be passed on today. In fact, the resolution could be acted upon. I have been told by the chairman of the committee, however, that the committee will not be called this afternoon, and I, myself, have urged that the committee be not called. I think I can assure the Senator that the committee will not be called this afternoon, but physically it could be called. If a majority of the members of the committee were willing to act on the resolution, they could act, but that will not take place.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I appreciate what the Senator has said, but I wish to interpose my objection just the same.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] has already objected.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I was the first to object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; but I thought perhaps I could make some headway. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'DANIEL. The Senator has made some headway, but I want it to be known that I was the Senator who objected first.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well. I believe the RECORD will show that the Senator from Texas was the first to object.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I appreciate the way the majority leader has cooperated with me.

Mr. BARKLEY. I believe that the word "cooperated" is a misnomer. I have not cooperated with the Senator in his

attitude on this legislation. I did cooperate with him the other night when I was trying to see that he received an opportunity to say what he had to say.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I was referring to that cooperation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was hoping that, by cooperating with me at this time, the Senator from Texas would accord me a little reciprocity in return for the cooperation which I gave him the other night.

Mr. O'DANIEL. If I could see any point to be gained by not objecting to this proposal, I might consider giving to the Senator a little more cooperation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know that I am in agreement that the Senator would have any advantage in not objecting, or in objecting. I do not believe that there would be any advantage to be gained either way.

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is why I wanted to have the honor of objecting.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator regards that as a vital matter in his public life, I shall not withhold the honor from him.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I certainly do regard it as being vital, because I had no hope of winning the battle when I started in the fight.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has recruited some powerful influences since he spoke. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; but as I have said, I have been praying that this would come about, because I know the Lord moves in mysterious ways His wonders to perform.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, He has certainly performed wonderfully in this case. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'DANIEL. He certainly has. He has enabled the American people to move in a wonderful style.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, as I understand it, the Lord is not compelled to accept the partnership if He does not want to.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I present the conference report on House bill 8496, the naval appropriation bill for 1947. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6496) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other 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 amendments numbered 6, 13, 26, 57, 63, 65, 69, and 70.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 27, 28, 33, 34, 46, 58, 60, and 61, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$13,844,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and at the end of the matter so restored insert the following: "or who have not been commissioned in the line of the Navy more than five years prior to the commencement of such educational courses or postgraduate instruction"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$246,390,000, of which $350,000 shall be available for placing the equipment at the Naval Torpedo Station, Newport, Rhode Island, in condition for operation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "not to exceed $500,000,000 from the naval stock fund: *Provided*, That the cash working capital of the naval stock fund shall not be reduced below $50,000,000 as the result of such transfer", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$70,966,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$131,018,300; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$370,558,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,239,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$325,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$706,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,271,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$354,412,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,785,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$15,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$17,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$57,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$275,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,642,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$31,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,425,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$967,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,626,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$383,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,456,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,705,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,075,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,045,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,715,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$35,562,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "September"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "August"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "September"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "September"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 12, 19, 59, and 62.

JOHN H. OVERTON,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
DAVID I. WALSH,
STYLES BRIDGES,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ALBERT THOMAS,
THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
WALTER C. PLOESER,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I wish to propound a question to the Senator from Louisiana with regard to amendment No. 10 in the conference report. I refer to the amendment which was carried by 2 votes in the Senate. The bill as it passed the House required that no funds under the act should be available for the manufacturing, assembling, repairing, or overhauling of torpedoes at Forest Park, Ill.

Was a vote taken on the amendment in the conferenece? Was a separate vote taken?

Mr. OVERTON. The House conferees receded on the amendment. It was not necessary for the Senate conferees to take any vote.

Mr. GERRY. Was any request made that a vote be taken?

Mr. OVERTON. Not on the part of the Senate conferees, as I recall. The amendment was a Senate amendment, and the House receded.

Mr. GERRY. Yes, but there were Senators who were interested in the amendment, and I should like to know if any of the conferees asked that a vote be taken on the amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. No. There was no necessity of any vote being taken, so far as the conferees on the part of the Senate were concerned, because the amendment was a Senate amendment. The House receded.

Mr. GERRY. The House receded?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes.

Mr. GERRY. Was there any debate on the matter before the conferees on the part of the House receded?

Mr. OVERTON. Not in connection with this amendment. There was debate in connection with another amendment.

Mr. GERRY. Which amendment?

Mr. OVERTON. The amendment which was inserted namely, that $350,000 shall be available for placing the equipment at the naval torpedo station, Newport, R. I., in condition for operation. There was some talk about that amendment.

Mr. GERRY. There was no talk with reference to the Forand amendment?

Mr. OVERTON. No.

Mr. GERRY. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Speaking on the same subject matter which was raised by the able Senator from Rhode Island, I note that there still remains in the naval appropriations bill the $350,000 appropriation for placing the equipment at the naval torpedo station, Newport, R. I., in condition for operation. Am I to understand that, by leaving that appropriation in the bill, it is still discretionary with the Navy, under the language of the bill, to open up the torpedo plant in Newport, R. I., or leave it just as it is?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, that is a matter of interpretation. The senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] took the position that this language would, in his opinion, at least as I understood him, require the Navy Department to resume the manufacture of torpedoes at Newport. I took an opposite view. It is my interpretation that the matter is left entirely within the discretion of the Navy. The Navy may use the money for such purpose at Newport as the Navy Department determines to be necessary or proper. The Navy may continue research work there, or abandon it. The Navy may continue the testing of torpedoes there or abandon the testing of torpedoes. I may say further that the Navy may manufacture torpedoes there or not manufacture them.

Mr. LUCAS. I believe that the able Senator is correct in his interpretation. There is no definite time stated in the amendment with reference to when the $350,000 shall be spent.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his explanation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, under the form of the report would it be possible to construct new hospitals?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes; it will be possible to construct new hospitals.

The PRESIDING OFFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report submitted by the Senator from Louisiana.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message announcing the action of the House of Representatives on certain amendments in disagreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6496, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 29, 1946.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 59 to the bill (H. R. 6496) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "and";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "*: Provided further*, That wherever there are architectural and engineering services in any State in which a project is located qualified tc do the work, such services shall be utilized"; and

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 120. The Secretary of the Navy may delegate to the commandants of the naval districts, for administration within their respective districts, his authority to authorize payment of the expenses of the transfer of household goods of employees, and of the costs of transportation of their immediate families on change from one official duty station to another."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 19, and 62.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, has the conference report been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been agreed to.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recorded as against the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the

committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 4512. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5244. An act to authorize the appointment of additional Foreign Service officers in the classified grades.

PROGRAM FOR MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on Monday next at 12 o'clock the two Houses of Congress are to assemble in joint session for memorial exercises in honor of the late President Roosevelt. The House has advised me that it wishes the Senate to be in the Chamber of the House at not later than 11:45 o'clock a. m. Therefore it will be necessary for us to assemble at 11 o'clock Monday, and when we have concluded the business of the Senate today it will be my purpose to move to adjourn until 11 o'clock Monday morning, so that we may have ample time to assemble and go to the House Chamber, in the meantime transacting any preliminary business in the morning hour prior to our departure for the House.

EXTENSION OF PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. In view of objection having been made a few moments ago when the Senator from New York, with other Senators, proposed to introduce a joint resolution for the continuation of OPA, I wish to ask whether, if the Senator were now to tender the joint resolution and objection were made, and there should be an adjournment of the Senate terminating the legislative day of March 5, in which we now are, it would be possible for the joint resolution to be offered subsequent to the adjournment, if the Senate reconvened after the adjournment on the same calendar day in which we now are?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Paragraph 1 of rule XIV provides, under the heading "Bills, joint resolutions, and resolutions," that if objection is made, it cannot be done.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Chair tell me to what section of the rule he refers?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be found in the rules on page 18, rule XIV, paragraph 5 of which provides:

All resolutions shall lie over 1 day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am not speaking about how long a resolution shall lie over once it comes from a committee or once it is offered. I am speaking about the possibility of introducing the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure the Chair will corroborate the statement I am about to make. Under the rules, during the morning hour, no matter whether that morning hour takes place from 12 to 2 o'clock or at 5 o'clock in the afternoon, a bill or resolution may be offered, and if objection is interposed, it has to lie over for 1 day before it can be introduced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. That has nothing to do with whether it has been reported from a committee. It means the mere offer of a resolution or bill during the morning hour. If objection is made, it must lie over for 24 hours, or to another day. As a rule that is not done, but that does not vitiate the rule, and if any Senator objected, it would have to go over.

For instance, if I should move that the Senate adjourn for 30 minutes this afternoon, and we met at the end of that period, we will say, and had a morning hour, and the Senator from New York offered his joint resolution and objection were made to its introduction, it would have to go over until Monday, at which time it could be introduced.

Therefore I have no purpose to have a brief recess or adjournment this afternoon, because nothing would be accomplished. It seems to me that there is no point in undertaking to do that, and I have no intention of doing it, because the joint resolution could not be introduced before Monday, at best. I have no doubt that when on Monday morning we reach the order, during the morning hour, for the introduction of bills, this joint resolution will be introduced and take its course before the Senate that other bills and resolutions take.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has correctly stated the rule. If a recess or adjournment should now be taken and the Senate reassembled in an hour, the same objection could be made to the introduction of the joint resolution that was made earlier today.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Chair will allow me to make a suggestion, I have before me section 1 of rule XIV, which no doubt the Chair had in mind in making the ruling he indicated. The section reads:

Whenever a bill or joint resolution shall be offered, its introduction shall, if objected to, be postponed for 1 day.

I make the parliamentary inquiry of the Chair as to whether that one day means a calendar day or a legislative day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It means a legislative day.

Mr. PEPPER. That is what I thought. We are presently in the legislative day of March 5, are we not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. If we were to adjourn, would not that end that legislative day, and if we were to reconvene, would we not reconvene in another legislative day?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That much is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. If that be true, then, if the joint resolution had been tendered in the legislative day of March 5, and an adjournment terminated the legislative day of March 5, and brought about a new day, when we reconvened would it not be possible for the resolution at that time to be introduced, there being another legislative day after the day when it was first offered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The tendering of it has not anything to do with it. Objection was made when it was tendered; therefore that is obliterated. The fact of taking an adjournment would not change the situation. The same objection could be made again.

Mr. PEPPER. If there were to be an adjournment terminating the legislative day of March 5, and the Senate were to reconvene, then that would put the morning hour back into effect, would it not, and the introduction of bills or resolutions would be permitted when that part of the morning hour was reached?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it would not be permitted if any objection were made, and if objection were made, though we were in a new legislative day, the resolution would have to lie over for another day. That is the rule, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator from New York offered his resolution today, and objection were made, he could not offer it during the following day and satisfy the rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today it is not offered under the rule at all.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand the parliamentary situation, in the event the joint resolution is offered, even on Monday, and an objection is made to its being offered, it would have to lie over until Tuesday before it could even be referred to the committee?

Mr. BARKLEY. It would have to lie over for one legislative day before it could be introduced and referred to a committee.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to make one more inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. That being true, if we were to have an adjournment and a reconvening of the Senate today, and then the joint resolution were offered, when the Senate reconvened on that new legislative day, then at least the resolution could be introduced on Monday instead of on Tuesday, could it not? We would save a day if we did that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would have to lie over a day, and, of course, its introduction could not be acted upon Monday.

Mr. PEPPER. But this is my question: We are now in the legislative day of March 5, and if we should adjourn in 15 minutes and then reconvene 15 minutes after we adjourned, that would constitute a new legislative day. Then there would be a morning hour, and if the Senator from New York should offer his joint resolution and objection were made, at least he could introduce it the next time the Senate convened.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He could offer it on Monday again.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; but as it is now, if we do not adjourn, if we go over until Monday and he offered it on Monday,

and objection were made, he could not introduce it until Tuesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would lie over 1 day.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the only way by which the joint resolution could be finally introduced today and referred to a committee, under the circumstances, would be for us to adjourn for a brief season and then return after the adjournment, at some hour to be fixed in the motion for adjournment, at which time we would have a morning hour, and the Chair would call for the introduction of bills and resolutions. If objection were made, then in order to get the resolution introduced at any time today, we would have to take another adjournment, and I doubt whether we could take two legislative adjournments in one calendar day. I should like to inquire of the Chair whether the Senate can adjourn twice in the same calendar day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that that cannot be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that we could not by taking a second adjournment, bring about the possibility of the joint resolution being introduced today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that it would have to go over until Monday in any event.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that in all likelihood there will be no objection to its introduction Monday if the resolution is proffered, because no point could be gained by objection. I cannot guarantee that, of course, because I am not in the confidence of any Senator who might feel like objecting, but I see no point to be gained in a further objection on Monday to the introduction of the resolution.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. If we should adjourn within a half hour and have a new legislative day, this resolution could then be offered. However, objection then would mean that it would go over until another legislative day. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MYERS. If the Senate should meet on Sunday, the resolution could be offered on Sunday and we could meet and consider it. Am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It could be read only one time. If any Senator objected it could not possibly be considered that day.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the rule requires that a bill or joint resolution having been finally introduced must be read on three different days, so if objection were made and it were finally introduced on Sunday, it would have to be read once on Sunday, and once on Monday, and it could not possibly be referred to the committee until Monday, and could not possibly be considered until Tuesday, even if the Senate met on Sunday; it could not be ready for consideration by that time, anyway.

Mr. MYERS. By following that procedure, however, Mr. President, we might be assured consideration of the joint resolution on Monday, while if there were objection made each day and three objections were made in all, it might be Thursday or Friday before consideration could be secured.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There would be no possible way of the Senate considering the joint resolution before the time stated.

PROVISION FOR SECONDARY MARKETS FOR FARM LOANS GUARANTEED BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on page 9 of the calendar will be found Senate bill 2280, Calendar No. 1541. It is necessary that this bill be passed as soon as possible in order that the banks may sell their mortgages to the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation so as to enable them to use again their capital for financing loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended. A bottleneck exists at the present time due to the fact that the small banks, especially, throughout the country are loaded up with mortgages which they cannot liquidate. They want to get rid of some of those loans, and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation has the money and wants to lend it, due to the fact that recently the farmers have not desired to borrow as much money as they wanted to borrow a few years ago.

The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation desires the law amended to permit the Corporation to purchase such loans, just as it has purchased other agricultural credit paper through the Federal Land Bank in the past. The bill was considered by the Banking and Currency Committee, which had hearings on it, and the committee approved the bill unanimously.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is the Senator desiring consideration of Senate bill 2280, which is Calendar No. 1541?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I will say that that bill was unanimously agreed to by the Banking and Currency Committee and reported to the Senate by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE]. I am sure there can be no objection to its enactment.

Mr. WHITE. I have talked with certain members of the minority on the Banking and Currency Committee, and they have no objection to the passage of the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I will say that as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee I hope the bill will be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2280) to amend the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act to provide a secondary market for farm loans made under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 (b) of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 1020d), is amended by inserting after the first sentence of said section the following new sentence: "The Corporation is further authorized to purchase from approved lenders, for cash, loans made under section 502 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong.), as amended, for such prices and upon such terms and conditions as the Board of Directors of the Corporation finds appropriate to effectuate the purposes of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944."

SIMPLIFICATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF CREDIT SERVICES TO FARMERS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1353, House bill 5991, which I discussed yesterday afternoon. The House has passed one bill relating to the Farm Security Administration and the Senate passed another bill which is now in the House. In the bill now on the Senate calendar the Senate committee struck out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and substituted the Senate bill. Passage of this bill will enable the conferees to deal with the contents of both bills in an effort to reach some legislation in regard to this important service.

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

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand, this is a bill against which there has been some objection urged by two or three Senators on the minority side, but I also understand that they have yielded their opposition and are in approval with the Senator's efforts to have the bill passed at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think there is some opposition to the bill, perhaps, Mr. President, but I have made a unanimous-consent request that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5991) to simplify and improve credit services to farmers and promote farm ownership by abolishing certain agricultural lending agencies and functions, by transferring assets to the Farmers' Home Corporation, by enlarging the powers of the Farmers' Home Corporation, by authorizing Government insurance of loans to farmers, by creating preferences for loans and insured mortgages to enable veterans to acquire farms, by providing additional specific authority and directions with respect to the liquidation of resettlement projects and rural rehabilitation projects for resettlement purposes, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment

to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 1 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, is hereby further amended by deleting the last word "farms", inserting a comma after the word "acquire", and adding the following: "repair, or improve family-type farms, to enlarge undersized farms, or to refinance indebtedness against undersized or underimproved farm units when loans are being made by the Secretary to enlarge or improve such units. Loans may also be made to assist borrowers under this title in making the repairs and improvements needed to adjust their farming operations to changing conditions."

Section 1 (b) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"Any veterans (defined herein as a person who served in the land or naval forces of the United States after December 6, 1941, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable) who is found by the Secretary by reason of his ability and experience, including training as a vocational trainee, to be likely to carry out successfully undertakings required of him under a loan which may be made under this title shall be eligible for the benefits of this title to the same extent as if he were a farm tenant. Except with respect to veterans, only farm tenants, farm laborers, sharecroppers, and other individuals who obtain, or who recently obtained, the major portion of their income from farming operations shall be eligible to receive the benefits of this title. In making available the benefits of this title, the Secretary shall give preference to persons who are married, or who have dependent families, or, wherever practicable, to persons who are able to make an initial down payment, or who are owners of livestock and farm implements necessary successfully to carry on farming operations. No person shall be eligible who is not a citizen of the United States."

Section 1 (c) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended to read as follows:

"No loan shall be made for the acquisition, improvement, or enlargement of any farm unless such farm will be of such size and type as the Secretary determines to be sufficient to constitute an efficient family-type farm-management unit and to enable a diligent farm family to carry on successful farming of a type which the Secretary deems can be successfully carried on in the locality in which the farm is situated: *Provided*, That loans may be made to veterans, as defined in section 1 (b) hereof, who have pensionable disabilities, to enable such veterans to acquire, enlarge, repair, or improve farm units of sufficient size to meet the farming capabilities of such veterans and afford them income which, together with their pensions, will enable them to meet living and operating expenses and the amounts due on their loans."

Section 3 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended to read as follows:

"Loans made under this title shall be in such amount (not in excess of the value of the farm as certified by the County Committee) as may be necessary to enable the borrower to acquire or enlarge the farm or to make the necessary repairs and improvements thereon, and shall be secured by a first mortgage or deed of trust on the farm. Loans may not be made for the acquisition or enlargement of farms which have a value, as required, enlarged, or improved, in excess of the average value of efficient family-type farm-management units, as determined by the Secretary, in the county, parish, or locality where the farm is located."

Section 4 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended by designating the present language as subsection "(a)", changing the period at the end of such subsection to a colon, and adding the following: *"Provided*, That there may be distributed in any fiscal year to each State or Territory such amount not in excess of $100,000 as is determined by the Secretary to be necessary to finance loans in such State or Territory under this title.

"(b) Special appropriations for the benefit of veterans may be allocated equitably among the several States on the basis of need, as determined by the Secretary, without reference to the formulae set forth in subsection (a) hereof."

Section 6 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended to read as follows:

"To carry out the provisions of this title, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $50,000,000 for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and such further sums as may be necessary for administrative expenses in carrying out this title during such fiscal year."

Title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is further amended by the insertion of a new section 7 immediately following section 6, to read:

"SEC. 7. Sums heretofore appropriated or otherwise made available hereunder shall be subject only to the limitations contained in this title, as amended."

Section 21 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"Grants may also be made to such eligible individuals, where necessary to aid in their rehabilitation, and to cooperative associations furnishing medical, dental, or hospital services to such individuals."

Section 21 (c) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended to read:

"There are eligible for the benefits of this title (1) veterans, as defined in section 1 (b) hereof, who desire the practical guidance in farm and home operations supplied by the Farm Security Administration to its borrowers, and (2) farm owners, farm tenants, farm laborers, sharecroppers, and other individuals who obtain, or who recently obtained, the major portion of their income from farming operations, and who cannot obtain the necessary financing elsewhere at reasonable rates and terms."

Section 23 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended to read:

"There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as the Congress shall from time to time determine to be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the purposes of this title."

Section 41 (g) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the following immediately thereafter: "including the release from personal liability, without payment of further consideration, of—

"(1) borrowers who have transferred their farms to other approved applicants under agreements assuming the outstanding indebtedness to the Secretary under this title; and

"(2) borrowers who have transferred their farms to other approved applicants under agreements assuming that portion of their outstanding indebtedness to the Secretary which is equal to the earning capacity value of the farm at the time of the transfer, and borrowers whose farms have been acquired by the Secretary, in cases where the county committees certify and the Secretary determines that the borrowers have cooperated in good faith with the Secretary, have farmed in a workmanlike manner, used due diligence to maintain the security against loss, and otherwise fulfilled the covenants incident to their loans, to the best of their abilities."

Section 42 (b) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended to read:

"Each member of the committee shall be allowed compensation at the rate of not to exceed $5 per day while engaged in the performance of duties under this act. The number of days per month that such members may be paid shall be determined and approved by the Secretary. In addition, they shall be allowed such amounts as the Secretary may prescribe for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to better adapt the loan programs authorized by the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to the needs of veterans and low-income farmers, and for other purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will appoint the conferees later.

SATURDAY HOLIDAYS FOR DISTRICT BANKS AND BUILDING-AND-LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is on the calendar Docket No. 1531, Senate bill 2307, a bill to provide that every Saturday shall be a holiday for banks and building-and-loan associations in the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. The bill has been approved by the Commissioners of the District; it has been approved by the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, and it has also been approved by the District of Columbia Committee of the House. All the bill does is to provide that every Saturday shall be a holiday for banks and building-and-loan associations in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BARKLEY. The bill applies only to the District of Columbia?

Mr. McCARRAN. It applies only to the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2307) to provide that every Saturday shall be a holiday for banks and building-and-loan associations in the District of Columbia, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fourth sentence of section 1389 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 28-616), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided*, That every Saturday shall be a holiday in the District and not a business day for (1) every bank or banking institution having an office or banking house located within the District, (2) every Federal savings and loan association whose main office is in the District, and (3) every building association, building and loan association, or savings and loan association, incorporated or unincorporated, organized and operating under the laws of and having an office located within the District; and any act which would otherwise be required, authorized, or permitted to be performed on Saturday in the District at the office or banking house of, or

by, any such bank or banking institution, Federal savings and loan association, building association, building and loan association, or savings and loan association, if Saturday were not a holiday, shall or may be so performed on the next succeeding business day, and no liability or loss of rights of any kind shall result from such delay."

DISTRIBUTION AND UTILIZATION OF HEALTH PERSONNEL, FACILITIES, AND RELATED SERVICES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 244, which is on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 244) further increasing the limit of expenditures for a study and survey of the distribution and utilization of health personnel, facilities, and related services, submitted by Mr. PEPPER on March 22, 1946, and reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, with an amendment at the end of the resolution to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$40,000."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move to amend the committee amendment in line 5 by striking out "$40,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "$5,000; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the authority heretofore granted by Senate Resolution 74, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to June 2, 1946, and as continued from time to time, shall be terminated August 1, 1946", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 74, Seventy-eighth Congress (providing for study and survey of the distribution and utilization of health personnel, facilities, and related services), agreed to June 2, 1943, is hereby increased by $5,000; be it further

Resolved, That the authority heretofore granted by Senate Resolution 74, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to June 2, 1943, and as continued from time to time, shall be terminated August 1, 1946.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] a question. Is that the amendment on which we had an agreement?

Mr. PEPPER. That is the amendment which the Senator from Nebraska agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not hear the amendment read. It seems to me that the figure "$10,000" was read. Was that the original language?

Mr. PEPPER. No; the original language was "$40,000," but the amendment cuts the amount to $5,000. The amendment is in the exact language to which the Senator agreed.

Mr. WHERRY. Our understanding is now that the amount of money appropriated under the amendment is $5,000, and that the authority heretofore granted shall be terminated on August 1, 1946.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

H. R. 1654. An act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3517. An act to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, and persons of races indigenous to the Philippine Islands, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4512. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of pevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5244. An act to authorize the appointment of additional foreign service officers in the classified grades;

H. R. 5716. An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended;

H. R. 6335. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6429. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; 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.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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.)

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

SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Louis LeBaron, of Hawaii, to be associate justice.

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. Bunk Gardner, of Kentucky, to be United States district judge, Canal Zone.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. George B. Harris, of California, to be United States district judge, northern district of California.

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

IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

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

That completes the nominations on the calendar.

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

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

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND RECEIVE COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Senate be authorized to sign enrolled bills during the adjournment of the Senate, and that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive communications from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADMISSION OF COLORED REPORTERS TO UNITED STATES SENATE AND HOUSE PRESS GALLERIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a resolution which was introduced and passed at the recent convention of the American Newspaper Guild, which pertains to representation in the press galleries of the House and Senate by newspaper men of the colored race.

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

SCRANTON, PA.—The weight of the 25,000 members of the American Newspaper Guild was thrown behind the fight of colored reporters for admission to the United States Senate and House press galleries here on Friday, June 21, when delegates to the thirteenth national ANG convention unanimously passed a resolution condemning racial discrimination in congressional press galleries.

Drafted by Lowell Lomax, reporter for the Washington Afro-American, and only Negro member of the 10-man District of Columbia delegation, the resolution calls on the ANG to protest this outrageous injustice to millions of American citizens.

Introduced at the convention by the Washington delegation of the ANG, the resolution reads as follows:

"Whereas the 13,000,000 Negro citizens of the United States have no duly accredited representative in the press galleries of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, thus depriving these citizens of direct access to news of their Government, and whereas the Negro press, still in its infancy, has more than 1,000,000 subscribers who are entitled to correspondents cognizant of their particular interests and problems: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the American Newspaper Guild protest this outrageous injustice to millions of American citizens; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the International Executive Board of the ANG and all guild locals appeal to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and members of the Rules Committee of the Senate to take appropriate action so that correspondents of this great

segment of the American press are welcomed to the press galleries of the House of Representatives and the Senate; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Guild officers be instructed to make a proper presentation of the action of this convention to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Rules Committee of the Senate and the chairman of the Standing Committee of Correspondents of the House and Senate Press Galleries."

After motion for adoption of the resolution was made on the floor of the convention, Lowell Lomax of the Washington delegation arose to denounce the discriminatory racial policies in the congressional press galleries and to urge the unanimous adoption of the motion.

Enthusiastic applause greeted Mr. Lomax at the conclusion of his speech on the press gallery resolution before the 250 delegates in the ballroom of Scranton's Hotel Casey.

Edward Talty, staff reporter on the Washington Times-Herald and Harry Read of the National CIO Committee to Abolish Discrimination also spoke in support of the resolution.

Other members of the Washington delegation who endorsed the resolution were William Flythe, Times-Herald; Philip J. Austensen, Post reporter and president of the Washington Newspaper Guild.

Mrs. Mary Spargo, Washington Post; S. Paul Hoffman, Post; John McLeod, Daily News; Quenten Mott, Evening Star, and Milton Murray, International President of the American Newspaper Guild.

REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD several editorials which I hold in my hand, which are in support of the bill which seeks to reorganize the Congress.

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

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register Guard of June 19, 1946]

TIME OUT FOR REPAIRS

The Senate, which has been trying rather desperately to cope with most of the Nation's pressing ills all at once, took time out the other day for a little self-improvement. The result was a bill reorganizing and streamlining congressional procedure which is excellent as far as it goes. And it goes quite a long way.

The senators discarded one or two mossy, cherished traditions, and it must have wrung some of the older, more conservative hearts to do so. But they voted themselves and their colleagues in the House a $5000-a-year salary increase by way of heart balm.

They also provided some generous social security which will permit them to retire with dignity and a pension after 62 years upon this earth, provided that six of those years were spent in Congress. To enlarge upon the wisdom of that move might lead to some unflattering examples. So perhaps it is enough to say that the pension appears to be a wise investment.

Among the reorganization bill's chief virtues are a reduction in the number of committees, expert assistance for appropriations committees, enough money to hire capable help for other administrative and research duties, and the registering of lobbyists.

A lot of Senators have enjoyed the power, prestige and importance of many committee memberships. But they really pay for their enjoyment in hard work. Besides answering their mail, having their ears bent by constituents, understanding all current legislation, being on the floor for debate and voting, they are also at present supposed to be experts on all the various, complex specialized subjects which they have to wrestle with in a half dozen committees to which they may belong.

It is just too much to do efficiently. Besides, the same general legislative subject may slop over into two or three different committees, all of which adds to the confusion, delay, and red tape.

As for appropriations, Congress has generally had to take an executive department's word for what it needed and why. The members have been busy enough without endeavoring to fathom the inner workings of outside agencies. Consequently, they have approved or slashed budgets through ignorance, caprice, benevolence and sheer cussedness. Provision for expert assistants will give the committees some boys on their side whom they can trust, and who presumably will know what they're talking about.

The new bill should ease group pressures not only through registration and financial accountability of lobbies, but by the establishment of majority and minority policy committees which would put major issues on a party basis. This last is something that Commerce Secretary Wallace suggested a while back, except that the Senate bill stipulates no reprisals if some rugged individualist refuses to hew to the party policy line.

In short, there is promise of better government in the Senate bill. If the House concurs, the result ought to win Congress a unanimous cheer. And that's a sweet sound that the legislators haven't heard in a long time.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union of June 20, 1946]

STEPPING UP PROCEDURE

After a long period of discussion about streamlining Congress, the Senate finally evolves a bill aimed to step up procedure and bring more modern methods into the legislative department of the Government. In addition to voting the Members of both Houses a $5,000-a-year salary increase and retirement pensions payable under certain conditions, the Senators provide for revision of committees, for financial and technical experts to assist Members and for the registration and financial accountability of lobbyists. The measure fairly well covers the purpose intended and in all probability will be concurred in by the lower House

There may be some criticism of the salary boost, in view of our existing debt and already heavy governmental outlays. However, anyone who has had much contact with Congressmen knows that there is little left at the end of a regular term after the expenses of living in Washington are paid. It is true that Members enjoy fairly liberal allowances and mileage; but it also is true that they have to carry a pretty heavy financial burden, including the legitimate expenses of primary and election campaigns. As to the pension plan, its propriety is questionable. If Members of Congress feel entitled to retirement pay, there is no reason why governors, mayors, and other public officials, including State legislators, should not feel likewise.

Those who enact the laws of the land and expend the money of taxpayers certainly should have the benefit of the best available research and information; many State legislatures already have such service at their disposal. Capable advisers in all probability could save the Treasury a vast amount of money when appropriations are under consideration.

One thing "streamlining" cannot do, of course, is to give Congressmen sufficient moral stamina to vote their convictions when playing politics is more expedient. If this could be done it would be a good thing for both Congress and the country.

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Tribune of June 13, 1946]

CONGRESSIONAL FACE LIFTING

A Congress fit to serve in an atomic age rather than that of the Clipper ships seems to be in store for the future if the House of Representatives accords the Government reorganization bill the same reception it received in the Senate on Tuesday. The bill was introduced to streamline Congress, reduce it from an overweight and ponderous growth to a sylphlike and vibrant body able to react to the demands of Government.

Outstanding in the provisions of the bill is the reduction in the number of Senate committees from 33 to 15 in order to lighten the load on lawmakers. The growth of committees has long bothered many solons, for they have been forced to spend more time in attending to committee business than on the floor of the Senate. Many Senators are on as many as 10 standing committees, which results in their being unable to efficiently perform their duties on any one of them. It has necessitated sketchy preparation and inadequate knowledge of the business at hand. With the number of committees reduced, Senators can, if they will, devote more time to carrying on the functions of Government. It is to be hoped that this reduction in the number of committees will see more Senators in the Chamber when that body is in session. Oftentimes important legislation has been acted upon with only an indifferent handful present.

Also of value will be that section of the bill which permits committees to retain technical and administrative assistants. More than once, committeemen have been ignorant of the facts behind the legislation they were considering never having been briefed on the subject. Assistants who are well versed in whatever phase of government the committee handles can keep Congressmen informed of all the aspects involved. This will remove the embarrassing episodes where Congressmen are made an object of humor by a witness who knows more about the subject than they do.

A pay hike for Congressmen is advisable, and the bill provided that $5,000 a year would be added to the $10,000 already received. Congressmen have been receiving $10,000 since 1925, but the manner of living in Washington, D. C., which might mildly be described as sumptuous, finds many of them unable to make both ends meet. This was perfectly agreeable in the days when, for example, the Senate was known as a rich man's club, but today when many Congressmen's sole income is that received for Government service they should not be forced to pinch pennies.

The optional pension plan whereby Congressmen could contribute 5 percent of their wages for 5 years and serve 6 years in Congress in order to be eligible is in line with the growing conviction that all persons should be given aid when they are no longer able to work.

Altogether the reorganization plan will give Congressmen a needed face lifting, restoring youthful vigor and removing the heavy paunch caused by an overindulgence in committees. It has met with some opposition, mainly from those Senators who would lose both face and rank as committee heads if the committees were removed, but those Congressmen who have any regard for doing a good job will accept it, realizing that it is something that has been needed for a long time.—T. W. C.

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune of June 20, 1946]

FOR REVISING CONGRESSIONAL PROCEDURE, MAKE LA FOLLETTE'S BILL A LAW

Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, has done at least one service to Congress and the country for which he deserves to be

remembered with gratitude. He conducted an investigation, submitted a report, introduced a bill and advocated its passage with such force and logic that a long-needed reform in legislative procedure in the direction of simplicity and efficiency should result.

He would keep pace with the growth of population and the attendant increase of public business, including problems and perplexities of which the founding fathers knew nothing and never lived long enough to learn about. Whether the overhauling contemplated comes through contrition or compulsion, the character and reputation of Congress will expand or dwindle accordingly.

The Senate has already approved the plan, the gentleman from the Badger State having secured a majority support before the southern Senators could organize a filibuster or effect a coalition. The vote was 49 to 16 in favor of the revision. As passed by the upper House, the bill embraces six major provisions, as follows:

1. Reduction of the number of Senate standing committees from 33 to 15, many memberships now being complimentary.

2. Increase in congressional salaries from $10,000 to $15,000 a year to enable men of moderate means to aspire and reject pressure.

3. Expansion of technical and administrative assistance to lawmakers. Each committee is to get four experts and each lawmaker a competent research aide.

4. Creation of a pension system which would allow a Member of Congress to contribute voluntarily to the Government's retirement fund.

5. Elimination of many routine tasks, such as a necessity for acting on each damage claim against the Government or on each proposal to build a bridge across a navigable stream.

6. Tighten fiscal controls by requiring Congress to go on record in favor of an increase in the national debt each time an estimated appropriation is above anticipated income for the next fiscal year.

As may be seen, this measure provides for simplification, expedition, and investigation of all legislation under consideration. Under the awkward system in vogue the legislator is often entangled in a complexity of committees, delayed in research or by numerous meetings, interfering with sessions which should be attended. Often there are not more than a half dozen Senators or a score of Representatives present when a bill is being discussed.

By supplying the several committees with experts to render technical and administrative assistance to 15 or 20 committeemen together, the saving in time would be enormous and opportunities for loafing would be minimized. The apparent obligation to press personal damage bills, to seek appropriations for the private convenience of constituents, to solicit Federal financial assistance while condemning bureaucracy, to fill the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with unspoken speeches, would no longer seem essential to official continuance of service.

Requiring Members of both Houses to answer the roll call, when appropriations are asked in excess of the estimated income for the following fiscal year, is desirable for two reasons: It will discourage indifference to the national debt and it will enable taxpayers to read the records of those who represent them. No frank and fair-minded legislator could object to that.

While the bill that passed the Senate omits reference to some important defects in the present system that need to be rectified, such as the selection of committee chairmen and personnel, as well as the enfeebling recognition of seniority rather than capability, there is enough proposed from which to make a start.

Representative ADOLPH J. SABATH, of Illinois, chairman of the House Rules Committee in charge of the bill, has asserted that he expects to take his time in considering its provisions. As he is past 80 years of age, he cannot expect to delay action indefinitely.

CITIZENSHIP—LETTER FROM ELIZABETH HARGRAVE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks an exceedingly interesting letter which I received from a young lady in the eighth grade of one of the Portland, Oreg., public schools, which illustrates, I think, and very interestingly, the breadth of educational work that is going on in our public schools. The letter deals with the subject of citizenship, and there is attached to it a statement of what the young eighth graders consider to be the "10 essentials of a really good American." I wish to be associated with the conclusions of those young citizens.

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

PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Portland, Oreg., April 17, 1946.

WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senator,
Eugene, Oreg.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Some extremely serious questions have arisen in our eighth-grade class discussion. You see, we have been studying a unit of work which teaches us better understanding of people of different races, nationalities, and religious faiths.

We have discovered that all human beings are very much alike. Difference in skin color is caused only by two chemicals just under the surface of the skin, melanin and carotene. All blood plasma is exactly the same. There is no such thing as Irish blood, Jewish blood, Negro blood, etc. The structure of the brain and central nervous system is exactly the same in all people. There is no Jewish race; it is the Jewish religion. Environment is what causes people to seem different.

We boys and girls have written what we think are 10 essentials of a really good American. I am enclosing a copy for you. We know that lots of people are prejudiced against people of other races and religious faiths because they do not know enough about them. We know many people do not feel as we do. We know all people are created equal and we think they should all have the same opportunities.

In our list of essentials of a really good American it is Nos. 3, 4, 5 that some people would not believe. That is our serious question. We wonder whether most people would think we were right in including them in our list. Each of us (there are 62 in our class) is writing to a different person somewhere in the United States to get opinions.

What is your opinion of the importance of attitudes of people toward those of different races, nationality backgrounds, and religious faiths as an essential qualification of a really good American?

We have a chart in our room with my name and your name on it. After it is a blue star which shows I sent the letter and a gold star will show I received an answer from you.

Please address me care of my homeroom teacher, Miss Ellen Dalquist. I am very grateful to you.

Sincerely yours,

ELIZABETH HARGRAVE.

GLEKCOE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, PORTLAND, OREG., SPRING TERM, 1945–46

The following were composed by 8B students after a study of intergroup understandings and a study of the rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution:

"TEN ESSENTIALS OF A REALLY GOOD AMERICAN

"1. A really good American shows reverence and love for God.

"2. A really good American is not unduly influenced by others but states his honest opinion according to what he thinks is right.

"3. A really good American does not dislike other Americans because of their race, nationality background, or religious faith.

"4. A really good American shows courtesy and respect toward all people regardless of race, nationality background, or religious faith.

"5. A really good American does everything possible to help his fellow Americans have equal opportunities to use their constitutional rights.

"6. A really good American is honest and trustworthy in all his dealings.

"7. A really good American, when saluting the flag, salutes it with full appreciation of the words he or she is speaking.

"8. A really good American is loyal to his country and his fellow men at all times.

"9. A really good American upholds and obeys the laws that concern him.

"10. A really good American uses his opportunities to the best advantage and does his work well to the best of his ability."

PARTICIPATION BY UNITED STATES IN THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION—STATEMENT BY WOMEN'S ACTION COMMITTEE FOR LASTING PEACE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement issued by the Women's Action Committee for Lasting Peace. This statement is in reply to a statement already appearing in the RECORD, which was inserted in the RECORD by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

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

The Women's Action Committee for Lasting Peace has one purpose; it is, to unite American women to work for full participation by the United States in the United Nations organization in order to build a world of peace and justice under law.

Its headquarters are in New York City but it is a national organization with State chairmen and congressional district chairmen in practically every State in the Union. It has over 20,000 members and the active cooperation of more than a dozen national women's organizations whose names appear on the stationery. It is the only women's organization working actively and exclusively for world peace through the United Nations organization. It supports measures in Congress aimed to achieve this result.

To secure its objective of furthering the United Nations organization and United States cooperation in it, the Women's Action Committee is concerned that Members of Congress shall be internationally minded. It keeps a record of the votes of Senators and Congressmen on international issues and it sends, on request, the records of these votes to its members. Seven Senators, who are running for reelection this fall, have consistently opposed international cooperation.

The Chicago Daily Tribune, May 1, 1946, attacked the Women's Action Committee in an editorial headed "Snobbery." The paper accused the organization of being made up

of eastern internationalists, consistent New Dealers, with knee-bending subservience to the empire, and viewing Stalin with worshipful regard. Said the Chicago Tribune, "This meddling organization follows the international line. It is difficult to believe that any middle westerners will fall victim to their snobbery."

The Senator from North Dakota, who is coming up for reelection, and who was one of two Senators who the Women's Action Committee is remembering voted against the United States' ratification of the United Nations Charter, read the editorial from the Tribune into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 3. He apparently did not know that this eastern organization has members in 13 of the North Dakota communities as well as in practically all congressional districts of the country.

It is only fair that a statement concerning the work of the Women's Action Committee for Lasting Peace should be inserted in the same columns.

ADMINISTRATION OF MILITARY JUSTICE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles and an editorial on the court-martial problem. One is entitled "Justice on a Drumhead," and is written by Maurice Rosenblatt. The second is an editorial entitled "Army Courts Martial," published in the San Francisco Chronicle of April 23, 1946; and the third is an article entitled "Revise Courts Martial," published in the Washington Post of January 1, 1946.

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

[From the Nation magazine of April 27, 1946]

JUSTICE ON A DRUMHEAD

(By Maurice Rosenblatt)

A colonel sits stiffly before the American flag. To his right and left, tapering in rank, are half a dozen junior officers, immobility and coldness masking their faces. This is a general court martial. The trial judge advocate, whose sole duty in the Army is to prosecute, sits on one side acting both as prosecutor and adviser to the court. Opposite is the defense counsel, who has been hastily called from his duties as supply officer. The defendant—call him Sergeant Smith—is marched in under guard. He is bewildered by the rank and isn't sure whether he should salute or sit down. He has seen his attorney only once before, for a few minutes.

Charges are read, and the defense counsel waives the right to challenge any member of the court. A witness identifies Smith and is handed a typewritten sheet from which he reads his testimony. A judge asks if Smith was sober when the witness saw him in the jeep. Two other witnesses read statements. The judge advocate says that Smith is clearly guilty.

While the court deliberates he stands outside under guard. Things happened so fast he missed the moment when he was going to tell the court all about the jeep; that he'd just been released from the hospital and wanted to pick up ice for a party at the casual camp. He was going to tell about getting no mail for 3 months while his division pushed the enemy back several hundred miles; about being wounded. Carrying an automatic rifle made him a special target, though these people wouldn't understand that. All he wants is to get back to his outfit and not let his family know he was court martialed. He goes over the unuttered story.

Meanwhile the court reaches its decision. The junior officer votes first so that he will not be swayed by the judgment of his senior. It is a scrupulous provision, one of those punctilios of Army law which could have meaning if the substance of the whole procedure were fair. Finally Smith faces the judges. He has been found guilty of unlawfully using Government property. Before fixing sentence the court examines his record; it is clean, but the president of the court has privately reminded the others that the commanding general is tired of vehicle thefts, and that these fellows back from the front must realize they are still in the Army.

So Smith hears that he is to be broken to private, forfeit all pay and allowances, including months of combat pay which never caught up with him, be confined at hard labor for 2 years, and be dishonorably discharged. The whole trial took scarcely longer than a traffic case in night court.

Eight months after VJ-day more than 33,500 American soldiers are still confined in army prisons and rehabilitation centers. How did they get there?

Upon entering the army the soldier surrenders his constitutional rights and becomes subject to a code set forth in the Army's Manual for Courts Martial. This defines three types of court. The summary court tries minor violations and may fine or restrict an enlisted man. The special court, a board of three officers, decides cases of a more serious nature; these are presented by the trial judge advocate, and the defendant is entitled to counsel. The highest tribunal, the general court martial, has power to try officers as well as enlisted men. It can administer fines, sentence to hard labor and dishonorable discharge, and even impose the death penalty. The defendant may choose his own counsel, but few soldiers know that they may retain a civilian lawyer if they desire, and guardhouses provide no facilities for inmates to make arrangements for their defense. In practice the defense counsel is usually inexperienced and sometimes without legal training.

On paper Army justice is severe but fair. Actually it is frequently unfair and even brutal, less a system of justice than an arbitrary disciplinary code. Instead of preserving order and curbing crime it serves too frequently as an instrument of oppression by which officers fortify low-caliber leadership. Army justice has become the club which polices the caste system, punishing petty misconduct while ignoring the grossest malefaction. It creates bitterness, disillusionment, and helpless resentment among citizen-soldiers.

An ex-GI can talk about Army justice for hours, drawing on an inexhaustible stock of stories. Most of the cases cited here came to my notice during the 3 years I was attached to the Army's Department of Criminal Investigation. Army men who worked in the Judge Advocate or Provost Marshal section can match these with examples far more grim and lurid.

The first complaint against Army justice is that it operates on a double standard. Theoretically both officers and men are subject to the Articles of War listed in the Manual; in practice Army justice is administered only by officers and applied almost exclusively to enlisted men. In 1940 the Army conducted 16,391 courts martial; 17 of the men tried were officers. Only commissioned officers may serve on the court. Consequently the soldier is not tried by his equals but by representatives of a superior class whose status is maintained by disciplining the ranks. And a large proportion of trials arise from conflicts between officers and men.

An officer may violate an Article of War flagrantly and publicly, and not be punished. During the war a married lieutenant stationed at an east-coast town dated an 18-year-old girl. As he was taking her home he dragged her into an alley and tried to rape her. During the struggle the girl's arm was broken. The lieutenant had her arm set at the Army hospital, and the case was reported to military authorities. When questioned, the lieutenant admitted his part in the affair but laughed it all off, saying the girl was notoriously loose. The captain conducting the inquiry, a good friend of the lieutenant's, dropped the matter with the comment that lots of people broke their arms in winter falling on ice.

A contrast to the case of the laughing lieutenant is offered by that of the two enlisted men who picked up a WAC hitch-hiker in New Guinea. The woman spent several hours with the soldiers and later reported to the MP's that her watch had been stolen. Some two hours after reporting the theft, she casually remarked that she had also been raped. The two soldiers readily admitted having had relations with the woman but said she had been completely agreeable. At the trial no medical testimony was introduced to show physical evidence of rape. The court had only the word of the woman. But the two soldiers were sentenced to more than 10 years' hard labor. The character of the woman was not discussed at the trial, although she was awaiting return to the States because of mental incompetence.

An accused officer is rarely confined to a guardhouse before his trial. He can collect his evidence and muster his witnesses. If he is found guilty, the double standard still operates—"the higher the rank the milder the penalty." A reprimand to an officer is regarded as equivalent to a prison sentence for an enlisted man. Even traffic violations were treated differently during the war. At a camp where noncoms caught speeding were reduced to private and compelled to dig graves, officers were fined and reprimanded.

Combat soldiers who had engaged the enemy and survived by their own wits and intiative clashed with the garrison mentally behind the lines. At the front the use of vehicles, equipment, and food was dictated by necessity, and small heed was paid to vouchers or requisitions. When combat soldiers returned to a rear base, they wanted to blow off steam and have a good time—which generally involved liquor and a vehicle. Often when they were apprehended they were still suffering from combat fatigue, but the courts martial were likely to ignore that fact and to convict these men along with barracks thieves and deserters.

An over-conscientious soldier can get into considerable trouble inasmuch as the preservation of authority is of greater concern to the court than the merits of the case. A private at Fort Custer, Mich., while on "k. p." was directed by the mess sergeant to take meat which had been thrown into the garbage and place it in the refrigerator. The private refused because the meat was dirty. Two days later he was court-martialed for refusing to obey a lawful order. The only factor which the court considered was that the sergeant had issued an order which the private failed to obey. He was sentenced to 3 months' hard labor.

There is no habeas corpus in the Army. The Articles of War direct that no one may be unduly detained without being properly charged and tried, but the soldier, jailed before trial, has no way of enforcing his rights. Public opinion, the watchdog of civilian justice, plays virtually no part in the Army's system.

A Pennsylvania soldier, the father of eight, went home on furlough and overstayed his leave a week to be with his sick wife. On his way back to camp he was picked up in New Jersey. His records failed to arrive, and his trial was therefore put off. He told his story to six chaplains and inspectors without results. After he had been kept in confinement 3 months the allotment to his family was cut off on the ground that he was not earning his pay while in the guardhouse. That night he swallowed a disinfectant poison but was rushed to a hospital, where a stom-

ach pump saved his life. A few lines in his home-town paper about the attempted suicide worked wonders. He was brought to trial immediately and received a full acquittal, followed in a few weeks by an honorable discharge.

Who was to blame? Nobody wanted to take the responsibility for releasing the soldier under a system set up to confine, try, and convict. The safeguards of Anglo-Saxon justice were missing.

Guardhouse censorship makes it impossible for a prisoner to tell the outside world about mistreatment or violations of regulations by prison officers. In many though not all Army prisons, at home and abroad, a sadistic streak developed in the jailors. Men have been beaten and tortured, and fatalities have resulted from guardhouse brutality. The most notorious camp, at Lichfield, England, is currently having its crimson history of flogging and murder spread before the public in the testimony given at the trial of nine guards and two officers accused of cruelty. Yet the Lichfield commandant, Colonel Killian, was recommended for promotion by the War Department. Public protest led, instead, to his being charged with responsibility for the cruel treatment of prisoners—treatment which is alleged to have included beatings with rifle butts and rawhide.

Apologists for the Army's court-martial record point out that there are practically no instances of an innocent man being convicted or framed. That is true, but one must remember that Army regulations are so voluminous and contradictory that every officer and man in the service could be proved a transgressor if the authorities desired to press a charge. Too much depends upon the caprice of superior officers. Stealing a jeep might rate only a 6 months' sentence at one camp; at another it might bring 3 years and a dishonorable discharge.

At present the House Military Affairs Committee and an Army commission are investigating the court-martial system. Nothing will be accomplished, however, if they recommend only superficial reforms instead of basic changes. Any effort to revamp military justice runs head on against the congealed caste system, the officers' code, the inflexability of the military mind, and the sacred traditions of the service. But the fact remains that now is the time to obtain the needed changes, while the Army is courting public favor for appropriations and recruits. Veterans and taxpayers can demand certain reforms:

1. The protection of habeas corpus must be extended to the Army.

2. Military courts should include enlisted men as well as officers among the judges, in the trials of both officers and enlisted men.

3. The legal section of the Army, the Judge Advocate General's Department, should not be under the control of commanders of troops but should be made directly answerable to the Secretary of War, a civilian. This would end the present practice of using the legal powers of the Army as an administrative weapon to enforce personal policies. A civilian board of review should examine all court-martial sentences, and periodically inspect guardhouses and rehabilitation centers.

4. The Judge Advocate section, which today functions as a prosecutor's office, should provide also for defense. Access to civilian attorneys, now provided for in theory, should be facilitated.

5. The Courts Martial Manual should be revised; penalties for specific offenses should be standardized and a distinction made between breaches of Army discipline and criminal offenses. Also, a policy should be worked out regarding psychiatric evidence and medical treatment of sexual abnormals.

6. Officers in the Judge Advocate and Provost Marshal sections who have shown bias, cruelty, or negligence should be prosecuted.

7. Court-martial proceedings are not secret. If the press made a point of reporting courts martial like civil courts, the spotlight of publicity would do more than anything else to remedy current abuses.

Above all, the thousands of American soldiers still confined in Army guardhouses and Federal penitentiaries are entitled to a prompt review of their cases. A distinction should be made between those who committed actual crimes and those who overstepped one of the innumerable taboos and happened to be caught.

Remember, the man in uniform can do nothing about all this. It is up to veterans and civilians to right the wrongs of the past and set up a court-martial system which will be the cornerstone of a democratic army.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of April 23, 1946]

ARMY COURTS MARTIAL

On the strength of statistics showing that Army courts condemned 142 men to death during the war while there were no executions in the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, Congressman J. LEROY JOHNSON of California appears justified in asking what's wrong with the Army court-martial system. Granting that the Army had twice the numerical strength of the naval services, and that opportunity for the two major types of capital crimes—murder and rape—was greater among the ground forces, these factors do not begin to explain the score of 142 of 0.

JOHNSON charges that the Army used its court-martial system to enforce discipline, rather than to administer impartial justice. The charge is serious enough to warrant the fullest investigation, and the investigation should have the whole-hearted support of the Army.

Wartime necessitates a considerable submergence of the individual rights for the welfare of the whole Nation, and several hundred thousand Americans willingly gave their lives on that basis. But it is doubtful if any young man perceived it his duty to face a firing squad of his own comrades for a crime which otherwise would not carry the death penalty so he might serve as an example to the service at large. That sort of stringency, far from promoting justice, would only kindle a deep and ominous resentment as an example of the kind of ruthless inhumanity we were trying to abolish from the earth.

If JOHNSON's charge is groundless the Army should refute it with all the vigor at its command. If the charge has basis in fact, the Army can serve its own best interests by overhauling its system of justice.

[From the Washington Post of January 1, 1946]

REVISE COURTS MARTIAL—COMMUNICATION POINTS UP DEFECTS

It is proper, I think, to point out at this time the existence of a type of duress practiced upon the courts in the Army court-martial system and, I assume, also existing in the Navy. Of course, any type of duress is prohibited by the manual for courts martial, but a method of exerting it upon a sworn court is nevertheless being practiced every day.

Courts are appointed by the commanding officer or general. The same officer refers charges for trial after he has examined them. Because of the fact that a report of an investigating officer is before him at the time of trial, too often commanding officers reach stern conclusions as to the guilt or innocence of the accused long before the trial is held. After the trial the same commanding officer must review and approve or disapprove the findings of the court and the sentence. To assist him in this work there is provided a staff judge advocate who is the judicial officer of the command.

One personal experience of the undersigned should be sufficient to prove the immediate need for a revamping of the entire system of courts martial and for reenactment of certain of the Articles of War.

The undersigned represented a staff sergeant in a general court martial in the military district of Washington about 2 years ago. It was a case in which the accused had been held without charges for a long period of time and had been held without trial for an even longer period, notwithstanding the fact that the Articles of War require that where a man is in arrest or confinement immediate steps will be taken to try him or he will be released.

Immediately after having been requested to act as defense counsel for the accused, the undersigned contacted the staff judge advocate of the military district of Washington in order to obtain a copy of the order appointing the court and certain necessary papers. In a discussion the judge advocate said to me the following: "Now, Ball, you have not got a chance in this case, and you might as well plead this man guilty and I will be satisfied with a sentence of 1 year."

This statement, mind you, was made by the highest judicial officer of the command, whose duty it was to review the record of the case at the trial from the standpoint of legality, competency, and sufficiency of evidence and the ever-present requirement of fair trial. The undersigned advised this officer quite frankly that he could abide by no such advice and that he considered it his duty to represent the man to the best of his ability on every issue at the trial.

The case was tried, a motion to release the accused on the ground that the Articles of War had not been complied with in that he had been held for months without trial was overruled, and the accused was sentenced to be reduced to the grade of private and to forfeit a certain amount of his pay per month for 6 months. You will note that the court did not sentence him to any confinement.

Upon review of this case the order, prepared by the staff judge advocate heretofore mentioned and issued by the commanding general of the military district of Washington included the following statement: "The sentence though grossly inadequate will be duly executed." This sentence in the order is an example of the type of duress exercised every day in court-martial procedure. The only possible effect of that statement was to admonish the court for not imposing a more severe punishment upon the accused.

It is such admonishment by the commanding officer of each member of the court in a published order which amounts to nothing short of duress upon the court and as a matter of fact in most cases results in more severe punishment in the next case heard by the court of equal guilt and circumstances.

Any system which allows courts, sworn to decide the case to their best ability according to the law and the evidence produced before them, to be ridiculed for their honest efforts is so contrary to the concept of democratic government which we in America have long since learned to love and appreciate that its very existence in its present state should be short lived and in its place should be a system of justice for each service separate and apart from command functions.

Only through the correction of the system, in order that the actual intent of Congress that every man should be given a fair and impartial trial be carried out, can real justice be provided. Otherwise the shocking injustices arising from courts martial in the past few years will continue to be a mockery of genuine judicial process.

FRANK J. BALL, Jr.,
Major, AUP, Inactive.

ARLINGTON, VA., *December 26.*

Mr. MORSE. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement on naval

and military justice by Arthur J. Fruend, presiding at a session of the section of criminal law of the American Bar Association at Cincinnati, Ohio, on December 19, 1945.

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

The subject of our discussion this afternoon is Naval and Military Justice. It will be treated by two distinguished members of our armed forces and followed by a discussion of experts. It is our hope that the discussion period will also have the participation of all persons here interested.

While a great variety of subjects have been studied at this American Bar Association meeting, it is likely that none is of greater importance or of greater public interest than the one assigned to us. The system of naval and military justice is under severe public scrutiny. Fire at our systems of courts martial has been directed by returning veterans, by our press, and in the Halls of Congress. It is obvious that this should be so.

The Articles of War and our courts martial procedure are deeply rooted in our Military and Naval Establishments. The summary and direct methods, while efficient in a mechanical sense, have but small comparison to the administration of justice administered in our civilian criminal courts. It is to be expected that contrasts should be observed by returning veterans and the parents and friends of men convicted by courts martial.

Complaint is made that officers untrained in the determination of facts and the fixing of punishment constitute the personnel of courts martial; that members of the court are frequently under domination of their superior officers; that untrained persons are often assigned to try and defend the accused and that defense counsel are themselves often under the fear of reprisal by a superior officer if complete zeal is given in such defense; that punishment inflicted is in a large number of instances by civilian or humanitarian standards out of all proportion to the nature of the offense or the character of the offender.

On the other hand, a naval or military force cannot perform its functions without the highest standards of discipline. It is said that the present system of courts martial is essential to the maintenance of that discipline.

It is not for me as chairman to discuss the merits of this extremely important controversy. But it is my hope that a frank and sincere consideration of the problem be given. We should, like Janus, look backward and forward. Looking backward, if injustices have been done, we should use our efforts to correct them. If the system is good, it can withstand the most careful and meticulous scrutiny. If the system needs to be changed, we should advise what changes are necessary. And to look forward, we should realize that we are going to have a large Naval and Military Establishment in this country for years to come. Many believe that we will have compulsory peacetime military service. If that be so, then it is all the more important that our system of naval and military justice to regulate the lives of hundreds of thousands of young men who will constitute a large part of our Naval and Military Establishment, be governed by as perfect a system of justice as the mind and heart of man can devise.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at this late hour I do not intend to make an extended statement on the subject of military justice; but before the Senate adjourns for the summer I intend to make further remarks upon it.

At this time I wish to point out that many of us who have been interested in the two court-martial resolutions which have been pending for many months in the Senate believe that it would be very unfortunate for the Senate to adjourn without passing one of the resolutions calling for a Senate investigation of the court-martial systems of the Army and Navy. I think we have been exceedingly patient. The so-called McCarran resolution was submitted some months ago, subsequent to the resolution which I submitted on the same subject.

Suffice it to say at this time that I do not think we have any right, as representatives of the people of the United States, to adjourn for a long recess—supposedly until next January—and permit many so-called military and naval prisoners to languish in military and naval prisons as the result of the miscarriage of military justice during this war. It seems to me that we have a duty to put a Senate committee to work during the summer and next fall, to make a thorough investigation and survey of military and naval justice.

I wish to say to the Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, that he does not impress me one iota by his defenses recently published in the press in regard to military justice. I am not at all impressed by the attempts on the part of the War Department and the Navy Department to investigate themselves. I repeat what I have previously said. It is the clear public duty of Members of the Senate to pass either the McCarran resolution or the Morse resolution, calling for an investigation of military and naval justice. I do not know how much longer we are going to tolerate the gross injustices which developed during the war on the part of the War Department and the Navy Department, with huge numbers of our men in the service suffering from such injustices.

I close by repeating what I previously stated. Let Mr. Patterson, the Secretary of War, produce a rebuttal to it. I have yet to talk with a single lawyer who served in the armed forces of the United States Army or Navy who had not said to me that it is of the utmost importance, in the name of justice, that either the McCarran resolution or the Morse resolution be passed by the Senate.

Thus once again I raise my voice on the floor of the Senate. I ask the Senate to recognize the importance of these pending resolutions and that we serve notice on the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War by action, demonstrated by a majority vote for one of the resolutions, that the Senate intends to analyze from top to bottom the military justice practices of the Army and Navy.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say that the Mead committee has, in a small way, looked into the question of military justice and court martial. The question arose in connection with an investigation in Hawaii, and one in Puerto Rico. I am of the opinion that a thorough investigation of the entire procedure of military justice during the war should be made. I feel that the problem calls for study. I believe that the Senate is the proper body to look into this question. Enough was disclosed during the two investigations to which I have referred to indicate that this subject is important in connection with our national defense. I believe that an overall, thorough investigation of military justice during the war should be made.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan for the support which he is giving me in this fight. I think the RECORD will show that I have yet to raise my voice in connection with this matter without having the support of the Senator from Michigan, as well as the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] who, as Members of this body know, is himself a veteran of this war and is thoroughly familiar with the importance of the fight which I am trying to make in my demands for an investigation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 1, 1946, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 29 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

William T. Mahoney to be United States marshal for division No. 1, district of Alaska. (Mr. Mahoney is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires July 7, 1946.)

Stanley J. Nichols, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 4, district of Alaska, vice Joseph A. McDonald, whose term will expire July 7, 1946.

Thomas P. O'Donovan, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Illinois, vice William H. McDonnell, resigned.

Eugene J. Smith, of New York, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of New York, vice Spencer C. Young, resigned.

Neale D. Murphy, of Rhode Island, to be United States marshal for the district of Rhode Island. (Mr. Murphy is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires July 3, 1946.)

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Eula E. Hamilton, Woodstock, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

ARIZONA

James Cohen Garrett, Eloy, Ariz., in place of R. E. Hamilton, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

Sylvia S. Richardson, Highway Highlands, Calif., in place of A. L. Routson, resigned.

Roscoe J. King, Indio, Calif., in place of Margaret Allen, retired.

Arthur Patterson, Lincoln Acres, Calif., in place of L. P. Comerford, removed.

COLORADO

J. Max Rush, Otis, Colo., in place of M. M. Reed, deceased.

FLORIDA

Lessie L. McMullen, Lee, Fla., in place of Vesta Blanton, removed.

GEORGIA

John W. Ray, Dalton, Ga., in place of W. M. Denton, retired.

ILLINOIS

Eleanore A. Morley, Good Hope, Ill., in place of J. M. Hickman, deceased.

IOWA

Lucille V. Gittinger, Eldon, Iowa, in place of J. A. Hollen, removed.

MARYLAND

Frank Scott Bradley, Federalsburg, Md., in place of R. W. Noble, deceased.

MISSOURI

Raymond H. Schell, Augusta, Mo., in place of Calvin Clay, resigned

Grace N. Davis, Desloge, Mo., in place of E. B. Newman, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Norma E. Emmans, Ledgewood, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEW YORK

Marian Chadderdon, Acra, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Wynford B. Bailey, Lexington, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Sarah A. Wilcox, Wellsburg, N. Y., in place of C. M. Stanton, removed.

NORTH DAKOTA

Arthur J. DeKrey, Pettibone, N. Dak., in place of H. B. Pruitt, designed.

OHIO

Lester Bishop, Johnstown, Ohio, in place of O. I. Foster, resigned.

John Merle Gibson, Savannah, Ohio, in place of A. M. Gibson, retired.

Joseph D. Ryan, Willoughby, Ohio, in place of M. A. Delsantro, removed.

PENNSYLVANIA

Thelma B. Kelley, Brier Hill, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charles E. Ongley, Grand Valley, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clara M. Baker, Penllyn, Pa., in place of O. S. Rosenberger, retired.

Thomas Mark Shockey, Rouzerville, Pa., in place of W. N. Rowe, resigned.

TENNESSEE

Levie B. Thomas, Pleasant Shade, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

TEXAS

Oneta M. Fersch, Wink, Tex., in place of P. E. Jette, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Juanita Collins, North Matewan, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 29 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Louis LeBaron, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Hon. Bunk Gardner to be United States district judge of the Canal Zone.

Hon. George B. Harris, to be United States district judge for the northern district of California.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY

The nominations of Charles E. Briner et al., officers, for appointment in the United States Navy, which were received by the Senate on June 25, 1946, and which appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Tuesday, June 25, 1946, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Charles E. Briner on page 7464 and ending with the name of Morris W. Woods, ending on page 7467.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JUNE 29, 1946

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

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

Thou infinite spirit of life, Thou hast not set a limit to the richness of love, to the power of self-sacrifice, nor to the sublimity of purity. O teach us the beauty and the simplicity of the Christian life apart from creeds and dogmas, that in faith we may walk with Thee, happy in the assurance of a wise fellowship of service. While days are difficult and discipline is hard, do Thou open our minds for the reception of Thy guiding wisdom and direct us with Thy nourishment. In affliction shield us, endowed with Thy plenteous gifts, that our endeavors may be in harmony with Thy will and our strength be able to bear it. Do Thou bless and enrich the church universal, and let the glory of the Lord be established in the souls of all the nations. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

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; and

H. R. 6682. An act to amend sections 81, 82, and 83, and to repeal section 84 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5933. An act to authorize and direct the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to establish and operate in the public schools and other suitable locations a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2234. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5990) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment numbered 1 to said bill, disagreed to by the House, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HOEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. WILLIS, and Mr. FERGUSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6428. An act making appropriations for the Coast Guard, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. WHITE, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. REED conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6837. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. REED to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1654) entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes."

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6496) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 186]

Adams	Gavin	Norton
Anderson, Calif.	Gerlach	Patrick
Andrews, N. Y.	Gibson	Patterson
Auchincloss	Gillespie	Peterson, Ga.
Baldwin, Md.	Granger	Pickett
Baldwin, N. Y.	Grant, Ala.	Ploeser
Barrett, Pa.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Powell
Barry	Hall, Leonard W.	Pratt
Bates, Mass.	Harless, Ariz.	Quinn, N. Y.
Bell	Harris	Rankin
Bender	Hartley	Rayfiel
Bennet, N. Y.	Hedrick	Reece, Tenn.
Bloom	Heffernan	Reed, Ill.
Bonner	Hoffman, Mich.	Rivers
Boren	Holifield	Robertson, N. Dak.
Boykin	Hook	Robinson, Utah
Bradley, Mich.	Izac	Rodgers, Pa.
Bradley, Pa.	Jackson	Roe, N. Y.
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, N. Y.
Buchanan	Johnson, Okla.	Rooney
Buckley	Judd	Sabath
Byrne, N. Y.	Kearney	Sadowski
Camp	Kee	Sasscer
Cannon, Fla.	Keefe	Sharp
Carnahan	Kefauver	Sheridan
Celler	Keogh	Sikes
Cochran	Kerr	Slaughter
Coffee	Kinzer	Smith, Va.
Cole, N. Y.	Klein	Somers, N. Y.
Colmer	Latham	Sparkman
Corbett	LeCompte	Spence
Courtney	Lesinski	Stefan
Cox	Luce	Stevenson
Crawford	Ludlow	Stewart
Crosser	McCowen	Stigler
Curley	McGehee	Stockman
Daughton, Va.	McGlinchey	Sumner, Ill.
Davis	McKenzie	Taylor
Dawson	Mahon	Thomas, N. J.
Dolliver	Mankin	Tolan
Domengeaux	Mansfield, Mont.	Torrens
Drewry	Mansfield, Tex.	Towe
Dworshak	Marcantonio	Vinson
Eaton	Merrow	Vorys, Ohio
Eberharter	Miller, Calif.	Weaver
Elsaesser	Morgan	Welch
Engel, Mich.	Morrison	West
Ervin	Murphy	Wickersham
Fellows	Murray, Tenn.	Winstead
Fisher	Norrell	Wolfenden, Pa.
Flannagan		Worley
Gamble		Zimmerman
Gardner		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 271 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the statement.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6496) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other 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 amendments numbered 6, 13, 26, 57, 63, 65, 69, and 70.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 27, 28, 33, 34, 46, 58, 60, and 61, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$13,844,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and at the end of the matter so restored insert the following: "or who have not been commissioned in the line of the Navy more than five years prior to the commencement of such educational courses or postgraduate instruction"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$246,390,000, of which $350,000 shall be available for placing the equipment at the Naval Torpedo Station, Newport, Rhode Island, in condition for operation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "not to exceed $500,000,000 from the naval stock fund: *Provided*, That the cash working capital of the naval stock fund shall not be reduced below $50,000,000 as the result of such transfer"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$70,966,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$131,018,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$370,558,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,239,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$325,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$706,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,271,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$354,412,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,785,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$15,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$17,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$57,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$275,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,642,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$31,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,425,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$967,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,626,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$383,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,456,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,705,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,075,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,045,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,715,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$35,562,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "September"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "August"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "September"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "September"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 12, 19, 59, and 62.

HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ALBERT THOMAS,
THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
WALTER C. PLOESER,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN H. OVERTON,
DAVID I. WALSH,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
STYLES BRIDGES,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,
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 amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6496) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 2: Appropriates $13,844,000 for "Miscellaneous expenses" instead of $13,205,000 as proposed by the House and $14,483,000 as provided by the Senate.

No. 3: Makes $15,000 of the appropriation for contingencies of the Navy immediately available as proposed by the Senate.

No. 4: Amends language inserted by the House and stricken out by the Senate preventing the use of the appropriation "Instruction" for certain postgraduate instruction of officers. The amended language will permit line officers of the Navy to qualify for staff duties provided they make the election to become staff officers within 5 years after their commissioning in the line.

No. 5: Adopts Senate amendment permitting the Navy to charter and hire vessels for auxiliary purposes.

No. 6: Appropriates $443,750,000 for "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships," as proposed by the House instead of $446,750,000 as provided by the Senate. The Senate increase of $3,000,000 was for the purpose of producing training devices. It is the intention of the conferees that the appropriation for "Research, Navy," may be available for the production of these devices.

No. 7: Adopts language inserted by the Senate making the appropriation for the Bureau of Ordnance available for research.

No. 8: Adopts language inserted by the Senate naming the five ordnance stations where schools may be conducted with Government funds.

No. 9: Appropriates $246,390,000 as proposed by the House for "Ordnance and Ordnance stores, Navy," instead of $247,990,000 as provided by the Senate. The Senate increase was for the purpose of producing training devices. It is the intention of the conferees that the appropriation for "Research, Navy," may be available for the production of these devices. The amendment, as agreed to, also makes $350,000 of this appropriation available for placing the equipment at the naval torpedo station, Newport, R. I., in condition for operation.

No. 10: Strikes out language inserted by the House and deleted by the Senate preventing the use of the appropriation for the Bureau of Ordnance to be used for the manufacture, assembly, repair, or overhaul of torpedoes at the naval ordnance plant, Forest Park, Ill.

No. 11: Places a limitation on transfers from the naval stock fund so as to prevent the fund from being reduced below $50,000,000 instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. No limitation was carried respecting these transfers as the bill passed the House.

No. 13: Eliminates a Senate proposal to make the appropriation for the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery available for the purchase of uniforms for guards at the Naval Hospital Medical Center in Bethesda, Md.

No. 14: Adopts the term "naval shipyards" as proposed by the Senate, instead of "navy yards" as proposed by the House.

No. 15: Clarifying amendment.

No. 16: Appropriates $70,966,300 for naval public works within the United States instead of $83,000,000 as proposed by the House and $35,966,300 as provided by the Senate.

No. 17: Exempts from the operations of the limitation on the amount of the appropriation for public works inside the United States that may be expended without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes fees paid for architectural or engineering services as proposed by the Senate.

No. 18: Limits the amount of public works funds within the United States that may be expended without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes to 10 percent as proposed by the Senate instead of 5 percent as proposed by the House.

No. 20: Clarifying amendment.

No. 21: Makes the appropriation for public works outside the United States available for expenditure without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes as proposed by the Senate.

No. 22: Permits disbursements and accounting of appropriations for public works as one fund as provided by the Senate.

Nos. 23, 24, 25, and 26: These amendments all deal with the appropriations for the Bureau of Aeronautics. The effect of the action taken is to appropriate $805,760,000 as proposed by the House instead of $812,845,800 as provided by the Senate but with certain redistributions of the appropriation as proposed by the Senate. The Senate increase which was eliminated was for the production of training devices. It is the intention of the conferees that the appropriation for "Research, Navy," may be available for the production of these devices.

No. 27: Appropriates $5,963,000 for the pay and allowances of the Marine Corps Reserve as proposed by the Senate instead of $15,634,000 as provided by the House.

No. 28: Corrects a total.

Nos. 29, 30, and 31: Appropriates, in each instance, 50 percent of the increase added by the Senate for the pay of civilian employees of the Marine Corps.

No. 32: Corrects a total.

No. 33: Appropriates $2,857,000 for general expenses of the Marine Corps Reserve as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,800,000 as provided by the House.

Nos. 34 and 35: Corrects totals.

Nos. 36 to 45, inclusive: Appropriates, in each instance, 50 percent of the increase added by the Senate for the pay of civilian employees in the various bureaus and offices in Washington.

No. 46: Adopts Senate language clarifying intent of the House provision.

Nos. 47 to 54, inclusive: Appropriates, in each instance, 50 percent of the increase added by the Senate for the pay of civilian employees in the various bureaus and offices in Washington.

No. 55: Corrects a total.

No. 56: Appropriates $1,500,000 for contingent and miscellaneous expenses of the Hydrographic Office instead of $1,425,000 as proposed by the House and $1,650,000 as provided by the Senate.

No. 57: Eliminates language inserted by the Senate permitting, under certain conditions, time studies to be made of work performed by Government employees of the Navy Department.

No. 58: Action same as that taken on amendment No. 14.

No. 60: Clarifying amendment.

No. 61: Adopts language inserted by the Senate preventing the use of funds appropriated in the bill for expenses incident to the care of surplus materials.

Nos. 63 to 70, inclusive: These amendments all deal with the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration. Under the House provisions the War Shipping Administration would become merged with the Maritime Commission on July 1, 1946, and the War Shipping Administration would be liquidated by December 31, 1946. The Senate provided that the merger would take place on October 1, 1946, with liquidation to follow on March 1, 1947. The amendments as agreed to will require the merger to take place on September 1, 1946, and liquidation to become effective on December 31, 1946.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendments are reported in disagreement:

No. 1, relating to cost-of-living allowances for civilian employees of the Navy Department in foreign countries. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 12, relating to the naval procurement fund: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 19, relating to use of public works funds: The House managers will move to cede and concur with an amendment.

No. 59, relating to limitations on expenditure of funds to pay salary and wages of anyone who engages in a strike against the Government, or who is a member of an organization that asserts the right to strike against the Government, etc. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 62, relating to language permitting the Secretary of the Navy to delegate certain authority. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ALBERT THOMAS,
THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
WALTER C. PLOESER,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the House managers, after a free and full conference, have been able to reach a complete agreement on all of the matters in dispute in the Navy Department Appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1947. There were a few contentious subjects, but by give and take we finally had a meeting of the minds.

The bill, as made up in conference, carries a total "out of the Treasury" appropriation of approximately $4,120,000,000 which is supplemented by a $500,000,000 transfer of funds from the Naval Stock fund. The total amount carried in the bill is roughly $10,000,000 under the total as passed by the House and the reduction results largely from the elimination of approximately $11,500,000 for the Marine Corps Reserve program. As passed the House, the bill provided funds to double the size of the Marine Corps Reserve. General Vandergrift appeared before the Senate Committee and indicated that the greatly augmented program would afford some difficulties and that he would be satisfied if the original Marine Corps estimates for the Reserve program would be approved. The agreement is in accord with his wishes.

There were really only two other matters that were of general interest. The House bill carried funds for the construction of four permanent Naval hospitals and an addition to an existing hospital. The Senate struck out these monies. We finally agreed to reinstate about $42,000,000 for this hospital program which is about $12,000,000 less than the House bill set up. This sum should provide something between 3,000 and 4,000 additional beds in permanently constructed hospitals and will at least be a start in the direction of meeting the 13,000 odd permanent bed deficiency that exists at the present time. The other matter that I think should be brought to your attention in the matter of the compromise we made on the action of the Senate in restoring approximately $5,500,000 for the salaries of civilian employees in the Navy Department in Washington. The House had cut that sum from the Budget estimates with an eye toward economy. The reduction spelled positions for about 2,000 individuals. Every one of the divisions in the Navy that were affected by the slash appeared before the Senate Committee and entered vigorous objection to the reduction. It was finally agreed, therefore, that we would halve the difference so we restored approximately 2 and three-fourths million dollars for these salaries. Even with this restoration, however, we reduced the budget estimates for civilian employees at the seat of Government by about 7 percent.

I think that is all that I care to say about the report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, all I wish to say is that I support unqualifiedly the report of the committee of conference.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON].

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, as the House knows, on Monday of this week the President accepted the resignation of the Honorable Ganson Purcell, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission. The great work of this able and fearless administrator over his 16-year period of public service is known to all of you. Hence, I will not recount his accomplishments in detail but merely use this brief moment to pay to him the tribute which he so justly and richly deserves.

Ganson Purcell entered into the services of the United States in 1930, when he became a member of the staff of the Legislative Counsel of the United States Senate. He became Assistant Legislative Counsel to the Senate in 1932. After ably serving in that capacity until 1934 he became a member of the legal staff of the Securities and Exchange Commission which was then in its infancy but whose future held such great promise. The Commission, which had been created by Congress to curb the financial excesses rampant in the twenties and which substantially contributed to the debacle of the early thirties, was then attracting to its staff some of the most brilliant minds and skilled technicians in this country. Ganson Purcell was one of the first of this group. His first job at the Commission was almost at the bottom of the organization, but it was not long before his keen mind, and exceptional abilities, led to his rapid advancement. He became, successively, Assistant Director of the Trading and Exchange Division, Director of the Trading and Exchange Division, and, in 1941, Commissioner. Since 1942 he has been the Commission's chairman.

Keenly aware of the public interest, zealous to protect the small investor from the unscrupulous practices of the Wall Street coterie and skilled in the techniques of both the law and the market place, he did much to build the stature of the Commission into a real bulwark of our system of free enterprise.

It was with great personal regret that I learned of his resignation from the Commission, and I know that my keen regret is shared by the other Members of the House. I see in his resignation another example of a solid, able, and even-handed public servant who stayed in the governmental harness years beyond the time when personal interest would have dictated otherwise.

While the loss of the services of Ganson Purcell is a real blow to the Commission, I know that his keen mind and great heart have left an enduring mark which should bode well for the common weal.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question. I realize we have to have a strong Navy now and a good Army and a strong air force. But when I hear over the radio, as I did yesterday morning, "This is WRC-NBC; we have collected $43,000,000,000 in taxes for the year and we have paid $12,000,000,000 off the national debt this year." Then they stop there and make the people of this country believe we are doing some good financing. But instead of the radio commentator telling the public we are going into debt over $2,000,000,000 for the year, with all the money that you have collected, it makes the picture sound, but it does not fool the public. It behooves the Committee on Appropriations at all times to cut down these appropriations to the limit of their ability with good sound financing. I wonder whether the Appropriations Committee has done everything it could do in eliminating every unnecessary expense in the naval appropriation bill. It has not been done in some other bills.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont to answer the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I would remind my good friend, the watchdog of the Treasury, that when we bring in a report after a conference with the Senate which measures our ability to trade to the extent that we reduced the original House bill by $20,000,000, he should not find any fault with that. May I say to him also that he should not believe everything he hears over the radio.

Mr. RICH. I do not believe in what I hear from many radio commentators. I am not so much interested so far as the conference report is concerned as I am in the ultimate financing of this Government of ours. Now you have to do either one of two things. You must either stop spending extravagantly or bust; and I do not want to be a party to the bust. For 15 years this country has had an orgy of high financing and very extravagant administration. No other administration has ever been like it for inefficiency and extravagance. It is the world's worst spenders.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time I intend to offer a motion to recommit this conference report with instructions to the House conferees to stand by the House language which was put in the bill; in other words, my amendment to prevent the use of funds by the Navy for the manufacture, overhaul, repair, and assembly of torpedoes at Forest Park, Ill. I was greatly surprised and disappointed when I found after the amendment had been adopted here on the floor of the House and had been adopted by the Subcommittee on Appropriations in the Senate that the full Senate Appropriations Committee had deleted it from the bill and the Senate sustained that action. However, in accordance with long-established precedent, I expected that the House conferees would stand up for the language in the House bill, which I understand they failed to do. Instead they yielded to the Senate. Therefore, the amendment was deleted from the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this really means something in more ways than one. It means that the Navy is riding roughshod and doing just what it pleases, regardless of the effect upon a torpedo station that was built in 1869, where the torpedo was invented and developed and where highly skilled personnel was used during the war, not only to manufacture torpedoes as they did during peacetime but also to teach the manufacture of torpedoes to those people who were to be hired by private contractors and who were to be used at the plant in Forest Park, Ill., a plant that was operated during the war by a private contractor, the American Can Co., and which was taken over by the Navy on December 10, 1945.

The reward for those men of Newport, who did so much for the war effort, as well as for many years previously, is that they are being thrown out into the street after having rendered 25, 35, and, in one case, 39 years of faithful service to Uncle Sam, under civil-service rates of pay, which are about 20 cents an hour less than the Navy is paying at Forest Park. While throwing out these long-term employees who were under civil service, but are too young to take advantage of the retirement law now on the books, they have blanketed into the Civil Service to man the plant at Forest Park the men who during the war were working for private contractors at much higher wages, and who are eligible for unemployment compensation, to which, of course, the employees at Newport are not eligible.

The Navy Department has made the specious argument that they can manufacture torpedoes cheaper at Forest Park than at Newport, but as usual, they handle their language very deftly. They also juggle figures very nicely. I do not say that they lied to you, but I could say it. For instance, in the case of manufacturing the mark-13 torpedo, the Navy Department states that the cost at Newport was $9,040, against $7,900 at Forest Park. What is the truth of the matter? I have the figures, and the Navy Department has the same figures on file, showing that for the last 5 years the average cost of the mark-13 torpedo manufactured at Newport is $7,000, which includes five or six hundred dollars for ranging. Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that Newport is to continue the research and development work, but the torpedoes will be manufactured at Forest Park, Ill., and then will be shipped 1,000 miles back to Newport for testing, for post ranging, and for issue. Moreover, they tell us that Forest Park is going to have 1,250 employees. Admiral Hussey admitted, and you will find it in the hearings before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, that if my amendment remains in the bill it means but 600 jobs at Newport. How can you reconcile the Navy Department's statement that they are going to save money by using Forest Park if they are going to use 1,250 workers at Forest Park when 600 people can do the same work at Newport? It does not jibe.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want to commend the gentleman for his splendid argument for the Newport station. In my judgment it is just bureaucratic arrogance and favoritism to close a station which was established by act of Congress, and transfer its activities elsewhere.

Mr. FORAND. The gentleman no doubt is aware of the statement made by Admiral Hussey that if the Navy so decided, they could close Annapolis without considering Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not believe in that kind of administration.

Mr. FORAND. I hold in my hand a copy of the Chicago Tribune of June 27, and I want to read an excerpt from it.

Mr. FORAND. Capt. Harry Hoffman, commanding officer at the naval ordnance plant at Forest Park, Ill., has given us a fine example of the arrogance of some Navy officers and the contempt they have for Congress.

I quote from Captain Hoffman's statement, as it appears in the Chicago Tribune:

> I thought everybody had learned the lesson of the vulnerability of our seacoasts in this war.

You know as well as I do that coming from the Arctic Circle they can reach Forest Park or Chicago or New York just as easily as they can reach Newport.

> It was a good, sound decision getting our plants dispersed and located inland, and now a small group of minority politicians—

Those who are fighting for their own districts are called minority politicians.

There is a fine example of what the naval officers think of us, we who are elected by the people to represent them here in this Congress. I believe that under the Constitution we in the Congress have the right and the duty to tell the Navy what they should do, not they tell us what we should do. I continue the quotation—

> and now a small group of minority politicians comes along and tries to wreck our program. The Navy wants Forest Park.

Will the Navy say what they want and what they will get, or will the Congress say so?

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DE LACY. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Rhode Island on the magnificent statement of facts he has made about his own torpedo station in relation to the Forest Park development.

In my own district we have a magnificent station, with a history not as long as that of the station in the gentleman's district, but one that is very efficient. We likewise are suffering the same penalty for having done good work over a long period of years and built up a corps of highly trained mechanics.

I certainly hope the gentleman will be successful in his fight.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Did I understand the gentleman to say that torpedoes could be manufactured in the Rhode Island torpedo plant $2,000 cheaper each than at Forest Park?

Mr. FORAND. Not quite that. The Navy says that Newport is manufacturing at $9,040, whereas Forest Park is manufacturing at $7,900. I say that the actual figures would prove that $7,000 is approximately the cost of a Mark 13 torpedo at Newport. If they want to use the same type of torpedo manufactured under similar conditions we maintain we cannot only meet that figure but that we have workmen who are so far superior by virtue of their long experience—in fact, to the point where they were used as teachers for the group at Forest Park—that we could better that figure.

Mr. RICH. I hope the gentleman will put those figures in the RECORD. It seems to me we ought to have them in the RECORD because wherever the Navy, the Army, or any component of the armed forces can purchase the necessary equipment at the cheapest possible price, they should, in order to assist in balancing the budget.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Rhode Island three additional minutes.

Mr. FORAND. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we can go just a little further than that and show that the figures quoted are the figures that were used when a private contractor was operating the Forest Park plant. Everybody knows that with the Government taking over operation of the Forest Part plant the cost will be higher.

Mr. RICH. Everybody knows that whenever the Government does anything the costs are a great deal more than in private enterprise, because Government accountants do not take into consideration all the costs that enter into private manufacturing. A lot of expenses, therefore, are not reflected in the costs.

Mr. FORAND. I believe this case has merit. In addition to what I have already said, we have got to consider the

human element and realize that at Newport the Navy Department has insisted right along over a period of years that no other industry be located in that area so that it would not afford competition in their labor market. By closing the manufacturing establishment at Newport you are closing the only industry in that entire area and are subjecting men and families who have been there for years to go into the wilderness looking for jobs.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield gladly to my friend from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman has brought out a fact that is very important, and that is throwing a great many men out of jobs, men who have been there through the years, who have been trained to do this particular kind of work, who either have to have this particular job or else be transferred to a country far, far away, where they do not want to go. A continuance of operations at Newport would save these men either from being out of jobs or having to go elsewhere to support their families.

Mr. FORAND. Unfortunately, I may say to the gentleman from Kansas, that has already happened and the welfare rolls of the city have already swollen because of the number of men who have lost their employment and their inability to support the number of dependents they have been supporting.

I am glad the gentleman from Kansas has made this statement because he is a member of the Committee on the Civil Service and heard the testimony of these men. He knows their story.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is a very serious thing to cause men to lose employment.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield.

Mr. WILSON. Will the gentleman explain to me why the Senator from Rhode Island signed this conference report?

Mr. FORAND. I cannot answer for the actions of a Member of the other body.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and include therein certain excerpts and tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island will not prevail and that the House will approve the conference report as submitted by the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations. It would appear that the only contention before us at the moment is the question of the location of a torpedo plant.

There is a plant located presently at Newport, R. I.; but during the war the Navy Department saw fit to establish an entirely new plant at Forest Park, Ill.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. That also includes a plant at Sharon, Pa.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. Now, it ought to be made clear at the outset that the conference report and the bill as passed by the House does not extinguish the plant at Newport, R. I. The essential point is that it is put upon a research basis and the plant will be rehabilitated. At the same time, this $32,000,000 plant at Forest Park, Ill., which is the finest and most efficient plant in all the world, will be preserved.

I can commend my good friend the gentleman from Rhode Island for his zeal in this matter because the plant is in his district. I can speak entirely dispassionately on the matter because the Forest Park plant is located 200 miles from where I live. As a matter of fact, there is not a single war installation in my congressional district. So I have no personal interest in the matter whatsoever. I do commend his zeal. But the real issue involved here, Mr. Speaker, is whether by the action of the Congress we propose to contravene the administrative judgment of the Navy, which is founded upon good ground and was taken for very persuasive reasons.

We should not for a light and transient reason undertake to roll back the administrative decision of the Navy unless there is good cause for it. The Navy had reasons for going out to Forest Park, Ill., and locating the torpedo plant, which, as I said before, is regarded by the Secretary of the Navy as the most efficient in the world. The Navy has not run roughshod over anybody. There has been none of the alleged arrogance on the part of Navy officials. The fact of the matter is there was good reason for preserving this plant and asking the Appropriations Committee and asking the Congress to preserve the plant and keep it in operation.

In the first place, the plant at Forest Park is the newest plant in all the world. The plant at Newport is about 77 years old and some of its machinery and its buildings are in an obsolescent stage. They have a sprawling plant, as distinguished from the compact torpedo plant located on 117 acres at Forest Park, where every part of the torpedo, from the tiniest little gyro mechanism on down is manufactured within the confines of a single plant. So it is self-sufficient.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is in error about that, is he not? There are parts coming in there that are manufactured elsewhere.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I still stand by the statement. I said that it was self-contained.

Secondly, it is the lowest-cost plant. I do not know anything about the figures that were submitted by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND]—and certainly I would not presume to impeach those figures—but I do know that the Navy Department is the authority for the figure that at Newport it cost $9,040 to manufacture a torpedo, as against $7,914 at Forest Park; in other words, the Navy comes with their figures and says, "You can manufacture a torpedo at Forest Park, Ill., $1,126 cheaper than you can at Newport, R. I." I do not know where the figures of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] came from, but I do know that those are the Navy figures indicating that the cost of manufacture at Forest Park is infinitely cheaper. I have no choice except to give full credit and authenticity to the figures that the Navy has submitted.

With respect to the item that appears here about men who have been engaged in the service for a long time and who, in some instances, may have to find other work, let me remind you that of the 1,200 employees at Forest Park today, 900 are veterans of World War II—900 out of 1,200 did yeoman service for their country in World War II. Are they not entitled to some consideration on the part of the Congress and the people if the future welfare of the employees is to be a determining factor? If you propose now, for the sake of one locality, to close a torpedo plant in another, and state that the Navy is interested in retaining and putting out of business 900 veterans of World War II, then what? There is no force at all in the sympathy or argument, and I brush it to one side unless it is considered from the standpoint of veterans at Forest Park as well as that of men with long service at Newport. But there is equity on one side as against the equity that has been submitted on the other; and when all is said and done, of course, you do not rationalize this question of efficiency in national defense on sympathy; and if it is the most efficient plant in all the world, then it ought to be retained.

The next argument I would make in opposition to the motion to be offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island in behalf and in support of the Newport plant is that the Forest Park plant is the only plant in the United States—and perhaps the only plant in the world—where the new Navy electrical torpedo can be manufactured, and I stand on that statement. That is one of these new instrumentalities of war that has been developed within the last few years. The only place in the United States where they have the machinery, where they have the capacity, where they have the precision, and where they have the skill to get out this new electrical torpedo is at Forest Park, Ill. Are you going to junk a plant like that for the sake of a sprawling plant that is 77 years old, when the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Forrestal, himself said that Forest Park is one Navy plant that must not get away from us—meaning the plant at Forest Park, Ill.?

That involves, then, this over-all, larger issue of contravening the best judgment of Admiral Hussey and the members of his staff in the Bureau of Aeronautics. After all, they did noble and great service in time of war. We were content to rely on their judgment when the Nation was at war. Are you going to say, "That is all right, as long as the war was on, but now we are going to run out on your best judgment, and notwithstanding the fact that you want to

retain the plant at Forest Park, we will arrogate to ourselves sufficient wisdom in that field and we propose now to shut down Forest Park in behalf of a 77-year-old plant at Newport, R. I."

Coming back to my good friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] I do commend his zeal in this respect, but when all is said and done, they have had this plant up there for a long time, nearly 3½ generations. If it is going to be a question of governmental benefits, then what about diffusing a few of those benefits? After all, are we not just as near to the Federal Treasury out in the Middle West as in any other section of the country? After all, are we not entitled to some of those benefits? We do not ask for all of them. We do not say, "Shut down Newport, R. I." It will be maintained. There is money in the bill for the rehabilitation of some of those structures. But we say at the same time, when the Navy in its best judgment says, "This is one plant we must not lose, this is the only plant in the United States where an electrical torpedo can be made," that Forest Park is entitled to full consideration.

You remember what happened in the early days of the war. The first thing our strategists did was to start moving inland with ordnance plants and shell-loading plants, and all that sort of thing. They did not want to locate huge war plants in areas that might be vulnerable to attack. I am no strategist. I do not propose to comment at any length on it. But certainly the Navy must have had it in mind at that time of building a plant in the very center of the country, so that the business of constructing torpedoes of all kinds to be launched against our enemies in the early days of the war might be safeguarded against all hazards.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. Admiral Hussey testified that the vulnerability of the plant at Newport was greater than that of the plants in the interior built at Oak Park, Ill., Sharon, Pa., St. Louis, Mo., and Pontiac, Mich.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly so. That was Admiral Hussey's contention.

I will not belabor the subject any further. Let me conclude by saying that within the next 30 days a new million-dollar addition which has already been completed at Forest Park will be opened. Are you going to junk that against the judgment of all the experts in the Navy? I think this House ought to return to that question a resounding "No," and say "They have made this finding upon the basis of the facts, and have located there what they regard as the greatest torpedo plant in all the world. Their hand shall be upheld and they shall be sustained."

Mr. Speaker, the motion the gentleman from Rhode Island will make ought to be voted down.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have in the past 6 years admired and respected the gentleman from Illinois in all his debates on the floor of this House, but it seems to me this morning that he has gone far afield and he does not know too much about the subject he is talking about. I do not believe he knows anything about the conditions that exist in Rhode Island and in Newport in particular in relation to the situation of this plan. He knows nothing of the type of mechanics we have in Newport. He knows nothing of the outlay on buildings that have been constructed since this war started. We have spent millions of dollars on this island where this torpedo station is located to construct new buildings and put in new equipment. We have a modern plant there at the present time. There is no question in the mind of anyone in the Navy Department or anyone else that we have the best mechanics obtainable in this country located in the city of Newport, men who have spent their lifetime in this torpedo station.

When the gentleman from Illinois quotes figures he has read in the Chicago Tribune about the cost of a torpedo, those figures just are not true. The figures that were presented to the committee are the figures that were given when the American Can Co. was building those torpedoes, but since that time the Navy Department has taken over Forest Park and the costs are going to go up. I can show you here figures and guarantee that a torpedo can be built at Newport about eight or nine hundred dollars cheaper than it can be built under Navy jurisdiction at Forest Park.

The gentleman from Illinois mentioned the veterans of World War II at Forest Park. I can say to him we have had over 100 veterans of World War II laid off at Newport at the present time. He also spoke about the new electrical torpedo and said that Forest Park is the only plant that has the mechanism available to build the new electrical torpedo. But Admiral Hussey has already stated before our Committee on Naval Affairs that the electrical torpedo today is obsolete and that the equipment which is now located at Forest Park to build these electrical torpedoes is just a waste of the Navy's money because he has already declared that the new electrical torpedo is no good, is obsolete, and will not be built in the future. Therefore, what is there to the argument of the gentleman from Illinois when he says that they have the only equipment to build a torpedo which has been already declared obsolete? In this particular plant in the city of Newport there is no other industry and when this industry is taken out it will affect the entire economy of the city. There is no other industry where the men who have been working at the torpedo plant all their lives can find another job. Newport is actually isolated from the State of Rhode Island. The only other naval activity anywhere near Newport is across the bay about 7 or 8 miles and the only way they can get there is by taking a ferry and crossing a bridge which costs them $3.50 a day. The only other way to get there would be by automobile by a ride of 60 miles. I sincerely hope that the motion to recommit which will be offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND], will be carried.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] a member of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this has been a most interesting discussion. Naturally, we commend the Members who are trying to take care of employment in their districts. I happen to come from a district that has no naval installations. I am not interested in any of the arguments that have been made in regard to employment as far as this particular matter is concerned. Naturally, when the war was over, Government employment had to be cut down because we were not producing and it was not expected that we would continue to produce the equipment and materials which we did during the war. Every community that had activities connected with production for war purposes wants to see their particular community benefited by keeping that production going. That is impossible if we are going to run our Government on anything like a business basis. It appears to me that the Navy Department is responsible for the production of this material; the Navy Department which knows what equipment it has and where it can produce needed equipment best is the proper agency to determine where the production should go on and at what place plants should be kept in operation. When the Navy Department comes before a congressional committee and lays down its facts and figures and makes its recommendations as to what it wants in order to do an efficient job, I believe that the Congress would do well to consider seriously what that department which has the responsibility says should be done.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Will you give us some information with reference to what the Navy Department says about manufacturing these torpedoes cheaper at one plant than at the other?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I understand that was covered in the hearings. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] I believe, covered that in his statement a few months ago.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] made a statement different from that. What was your opinion of that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The fact of the matter is, it is the Navy official. The Navy Department has made the statement that you can manufacture them at Forest Park, Ill., for $7,914, and at Newport, R. I., for $9,040; that you can manufacture them at $1,126 cheaper for every torpedo at Forest Park than at Newport. You can impeach figures if you like to, but nobody has authentically impeached them as yet. We can only depend upon the naval officials.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Now, I would like to proceed a minute. As a

matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the same argument that has been made about continuing this plant at Newport in the production of torpedoes, and closing the one at Forest Park could be made as to one plant against another in thousands of instances throughout our country. We should adopt a business basis, have some confidence in what those who have the responsibility say to us, and stop considering the proposition that it is the duty of the United States Government to somehow, some way, keep every plant that we had during the war in operation. That just cannot be done in the postwar economy.

I believe this conference report should be adopted.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. HUBER. I was wondering why we should be quarreling as to whether Rhode Island or Illinois shall make the torpedoes when the atomic-bomb test tomorrow may make every production obsolete.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. The gentleman may have something there. I think the proper thing to do is simply to follow out what the responsible people say we should do and adopt this conference report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, some of my constituents have lived long in this particular section. I cannot believe that efficiency in any new mushroom plant exceeds that of the people who have worked at Newport these many years and who have had long experience. Would any of you allow your own old-established plants to be uprooted and abandoned in order that plants built hastily for temporary needs might remain in operation? What interests me greatly is that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] argues efficiency and declares that sentimentality must not enter into the decision. He then appeals for the veterans working in the new locations. That, indeed, is a very effective sentimental appeal. We are appealing for an old-established plant, where workers have been employed for years and they and their families have established themselves in the vicinity. I do not wish them uprooted, and none of you would hesitate to object in a similar situation. The report of the committee is unfortunate. We could and should reject it. Do not tell us that the new plants are more efficient than the one at Newport after all these many years of experience and training. We cannot accept such claims, especially when the reports are so conflicting.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take the 3 minutes. I do want to point out, however, that when this bill was being considered in the first instance in the Committee of the Whole House, near the end of the day when there were just a few Members present, because of the stress of time and the parliamentary situation prevailing, a teller vote was prevented. It is my considered opinion that had a teller vote been taken the amendment offered then by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] would have been defeated, and I expect to take advantage of every parliamentary procedure today to defeat his amendment, because of its lack of merit.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman knows there was just a handful of Members on the floor at that time.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I do not yield. I only have 3 minutes.

The gentleman also knows that I rose at the time and asked for tellers; a gentleman on the other side gained the floor which procedure automatically prevented a successful attempt on my part to obtain a vote by tellers.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an answer?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield.

Mr. Speaker, after full hearings in the Senate the item the gentleman from Rhode Island is now fighting for was stricken from the bill, and the Senator from Rhode Island signed the conference report. In addition to that $350,000 was added by the Senate and retained by the conference committee to more than take care of the Newport needs.

I believe that when experts of the Navy Department testify as they did testify before both the House and the Senate committees, giving abundant evidence of the necessity for the Forest Park item, we should pay attention to their recommendations, and all the more so when the Senator from Rhode Island signs this conference report. It seems to me that that action outweighs the action by which this amendment was adopted originally in the House side when fewer than 50 Members were present.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. WILSON. Is it not true that the storage depot for these torpedoes is located at Crane, Ind., and that if they were made on the coast it would involve shipping of the finished torpedoes all the way to Indiana for storage and then shipping them back again, whereas if they are manufactured out there they will be nearer the place where they are to be stored?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, the hearings are full of testimony that sustain the action in the Senate. At page 197 of the Senate hearings on this bill you will find the statement made by one of the Navy experts to the effect that the vulnerability of installations such as Newport was a very compelling reason to relocate the torpedo manufacture at Forest Park, St. Louis, Sheridan, Pennsylvania, Pontiac, and Chicago.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I wish to take this opportunity of paying tribute to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] and his colleagues for the aggressive manner in which they have made their presentation to the Congress and to the members of our subcommittee.

When this issue was under consideration the committee in its hearings obtained all the justifications for these activities that it was possible to secure from the gentlemen representing the interests of the Government. The final judgment of the subcommittee was verified by the action of the full committee. When I presented the issue to them they concurred in what the subcommittee had done insofar as it applied to Newport and Forest Park. When we came to the floor of the House, however, the gentleman from Rhode Island offered an amendment and I wish to call the attention of the membership to what is involved.

There is a splendid plant in Rhode Island that has been in existence for a long period of years. You also have at Forest Park one of the most modern plants of this character that is known in the world, in which the Federal Government has invested more than $21,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. I call your specific attention to the language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island. It reads as follows:

> That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the manufacture, assembly, repair, or overhaul of torpedoes at the naval ordnance plant, Forest Park, Ill.

Your subcommittee naturally would not go along with that amendment and approve it on the floor, although the House at that time placed it in the bill over the committee objections.

It went over to the Senate. Senator GREEN, who also represents the great State of Rhode Island, was, I am advised, present at the time this amendment was considered by the Senate. Full debate was had in the Senate and the provision was eliminated from the bill.

Mr. Speaker, in order to take care of the Newport station the House managers agreed to incorporate the following language in the bill. Let me call to the attention of the House, however, that it is rather interesting that the gentleman who speaks so adversely about the conference report, neglected to comment on this language. Here is the wording:

> Two hundred forty-six million, three hundred ninety thousand dollars of which $350,000 shall be available for placing the equipment at the naval torpedo station, Newport, R. I., in condition for operation.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that you have before you in this particular issue a question of policy. Either the House is gong to legislate as to which operational projects will be closed and which are to remain open and perforce exercise the prerogative of geographical favoritism, or it is going to legislate upon

the basis of equity which means that we must leave these decisions up to administrative officials who are competent to make these decisions.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. I am just wondering what advantage that $350,000 is going to be to rehabilitate Newport if they are not going to use the machinery?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am assuming that Senator GREEN, representing your State, would have asked that question at the time he was discussing it with the naval officials. He seems to be a very intelligent gentleman. When we were discussing the problem with him he said, "As a compromise I think we have reached as satisfactory a conclusion as is possible under the circumstances." That is the only answer I can give the gentleman because I did not do the gentleman's thinking.

Mr. FORAND. How come the $350,000 was suggested? If the gentleman does not know the origin of it, I can give it to him.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It was put in at the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island, if the information given to me by the Senator is correct.

Mr. FORAND. It was put in there because the Secretary of the Navy in trying to offset the amendment which I offered said it would require $350,000 to rehabilitate the plant up there, take the machinery out of grease and start to operate. I think the figure is wrong. In fact, the experts who work there tell me it is.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, permit me to make a few observations about this very troublesome matter. Before I start, I want to say a few words about my two distinguished friends from Rhode Island, Mr. FOGARTY and Mr. FORAND, two of my good, close, personal friends. I commend them for their fine fight which they have made for their district. I do not know of any two men in Congress, when you get right down to bare facts, who have done more for their districts than have these two gentlemen. When November comes I know your good people, whom you have the honor to represent, will so recognize your outstanding ability and we will see you back here next January.

Let us discuss this matter on its merits. The proposition opens up two very fundamental factors. First, is it going to be the policy of the House of Representatives to take away from the Navy its administrative functions; namely, out of the literally hundreds and hundreds of projects that the Navy has undertaken, will it be the policy of the Congress which it certainly has not been heretofore, now at this late date to write that policy of the Navy by telling it where it is going to have installations?

We have not done it in the past, and certainly we will not do it in the future, because it just does not make sense. I might say that four out of five of the conferees of the other body just put their feet down on that proposition and said, "We will not usurp the administrative functions of the Navy." In the first place, the House is not qualified to do that job. If there is any doubt in the wisdom of the policy that we have followed these many years, that great committee of this House, the Committee on Naval Affairs, ought to look into the matter and do a little legislating and change the policy if it needs changing.

The second fundamental principle is simply this, as was so ably brought out by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON]: Can we keep all of these fine plants going in the Army and the Navy? Of course not. There have been thousands of business dislocations throughout the United States. There have been many dislocations of families. Do we want to say to the Navy, "You must keep this fine community going by keeping this plant there?" The Navy says, "We want to do otherwise. We are not going to close it, but we are going to operate it as a scientific laboratory." Yet, this fine community says, "Well, you have operated it so many years here that we feel it belongs to us, and we want you to operate it just like you have done in the past."

We grant you that there may be some dislocations in that fine community, though I hope not, but if there are, there will be dislocations in your district and mine and every other district in the country on account of this war.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Members will think carefully over this matter, and when it comes to a vote let us not recommit this bill. We have worked long and hard on it, and there is only one little item in here that we cannot get together on. Certainly the House is not going to tear up 4 months of hard work over one matter that in truth and in fact should not have been before us now. It should have been handled in the regular way.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. The only stand we take today is that we claim that the Newport torpedo station is the most efficiently operated station in the country; that we have the best group of mechanics available; that we have the old-line mechanics that know about the making of a torpedo inside and out, and that is where efficiency counts.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I understand the gentleman's point of view. They make them in Forest Park and they have trained labor there also.

Mr. FOGARTY. But they will be sent to Newport to be passed on afterward.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CHURCH. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CHURCH moves to recommit the conference report on H. R. 6496 to the committee of conference with instruction to the managers on the part of the House to insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 9.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 2, line 22, after the comma insert "special cost of living allowances for employees abroad."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 22, line 11, insert the following paragraph:

"NAVAL PROCUREMENT FUND

"For the purpose of settlement of war contracts under the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, and during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, advances by check or warrant and reimbursements to the Naval Procurement Fund from naval appropriations may be made on the basis of the estimated cost of a project without further accounting distribution of expenditures to the individual appropriations involved."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHEPPARD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: On line 2 of said Senate amendment strike out the word "and."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 25, line 16, after "Statutes", insert "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for hospital construction: *Provided further*, That wherever there are architectural and engineering services in any State in which a project is located qualified to do the work, such services shall be utilized."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHEPPARD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said Senate amendment insert the following: "*Provided further*, That wherever there are architectural and engineering services in any State in which a project is located qualified to do the work, such services shall be utilized."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to ask the gentleman two questions.

First, I assume that the purpose of the amendment the gentleman has offered is to permit the use of funds in the bill for hospital construction.

Mr. SHEPPARD. No. That is not a part of this amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it Senate amendment No. 19 we are now considering?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is not the gentleman dropping the limitation against part of the funds being used for hospital construction?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have moved that the House recede and concur with an amendment which will eliminate that language.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What language is being eliminated?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That none of the money can be used for the construction of hospitals. That is the pertinent part of the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. So that it will be possible to use money in the bill for hospital construction?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That correct, under the amendment which is now under consideration.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is the point I want established. It will be remembered that in the consideration of the Army appropriation bill the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] established that the Tripler Hospital was started in Hawaii with transferred funds. So, now, I ask the gentleman with reference to the transfer clause which was embodied in the bill originally. I recognize that that is not before us in the conference report, but in view of the proposed elimination of the restriction on hospital construction I desire to get a statement from the gentleman. It is also important for the conference which will probably be held on the War Department appropriation bill today. Heretofore the Navy bill has not carried a transfer clause, but the bill that is now being approved does carry a transfer clause permitting the Navy Department to transfer money from one appropriation head to another. Is the present proposal for the purpose of permitting a hospital or hospitals to be started with transferred funds?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; not as such. I may say to the gentleman that there was an agreement in this bill on 5 percent for 1 year only.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The situation with which we are confronted in connection with the conference on the Army appropriation bill is that the Army bill was passed by the House eliminating any transfer clause, and I understand that the other body put in the Army bill a transfer clause for 10 percent. Was there any suggestion in the conference with the other body on the Navy bill in connection with the language of that bill that a uniform policy of transfer should be developed between the Army and the Navy?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; there was not, because it was no in conference. The Senate agreed to the amount of 5 percent as set originally by the House.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I will say to my friend from South Dakota that we reluctantly put the 5-percent transfer clause in this bill for this year and served notice on the Navy that in the future we would not do it under any circumstances. They wanted it more or less to give them a little flexibility during this change-over period. Next year they will not get it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is not to be regarded as a precedent, either for the Navy or War Department.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. No.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And it is not for the purpose, taken in connection with the amendment to lift the ban on hospital construction, of permitting transfers to start some major hospital?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 59: Page 43, line 9, strike out all of page 43 after line 9, including line 9, and lines 1 and 2 on page 44, and insert the following:

"SEC. 109. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, this is the antistrike provision and is a matter which has been inserted in all the appropriations bills. The House has already declared its position on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 62: Page 50, line 22, insert the following:

"SEC. 120. The Secretary of the Navy may delegate to the commandants of the naval districts, for administration within their respective districts, his authority (1) to employ persons in the departmental service of the Navy Department, wherever located, and (2) to authorize payment of the expenses of the transfer of household goods of employees, and of the costs of transportation of their immediate families on change from one official duty station to another."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHEPPARD moves to recede and concur with an amendment to Senate amendment No. 62: In lieu of the matter inserted by said Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 120. The Secretary of the Navy may delegate to the commandants of the naval districts, for administration within their respective districts, his authority to authorize payment of the expenses of the transfer of household goods of employees, and of the costs of transportation of their immediate families on change from one official duty station to another."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial entitled "Texas" which was published in the Lexington Gazette, of Lexington, Va., on May 14, 1846.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

(Roll No. 187)

Adams	Eberharter	LeCompte
Anderson, Calif.	Elsaesser	Lemke
Andrews, N. Y.	Engel, Mich.	Lesinski
Auchincloss	Ervin	Ludlow
Baldwin, Md.	Fernandez	McGehee
Baldwin, N. Y.	Fisher	McGlinchey
Barrett, Pa.	Gardner	McKenzie
Bates, Mass.	Gerlach	Mahon
Bell	Gibson	Mansfield, Mont.
Bennet, N. Y.	Gillespie	Mansfield, Tex.
Bonner	Granger	Merrow
Boren	Grant, Ala.	Miller, Calif.
Boykin	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Morgan
Bradley, Mich.	Hall, Leonard W.	Morrison
Bradley, Pa.	Harness, Ind.	Murphy
Brooks	Harris	Norrell
Buchanan	Hartley	Norton
Buckley	Hébert	Patrick
Byrne, N. Y.	Hedrick	Patterson
Camp	Heffernan	Peterson, Ga.
Cannon, Fla.	Hoffman, Mich.	Pickett
Celler	Holifield	Ploeser
Cochran	Izac	Powell
Coffee	Jackson	Quinn, N. Y.
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Okla.	Rankin
Colmer	Kearney	Rayfiel
Courtney	Kee	Reece, Tenn.
Cox	Kefauver	Rivers
Crawford	Keogh	Robertson, N. Dak.
Curley	Kerr	Robinson, Utah
Daughton, Va.	Kinzer	Rodgers, Pa.
Dawson	Klein	Roe, N. Y.
Dolliver	Latham	Rooney
Drewry		
Dworshak		

Sabath	Stigler	Vinson
Sheridan	Stockman	Welch
Sikes	Sumners, Tex.	West
Smith, Va.	Taylor	Wickersham
Sparkman	Thomas, N. J.	Winstead
Starkey	Tolan	Wolfenden, Pa.
Stevenson	Torrens	Worley
Stewart	Towe	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 307 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT AND STABILIZATION ACT—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning without my approval H. R. 6042 amending the price-control laws and extending them for another year.

The choice which H. R. 6042 presents is not a choice between continued price stability and inflation. It is a choice between inflation with a statute and inflation without one. The bill continues the Government's responsibility to stabilize the economy and at the same time it destroys the Government's power to do so.

If this bill were allowed to become law, the American people would believe that they were protected by a workable price-control law. But they would not be protected and they would soon come to a bitter realization of that truth. It is only fair to tell them the facts now.

The lesson from our own experience after the last war, disastrous as it was to our farmers, our workers, our manufacturers, our distributors, and our consumers, has been too easily obscured by the annoyances and irritations and the occasional inequities of price control. The fact that inflation has already gutted the economy of country after country all over the world should shake our comfortable assurance that such a catastrophe cannot happen here.

For 5 years we have proved that inflation can be prevented. It still can be prevented if we have the will to prevent it. Today the opportunity of completing the transition from war to peace with an economy which is stable, sound, and secure is within our grasp.

To avoid sacrificing this opportunity requires courage, wisdom, and self-restraint. This winter and spring the tensions have been more acute than ever before. We are all weary and impatient of Government restrictions and controls. We are all eager for the day when we can pursue our own affairs in our own way. In such a mood there is the natural temptation to remove essential safeguards, prematurely.

This bill yields to that temptation. It would provide us with no real safeguards at all. It would start prices and costs climbing and keep them climbing. It would start the value of the dollar falling and keep it falling. Far from helping production it would retard it. In the end this bill would lead to disaster.

I shall not attempt to comment on all the bill's provisions. Some of them are entirely appropriate. Many others reflect minor concessions to special interest groups of the sort which the Congress has heretofore resisted. To these latter provisions I object on grounds of principle. But in the last days before the expiration of legislation so vital to the Nation's welfare I should not regard these concessions as a basis for withholding my approval from an extension bill.

My fundamental objection to the bill is to the numerous amendments which would raise the price of essential cost-of-living commodities. Of those by far the most damaging is the price-raising amendment for manufacturers introduced by Senator TAFT (section 11), operating in conjunction with the revised price-raising amendment for distributors introduced by Senator WHERRY (section 10, par. [t]), and with the special cost-plus amendments for automobile and appliance dealers first offered to the House Committee on Banking and Currency by Representative CRAWFORD (sec. 10, par. [q] and [r]).

The mainspring of this combination is Senator TAFT's amendment. It is that amendment which would compel thousands of needless price increases amounting to many billions of dollars. The Wherry and Crawford amendments simply make sure that before the Taft amendment price increases for the manufacturers reach the consumer, they will be pyramided by generous wholesalers' and retailers' mark-ups.

The provisions of the Taft amendment are complex but they wear a superficial reasonableness. I am sure, however, that Congress adopted this amendment without full appreciation of its consequences.

I wish it were possible to tell you exactly how many billions of dollars the American people would eventually have to pay for the Taft amendment and its companion pieces. To attempt to do so, however, would be like trying to estimate the cost of a fire about to sweep a city before the first building had started to burn. Even to estimate the total amount of all the first round of price increases is not now possible.

Here, however, are a few examples which would enter into such a total.

The first impact of the Taft and Wherry amendments in the crucial field of housing would be little short of devastating. The prices of nearly all building materials would be affected. The average increase of such materials, excluding lumber, would be approximately 20 percent. This would completely disrupt the program recently approved by the Congress to provide veterans' housing at reasonable cost.

Ceilings for steel would have to be raised an average of $4 to $8 a ton. These increases would in turn be reflected in the ceilings of everything made of steel.

The average price of low-priced automobiles would be increased $225 to $250, on top of the substantial increases already granted.

Household appliances such as washing machines and refrigerators would increase from 25 to 30 percent. Floor coverings would go up about 17 percent; plumbing supplies, about 16 percent; farm machinery, about 13 percent.

The prices of clothing—already too high—would be increased by an estimated average of 15 percent—more than half of which would be attributable to the Taft and Wherry amendments and the balance to other amendments. This by itself would add about $3,000,000,000 a year to the living expenses of American families.

These are only preliminary estimates of a few of the initial price increases. They do not take into account the further increases, for example, on automobiles, after steel, tires, safety glass, and other materials and parts have received their own increases.

The bill would cause some major increases in foods immediately. It would curtail subsidy payments so that the prices of certain foods would have to go up. Other foods would get immediate increases under the Taft amendment, but these would go to processors rather than to farmers. Like the wage earner, the white-collar worker, and the millions of old people and others who must live on fixed incomes, the farmer is a victim of this bill.

This, however, does not mean that the country would get any real protection for long in what it costs to eat. The same thing is true of rents. The bill does not direct any immediate increases in rents at all. But this does not mean that rents could be effectively controlled.

If I thought that this bill would make possible some genuine protection against soaring food prices and rents, I should hesitate long before disapproving it, despite the total impossibility of stabilizing the prices of other essential commodities. Our economy, however, cannot be half-stabilized. We cannot quarantine inflation. Higher prices for the things that farmers and landlords buy would inevitably force up farm prices and rents. In the case of farm prices, this is required by the parity provisions of the law. In the case of both farm prices and rents, general increases would be forced upon us by simple justice and the hard facts of business and economics.

This bill, therefore, gives only the delusion of protection against rising costs of food and shelter. It would delay their rise a little. But the delay would be long enough only to cause unnecessary hardship for farmers and landlords—not long enough to bring real benefits to consumers and tenants.

The spectacular increases in the prices of manufactured goods which the Taft amendment and its companion amendments would cause, right at the beginning, are far in excess of anything which industry needs to earn generous profits and obtain full production. The increases are so large because the formulas for computing them are bonanza formulas.

The Taft amendment puts into prices the profit per unit of sales which the industry received for the particular product in the year 1941. That was a year in which manufacturers and processors received a much greater profit out of each dollar of sales than in any one of the five peacetime years which preceded 1941

and more than in any one of the following five wartime years. Indeed, 1941 profit margins were half again as great as in the banner year of 1929. Today, however, the volume of sales is greater than that of 1941 and it is going to increase steadily if inflation does not stop it. Thus, at the very time when we should be getting the benefit of high volume in the form of lower prices, the Taft amendment would inflate prices.

In the case of products like automobiles, washing machines, and refrigerators which are just returning to the market, the Taft amendment produces especially unreasonable prices. This is because the amendment adds to prices all the abnormally high costs arising from temporarily low volume and changeover conditions.

The Wherry amendment gives a final boost to prices by requiring the pyramiding of manufacturer's increases at the wholesale and retail levels.

Of course profits ample to provide the incentive for full production are what makes the American free enterprise system work. Prices must not be inflexibly held. Increases have been granted and more will have to be granted to remove impediments to production. The Taft amendment, however, in the name of stimulating production, promises peak profits on every product even where production is already going at full blast and profits are eminently satisfactory. As industry after industry accepts the invitation of the Taft amendment in an attempt to make good profits better, prices will go up and up.

In addition, the industries in real need of relief will tend to be lost in the shuffle. The OPA, already criticized for delay in these deserving cases, will be increasingly unable to act promptly to break production bottlenecks.

There is a grim irony in the fact that the Taft amendment is defended as a stimulant to production when in fact it will greatly impede production.

The evidence is readily at hand. For weeks we have seen meat and other commodities withheld from the market in anticipation of higher prices. The simple fact is that the average businessman or farmer who knows that his price will soon be higher will not sell any more goods this week than he has to—be they suits or sewing machines or cattle.

The manufacturer with a price increase pending would naturally slow down deliveries as much as his working capital and his storage facilities would permit. At the same time the knowledge that his suppliers had their own increases pending would lead him to do all he could to build up his inventories. But his suppliers would also slow down deliveries for the very same reason. As essential materials and parts were withheld from the market, production lines would gradually grind to a halt. Workers would pay their toll to this amendment in loss of employment. Consumers would pay theirs in lack of goods.

These cases would develop, not by hundreds but by thousands. As fast as price increases were granted, they would raise the costs of purchasing industries and form a basis for additional increases. Each one would bring its new slow-downs and new bottlenecks. It is plain to see why the enactment of the Taft amendment as an aid to production would be a sorry jest. Production requires a reasonable stability in costs, a continuing flow of goods, and a readiness to buy and sell. The Taft amendment would result in erratic price and cost movements, a feverish effort to buy, and a calculated reluctance to sell.

The Taft amendment would wholly destroy the program of wage stabilization which has been so painstakingly, and at times painfully, developed during the months since VJ-day.

The Wage Stabilization Board has contributed greatly to that development. The representatives of industry, labor, and the public who compose it have brought what threatened for a time to become a runaway wage movement into a fair and orderly procedure with which virtually all unions and managements have cooperated. This Nation still needs the continuing services of the Wage Stabilization Board.

I wonder therefore if the Congress realized when it voted for the Taft amendment that it was voting to destroy the present wage stabilization program and the usefulness of the Wage Stabilization Board. Under the existing program the Board has the task of determining the limit of wage increases which an employer can use as the basis for price increases. Its determinations of these limits have played a vital role in bringing about innumerable wage settlements. The Taft amendment, however, provides that, "in determinating costs for the purposes of this section, all costs shall be included." The Office of Price Administration advises me that under this provision it would be required to recognize all wage increases as a basis for price increases, even if the Board had not approved them and regardless of their amount.

This is the beginning of an inevitable spiral of uncontrolled inflation—a race between rising wages and rising prices. Farsighted leaders of both labor and management know that nothing can be gained—and everything lost—by simply letting prices and wages chase each other.

Yesterday I received a letter from the National Wage Stabilization Board, which Board represents industry, labor, and the public. The Board advises that it believes that uncontrolled inflation will result from this bill. Furthermore, the Board states:

> It is our unanimous judgment that the proposed legislation presents no possibility of wage stabilization or of the achievement of the balance between wages and prices which is essential to economic stability.

This bill provides a sure formula for inflation:

1. A first round of sharp and widespread price increases;

2. Production slow-downs due to price uncertainties;

3. Renewed demands for further wage increases due to higher living costs;

4. Higher production costs due to production slow-downs and stoppages and to higher labor costs;

5. A cost-plus pricing amendment which requires higher production costs to be translated immediately into higher prices.

And all this at a time when the supply of goods is still far below the record demand.

The formula would lead to disaster even if it could be assumed that price control could be administered in an orderly fashion, and that the Office of Price Administration would be able to build up a staff adequate to its new burdens. The fact is, however, that these assumptions are unreal. The OPA could not discharge the responsibilities which the Taft amendment and the other price-raising amendments would thrust upon it—either with its present staff or with any staff that it might conceivably recruit.

Moreover, enforcement and compliance with price regulations are dependent on the general stability of prices over considerable periods of time. Once prices were set in continuous upward motion, compliance would deteriorate rapidly. Little hope could be held out for compliance with ceiling prices fixed under the Taft amendment.

The reason for this is that the ceiling price of each individual manufacturer would depend upon the price which that particular manufacturer charged in the base period—usually October 1–15, 1941. To this base period price each manufacturer would be entitled to add a uniform increase factor representing cost increases incurred by the industry generally since that time.

Under this system, obviously, every manufacturer who had a different price in the base period would have a different ceiling price now. Uniform ceiling prices would become impossible, except in those industries which charged uniform prices in the base period. Thus, most of OPA's dollars-and-cents regulations, which are the most readily enforceable kind, would be wiped out.

Proof of any ceiling price violation would require proof of the price which the particular manufacturer charged during a 2-week period 5 years ago. Every enforcement proceeding would thus becomes a time-consuming and often futile historical investigation.

In these circumstances, the formal structure of price and rent control which the bill retains would be wholly ineffectual to stem the tide of inflation which it would set in motion. Unable to cope with the deluge of industry demands for higher ceilings under the new pricing formulas, and increasingly aware of the futility of its task, OPA's administrative staff would disintegrate. After irreplaceable losses from its ranks had reached a certain point, the consequence would not be more administrative delay; it would be complete collapse.

In the face of these alarming consequences to the country if the present bill should become law, I urge the Congress with all the earnestness at my command to reconsider the whole problem of stabilization.

In that reconsideration, let us see just where we stand today. Under the existing stabilization laws production has recovered remarkably from the shock of war's end. Output of civilian goods already surpasses the 1941 level and employment exceeds that level by six mil-

lion. This record has been achieved in spite of shortages of critical materials and parts and in spite of extended work stoppages in basic industries. The major labor-management disputes are settled, and we are moving rapidly toward the realization of our postwar objectives of full production and full employment in a sound economy.

There still are shortages but they will be progressively wiped out in the months ahead if business and labor stick to their job of producing the most possible goods in the shortest possible time. This can happen only if business has assurance of reasonable stability in its costs, and if labor has assurance that its real wages will not be cut sharply by rising living costs.

We can look ahead to a steady easing of other inflationary forces. The efficiency of production is bound to increase and bring with it an upsurge in total output. If the stabilization laws are renewed in effective form it is expected that the Federal Budget will be balanced during the coming year, thus eliminating the deficit which was a basic source of inflationary difficulties.

As the inflationary pressures lessen, commodity after commodity can be removed from controls, and we can emerge with a stable economy in which the traditional American free enterprise competitive system can take command. Not until then will the law of supply and demand keep prices at reasonable levels. So long as demand far exceeds supply the law of supply and demand will drive prices up.

Let us remember further that inflation and collapse in the United States would gravely jeopardize our efforts to build the kind of international economic relations that will provide a solid basis for world peace. The whole structure of international prices, currency values, and financial and trade relations is still unsettled. Because of our position and influence in world trade and finance, inflation and collapse in this country would shake the entire world.

In short, the most serious difficulties of the transition from war to peace are already behind us if only we have the wisdom and fortitude to see to it that the forces of inflation, so long held in check, are not unleashed when victory is all but won.

Therefore I call upon the Congress to act and act now by passing a bill which will give the Nation adequate assurance of completing a successful transition to a sound peacetime economy. Such a bill should contain the following provisions:

First. The bill should provide for extension of the stabilization laws for a full year.

Second. The bill should authorize the continuance of stabilization subsidies on a scale sufficient to avoid serious increases in food prices during the next 6 months and to permit the orderly termination of subsidies during the first half of 1947. In my judgment, an authorization for the expenditure of a billion and a quarter dollars during the year as a whole is the minimum necessary for these purposes.

Third. The bill should lay down a congressional policy with respect to the termination of price controls and subsidies. I approve the provisions of paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of the proposed new section 1A of the Price Control Act contained in section 3 of the present bill. These provisions call for the orderly removal of all price controls and subsidies during the course of the coming year, with the exception only of those commodities which, on or before April 1, 1947, the President finds to be still in critically short supply and for which he asks and secures authority for continued control to be administered by some established department or agency of the Government other than the Office of Price Administration.

I would not oppose the formulation of standards for the decontrol of particular commodities, as provided in H. R. 6042, or the establishment of an independent Price Decontrol Board to review these applications—provided that the standards were modified to make sure that, during the next crucial 6 months, ceilings do not have to be lifted where it is clear that serious price rises would result. The spelling out of detailed standards and the establishment of new and complex administrative machinery, however, do not seem to me to be necessary. If the Congress lays down the declaration of decontrol policy contained in paragraph (b) of the proposed new section 1A, permitting administrative flexibility in its application, I give my personal pledge that the policy will be carried out to the full in spirit as well as in letter.

I ask the Congress also, if it gives me responsibility for carrying out a measure of the kind I am urging, to permit me to do this through a unified or effectively coordinated administrative organization and not to handicap me by legislating an unsound split of authority.

Fourth. The adjustment of product prices to make possible the maximum total production is, of course, one of the fundamental requisites of good price administration during this final transition period. I do not believe that any change in the present law is necessary to assure that such adjustments are made. To put the matter beyond doubt, however, I would not object to a provision which expressly requires the adjustment of price ceilings wherever this is necessary and would be effective to increase the total production of needed goods.

The great majority of the American people want an effective price control law. They are entitled to have it. Under such a law we can win the war against inflation just as decisively as we won the war against the Axis.

Most Members of the Congress have not yet had an opportunity to take an unequivocal position on this issue. As the present bill becomes more and more heavily loaded with amendments during its 4½ months' progress through the Congress the issues became more and more obscured. Members who wanted more effective price control were found voting for the bill, or for particular amendments to the bill, on the basis that these were the best that could be secured. Side by side with them were Members who wanted to weaken price control or get rid of it altogether.

It is most unfortunate that the Congress has delayed final passage of a bill down to the eve of the very date of termination of the existing law.

As far back as September 6, 1945, I urged the Congress to pass an extension of the Price Control Act at an early date so as to avoid the uncertainties which have made control more difficult for the last few months. Had this been done there would now be no necessity for these last-minute decisions. I repeated my request to the Congress to extend price-control legislation without crippling amendments again and again—on January 21, 1946, May 22, 1946, May 25, 1946, and June 11, 1946.

Nevertheless, just before the expiration of all price control there has been presented to me by the Congress an impossible bill.

I cannot bring myself to believe, however, that the Representatives of the American people will permit the great calamity which will befall this country if price and rent control end at midnight Sunday. On behalf of the people I request the Congress to continue by resolution the present controls for the short period of time necessary to write a workable bill.

The fight against inflation is never easy. We are battling against economic forces which have caused us untold misery after every previous war and which have overcome or are threatening to overwhelm many of the nations engaged in this war.

We shall not win this fight by soft measures.

All of us who must play a part in the decision of this issue face a solemn responsibility. We stand at an historic moment. Our actions will be judged by the American people and judged again by history.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 29, 1946.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, as we have an hour to discuss this measure, I have agreed to yield 30 minutes to be used as directed by the senior minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

I now yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I see no reason why we should have extended debate on this question. I think everybody here has made up his or her mind as to how to vote.

I introduced a bill providing for the extension of the Price control and Stabilization Acts as they now exist. That bill was amended in the House, and I thought it was greatly weakened. I voted against those amendments. I believe the economic pressures that make for inflation are as strong now as they have ever been. I believe there is a great danger confronting the people of the United States. We passed a bill in a weakened form. It went to the Senate. The Senate passed a bill that was still weaker. The conferees labored long and diligently to bring forth a bill that would

meet with the approval of both Houses. We did report a bill which I think was much superior to the bill that was passed by the House and the bill passed by the Senate. I told you I thought that bill was workable. It did not meet with my approval, however. We took the material we had and did the best we could with it.

The responsibility for the enforcement of this law is in the executive department. I urged the President to sign the bill. He told me the same things he has set forth in his veto message to the Congress. I am not an expert on price control. It is a highly involved and technical matter, a matter that should be considered by men who are charged with the duty of enforcing it and who know the practical effect of the amendments which we adopted. I was hopeful that the President would approve the bill. I was hopeful that he would think the bill might work to effectuate the purposes for which it was enacted. I cooperated in bringing back, as your agent, the best bill that I could bring back so far as my influence was concerned. That, however, did not mean I was in favor of it. It meant that, as your agent, I was trying to keep the processes of legislation operating. I voted for it because I thought it was the best bill we could get and that it would subserve the purposes for which it was enacted. The President, who is charged with the duty of enforcement, says it will not do that. I do not think there is any inconsistency on my part or any subserviency to any other department of Government when I say to you I am going to vote to sustain the President's veto. If the bill we sent to the President will not be effective, I am hopeful we may pass something that will be effective. At the conclusion of the debate I shall introduce a House joint resolution to continue the Price Control and Stabilization Acts until July 20, 1946, in order that the Congress may again consider this important and complicated question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I can surely sympathize with the position in which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] finds himself this morning. I can heartily agree with him when he says he thought, as we all thought, when the conference report came back to the House, that it was the very best bill which could be presented to this House, under the circumstances. I cannot understand why with that statement so fresh on his lips, he announced he was going to vote to sustain the veto, because anyone who votes to sustain the President's veto today, according to the statements which have been made by the ranking Members in the Senate and in the House, is voting to destroy price control. I do not want to take the responsibility, notwithstanding the President's statement, of destroying control of price. I believe sincerely that if President Truman had conferred with his congressional leaders a few weeks ago instead of very recently, he would have signed this bill. I believe he has been misinformed on almost all of the major statements contained in the veto message. Surely one could point out many inconsistencies in the statement. I shall not take the time to do it. They speak for themselves.

President Truman has been given more or less of an ultimatum by the leadership of this Congress that if he vetoed this bill he would take the responsibility for the control of prices being discontinued at midnight on June 30.

Now, it is utter folly, and in this respect he had been very much misadvised by some people other than the leadership here in Congress—it is utter folly to send this question back to either House of Congress in the hope that anything will come out of it different than came out of that conference. The President says he would have no objection to having the power to adjust prices to get production. Specifically, I want to call your attention to the fact, and it is obvious that the President's attention has not been called to the fact, that he has always had the power to adjust prices to get maximum production, even as far back as Public 729, the Stabilization Act of October 1942, when the Congress laid down the very definite policy that he should make adjustments to get the maximum amount of production in cases where, by reason of increased labor costs to the producers of agricultural commodities, the prices did not reflect the increased costs. So it has been the policy of this Congress—this Government, because it is law—that prices should be increased to absorb the increase in production costs, ever since the Stabilization Act of 1942.

Mr. Bowles comes before us and he says: "We are going to raise prices to absorb production costs where necessary to get production." The House says, "You shall."

Mr. Bowles says, "We want to get rid of subsidies as quickly as we can." The Congress says to Mr. Bowles, "You shall." With the exception of transferring the authority to adjust prices on agricultural commodities from a mismanaged OPA to, we hope, an efficient Department of Agriculture, there is nothing in this bill that does not reflect the attitude of all Administration witnesses who appeared before both the House and Senate committees. The only controversy in this bill, the only controversy in this veto message, is whether the administrators of price control shall be told that they must do the things which they say they are going to do anyway.

I think we owe the country an obligation for transcending any obligation which we might as individuals feel to follow the President of the United States in this. There are no new arguments in the message, not any new arguments at all. Every sentence contained in this veto message was considered by both the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees and debated for days and days in both the Senate and the House. There is nothing new in this. The situation is still as it was when we voted to adopt the conference report day before yesterday, the same identical problems. I know that the question has been raised that it would be inconsistent for anyone who voted against the conference report now to vote to override the President's veto. Anyone who took the attitude that there were deficiencies in the bill that should be corrected in conference in keeping with his philosophy of price control could, of course, have voted not to accept the conference report in an attempt to force the conference report back to the conferees where he might hope the conferees would adopt his particular philosophy. But the situation today is that both the House and the Senate have accepted the conference report, and now it is this or nothing. We cannot ever hope to report out and submit to the Congress any better bill than we have at the present time.

I want to warn you and I want to warn the President that if this is continued for 2 or 3 weeks then there probably will be a movement, which we will no longer take responsibility to control, to write specific decontrols into the bill. I was one who led the fight against specific decontrols. If he takes the attitude that he will take the responsibility for the defeat of price control, then those of us who fought so successfully to get this bill into such shape that he could consistently sign it, surely will have to give up the fight.

Mr. Speaker, we should override this veto. We should vote notwithstanding the President's veto to continue price controls to save the President himself from being embarrassed later on by following the misguided consultants who evidently wrote the veto message. If you will take Mr. Bowles' radio speeches of the past 3 months and compare the phraseology with the veto message I think it will be very obvious to you who wrote this veto message.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, today the Congress has the most momentous decision to make that it has been called upon to face in the postwar period. Today, we will decide whether America will escape the devastation of inflation that has beset most of the rest of the world as a result of the war—or whether we will surrender to it.

We will decide whether we will have a reasonable and a sound prosperity, full employment and full production through an effective and real price-control bill—or whether we will have dislocations, labor difficulty, shortages, and profiteering with a phony price-control bill.

For myself, I intend to support and sustain the President in his veto of the so-called Price Control Act recently sent to him by the Congress. No phony price-control bill will help this Nation in the period which lies ahead and only through the President's veto can the Congress have a chance to pass a real and an effective bill which will control inflation.

GIVES CONGRESS ONE MORE CHANCE

The President by his veto gives the Congress this choice of a real bill, if we choose to write one. That is the reason why I think all friends of inflation control should support the President here today.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], who has just spoken, has charged that the President's message is inconsistent. If there is any inconsistency, it is in the bill as passed by the Congress itself. This bill, which purports in its preamble to control inflation, in fact would encourage it by congressional order. Everyone knows that this bill was loaded down with amendments ordering mandatory price increases on the millions of prices of the things that the American people must buy. It is a mandatory order to increase the cost of living of the American people.

As the President so wisely points out, it orders increases in thousands of prices where the manufacturer now may be making record-breaking profits from his over-all operation. It complicates and delays the making of necessary price adjustments to relieve real hardship or to encourage additional necessary production. It is impossible of good administration.

It unhinges the price-wage relationship which has been so difficult to establish or to keep in balance. With the bill as passed by the Congress, no wage stabilization would be possible. And without wage stabilization, there can be no end to price advances on everything.

FARMERS FACE HIGHER COSTS

The bill does nothing to actually help the farmers of America. Already, increasing processor and distributor margins, are cutting into the farmer's share of the American dollar. This bill, designed primarily to add to the profits of industry, will further decrease the value of the farmer's dollar by raising the price of almost everything he buys—without materially helping him on the things he has to sell.

Lack of production has been charged against restrictive OPA ceilings. Yet labor difficulties have caused nine-tenths of our loss of production and restrictive pricing less than one-tenth of this loss. But with this bill labor difficulties will be increased as strikes and new contracts are started to keep up with the skyrocketing cost of living.

PROFITS AT RECORD LEVELS

Insufficient profits of business and industry have also been charged against the OPA in the drive to put in many special interest amendments into this bill. The City National Bank of New York shows that only in 2 years out of the last 20, aside from the price-control years, have all corporation profits, after taxes been as high as they were last year. And still profits after taxes will go higher this year because of great tax relief granted to all business in this year's tax bill. But, still, this bill, with its Taft and Wherry amendments asks for more and more profits at the risk of destroying inflation control.

However, it is to the Members on my side of the aisle that I would like to address my remarks. Many ask, would they be inconsistent in voting now to sustain the President's veto, when they voted earlier in the week to send the emasculated and mangled bill on to him for action.

I do not think they would be inconsistent in any degree. It was with the greatest reluctance that I voted to send the bill on to the President. I knew I was voting for a straw man to control inflation. I knew I was voting for an unworkable, yes, an impossible OPA bill. But it was the only bill that as a legislator I had a chance to vote on—and I had to vote to send it on to the President to complete the legislative action on even a bad bill. Bad as it was, it was still better than no price control bill at all.

WANT BEST POSSIBLE BILL

As in the past, I have voted for the best that the legislative situation permitted and there was no other choice but to send the bill on to the President. I had voted against all crippling amendments and there was no further chance, without a Presidential veto, of getting a chance to rewrite a new and an effective bill.

The President, in his wisdom and under his constitutional right, has vetoed this bill. This, Mr. Speaker, gives the Congress another chance to try to work out an effective price-control bill—one that will prevent—rather than encourage inflation.

By voting to sustain the President, then, Members are giving the Congress another 15 or 20 days in which to try again to work out a good price-control bill. I am certain we cannot possibly send him a worse one at the end of this 15 or 20 days, and I think—I hope—that we can certainly improve on the feeble effort of the current bill.

Fifteen or twenty days is all that the President asks in this veto—15 or 20 more days of the time of the Congress to give America a real effective price-control bill. Is it not worth these extra days of work to give real meaning to the successful effort of the war years to prevent inflation?

LOSE ALL GOOD EFFECTS OF CONTROL

If we surrender now, without taking this added time, we wipe out the good results of all the headaches, the difficulties, the pain that American business has gone through during the war years to prevent inflation. We will fumble the ball in the last 2 minutes of the game and lose all the good effects of a difficult price-control program with which we have put up during these past years.

The President asks for these 15 or 20 days during which time a temporary act would continue the price-control program as is. I feel that the Congress must and should pass this temporary extension today, and then go to work on writing a real price-control bill for the coming year. We must take action today on this temporary extension or run the danger of forcing the country into a lost week end of inflation. But even if we fail to get action completed today, one lost week end of inflation is better than a year of lost week ends and the attendant DT's of ruinous inflation.

We must sustain the President and then give him this 15 days of temporary continuance. The people of this Nation want and demand effective price control. All the public-opinion polls show that from 70 to 80 percent of the people want effective price control. They do not want legislation for special-interest groups.

I plead with the Members who voted to send this bill on to the President for final action to now sustain him, so that we can have one more chance to prevent the disaster of inflation.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. Will the gentleman tell us what new evidence is going to be presented that we have not heard during the last 2 months?

Mr. MONRONEY. I may say to the gentleman that the people of the country surely are entitled to have the Congress work 15 days more, as much as we want a vacation, to see if we can give them a price-control act.

Mr. BARRY. What is the new evidence?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITE. In the event that the President's veto is sustained, then the House can immediately adopt a joint resolution to extend the time of the present bill that we are now considering for 20 days?

The SPEAKER. It could.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing that is important to secure both for the individuals of this country, the citizens of the country, and for this Congress, it is to get the matter settled. Then the people will know what they can expect. There is only one way in which it can be settled and that is to override this veto.

I thoroughly agree with the position taken by the gentleman from Michigan, the ranking minority member of this committee, in urging everyone, no matter how they voted on the previous conference report, to vote to override the veto at this time. If you do not do that, no one will have the slightest idea what will happen. I do not think it would be wise to leave the country in that shape.

People will probably withhold goods for a longer period of time if it is their disposition to do so because they will not know what to expect in the next price-control bill, if any, that is presented to the President.

The President has made some suggestions in his veto message. If he had made those suggestions 3 or 4 months ago, if there had been any disposition to find a compromise that was workable, I believe the Congress would have gone along with him. But the trouble was all through it has been a policy of all or nothing. Our only opportunity to settle this question is to override the veto today and put this law on the books. It is a workable substitute. I do not see how any better one could be obtained.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly agree with the chairman of my committee that we have brought

to the House the best bill that can be given to you. We have worked on it for weeks and months. Not only do I join with him, but I join with the leaders of this House and with the leaders of the other body in making that statement. Think before you vote today. In my opinion, if you vote to sustain the President's veto, you will kill OPA.

I agree with the chairman that we have done the best we can in securing an effective price control, yet I do not agree with him that the President knows more about this subject than he does, because my chairman has lived with this subject for the last 5 years and the President has thousands and thousands of problems and therefore cannot give it the attention it deserves, and I will say that my chairman knows a great deal more about it than Mr. Bowles. Mr. Bowles, deep down in his heart, does not object to this bill so much. He objects to the authority that you are taking away from him and placing in the Department of Agriculture. He objects to the authority of the decontrol board which has concurrent jurisdiction, along with OPA, of decontrol and taking ceilings off of the merited cases. He wants it all. Any man who will not work in harness unless he is the lead horse, so to speak, cannot last very long.

Mr. Porter, in his testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, stated that they did not need any amendment for a successful price control. He said that they could decontrol, when necessary to do so, under the present law, and that the law should not be changed in any way. I told Mr. Porter, who is a very affable gentleman, that he had just about as much chance to get the OPA bill, as written by his department, through the committee and the House as a snowball has to survive in the lower regions.

The main thing the OPA officials objected to, and the advice they gave the President, was that the so-called Wolcott-Taft amendment would authorize higher prices to manufacturers and processors, but they failed to tell the President that the conference report included producers, agricultural producers, along with manufacturers and processors. This amendment would probably not increase the price of any agricultural product, except dairy products, and three-fourths of the complaints have been from the dairy producers.

Why should anyone object to this amendment? It only says that people engaged in business are entitled to prewar profits at a period of free economy, and during that period many high-cost producers did not make a profit. This amendment just simply says that you have a base of what was made during the years of free economy and add to it only the additional cost to the producer. The high cost producer, under this amendment, would not make anything now, but he and those who made a fair profit are entitled to at least what he did obtain during that period and by adding the additional cost since that period it is only fair and equitable to producers at that time. It means that the high-cost producer of that period will not make any profit now.

We all know the only way to defeat inflation is production. This amendment is perfectly fair and will give more production, the goal we are all asking for to defeat inflation, without much higher cost to the consumer. Some are trying to claim that the high-cost producer, under this amendment, would make a greater profit now. If he lost in that base period because he was a high-cost producer, he will not profit very much now, but certainly he is entitled to the increased cost since that period. Let me repeat the thing that will destroy inflation is production, and let me stress that price control is intended to curb people bidding against each other on commodities that are scarce, but at the same time prices must be high enough to keep people producing commodities, and just why anyone would be against the policy of the so-called Wolcott-Taft amendment I cannot understand. Under this amendment, commodities that are scarce cannot get out of bounds by competitive bidding, and on commodities that are so necessary the producer must have an incentive, and, therefore, he is entitled to at least a profit that a good businessman made in prewar days

The amendment may raise the price of some things, but not many. It is conceded by all, so far as agriculture is concerned, it probably will raise prices only on dairy products and on these it will be very little. So far as clothing is concerned, if you do not give a profit to the producer he will not produce, or if he does produce he will retain the merchandise in warehouses until he can secure a legitimate profit. I feel that some manufacturers are obtaining too much profit, but many others who are producing scarce articles do not make enough to stay in business. It is very difficult to have a yardstick for all the producers of clothing, and the only fair yardstick I know, not only for producers of clothing, but of food and everything else, is that they all be given the same profit they received in a period when we had a free economy. Not only would this be fair, but this would bring full production in a short time.

I think the OPA has done a fairly good job in holding down inflation. Of course, we have some inflation. We will always have inflation as long as we have war and spend as much money as we have during the war and since. It is estimated that the purchasing price of the dollar now is about 70 cents. That shows we have inflation, but nothing like we had following World War I. A few years after World War I the purchasing power of the dollar went down to about 40 cents. The OPA officials estimated that if they could hold the value of the dollar down to 60 cents it would be a good job. I admit that some few things will go higher under the bill agreed to by the conferees; but if the producers of these commodities will produce more, which will defeat inflation, I believe, in the end, if the present bill is adopted, your dollar will be worth at least 60 cents, and you will have a contented people because they will realize the fairness of the law.

Let me repeat that I think this is a good bill in the present emergency, after the war is over, at least after the shooting is over, if properly administered, and that the leaders of our party in the House and in the other body, and also the leaders of the Republican Party in the House and the other body, agree that this is the only fair bill for price control that can be obtained now. I believe this bill, if properly administered, will give incentive to all producers and will stop the black markets in lumber, meats, dairy products, and everything else. I think the President has been badly advised in recognizing the views of Mr. Bowles and one or two other men who are anxious to work alone and not in harness in preference to leaders of both parties in both bodies in securing a workable price-control law in the present emergency.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Bowles in his bitterness and the President in his disappointment would now turn their efforts and influence toward production and more production which is after all the answer to most of the world's problems, instead of trying to sell the country on the idea that we are going to have uncontrolled inflation, they would do much to allay certain fears that are so widespread at this moment. For after all, "The only thing we have to fear is fear."

Maximum production together with the cooperation on the part of the public not to purchase anything except necessities would, I am sure, control inflation and go far toward helping to stabilize our economy.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the House a few minutes ago received the message of the President vetoing the OPA bill. The question now before us is, Shall the House pass the bill notwithstanding the veto of the President? We passed the bill in the House by a vote of 265 to 105. An overwhelming majority of Democrats and Republicans voted for the compromise bill. I was one of the 265. The 105 votes against the bill represented two groups. One group insisted that OPA be continued another year without the changes. The other group was against any extension whatsoever. It will require a two-thirds vote to override the veto of the President. The President has been warned heretofore time and again by his friends and his leaders in the House and Senate that a veto of this will would kill OPA, but the President ignored the advice of Speaker RAYBURN, Democratic Leader McCORMACK, Mr. SPENCE in charge of the bill, Senator BARKLEY, and Senator McKELLAR, the President pro tempore in the Senate, and no doubt he accepted the advice of Chester Bowles and others who desired to continue for at least another year these war-emergency controls over agriculture, industry, and the American people. These Democratic leaders, as well as Republicans, have been studying this price-control problem for more than 4 years. They really know more about it

than the President, Mr. Bowles, and others who urged him to veto this bill. They seem to think that, if they could kill the OPA bill, that they could force through the Congress a resolution to continue the life of the OPA without change. The Roosevelt and Truman administrations, because of the war emergency, secured almost unlimited control over the American people, agriculture, industry, and commerce. Although the war has been over in Europe for nearly 15 months and in Japan nearly a year, they refuse to relinquish these war emergency controls. Now is some modification necessary?

Many able Members of the House and Senate and countless millions of Americans in agriculture, industry, and in all walks of life insisted that we could not have recovery in this country under present OPA. They pointed to the fact that after 4 years of OPA, scarcity and famine stalked through the richest agricultural and the greatest industrial country of the world. Poultry and livestock were dying because of the lack of necessary food. The health and lives of the American people were threatened because of the lack of food and other necessities. I am receiving daily pleading wires and letters from the people and businessmen of my district stating that workers were forced to quit their employment because of the lack of food, and they also stated that poultry and livestock were dying because of the lack of feed.

It was claimed that the OPA would prevent the rise of prices, black markets, and inflation. We all know that prices have rapidly and steadily risen. Many commodities have increased from 25 to more than 200 percent. Black markets have increased by leaps and bounds, so that today it is generally admitted that 75 percent of the transactions are handled in some form or another of the black market and, of course, the threat of inflation has steadily grown stronger. There have been appropriated by the Congress and made available approximately $4,500,000,000 in the way of subsidies which the OPA insisted was necessary to help keep down prices. The Congress has appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars to provide the salary and other expenses of more than 60,000 office holders. The OPA has had almost unlimited power over the American people and all of their activities for approximately 4 years and yet we find this country in the worst condition it has ever been in.

Literally millions of people have been insisting that there must be a change. They say the OPA has failed to realize the purposes for which it was set up. To wit: Keep down prices, prevent black markets, provide for an equitable distribution of available supplies, and prevent inflation. To this appeal those engaged in industry, agriculture, and commerce, as well as the American people, the President, Chester Bowles and his crowd have insisted that the Congress extend the life of the OPA with all of its war powers and with billions in subsidies and more than 60,000 office holders. The House and Senate decided to make a thorough investigation of the whole subject and to that end bills were introduced in the House and Senate to extend the life of the OPA. These bills were referred to the Banking and Currency Committees of the House and Senate. Chester Bowles and his associates and others who insisted on an extension with no change and the representatives of agriculture, industry, and business and others who insisted there must be changes, and many of the very best experts in the land on this subject testified before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House and the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate. I know of no other proposed legislation that has been given more thorough hearings than these bills. It turned out on cross-examination Mr. Bowles and others, that they each and every one admitted that OPA had not achieved its objectives. They admitted that there should be changes.

The Banking and Currency Committee of the House, made up largely of Democrats, reported favorably a bill which provided for many changes to the OPA. This bill came to the House. It was debated and considered for many days where additional amendments were adopted by an overwhelming majority and the bill, as finally amended, was approved by a vote of 265 to 105 and as we have pointed out, an overwhelming majority of Democrats and a very substantil majority of Republicans voted for the bill. It then went to the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate. That committee held exhaustive hearings and all groups were given the fullest opportunity to appear and give their views, that committee, controlled by the Democrats, made other substantial changes and reported the bill favorably to the Senate. In the Senate the bill was debated and considered at great length. The Democrats have a very substantial majority in the Senate as well as in the House. The Senate passed the amended OPA bill by a vote of approximately 3 to 1. As there was some difference between the Senate bill and the House bill it was necessary for them to go to conference. The conferees, made up of Republicans and Democrats of the Banking and Currency Committees of the House and Senate, spent about 2 weeks in considering the two bills and finally the conferees agreed upon a compromise bill and submitted in their report to their respective Houses, this compromise bill. The compromise bill came up in the House and was debated and considered and was adopted by an overwhelming majority. The compromise bill was taken up in the Senate and discussed for some days and the Senate adopted it by a vote of more than 2 to 1.

When the compromise bill was up in the House Speaker RAYBURN, Democratic Leader MCCORMACK, and our colleague, Mr. SPENCE, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, took the floor and urged the House to adopt the conference report, the compromise bill, and stated unless the compromise bill was adopted there would be no OPA extension bill passed. The ranking Republican of Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] on the Banking and Currency Committee of the House and other Republicans stated that they fully concurred in what Speaker RAYBURN, Mr. MCCORMACK, and Mr. SPENCE had said. The records show that Senator BARKLEY and other leading Democrats in the Senate told their colleagues that if this conference report, the compromise bill, was defeated it would mean the death of the OPA and there would be no OPA legislation. With all the statements and consideration the House and Senate, by an overwhelming majority, adopted the conference report containing the compromise bill and it then went to the President. Speaker RAYBURN, Democratic Leader MCCORMACK, Senator BARKLEY, Democratic leader in the Senate, Senator MCKELLAR, Democrat, of Tennessee and President pro tempore of the Senate, all of them able men and strong friends of the President, called on him and urged him to approve the bill that was so strongly supported by the House and Senate, but Mr. Bowles and some others urged the President to veto it and we have his veto now before us. He urges the House and Senate to sustain his veto. He and his administration have no doubt put plenty of pressure on Members of the House and Senate. Because of the pressure and influence of the administration we may not secure a two-thirds majority to override the President's veto, but I am quite certain that a majority of the Members of the House will vote to pass the bill over the President's veto. Quite a number of Members of the House, Democrats and Republicans, who are opposed to any extension or any form of OPA, of course, will vote to sustain the President's veto and the vote will not correctly reflect the true sentiment against OPA.

SUBSIDIES

We pointed out that Congress has, through the urgency of the administrations of President Roosevelt and President Truman, voted and made available approximately $4,500,000,000 for subsidies. This money was taken out of the tax and bond money of the American people. The OPA said that it was necessary to keep down prices. The way it was used to keep down prices was that we took the money out of the Treasury and paid part of the grocery and store-account bills of the Rockefellers, the Fords, the Morgans, and others of great wealth, as well as other people of little wealth. The price of their butter, meat, cheese, and other commodities was reduced by so much per pound—paid to the producers, processors, and distributors. Is it not strange indeed that our Government would borrow money, increase the national debt, to aid in paying the grocery bill of the American people and at a time when they had more money to spend than any other time in our history? Why was this? It was simply to fool the American people. They were getting a reduced price on the goods they purchased by the Government taking their own bond and tax money and paying part of their store bills. Of course, this borrowed money will bear interest, and they and their children, and children's children will have to pay interest and the principal.

The vetoed bill provides for the gradual elimination of these subsidies. Our Government has been going into the red for the last 15 consecutive years. We cannot

balance the budget or reduce the tax burden of the American people so long as we indulge in deficit financing. But with all the subsidies prices have gone up, and up all the way from 25 percent to more than 200 percent on many of the articles of necessities. The OPA has not kept down prices. The black markets have increased by leaps and bounds. Every American housewife, as well as our citizens generally, now know that by some scheme or other the OPA prices are disregarded either in actual price or in quantity or quality of goods. The American people generally know that black markets have been produced through the unwise policies, the Executive orders, directives, rules, regulations, and interpretations, and other onerous conditions imposed upon legitimate business in this country by OPA. Some of the Federal judges who have been trying the OPA cases have declared that scarcely any business could remain in business and live up to the onerous conditions placed upon legitimate business by the OPA. It is a sad commentary when a great people in a great country with the greatest agriculture, and the most efficient industries of any people in the world are forced to indulge in black markets or be driven out of business. Hundreds of thousands, large and small, business concerns have been driven out of business and destroyed by the OPA. It has caused millions and millions of decent American people to resort to practices that are entirely foreign to our country and to our people. There must be some changes in the OPA to correct these conditions. Our own Federal Government has encouraged the black markets. The OPA put a ceiling on wheat, corn, and other grains. The Government came along and offered a bonus of 30 cents more a bushel on corn and wheat to the owners of these grains who would make their wheat and corn available for the Government to give away in foreign lands.

In other words, the Government paid 30 cents above ceiling price, with the result that the wheat and corn were turned over to the Government. Our processors of corn and wheat could not pay more than the ceiling price with the net result that 90 percent of our mills processing corn and wheat have been forced to close down and we have a great shortage of meal and flour, and with the further result that we are without feed for our livestock, dairy cattle, and poultry, and yet we have persons who say there must be no change in the OPA.

The Federal Government, with its excessive borrowings and its deficit financing, has contributed more to inflation than all other causes. The $4,500,000,000 of subsidies adds fuel to the flame of inflation. The sale of tens of billions of bonds and the printing and distribution of paper money adds to the threat of inflation, and now this administration proposes to sell $3,750,000,000 worth of bonds for a loan of that sum to Great Britain. The Government, as we have pointed out, bought hundreds of billions of bushels of grain and millions of tons of various other commodities and paid for them through the sale of bonds and shipped these grains and commodities to foreign countries. These transactions, of course, cut down the amount of consumer goods—food, clothing, and so forth. These, of course, added to the flames of inflation.

A few years ago our New Deal administration was killing millions of cattle, hogs, pigs, and sheep, burning millions of bushels of grain, plowing under crops to bring about a scarcity. They adopted a new technique and that was to establish the OPA under Leon Henderson and Chester Bowles. Through their oppressive and unwise policies they have destroyed hundreds of thousands of productive enterprises. They have been the greatest enemies of private competitive business. This cut down production. We now have great scarcity in 2,000 or more necessary commodities of every kind. The answer to high prices, black markets, inflation, and scarcity is plenty. We cannot have plenty without full production. There cannot be full production under the blighting influences and the strangling directives, regulations, and rules imposed upon agriculture and industry. If this administration will give proper consideration to the needs of the American people, encourage production, and will quit deficit financing and the increase of taxes, prices will soon be brought under control, black markets will disappear, and inflation will no longer disturb us.

Bowles and company have tried to have private enterprise and full production go forward by fixing prices less than cost of production. This is one of the main causes of scarcity in this country. We cannot expect people on the farms or in industry to receive less than their cost of production. This bill on that point merely provides that the producers shall receive the actual cost of production, plus a reasonable profit based on the 1941 prices. Producers are entitled to a price that will cover the actual cost of production and a reasonable profit. The failure of the OPA to recognize this great fundamental American principle of right and justice has discouraged production and intensified scarcity. It is now agreed that 75 percent of our commodities and consumer goods are handled in the black markets. A careful check-up shows the American people, on an average, pay 25 percent above the OPA price in black markets. The American people have nearly $150,000,000,000 of liquid assets to buy what they want. If they cannot get it at OPA prices, then they get it in the black markets.

The OPA must be modified so as to restore legitimate and honest business, increase production, and give to the American people consumer goods of ascertained quality and honest prices. The OPA has helped to establish the reputation that was declared by one of our distinguished colleagues some time ago—that this is a government of tyranny, oppression, favoritism, and corruption. If we listen to the Bowles and other radicals we shall never get from under the oppressive wartime controls and our free economy will be destroyed.

This is Saturday afternoon, June 29. The Congress does not meet on Sunday. The OPA Act expires tomorrow night, Sunday, June 30. The President, at this late hour insists that the Congress now pass a resolution extending the OPA as is, in the face of the fact that it has not accomplished either one of its purposes. The House and Senate and its committees considered this whole subject with very great care for 4½ months. The Members of the House and Senate are quite as anxious as anybody to protect the people in their own districts and in their own States and the American people as a whole. The President has cut down with a stroke of his pen and thrown out the window the result of their labors and cast upon us at this late hour, only a few hours, to get through a resolution extending this OPA as is, when nearly everybody believes there must be substantial changes. His leaders and friends in the House and Senate advised him correctly when they told him that if he vetoed this bill it would mean the death of the OPA.

Under the rules of the House and Senate there would be no way to get through such a resolution today or even if the House and Senate worked until midnight tomorrow night. We have heard today that a number of the President's leaders and friends in the Senate would not give consideration to any such resolution. No such resolution could be passed in the House today.

I am voting to override the President's veto so that the bill as passed by the House and Senate may become law. I am unwilling to vote to sustain the veto, which means that there would be no price control whatever after June 30. The President must assume full responsibility for killing the OPA. Mr. Bowles has spent billions in subsidies, and he has spent millions in propaganda. He has deceived millions of good Americans. He has from day to day misrepresented the facts, grossly and wilfully, and deceived many American people. If the President wants to listen to Mr. Bowles instead of the elected representatives of the districts and the States and his own leaders in the House and Senate, he will have to bear the blame for destroying this agency at this time. I certainly would not vote for the continuance of the OPA without substantial changes to protect the rights and interests of the American people.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently voted for the extension of OPA without crippling amendments. The bill providing for the extension was introduced in the House on April 8, 1946, so that it has now been under continuous consideration for approximately 3 months. When the report of the conference committee was before this body several days ago the managers on the part of the House stated that the bill then presented was the best that could be agreed upon by the Senate and the House. In view of this fact I voted for the bill although it contained objectionable provisions.

The same bill is before us again under similar conditions. I am convinced that it is the best bill that we can get. If the President's veto is sustained there is at least a grave danger that all price controls will end tomorrow at midnight. This bill is preferable to none at all and if it is enacted it can be subsequently amended as circumstances may require.

I am unwilling to cast a vote which may result in killing the OPA. I shall, therefore, vote to override the President's veto.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, today on this floor someone asked the question, "What is new in this matter of OPA?" And I welcome the opportunity to answer: There is one thing new that should give heart to the people, and that is the veto of the President of the United States, wherein he declares to the world that he has the intestinal fortitude to be the defender of the rank and file of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, it was on June 15, after listening to the Senate debate and the roll call on the OPA in the Senate Chamber, I phoned the White House and expressed my opinion that what had taken place was terrible. I further said the measure should be vetoed, and that I did not feel that any Representative, regardless of his party, having the best interest of the people at heart, would dare to return to his home and face an electorate under a situation so brazen in its attempt to abandon the best interests of the Nation.

Today the Members of the House, as well as the Senate are confronted with that very proposition. And while there has been much talk setting forth arguments, eloquently phrased but void of reason, why no change could be made in the law as passed, nevertheless the very apprehension voiced on the occasion is significant of the guilt attendant to such utterances, for a designed delay of 4 months on the part of Congress, now presents itself in all significance.

Let the country realize that the bill was presented to the President by a dilatory Congress in its dying twilight hour; and in my opinion designedly so. Where, I ask, were the friends of the Chief Executive of this Nation to permit this situation that has come to pass? He surely must have been regarded as one unfamiliar with delays and procrastination. Now he has risen to the occasion, exercising his prerogative of veto-champion of the people, protector of their resources, a devotee to the veteran and his GI rights, and a defender of those with set incomes.

In my opinion, the President's stature mounted this day, while the chicanery and subterfuge of the would-be champions of OPA dwindled to dwarf proportions. His voice was mild but he carried the big stick.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, every time they have had the same old compromise under the same conditions, and you extend OPA. It is the same old baloney. OPA has gone on and on producing less and less and less until today they are even killing the little chickens so that they can feed the American people the chicken feed.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In the President's veto message he manifests a great interest in efficient price control. If he were interested in efficient price control he could have discharged or fired Chester Bowles months ago, could he not?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Yes; when we first started calling him Bottleneck Bowles.

This is not a Republican fight nor a Democratic fight nor a personal fight, this is the same fight that is going on all over the world, from Chiang Kai-shek and all around the world and back to Stalin. The fight is totalitarianism against freedom, and OPA is totalitarianism.

The wartime of Council of Defense, using American taxpayers' money, got out a book, presumably given to them by the inside Nazi officials, showing that the way they destroyed free enterprise in Germany was to sing paeans of praise for private enterprise. The key to the program was price control, confiscatory price ceilings, and enslavement through subsidies.

The American system that grew to be so successful is too complicated for free men with all their energy to be controlled by any one person or group of persons. The good Lord himself could not control it successfully, and the Lord would know better than to try.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I share the feeling of my chairman, the feeling of disappointment that the President did not sign this bill. I voted for the conference report. I also appreciate the position taken by my good friend the ranking minority member of the committee [Mr. WOLCOTT], whom I respect very much, as we all do. I am sorry that we are confronted with this decision. I am not sure that I can help anyone. I can only offer my reasons for following the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] in voting to sustain the veto in this case, although I do not always agree with the President, and have demonstrated that on previous occasions when our responsibility, as I viewed it, was to override a veto. But in this instance in a very solemn situation one has to do what he thinks is his own duty, and I shall not question the attitude of any other. I shall appeal, however, to the gentleman from Michigan, in case we could pass this brief extension of 2 weeks—I believe he will do this—to go into this problem and to help present to the President a bill that we can convince him he can live with, one he can accept and administer.

The gentleman from Michigan will remember when the President of the National Association of Manufacturers appeared before our committee I commented upon our dilemma and pointed out that there was something to be said for his position, which was, "Let us do away with controls altogether." I responded rather sympathetically to his appeal that we could outrun inflation. It was a bold thing which he suggested and we were not bold enough to do it. I personally would not be quite willing to do it. Yet, between his position and the position of those who favor this bill as it is, in spite of the President's objections, it seems to me there is much to be said for the position of the manufacturers for lifting all controls. I am afraid that if this bill becomes law, we will simply have a continuing harassment of our businessmen with none of the benefits of a sound price-control law. So I shall vote to sustain and then for a 2 weeks' extension. We should then make an effort to work out a constructive measure upon which we can agree without reference to partisan politics. The decision is between that course and a bill that will prove ineffectual and will please no one and I fear will actually force us into an inflationary situation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, when I came to the office this morning, I felt there was something in the atmosphere around Capitol Hill which had not been here before. I felt that there was an increased confidence, and a renewal of courage, and an obvious determination to return this Nation to the position of strength and security which the powers of production have always assured it in the past.

It was the custom, in earlier days, on momentous occasions, that poems should be written, commemorating those occasions. So, Mr. Speaker, I wrote a poem and this is it:

The buyers cheer,
The farmers shout,
Production's near,
For Bowles is out.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who voted against the conference report. I voted that way because I wished to do away with the deceptive, disastrous subsidy policy which was imposed upon this country. I wanted other changes. I wanted foodstuffs in the hands of people who understood farm production and distribution. I wanted Mr. Bowles' political ambitions transferred to some other field.

Today my choice is between the bill the President vetoed, or no bill at all. I am not at all sure that we would not be better off without any bill at all, and thus no OPA. However, I have consistently held out for the transfer of food control to the Secretary of Agriculture, and for industrial decontrol in some orderly fashion. I have particularly felt that rentals should be decontrolled carefully, perhaps through local authorities, which now have that right.

With these points in mind, Mr. Speaker, I am today voting to override the veto, and I think other Representatives from the farm areas, where we do not like the administration of OPA, will decide to vote to override, even though we voted against the conference committee report, desiring further consideration then. However, Mr. Speaker, I want no misunderstanding on the matter of a temporary extension. I shall not vote to extend the OPA, under its present administration and present regulations, for 3 weeks, nor for 3 days, nor for 3 minutes. The Congress sent an extension bill to the White House. It may not have been a perfect bill but it was infinitely better than the present situation in OPA. The President chose to veto that bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the conference report with great misgivings, hoping that the President could find something that would save it. I want to print in the RECORD these two articles regarding the largest renter of apartment houses in Minnesota, together with a letter to one of his tenants. This letter concerns one particular tenant, but he has many of them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY,
INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION OF MINNESOTA,
St. Paul, June 3, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed find copy of letter served on me by registered mail June 1, 1946. The paragraph referring to my personal attitude toward Harold Warner is difficult to understand. I saw him 7 years ago when I first rented the apartment and have never contacted him personally or by telephone since that time. Nor have I ever interviewed any of his tenants on any of his affairs.

The Warner Holding Co. is one of the largest apartment-house owners in the Twin Cities, the apartment in which I reside alone containing about 70 rental units. I am in no position to comment on either the profits or losses of this concern, except to know that during the last 3 years not one dollar has been expended on my apartment in the way of painting, papering, decorating, or for any other purpose.

There is no doubt that most of us are becoming irritated by too much Federal interference in our daily lives. However, if only a few real-estate operators in Minnesota adopt policies similar to those indicated by the Warner Holding Co. it would result in a chaotic condition all over the State. Owners of property may be and probably are entitled to increases over the 1942 rental basis, but some reasonable limitation should be placed on such increases.

As far as I am personally concerned the threats of Mr. Warner do not bother me any. Fortunately I am so situated that I can take care of an emergency if he creates one for me. There are thousands of people in the Twin Cities alone, to say nothing of many other communities in the State, who are not that fortunate.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,
Yours respectfully,
J. D. WILLIAMS.

WARNER HOLDING CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn., May 29, 1946.

J. D. WILLIAMS,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: Our real estate operations for our fiscal year just concluded show that we lost over $10,000.

You must have known for many months that you have been getting your apartment at least 25 percent cheaper than it should have been because it was frozen by arbitrary action of a Federal Government bureau. You must have known that your individual other costs have increased greatly. Ours have also in the same if not greater proportion.

Your rental terms as frozen are $55 per month less $5 discount if paid on or before the fifth. In all these months that our income has been rigidly held at the March 1942 rate, you could have voluntarily withheld paying your rent until the sixth of the month and then tendered us the gross rate of $55 had you chosen to do so. In this manner you could have shown us that you realized that we had been victimized for these many months and signified your sympathy in a tangible form; however you chose to selfishly pay your rent before the lapse of the discount date.

Apart from the above, during your tenancy you have been uncooperative and arbitrary in your attitude, and in addition, interviewed other tenants and caused us a lot of trouble.

As it now stands, the Emergency Price Control Act will expire June 30, 1946. Minnesota law requires 30 days notice of intention to increase rent. You are therefore hereby notified that in the event the Emergency Price Control Act is not renewed nor extended after June 30, 1945, your rent for the premises you now occupy from and after July 1, 1946, will be $120 per month with a $5 discount, if paid on or before the 5th of the month, making net $115.

Yours truly,
WARNER HOLDING CO.,
By H. L. WARNER.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO MESSAGE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the conference report on the price-control bill with reluctance. Had I had the information before me that was given to us by the President this morning, I would have been obliged to vote against it. I believe he knows more about the needs of the entire Nation than any one of us here. He is interested in the people, not in a few of the manufacturers or beneficiaries that have spent millions in trying to defeat this legislation.

It seems to me that the people who have been trying to kill price control, and who have done most to bring about the bill which the President, as the Chief Executive of the Nation, was forced to reject, are speaking for only a small number of speculative industrialists, financiers, and merchants. These men, and it distresses me to have to say it, seem to have no thought except to reap a quick profit. Their philosophy is that of boom and bust; they are one with the French tyrant who said grandiosely, "After me, the deluge."

NO ONE WINS

The truth is that no one wins in this kind of a race with inflation. There are vast forces in motion which, left to the winds of chance, can but blow up a storm that may destroy all chance of peace and prosperity for our time.

Our only chance to win out, at home and abroad, is to control these powerful forces as well as we are able by laws and regulations self-imposed. It is, Mr. Speaker, and I say it sadly, too late to do more than put a heavy brake on these runaway prices; for already the cost of living, in spite of the best efforts of this administration, has gone up and up and up, 40 percent, 50 percent, 60 percent, above prewar prices. Some items are selling at double their 1940 price today.

PRODUCTION IS UP 69 PERCENT

We hear that production is the answer; yet Federal Reserve Board and Civilian Production Administration reports show that in mid April—less than 9 months after VJ-day—civilian production was higher than ever before in our history.

Civilian production at that time, Mr. Speaker, was 69 percent higher than in our last prewar years—1935 to 1939—and rising. In April 52,000,000 people were at work producing goods and services. That was more than ever before worked and produced in peacetime.

The "shortages" are in lines of high demand. More people have more money to buy more things than ever before in American history; spendable income of the average family is twice as great as in 1939, I am very pleased to be able to say; and there are, of course, some particular items which are in short supply as compared with prewar.

THIS IS NOT A PARTY FIGHT

This is not just a Republican fight, or a Democratic fight.

It is a fight between the people, the national interest, and the greed and avarice of big business which has misrepresented the issue for the sake of bigger and bigger profits—while they last.

It is a struggle between the desire of the people to make a living, and the desire of selfish interests to make a killing.

CORPORATE PROFITS ARE HIGH

Mr. Speaker, I have before me a graph published in the Survey of Current Business, an official and authoritative publication of the Department of Commerce. That graph shows that even after taxes corporate profits have been maintained at practically 1929 levels for 4 years, from 1941 through 1945.

And still they cry for more and more profit.

INFLATION WILL NOT HURT THE RICH

Mr. Speaker, I have here also a report from the Treasury Department, which I ask unanimous consent to insert, which shows that here in the United States there are 620 men and women who receive incomes in salaries and bonuses amounting to more than $75,000 a year. In the highest brackets some of these people received almost a half million dollars in 1945.

The end of price control will not hurt them, Mr. Speaker, but these are the high-paid servants of the financial powers of Wall Street who have demanded the end of OPA for the greater profit of Big Business, who have hoodwinked the small retailers into making the same demands, and who have carried on a long and expensive and bitter campaign to get rid of OPA, or to strip OPA of all effective powers to save us from a ruinous inflation.

ENEMIES OF FREE ENTERPRISE

They have not hesitated to carry their campaign into the very halls of Congress, Mr. Speaker. The Washington Daily News spoke strongly yesterday in its editorial. The News is not a radical paper; and its warning is not to be taken as any liberal outpourings; in fact, this is not a question of liberalism or conservatism, of Democrats or Republicans. It is a question of saving America from another 1929.

Let me read from the final paragraph of that editorial, which so clearly explains the stake of business in price control:

90 PERCENT OF PEOPLE WANT OPA

Any manufacturer or merchant who sees the present situation as an opportunity or

excuse for profiteering is an enemy of the free-enterprise system. There never was a time when voluntary restraint in pricing was more necessary, or more certain to pay big long-run dividends.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, 90 percent of the American people plead and beg with us to save OPA.

Among the hundreds of letters I have received pleading for extension of a strong price-control act—letters from workers, from businessmen, from dentists, and lawyers, and housewives, and plumbers, and workers, from stenographers, and annuitants and school teachers, letters from American citizens who have to make every dollar count—there is one that stands out, and which should open the eyes of all those who refuse to see.

TWENTY-FIVE DOLLARS FOR A $5 DRESS?

Coming from an outstanding Chicago businessman, it makes clear what the end of OPA will mean as he says, "We do not want to pay $25 for a $5 dress, nor $125 for a $30 suit of clothes."

This letter is from Mr. Allison Waugh, head of the Allison Waugh Financial Development Co., at 105 South La Salle Street, Chicago. I desire to call special attention to Mr. Waugh's warning that our returned servicemen are finding out that their GI loans at 4 percent are no bargains if they have to pay that rate on a 100-percent inflation of the real value.

This is the text of Mr. Waugh's letter:

JUNE 20, 1946.

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SABATH: We folks back "in the provinces" are beginning to feel more and more that in the political game too much attention is being given to pressure groups and too little to "the common peepul." We begin to realize that the manufacturers, processors, and other suppliers on the one side and labor, big business, etc., on the other side, exist solely because of some 140,000,000 men and women and youngsters who buy merchandise, build homes, save money, and seek the famed Four Freedoms for themselves as well as for other peoples.

Increasing thousands are dismayed at the prospect that the National Legislature will remove the only protection available against inflation, against an increasing rise in all prices which cannot be adjusted until panic ensues. We do not look with favor on rents going to a 200-percent increase. We do not want to pay $25 for a $5 dress nor $125 for a $30 suit of clothes. We do not want stocks to rise to those levels which they will reach in this approaching inflation, to crash once again as they did, to the ruination of millions of us.

We do not want the floods started down as a mountain torrent to the sea of oblivion, with only a large mesh net attached to the sides of the stream so as to permit the saving of the largest fish, our millionaires, permitting all of us small fry to be swept away.

Certainly OPA has its faults; so does everything worth-while and good, even our Supreme Court, but OPA is the only thing which can save us. Organized pressure groups, big business, NMA, and those in the favored class insist on our being almost destroyed in this campaign to destroy OPA.

Thousands are talking buyers' strikes, defeats of our Senators and Congressmen who permit this destruction. We have heard even worse. We are not organized, we have no voice, but we do buy the merchandise, and we do pay the bills. We do not want OPA so emasculated as to be impotent. We want OPA to function. We do not want a recurrence of that period from 1929 to 1934. We are going to vote against the men in Congress who will not support us who elect and maintain those men.

We know we are giving the veterans nothing, when we offer GI loans at 4 percent, because a loan for $5,000 (the real value of the home) at 5 percent would be infinitely better than a loan at 4 percent on a $10,000 inflated valuation. These boys are beginning to know it, also.

Cordially yours,

ALLISON WAUGH.

Consequently, there is nothing else for me to do but to vote to sustain the President, believing that he is sincere, that he is honest, and that he desires to save the Nation from inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a report from the Treasury Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington.

The Secretary of the Treasury today made public, in accordance with a provision of the Internal Revenue Code, a list of individuals receiving from corporations compensation for personal services in excess of $75,000 for the calendar year 1944 and fiscal year ending in 1945 as well as a supplemental report for the calendar year 1943 and fiscal years ended in 1944.

The Secretary of the Treasury is required by section 148 (f) of the code, as amended by section 407 of the Revenue Act of 1939, to make public the names of such individuals as were reported by employing corporations in their income-tax returns. The list compiled shows the amounts paid to officers and employees by reporting corporations in the form of salary, commission, bonus, or other compensation for personal services.

Section 148 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by section 407 of the Revenue Act of 1938, is as follows:

"Compensation of officers and employees: Under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, every corporation subject to taxation under this chapter shall, in its return, submit a list of the names of all officers and employees of such corporations and the respective amounts paid to them during the taxable year of the corporation by the corporation as salary, commission, bonus, or other compensation for personal services rendered, if the aggregate amount so paid to the individual is in excess of $75,000.

"The Secretary shall compile from the returns made a list containing the names of, and the amounts paid to, each such officer and employee and the name of the paying corporation and shall make such list available to the public. It shall be unlawful for any person to sell, offer for sale, or circulate, for any consideration whatsoever, any copy or reproduction of any list, or part thereof, authorized to be made public by this act or by any prior act, relating to the publication of information derived from income-tax returns; and any offense against the foregoing provision shall be a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine not exceeding $1,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both, at the discretion of the court: *Provided,* That nothing in this sentence shall be construed to be applicable with respect to any newspaper, or other periodical publication entitled to admission to the mails as second-class matter."

The names of the corporations and of the officers and employees who received compensation in excess of $75,000, as reported to the Secretary by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, are as follows:

Name of corporation and officers or employees	Calendar or fiscal year ended—	Salary	Commission	Bonus	Other compensation	Total
ALABAMA						
The Birmingham News Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Hanson, Victor H		$93,600.00		$9,000.00		$102,600.00
CALIFORNIA						
Phil Berg-Bert Allenberg, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Allenberg, Bertram		106,000.00			[1] $504.38	106,504.38
Bullock's, Inc	Jan. 31, 1945					
Winnett, P. G		75,000.00		20,000.00		95,000.00
Cagney Productions, Inc	July 31, 1945					
Cagney, James		150,000.00				150,000.00
Cagney, William		150,000.00				150,000.00
Captain Kidd Productions, Inc	Nov. 30, 1945					
Laughton, Charles		100,000.00				100,000.00
Scott, Randolph		85,000.00				85,000.00
California Pictures Corp	July 31, 1945					
Sturges, Preston		190,000.00				190,000.00
The Emporium Capwell Co	Jan. 31, 1945					
Civelli, J. S		24,000.00		58,344.00		82,344.00
Fisher, Haldane S		40,000.00		75,521.84		115,521.84
Lipman, E. C		35,000.00		87,296.50		122,296.50
Fox Midwest Amusement Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Rhoden, E. C		39,750.00		54,863.25		94,613.25
Fox West Coast Agency Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Skouras, Charles P		130,000.00				130,000.00
Hearst Consolidated Publications, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Hearst, William Randolph		100,000.00				100,000.00
Lockheed Aircraft Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Barker, C. A., Jr		90,000.00				90,000.00
Gross, Robert E		125,000.00				125,000.00

[1] This item represents premiums on life insurance carried on the life of Bertram Allenberg by trustees under declaration of pension trust for the employees of Phil Berg-Bert Allenberg, Inc.

Name of corporation and officers or employees	Calendar or fiscal year ended—	Salary	Commission	Bonus	Other compensation	Total
CALIFORNIA—continued						
Los Angeles Turf Club, Inc	June 30, 1945					
Strub, Charles H		$12,000.00		$454,537.53		$466,537.53
Marchant Calculating Machine Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Cooke, Dwight R		128,429.42				128,429.42
The National Dollar Stores, Ltd	Jan. 31, 1945					
Shoong, Joe		75,120.00		90,000.00		165,120.00
National Theatres Amusement Co., Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Skouras, Charles P					$263,000.00	263,000.00
Pacific Chemical Co	Nov. 30, 1945					
Alden, A. T		7,200.00	$85,304.25		[1] 4,319.96	96,824.21
Pacific Gas & Electric Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Black, James B		75,000.00			1,320.00	76,320.00
Hal Roach Studios, Inc	Aug. 31, 1945					
Bendix, William E		25,666.67		208,276.35	261.38	234,204.40
Rosenberg Bros. & Co	May 31, 1945					
Oppenheimer, Arthur C		25,000.00		134,353.24		159,353.24
S & K Sales Co	June 30, 1945					
Kahn, Richard		7,200.00		81,999.01		89,199.01
Wells Fargo Bank & Union Trust Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Lipman, F. L		80,000.00				80,000.00
CONNECTICUT						
American Chain & Cable Co., Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Morris, William T		50,000.00		25,500.00	240.00	75,740.00
Wheeler, Wilmot F		35,000.00		49,437.50	260.00	84,697.50
Edwards & Co., Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Edwards, R. Stafford		118,817.18				118,817.18
McHugh, Edward P		77,231.94				77,231.94
Miller, Christian		77,231.94				77,231.94
Nolan, Thomas S		77,231.94				77,231.94
The National Folding Box Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Lynch, Walton D		196,500.00	46,650.00			143,150.00
Mabee, George W		134,000.00				134,000.00
Northam Warren Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Warren, Northam		100,000.00				100,000.00
Remington Arms Co., Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Davis, C. K		39,996.00		46,250.00	220.00	86,466.00
United Aircraft Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Rentschler, Frederick B		75,000.00			4,150.00	79,150.00
Wilson, Eugene E		75,000.00			2,350.00	77,350.00
DELAWARE						
American Viscose Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Appleton, William C		75,000.00		25,000.00		100,000.00
Griffin, Frank H		60,000.00		20,000.00		80,000.00
The Coca-Cola Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Acklin, A. A		80,000.00			700.00	80,700.00
Brock, Pope F		80,000.00			550.00	80,550.00
Jones, Harrison		80,000.00			600.00	80,600.00
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Brown, J. Thompson		50,000.04		56,407.69	600.00	107,007.73
Carpenter, Walter S., Jr		150,000.00			550.00	150,550.00
Crane, Jasper E		50,000.04		54,480.50	550.00	105,030.54
du Pont, Henry B		50,000.04		44,938.13	500.00	95,438.17
Echols, Angus B		57,999.96		60,834.88	550.00	119,384.84
Harrington, Willis F		50,000.04		56,407.69	600.00	107,007.73
McCoy, John W		50,000.04		56,407.69	600.00	107,007.73
Robinson, Edmund G		45,912.00		43,010.94	600.00	89,522.94
Stine, Charles M. A		50,000.04		51,407.69	550.00	101,957.73
Wardenburg, Frederic A		39,680.00		42,010.94	450.00	82,140.94
Yancey, Edward B		44,735.05		51,046.38	550.00	96,331.43
Yerkes, Leonard A		52,968.00		45,938.13	550.00	99,456.13
Hercules Powder Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Higgins, Charles A		60,000.00		21,900.00		81,900.00
The Lambert Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Johnston, John L		80,000.00		15,000.00		95,000.00
GEORGIA						
Colonial Stores, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Phelan, Hunter C		26,000.00		63,805.00		89,805.00
Industrial Life & Health Insurance Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
McEachern, J. N		84,959.31				84,959.31
ILLINOIS						
American Steel Foundries	Sept. 30, 1945					
Drever, Thomas		60,000.00		30,000.00		90,000.00
B. & K. Management Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Balaban, John		104,000.00				104,000.00
John Blair & Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Blair, John P		12,000.00	1,000.00	78,554.49		91,554.49
Borg-Warner Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Blood, Howard E		60,000.00		27,034.39	450.00	87,484.39
Ingersoll, R. C		57,000.00		32,677.00	550.00	90,227.00
Brink's, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Allen, Frank		85,000.00			850.00	85,850.00
Allen, John D		85,000.00			850.00	85,850.00
Burgess-Norton Manufacturing Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Smith, H. S		3,000.00	102,016.72	1,500.00		106,516.72
Butler Bros	Dec. 31, 1944					
Freeman, Thomas B		50,000.00		31,000.00		81,000.00
Caron Spinning Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Caron, O. J		24,999.96		82,368.28		107,368.24
Central Steel & Wire Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Lowenstine, Mandel		66,000.00		18,000.00		84,000.00
Container Corp. of America	Dec. 31, 1944					
Paepcke, Walter P		75,000.00			45,000.00	120,000.00
Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago	Dec. 31, 1944					
Cummings, Walter J		150,000.00			1,050.00	151,050.00
Crane Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Collier, J. H		50,000.00		25,000.00	700.00	75,700.00
R. R. Donnelley & Sons Co	Dec. 31, 0944					
Littell, C. G		26,000.00		107,762.28		133,762.28
Zimmerman, H. P		20,800.00		64,657.37		85,457.37
The Reuben H. Donnelley Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bamforth, Arthur H		19,500.00		55,810.92		75,310.92
Gunnison, Raymond M		25,000.00		55,810.92		80,810.92
Harrington, David L		10,800.00		64,510.92		75,310.92
Lillyblade, Clarence O		19,500.00		55,810.92		75,310.92

[1] Reimbursement of business expenses.

Name of corporation and officers or employees	Calendar or fiscal year ended—	Salary	Commission	Bonus	Other compensation	Total
ILLINOIS—continued						
Fairbanks, Morse & Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Morse, Robert H.		$75,000.00		$79,163.71	$3,000.00	$157,163.71
The First National Bank of Chicago	Dec. 31, 1944					
Brown, E. E.		85,000.00			3,875.00	88,875.00
General Outdoor Advertising Co., Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Robbins, Burnett W.		75,000.00			150.00	75,150.00
Gunthorp-Warren Printing Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Moran, John T.		8,500.00		127,500.00		136,000.00
Household Finance Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Henderson, B. E.		75,038.22		50,000.00		125,038.22
Inland Steel Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Sykes, Wilfred		50,000.00		30,000.00		80,000.00
International Harvester Co.	Oct. 31, 1945					
Elliott, William S.		60,000.00		24,000.00	600.00	84,600.00
McCaffrey, J. L.		68,750.00		27,500.00	1,100.00	97,350.00
McCormick, Fowler		99,999.96		40,000.00	1,280.00	141,279.96
International Minerals & Chemical Corp.	June 30, 1945					
Ware, Louis		50,000.00		50,000.00	1,200.00	101,200.00
William F. Jobbins, Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
McKnight, William A.		10,000.00		75,000.00		85,000.00
Kraft Cheese Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Kraft, John H.		80,833.37				80,833.37
Lion Manufacturing Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Lyon, Stuart G.			$76,852.00			76,852.00
Lumbermen's Mutual Casualty Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Kemper, James S.		45,000.00			200,904.09	245,904.09
Mars, Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Mars, Mrs. E. V.		120,000.00				120,000.00
Maybelline Co.	June 30, 1945					
Williams, Thomas L.		80,000.00				80,000.00
W. H. Miner, Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Withall, A. P.		50,000.00	144,264.03			194,264.03
Monroe Chemical Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bonfoey, L. P.		[3] 76,120.57				76,120.57
Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc.	Jan. 31, 1945					
Avery, S. L.		100,000.00			850.00	100,850.00
Ryan, C. D.		75,000.00		20,000.00	800.00	95,800.00
Northwest Engineering Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Houston, L. E.		50,000.00		50,000.00		100,000.00
Pabst Brewing Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Perlstein, H.						82,000.00
Reid, Murdoch & Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Anderson, L. S.		25,000.00		115,822.71		140,822.71
Republic Food Products Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Clair, J. M.		26,000.00		62,620.00		88,620.00
C. A. Roberts Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Kaiser, A. A.		83,570.76				83,570.76
Sears, Roebuck & Co.	Jan. 31, 1945					
Barrows, A. S.		77,130.00		35,000.00		112,130.00
Houser, T. V.		59,999.95		20,000.00		79,999.95
A. E. Staley Manufacturing Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Staley, A. E., Jr.		48,000.00		44,500.00		92,500.00
Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)	Dec. 31, 1944					
Seubert, Edward G.		41,925.60			66,911.76	108,837.36
Swift & Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Holmes, John		85,000.00				85,000.00
Chicago Tribune-New York News Syndicate, Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Gray and Gray		13,250.00			81,187.45	94,437.45
News Syndicate Co., Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Clarke, R. W.		67,200.00		22,800.00		90,000.00
Flynn, F. M.		67,200.00		22,800.00		90,000.00
Holliss, R. C.		67,200.00		22,800.00		90,000.00
Tribune Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Campbell, C. M.						80,786.91
Rose, L. H.						111,068.00
United Drill & Tool Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Kearins, M. J.		24,999.84			65,000.00	89,999.84
Zenith Radio Corp.	Apr. 30, 1945					
McDonald, Eugene F., Jr.		55,000.00		30,000.00		85,000.00
INDIANA						
Mead Johnson & Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Johnson, Lambert D.		40,478.88		78,611.12		119,090.00
IOWA						
The Register & Tribune Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Martin, Henry P., Jr.		6,573.75	70,806.22			77,379.97
LOUISIANA						
Higgins Industries, Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Higgins, Andrew J.		83,333.33				83,333.33
MARYLAND						
Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Montgomery, William		75,000.00			200.00	75,200.00
American Totalisator Co., Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Straus, Henry L.		53,000.00		34,811.53		87,811.53
The Hecht Co.	Jan. 31, 1945					
Davidow, Harry		45,593.45		80,214.47		125,807.92
Dulcan, Charles B., Sr.		50,000.00		133,235.62		183,235.62
Goodman, Moses H.		45,000.00		47,143.13		92,143.13
MASSACHUSETTS						
American Optical Co. (voluntary association)	Dec. 31, 1944					
Cozzens, C. O.		90,000.00				90,000.00
Mosher, Ira		83,333.33				83,333.33
The Atlantic Lumber Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Crowley, Ralph C.		77,399.00				77,399.00
French, Edward V.		185,497.51				185,497.51
McHugh, Thomas J.		185,497.51				185,497.51
E. B. Badger & Sons Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Badger, Erastus B.		18,000.00	132,383.56		1,364.24	151,747.80
Campbell, Charles L.		10,000.00	88,255.70		956.03	99,211.73
Hall, Walter T.		18,000.00	132,383.56		1,225.85	151,609.41
Hargrove, George C.		12,000.00	88,255.70		658.06	100,913.76
Lunt, George P.		12,000.00	88,255.70		734.49	100,990.19
Peters, William A., Jr.		18,000.00	132,383.56		1,093.02	151,476.58

[3] Compensation based upon contract dated June 24, 1940.

Name of corporation and officers or employees	Calendar or fiscal year ended—	Salary	Commission	Bonus	Other compensation	Total
MASSACHUSETTS—continued						
Evans Case Co.	Feb. 28, 1945					
Reilly, Alfred F.		$25,000.00		$51,356.74		$76,356.74
Haffenreffer & Co., Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Haffenreffer, T. C.		28,750.00	$54,212.11			82,962.11
The Lahey Clinic	Dec. 31, 1944					
Lahey, Dr. Frank H.		110,000.00				110,000.00
Meisel Press Manufacturing Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Skelton, W. A.		15,000.00	65,096.44			80,096.44
Packard Mills, Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Hubbard, Ralph K.		26,400.00	57,461.69	20,000.00		103,861.69
Potter Drug & Chemical Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Best, Samuel M.		25,000.00		58,832.70		83,832.70
Transit Bus Sales, Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Steeves, Henry A.		75,200.00				75,200.00
United Business Service Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Babson, Paul T.		24,000.00			$55,413.17	79,413.17
The Van Keuren Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Van Keuren, Harold L.		100,000.00			300.00	100,300.00
Winslow Bros. & Smith Co.	Oct. 31, 1945					
Cook, Cheney E.		75,000.00			380.00	75,380.00
MICHIGAN						
Aurora Gasoline Co.	Mar. 31, 1945					
Wenger, Henry E.		21,600.00		74,400.17		96,000.17
Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bohn, Chas. B.		50,000.00		50,000.00	100.00	100,100.00
Markey, P. A.		50,000.00		49,000.00	125.00	99,125.00
Burroughs Adding Machine Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Doughty, A. J.		80,000.00			175.00	80,175.00
The Dow Chemical Co.	May 31, 1945					
Dow, Willard H.		100,000.00				100,000.00
Evans Products Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Evans, E. S.		75,000.00			789.12	75,789.12
Singer, R. M.			80,638.82			80,638.82
Ford Motor Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bricker, M. L.		75,444.42				75,444.42
Craig, B. J.		136,624.92				136,624.92
Ford, Henry II		94,004.20				94,004.20
Rausch, R. R.		75,063.17				75,063.17
The Gear Grinding Machine Co.	Aug. 31, 1945					
Macdonald, C. N.		26,000.00		50,000.00		76,000.00
General Motors Corp.[4]	Dec. 31, 1944					
Anderson, Harry W.		38,333.30		54,770.00	525.00	93,628.30
Archer, Thomas P.		72,100.00		70,558.05	1,300.00	143,958.05
Babcock, Irving B.		61,250.00		90,571.38		151,821.38
Badgley, Ollie V.		30,000.00		53,234.30	750.00	83,984.30
Bradley, Albert		100,000.00		168,057.50	[1] 4,312.15 3,650.00	276,019.65
Brown, Donaldson		100,000.00		129,170.65	3,400.00	232,570.65
Codrington, George W.		50,000.00		69,671.45	939.00	120,610.45
Coyle, Marvin E.		100,000.00		137,114.95	3,100.00	240,214.95
Crawford, James M.		36,000.00		57,506.70	900.00	94,406.70
Curtice, Harlow H.		90,000.00		113,483.15	2,750.00	206,233.15
Dean, Hugh		30,000.00		44,629.17	675.00	75,304.17
Donner, Frederic G.		50,000.00		78,802.60	2,050.00	130,852.60
Dreystadt, Nicholas		60,000.00		77,534.10	1,125.00	138,659.10
Earl, Harley J.		65,000.00		49,829.60	750.00	115,579.60
Evans, Ronald K.		65,000.00		102,401.35	1,500.00	168,901.35
Fisher, Alfred J.		50,000.00		49,529.35	600.00	100,129.35
Fisher, Edward F.		100,000.00		122,161.55	2,275.00	224,436.55
Fisher, Lawrence P.		50,000.00		35,487.10	1,343.75	86,830.85
Goad, Louis C.		54,166.63		66,853.10	[5] 3,300.00 750.00	125,069.73
Godfrey, Edward H.		45,000.00		41,232.85	339.00	86,571.85
Grant, Richard H.		53,711.96		60,109.80	2,250.00	116,071.76
Harder, Delmar S.		30,000.00		51,231.70	600.00	81,831.70
Hogan, Henry M.		50,000.00		77,667.70	1,050.00	128,717.70
Holler, William E.		60,000.00		66,752.55	1,125.00	127,877.55
Hufstader, William F.		34,750.00		44,989.75	600.00	80,339.75
Hughes, Frederick G.		40,000.00		46,940.40	639.00	87,579.40
Hunt, Ormond E.		100,000.00		183,745.00	4,000.00	287,745.00
Johnson, Earle F.		59,166.67		56,840.10		116,006.77
Kettering, Charles F.		100,000.00		141,087.10	3,100.00	244,187.10
Klingler, Harry J.		70,000.00		70,724.70	1,125.00	141,849.70
Kunkle, Bayard D.		59,583.33		81,020.45	939.00	141,542.78
McCuen, Charles L.		75,000.00		98,429.20	1,500.00	174,929.20
Newill, Edward B.		40,000.00		41,284.80	450.00	81,734.80
Osborn, Cyrus R.		40,000.00		38,147.30	300.00	78,447.30
Prentis, Meyer L.		35,000.00		42,018.90	675.00	77,693.90
Riley, Edward C.		40,000.00		35,610.30	450.00	76,060.30
Skinner, Sherrod E.		60,000.00		79,370.05	1,050.00	140,420.05
Sloan, Alfred P., Jr.		200,000.00			900.00	200,900.00
Smith, John Thomas		100,000.00		129,170.65	3,500.00	232,670.65
Wetherald, Charles E.		50,000.00		66,318.70	1,050.00	117,368.70
Williams, William C., Jr.		60,000.00		90,585.45	1,125.00	151,710.45
Wilson, Charles E.		150,000.00		208,579.20	4,375.00	362,954.20
Young, Orville W.		39,999.96		45,123.35	525.00	85,648.31
The J. L. Hudson Co.	Jan. 31, 1945					
Preston, George E.		26,266.66		54,000.00		80,266.66
Webber, James B.		26,266.66		75,000.00		101,266.66
Webber, Oscar		26,266.66		113,000.00		139,266.66
Webber, Richard H.		52,433.33		50,000.00		102,433.33
Hudson Motor Car Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Barit, A. Edward		90,000.00				90,000.00
Koestlin Tool & Die Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Fralick, Foster L.		23,000.00			55,000.00	78,000.00
S. S. Kresge Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Tuttle, C. B.		89,250.00				89,250.00
Williams, R. R.		89,250.00				89,250.00
Lyon Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Lyon, G. A.		50,000.00		40,000.00		90,000.00

[4] Bonus includes the total value of bonus awards granted for 1943, partly in General Motors Corp. common stock and partly in cash, payable Aug. 3, 1944. The stock portion of the awards was computed at $61.50 per share, the closing market price of General Motors Corp. common stock on Aug. 3, 1944, as evidenced by the New York Stock Exchange. Bonus also includes the fourth of bonus awards granted for 1941, payable in General Motors Corp. common stock in 1944, computed at $62.75 per share, the closing market price of General Motors Corp. common stock on Dec. 26, 1944, the available delivery date, as evidenced by the New York Stock Exchange. Other compensation represents dividends received on bonus stock held in escrow.

[5] Covers allowance for living expenses.

Name of corporation and officers or employees	Calendar or fiscal year ended—	Salary	Commission	Bonus	Other compensation	Total
MICHIGAN—continued						
National Bank of Detroit	Dec. 31, 1944					
McLucas, Walter S		$50,000.00			$58,250.00	$108,250.00
National Sheet Steel Co., Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Deskin, Ray		25,000.00	$55,158.21			80,158.21
Packard Motor Car Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Christopher, G. T		81,000.00		$20,000.00		101,000.00
Reo Motors, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Hund, H. E		40,800.00		70,000.00		110,800.00
Square D Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Magin, F. W		45,000.00		72,147.59		117,147.59
The Timken-Detroit Axle Co	June 30, 1945					
Rockwell, Walter F		50,000.04		31,483.30		81,483.34
MINNESOTA						
The J. R. Watkins Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
King, E. L., Jr		42,500.00		40,000.00		82,500.00
MISSOURI						
American Lithofold Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Blauner, Robert A			125,493.22	25.00		125,518.22
Katherman, Karen		1,200.00	117,246.25	25.00		118,471.25
The Bayer Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Linaker, F. W		7,500.00		87,142.85		94,642.85
D'Arcy Advertising Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Lee, A. L		126,197.00				126,197.00
J. A. Folger & Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Atha, R. E		21,000.00		75,758.50		96,758.50
Lawton Byrne Bruner Insurance Agency Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Lawton, C. S			83,823.53			83,823.53
The Pulitzer Publishing Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Pulitzer, Joseph		100,000.00	84,889.88			184,889.88
Southern Comfort Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Fouke, P. B			89,695.73			89,695.73
Fouke, L. R		5,000.00	138,909.37			143,909.37
Fowler, F. E., Jr		10,000.00	157,693.59			167,693.59
NEBRASKA						
J. L. Brandeis & Sons	Jan. 31, 1945					
Brandeis, George		49,999.92		74,916.61		124,916.53
NEW JERSEY						
American Home Products Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Brush, Alvin G		50,000.00		15,000.00	15,000.00	80,000.00
Bengue, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Seltzer, Theodore		12,000.00	254,691.14			266,691.14
Campbell Soup Co	July 31, 1945					
Dorrance, Arthur C		99,000.00				99,000.00
Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Coulter, J. A		40,000.08		35,500.00		75,500.08
Little, E. H		100,000.08		140,141.00		240,141.08
Railey, B. W		40,000.08		60,000.00		100,000.08
Hahne & Co	Jan. 31, 1945					
Buck, Junior C		30,000.00			70,000.00	100,000.00
Hoffman-La Roche, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Barell, Dr. E. C						98,362.57
Bobst, E. H						300,000.00
A. Hollander & Son, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Hollander, Michael		52,000.00		52,000.00		104,000.00
Johnson & Johnson	Dec. 31, 1944					
Johnson, R. W		75,000.00		17,000.00		92,000.00
New Jersey Worsted Mills	Dec. 31, 1944					
Haltermann, Frederick W		12,000.00		94,078.20		106,078.20
NEW YORK						
J. N. Adam & Co	Jan. 31, 1945					
Holder, A. C		45,000.00		55,000.00		100,000.00
Air Reduction Co., Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Adams, C. E		65,000.00		43,900.00	1,250.00	110,150.00
Allied Chemical & Dye Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Atherton, H. F		125,000.00				125,000.00
Allied Stores Corp	Jan. 31, 1945					
Broidy, Edward W		26,000.00		100,237.00	140.00	126,377.00
Coons, Albert		26,000.00		63,780.00	180.00	89,960.00
Lawrie, Walter H		24,000.00		173,396.51		197,396.51
McCarthy, Charles E		13,000.00		71,780.00	200.00	84,980.00
Puckett, B. Earl		30,000.00		185,220.00	200.00	215,420.00
Pyke, Robert W		26,000.00		68,048.00	200.00	94,248.00
American Brake Shoe Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Given, Wm. B., Jr		75,000.00		20,000.00		95,000.00
American Can Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Figgis, D. W		100,000.00			4,200.00	104,200.00
Sullivan, M. J		150,000.00			4,000.00	154,000.00
American Cyanamid Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bell, W. B		75,000.00		141,571.58		216,571.58
Cooper, K. F		43,200.00		40,149.99		83,349.99
American Cyanamid & Chemical Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Derby, H. L		44,928.00		41,755.99		86,683.99
American Car & Foundry Co	Apr. 30, 1945					
Hardy, Charles J		96,000.00			1,201.00	97,201.00
Stevenson, F. A		75,000.00			1,201.00	76,201.00
American Locomotive Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Dickerman, William C		112,500.00			1,340.00	113,840.00
Fraser, Duncan W		90,000.00			1,355.00	91,355.00
American Telephone & Telegraph Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Cooper, C. P		99,999.96			1,400.00	101,399.96
Gifford, W. S		206,250.00			3,900.00	210,150.00
American Tobacco Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Hahn, Paul M		[6] 50,000.00		39,691.98		89,691.98
Hill, George W		120,000.00		66,153.29		186,153.29
Riggio, Vincent		50,000.00		39,691.98		89,691.98
American Weekly, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Berkowitz, Mortimer		52,166.64		132,462.99		184,629.63
Bankers Trust Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Colt, S. Sloan		100,000.00			5,450.00	105,450.00
Herman Basch & Co., Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Nauen, Ernest		18,000.00			63,927.62	81,927.62
Vortrefflich, Paul W		18,000.00			63,927.62	81,927.62

[6] Less: Salary paid to P. M. Hahn by the American Tobacco Co., but billed to a subsidiary company.

Name of corporation and officers or employees	Calendar or fiscal year ended—	Salary	Commission	Bonus	Other compensation	Total
NEW YORK—continued						
Blue Network Co., Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
La Roche, Chester J		$75,000.00		$10,000.00		$85,000.00
Bristol-Myers Co. (Delaware)	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bristol, H. P		60,000.00		29,548.92		89,548.92
Bristol, L. H		49,999.92		29,548.92		79,548.84
Bristol, W. M., Jr		49,999.92		29,548.92		79,548.84
Brockway Motor Co., Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Piroumoff, G. S		30,000.00		27,000.00	$20,000.00	77,000.00
Carter Carburetor Corp	Apr. 30, 1945					
Weed, Hugh H. C		48,000.00			58,456.00	106,456.00
Charles Stores Co., Inc	Jan. 31, 1945					
Hornstein, B. S		30,000.00		158,414.63		188,414.63
The Chase National Bank of the City of New York	Dec. 31, 1944					
Aldrich, Winthrop W		175,000.00			7,800.00	182,800.00
Campbell, H. Donald		100,000.00			7,000.00	107,000.00
Chemical Bank & Trust Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Houston, Frank K		75,000.00		1,725.00		76,725.00
Corn Exchange Bank Trust Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Sherer, Dunham B		75,000.00		1,020.00		76,020.00
Cluett, Peabody & Co., Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Palmer, C. R		95,000.00				95,000.00
Crucible Steel Co. of America	Dec. 31, 1944					
Hufnagel, F. B		110,000.00				110,000.00
H. Duys & Co., Inc	Mar. 31, 1945					
Steur, John A. C					[7] 122,972.28	122,972.28
Eastman Kodak Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Hargrave, T. J						107,482.69
Lovejoy, Frank W						85,451.92
Sievers, H. C						75,775.00
Electro-Chemical Engraving Co., Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Jacober, M. C		14,800.00	$29,675.92	3,000.00	59,391.83	106,867.75
Ethyl Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Webb, Earle W		60,000.00		30,438.00		90,438.00
The First National Bank of the City of New York	Dec. 31, 1944					
Fraser, Leon		85,000.00			1,200.00	86,200.00
Welldon, Samuel A		75,000.00			1,200.00	76,200.00
General Foods Corp.[8]	Dec. 31, 1944					
Chester, Colby M		75,000.00			75.00	75,075.00
Francis, Clarence		130,000.00				130,000.00
Igleheart, Austin S		115,000.00				115,000.00
Metcalf, Charles W		100,000.00				100,000.00
Young, Udell C		85,000.00				85,000.00
General Motors Acceptance Corp.[4]	Dec. 31, 1944					
Schumann, John J., Jr		65,000.00		64,030.00	1,489.00	130,519.00
W. T. Grant Co	Jan. 31, 1945					
Fogler, Raymond H		60,000.00		75,000.00		135,000.00
The Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. (New Jersey)	Feb. 28, 1945					
Adams, O. C		100,021.00			20.00	100,041.00
Brooks, C. A		100,021.00				100,021.00
Byrnes, W. M		100,021.00			60.00	100,081.00
Smith, R. B		79,259.96				79,259.96
Guaranty Trust Co. of New York	Dec. 31, 1944					
Cleveland, J. Luther		98,548.39			7,310.28	105,858.67
Conway, W. Palen		100,000.00			5,242.47	105,242.47
Stetson, Eugene W		100,000.00			7,589.53	107,589.53
Guggenheim Nitrate Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Whelpley, Medley G. B		87,500.00				87,500.00
Handy & Harman	Dec. 31, 1944					
Handy, C. W		84,000.00				84,000.00
Niemeyer, G. H		84,000.00				84,000.00
Harcourt, Brace & Co., Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Brace, Donald C		7,500.00	76,464.60	525.00		84,489.60
Scott, S. Spencer		5,000.00	76,464.60	350.00		81,814.60
The Hearst Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Winchell, Walter		62,400.00	34,841.19			97,241.19
Hearst Magazines, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Berlin, Richard E		50,000.00		74,134.43		124,134.43
The William Hengerer Co	Jan. 31, 1945					
Hecht, Harold M		30,000.00			70,000.00	100,000.00
Hickok Manufacturing Co., Inc	Apr. 30, 1945					
Hickok, S. Rae		27,000.00		93,000.00		120,000.00
Ingersoll-Rand Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Doubleday, George		78,000.00				78,000.00
Johnson & Higgins	Dec. 31, 1944					
Davey, W. N		132,418.03			140.00	132,558.03
Hall, W. E		117,704.91			220.00	117,924.91
Hunt, E. F		117,704.91			200.00	117,904.91
Keegan, J. S		132,418.03			220.00	132,638.03
La Boyteaux, W. H		205,983.59			240.00	206,223.59
Lowe, Henry W		132,418.03			240.00	132,658.03
Otis, Courtlandt		88,278.68			220.00	88,498.68
Sexton, Herbert B		102,991.80			260.00	103,251.80
Jordan Marsh Co	Jan. 31, 1945					
Mitton, Edward R		49,000.00		91,800.16		140,800.16
Joske Bros. Co	Jan. 31, 1945					
Calvert, J. H		24,000.00		121,052.10		145,052.10
Kennecott Copper Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Stannard, E. T		125,000.00			1,100.00	126,100.00

[4] Bonus includes the total value of bonus awards granted for 1943, partly in General Motors Corp. common stock and partly in cash, payable Aug. 3, 1944. The stock portion of the awards was computed at $61.50 per share, the closing market price of General Motors Corp. common stock on Aug. 3, 1944, as evidenced by the New York Stock Exchange. Bonus also includes the fourth fourth of bonus awards granted for 1941, payable in General Motors Corp. common stock in 1944 computed at $62.75 per share, the closing market price of General Motors Corp. common stock on Dec. 26, 1944, the available delivery date, as evidenced by the New York Stock Exchange. Other compensation represents dividends received on bonus stock held in escrow.

[7] Includes $10,000 paid on account for expenses.

[8] The foregoing compensation comprises amounts paid on behalf of General Foods Corp. and subsidiaries as follows:

	General foods, comparative	Subsidiaries	Total		General foods, comparative	Subsidiaries	Total
Colby M. Chester	$62,612.62	$12,462.38	$75,075	Charles W. Metcalf	$83,400.24	$16,599.76	$100,000
Clarence Francis	108,420.32	21,579.68	130,000	Udell C. Young	62,900.00	22,100.00	85,000
Austin S Igleheart	95,910.28	19,089.72	115,000				

Name of corporation and officers or employees	Calendar or fiscal year ended—	Salary	Commission	Bonus	Other compensation	Total
NEW YORK—continued						
Lackawanna Steel Construction Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Phillippi, W. H		$89, 205. 73				$89, 205. 73
Lennen & Mitchell, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Lennen, Philip W		79, 999. 92		$3, 333. 33		83, 333. 25
Frederick Loeser & Co., Inc	Jan 31, 1945					
Pridday, Joseph E		50, 000. 00		49, 831. 26		99, 831. 26
Longines-Wittnauer Watch Co., Inc	Mar. 31, 1945					
Cartoun, M. F			$100, 585. 17	10, 000. 00		110, 585. 17
Guilden, Morris		33, 000. 00	75, 585. 18	15, 000. 00		123, 585. 18
Heinmuller, J. P. V		21, 000. 00	45, 693. 72	10, 000. 00		76, 693. 72
Perlman, Samuel		25, 000. 00	56, 613. 91	10, 000. 00		91, 613. 91
Lord & Taylor	Jan. 31, 1945					
Hoving, Walter		70, 000. 00			$65, 000. 00	135, 000. 00
Joe Lowe Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Lowe, Joe		50, 000. 00		45, 000. 00		95, 000. 00
Nissman, Morris			114, 882. 59			114, 882. 59
Price, Louis		50, 000. 00		45, 000. 00		95, 000. 00
R. H. Macy & Co., Inc	Jan. 31, 1945					
Marks, Edwin I		90, 000. 00			280. 00	90, 280. 00
Straus, Jack I		99, 999. 99			320. 00	100, 319. 99
McCall Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Warner, William B		75, 000. 00		65, 179. 00	600. 00	140, 779. 00
McCallum-Hatch Bronze Co., Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
McCallum, John C		82, 608. 78				82, 608. 78
James McCreery & Co	Jan. 31, 1945					
Davidson, J. E		60, 000. 00			40, 000. 00	100, 000. 00
Metropolitan Life Insurance Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Lincoln, Leroy A		125, 000. 00				125, 000. 00
George W. Millar & Co., Inc	June 30, 1945					
Greenman, Lewis C		81, 217. 72		1, 588. 11		82, 805. 83
Philip Morris & Co Ltd., Inc	Mar. 31, 1945					
Chalkley, O. H		75, 000. 00		25, 000. 00		100, 000. 00
Lyon, A. E		75, 000. 00		25, 000. 00		100, 000. 00
National Biscuit Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Tomlinson, R. E		91, 200. 00				91, 200. 00
National Broadcasting Co., Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Trammell, Niles		70, 000. 08		14, 000. 00	200. 00	84, 200. 08
National Dairy Products Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Van Bomel, L. A		120, 000. 00			620. 00	120, 620. 00
National Distillers Products Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Balfe, Thomas W		50, 000. 00		42, 000. 00		92, 000. 00
MacNamara, M. J		50, 000. 00		42, 000. 00		92, 000. 00
Porter, Seton		100, 000. 00		105, 000. 00		205, 000. 00
National Gypsum Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Baker, Melvin H		91, 250. 08				91, 250. 08
The New York Trust Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bierwirth, John E		75, 000. 00			5, 000. 00	80, 000. 00
Paramount Pictures, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Balaban, Barney		156, 000. 00				156, 000. 00
Bracken, Edward V		105, 083. 34				105, 083. 34
Brackett, Charles		102, 100. 00				102, 100. 00
Butler, Frank		104, 525. 00				104, 525. 00
Crosby, Harry L. (Bing Crosby)		192, 944. 48				192, 944. 48
DeSylva, George G		204, 654. 76				204, 654. 76
Donlevy, Brian		86, 166. 67				86, 166. 67
Farrow, John V		92, 141. 67				92, 141. 67
Freeman, Y. Frank		130, 000. 00				130, 000. 00
Ginsberg, Henry		146, 566. 66				146, 566. 66
Goddard, Paulette		187, 333. 33				187, 333. 33
Hope, Bob		185, 416. 67				185, 416. 67
Howard, Dorothy (Dorothy Lamour)		167, 500. 01				167, 500. 01
Keough, Austin C		78, 000. 00				78, 000. 00
Kohlmar, Fred		75, 333. 34				75, 333. 34
Ladd, Alan Walbridge		88, 999. 99				88, 999. 99
Lanfield, Sidney		104, 464. 25				104, 464. 25
Leisen, Mitchell		172, 816. 24				172, 816. 24
MacMurray, Fred		213, 333. 33				213, 333. 33
Marshall, George		156, 000. 00				156, 000. 00
McCarey, Thomas Leo		75, 000. 00			1, 038, 035. 37	1, 113, 035. 37
McCrea, Joel		81, 250. 00				81, 250. 00
Milland, Raymond		243, 333. 33				243, 333. 33
Miller, Seton I		130, 600. 00				130, 600. 00
Moore, Victor Fred		91, 000. 00				91, 000. 00
Reagan, Charles M		78, 611. 16				78, 611. 16
Sandrich, Mark Rex		141, 000. 00				141, 000. 00
Scott, Allan		78, 750. 00				78, 750. 00
Thornburg, Betty June (Betty Hutton)		84, 875. 00				84, 875. 00
Tugend, Harry		131, 650. 00				131, 650. 00
Wilder, Samuel "Billy"		136, 750. 04				136, 750. 04
Zukor, Adolph		104, 000. 00			5, 000. 00	109, 000. 00
J. C. Penney Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Binzen, F. W		10, 000. 00			67, 365. 84	77, 365. 84
Crocker, G. H		10, 000. 00			67, 365. 84	77, 365. 84
Herbert, J. I. H		10, 000. 00			67, 365. 84	77, 365. 84
Hughes, A. W		10, 000. 00			67, 365. 84	77, 365. 84
Reynolds, W. A		10, 000. 00			67, 365. 84	77, 365. 84
Ross, E. A		10, 000. 00			67, 365. 84	77, 365. 84
Trown, R. W		10, 000. 00			67, 365. 84	77, 365. 84
Phelps Dodge Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Cates, Louis S		150, 000. 00				150, 000. 00
The Reader's Digest Association, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Cole, Albert L		84, 500. 00				84, 500. 00
Payne, Kenneth W		48, 000. 00		36, 462. 82		84, 462. 82
Wallace, DeWitt		99, 500. 00				99, 500. 00
Reeves, Bros., Inc	June 30, 1945					
Kerr, A. M		36, 000. 00		42, 000. 00		78, 000. 00
Reeves, J. M		66, 000. 00		61, 000. 00		127, 000. 00
Russell & Stoll Co., inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Stoll, Albert F		52, 000. 00	38, 055. 47			90, 055. 47
The F. & M. Schaefer Brewing Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Schaefer, F. M. E		84, 000. 00			140. 00	84, 140. 00
Schaefer, R. J		108, 000. 00			140. 00	108, 140. 00
Simplicity Pattern Co., Inc. and subsidiary companies	Dec. 31, 1944					
Shapiro, Joseph M		60, 000. 00			53, 359. 45	113, 359. 45
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Brown, John A		90, 000. 00				90, 000. 00
Holton, George V		80, 000. 00				80, 000. 00
Sheets, Harold F		86, 667. 00				86, 667. 00

Name of corporation and officers or employees	Calendar or fiscal year ended—	Salary	Commission	Bonus	Other compensation	Total
NEW YORK—continued						
L. Sonneborn Sons, Inc.	Jan. 31, 1945					
Roten, J. F.		$18,000.00		$69,086.26		$87,086.26
Sonneborn, Dr. F.		22,500.00		69,086.26		91,586.26
Sonneborn, R. G.		13,500.00		69,086.26		82,586.26
Technical Metal Finishing Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Munzer, Alfred E.		36,400.00		48,800.00		85,200.00
Munzer, William		36,400.00		48,800.00		85,200.00
Munzer, William A.		36,400.00		48,800.00		85,200.00
Tide Water Associated Oil Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Humphrey, William F.		75,000.00			$3,585.20	78,585.20
The Titche-Goettinger Co.	Jan. 31, 1945					
Brown, William J.		18,000.00		81,574.35		99,574.35
Todd Shipyards Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Reilly, John D.		135,912.50				135,912.50
M. H. Treadwell Co., Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Casey, J. S.		44,800.00			50,000.00	94,800.00
Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Ameche, Don F.		117,000.00				117,000.00
Bacher, Wm. A.		79,500.00				79,500.00
Bacon, Lloyd		161,250.00				161,250.00
Bankhead, Talullah B.		116,666.65				116,666.65
Caldwell, Erskine		83,750.00				83,750.00
Coburn, Charles D.		197,991.24				197,991.24
Connors, Thomas J.		106,000.00			6,300.00	112,300.00
Foster, Preston S.		78,666.67				78,666.67
Foy, Bryan		172,250.00				172,250.00
Grable, Betty		172,000.00				172,000.00
Hathaway, Henry L.		132,500.00				132,500.00
Haymes, Richard B.		104,062.50				104,062.50
Humberstone, H. B.		75,541.67				75,541.67
Jessel, George A.		99,291.66				99,291.66
King, Henry		143,333.34				143,333.34
Lebaron, William		159,000.00				159,000.00
Lighton, Louis D.		77,833.33				77,833.33
Lubitsch, Ernst		159,500.00				159,500.00
MacMurray, Frederick		177,884.59				177,884.59
Mankiewicz, Joseph L.		185,500.00				185,500.00
Mayo, Archie L.		89,038.37				89,038.37
Miranda, Carmen		201,458.33				201,458.33
Mitchell, Thomas		106,666.66				106,666.66
Moskowitz, Joseph		79,500.00				79,500.00
Newman, Alfred		81,317.41				81,317.41
Perlberg, William		185,500.00				185,500.00
Preminger, Otto L.		95,875.00				95,875.00
Raft, George		108,333.32				108,333.32
Raine, Norman R.		102,375.00				102,375.00
Ratoff, Gregory		145,000.00				145,000.00
Schenck, Joseph M.		130,416.57				130,416.57
Schreiber, Lew		81,500.00				81,500.00
Seaton, George E.		123,266.66				123,266.66
Skouras, Spyros P.		254,807.57			1,100.00	255,907.57
Stahl, John M.		172,250.00				172,250.00
Swerling, Joseph		137,000.00				137,000.00
Tierney, Gene		77,083.34				77,083.34
Trotti, Lamar		88,375.00				88,375.00
Wooley, Edgar M.		80,104.16				80,104.16
Wurtzel, Sol M.		77,500.00				77,500.00
Zanuck, Darryl F.		260,833.33				260,833.33
Underwood Elliott Fisher Co. (Delaware)	Dec. 31, 1944					
Wagoner, Philip D.		138,860.00				138,860.00
Union Bag & Paper Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Calder, Alexander		85,000.00		32,810.00	900.00	118,710.00
Union Pacific R. R. Co. and affiliated companies	Dec. 31, 1944					
Charske, F. W.		75,000.00			4,215.00	79,215.00
Jeffers, W. M.		75,000.00			780.00	75,780.00
United States Rubber Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Davis, F. B., Jr.		150,000.00			550.00	150,550.00
Humphreys, H. E., Jr.		72,000.00		35,000.00	500.00	107,500.00
Marlor, H. S.		50,000.04		35,000.00	500.00	85,500.04
Needham, T. J.		50,000.04		35,000.00	550.00	85,550.04
Roberts, Elmer		50,000.04		35,000.00	500.00	85,500.04
Smith, H. E.		99,999.96		49,000.00	550.00	149,549.96
Wah Chang Trading Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Li, K. C.		4,500.00	$88,809.00		40.00	93,349.00
Wallerstein Co., Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Graf, William		60,000.00		21,000.00		81,000.00
Wallerstein, Leo		84,000.00		10,000.00		94,000.00
Walworth Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Holton, W. B., Jr.		75,000.00			45,000.00	120,000.00
Warner Bros. Circuit Management Corp.	Aug. 31, 1945					
Coston, J. E.		46,800.00		25,706.13	[9] 5,200.00	77,706.13
Hoffman, I. J.		52,000.00		24,191.94		76,191.94
Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc.	Aug. 31, 1945					
Bernhard, Jos.		130,000.00			1,100.00 26,000.00	157,100.00
Bernhardt, Kurt		111,708.33				111,708.33
Blanke, Henry		154,500.00				154,500.00
Bogart, Humphrey		132,916.67				132,916.67
Boyer, Charles		207,500.00				207,500.00
Buckner, Robert		81,625.00				81,625.00
Butler, David		123,750.00				123,750.00
Crawford, Joan		100,000.00				100,000.00
Curtiz, Michael		203,759.83				203,759.83
Daves, Delmar		87,450.00				87,450.00
Einfeld, S. C.		151,333.33				151,333.33
Flynn, Errol		184,000.00				184,000.00
Forbstein, Leo		91,000.00				91,000.00
Francen, Victor		86,916.67				86,916.67
Garfield, Jules		114,708.33				114,708.33
Grant, Cary		172,916.67				172,916.67
Hawks, Howard		80,000.00				80,000.00
Hellinger, Mark		159,000.00				159,000.00
Henreid, Paul		163,437.66				163,437.66
Morner, Stanley		88,541.67		30,000.00		118,541.67
Sakall, S. Z.		80,208.33				80,208.33

[9] Allowance for expenses.

Name of corporation and officers or employees	Calendar or fiscal year ended—	Salary	Commission	Bonus	Other compensation	Total
NEW YORK—continued						
Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc.						
Schneider, S.		$65,000.00			$900.00 [9] 13,000.00	$78,900.00
Shumlin, Herman		91,666.74				91,666.74
Stanwyck, Barbara		125,666.67				125,666.67
Steiner, Max		89,566.67				89,566.67
Wald, Jerry		75,416.67				75,416.67
Walsh, Raoul		173,000.00				173,000.00
Warner, A.		91,000.00			900.00 [9] 13,000.00	104,900.00
Warner, H. M.		182,000.00			500.00	182,500.00
Warner, J. L.		182,000.00			100.00	182,100.00
Woolley, Edgar M.		125,000.00				125,000.00
Warner Bros. Pictures Distributing Corp.	Aug. 31, 1945					
Kalmenson, Benj.		71,761.00			[9] 13,000.00	84,761.00
Western Electric Co., Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Stoll, C. G.		90,000.00			520.00	90,520.00
R. C. Williams & Co., Inc.	Apr. 30, 1945					
Jaburg, Hugo F.		52,000.00		$25,000.00		77,000.00
Roer, Albert			$76,818.30			76,818.30
F. W. Woolworth Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Chamberlain, C. S.			75,156.76			75,156.76
Cornwell, A. L.			94,209.01			94,209.01
Crowther, H. S.			80,484.29			80,484.29
Deyo, C. W.			250,974.50			250,974.50
O'Neil, H. E.			87,675.87			87,675.87
NORTH CAROLINA						
R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Williams, S. Clay		100,000.00				100,000.00
OHIO						
The Aetna Paper Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Howard, H. M.		36,000.00		84,949.74		120,949.74
The American Rolling Mill Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Hook, Charles R.		80,292.00		17,552.15		97,844.15
The Austin Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bryant, George A.		12,875.16		62,275.00		75,150.16
The Buick Youngstown Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Hopper, E. D.		9,900.00		98,731.20		108,631.20
Champion Spark Plug Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Stranahan, Frank D.		120,000.00				120,000.00
Stranahan, Robert A.		170,000.00				170,000.00
The Crosley Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Cosgrove, R. C.		50,000.00		39,999.92		89,999.92
David Davies, Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Jameson, Harry W.		18,000.00		95,635.41	1,200.00	114,835.41
The Denison Engineering Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Denison, W. C., Jr.		100,000.00				100,000.00
Eaton Manufacturing Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Eaton, J. O.		60,000.00		40,000.00		100,000.00
The Forest City Publishing Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bellamy, Paul		15,600.00			83,445.22	99,045.22
Graham, Sterling E.		40,000.00			50,000.00	90,000.00
General Machinery Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Rentschler, G. A.		90,000.00		10,000.00	100.00	100,100.00
The B. F. Goodrich Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Collyer, John L.		100,000.00		45,000.00	[10]	145,000.00
The Gruen Watch Co.	Mar. 31, 1945					
Katz, Benjamin S.		42,000.00		41,000.00		83,000.00
Robert Heller & Associates, Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Heller, Robert		75,000.00			[11] 1,069.01	76,069.01
Industrial Rayon Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Rivitz, Hiram S.		75,000.00		33,893.84	[12]	108,893.84
The Kroger Grocery & Baking Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bracy, Harry W.		25,000.00		196,393.75		221,393.75
Robertson, Charles M.		81,284.32				81,284.32
The F. & R. Lazarus & Co.	Jan. 31, 1945					
Lazarus, Simon		100,000.00				100,000.00
The Midland Steel Products Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Kulas, E. J.		99,428.92				99,428.92
The National Cash Register Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Allyn, S. C.		80,000.00		16,000.00		96,000.00
Deeds, Edward A.		75,000.00			[9] 25,000.00	100,000.00
Owens-Illinois Glass Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Levis, J. P.		90,000.00				90,000.00
Levis, W. E.		100,000.00				100,000.00
The William Powell Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Coombe, H. E.						83,614.97
The Procter & Gamble Co. and affiliated group	June 30, 1945					
Barnes, F. M.		75,000.00		19,000.00		94,000.00
Brodie, R. K.		75,000.00		19,000.00		94,000.00
Deupree, R. R.		100,000.00		78,049.00		178,049.00
The Pyramid Rubber Co.	Sept. 30, 1945					
McIntosh, W. B.		8,400.00		126,899.73		135,299.73
The Wm. Taylor Son & Co.	Jan. 31, 1945					
Scholl, D. H.		32,500.00		67,500.00		100,000.00
The Timken Roller Bearing Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Umstattd, William E.		139,900.00				139,900.00
The Weldon Tool Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bergstrom, C. A.		25,090.00		50,000.00		75,090.00
OKLAHOMA						
Continental Oil Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Moran, Dan		100,000.00			200.00	100,200.00
OREGON						
Meier & Frank Co., Inc.	Jan. 31, 1945					
Adams, R. R.		60,000.00		25,000.00		85,000.00

[9] Allowance for expense.

[10] There was also paid during the year $9,191.23 to an insurance company under the terms of an approved retirement income plan. This amount is not considered compensation as it is forfeitable.

[11] Premium on life insurance—portion of company's contribution to pension trust.

[12] This amount does not include an amount of $26,106.16 paid by Industrial Rayon Corp. during 1944 into Industrial Rayon Corp. employees' pension fund trust for the benefit of this officer. This amount was not available to this officer during the year 1944.

Name of corporation and officers or employees	Calendar or fiscal year ended—	Salary	Commission	Bonus	Other compensation	Total
PENNSYLVANIA						
Aluminum Co. of America and affiliated corporations	Dec. 31, 1944					
Davis, Arthur V		$108,000.00				$108,000.00
Gibbons, G. R		75,400.00				75,400.00
The Anchor Packing Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Clarke, Walter J			$85,133.72			85,133.72
Edmonds, John F			78,322.84			78,322.84
Kohl, Frank			118,415.38	$10,000.00		128,415.38
Armstrong Cork Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Prentis, H. W., Jr		125,000.00				125,000.00
Bethlehem Steel Co. (Delaware)	Dec. 31, 1944					
Mackall, Paul		90,000.00		59,760.00		149,760.00
Copperweld Steel Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bramer, S. E		27,520.00		74,960.48		102,480.48
Great Lakes Steel Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Fink, G. R		62,500.00		75,000.00		137,500.00
Heintz Manufacturing Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Meinel, William J		25,000.00		171,308.79		196,308.79
Hershey Chocolate Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Murrie, William F. R		95,014.01				95,014.01
Joseph Horne Co	Jan. 31, 1945					
Burchfield, W. H		49,563.00		69,189.55		118,752.55
Friesell, William H., Sr		46,884.00		65,449.58		112,333.58
Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Lewis, H. E		120,416.65				120,416.65
Parsons, L. M		79,166.69				79,166.69
Lowman-Shields Rubber Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Shields, John, Jr		8,000.00	75,481.15			83,481.15
Lukens Steel Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Wolcott, Robert W		75,624.77			$2,565.00	78,189.77
McCloskey & Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
McCloskey, M. H., Jr		156,000.00				156,000.00
The Midvale Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bradley, Francis		45,000.00		40,850.00	550.00	86,400.00
G. C. Murphy Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Mack, Edgar M		20,000.00		80,000.00		100,000.00
Sample, Paul L		15,000.00		61,000.00		76,000.00
Shaw, Walter C		20,000.00		80,000.00		100,000.00
National Steel Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Fink, G. R		62,500.00		75,000.00	400.00	137,900.00
Millsop, T. E		26,666.64		50,000.00	400.00	77,066.64
Weir, E. T		93,750.00		112,500.00	400.00	206,650.00
The Pennsylvania R. R. Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Clement, M. W		110,000.00			745.00	110,745.00
Jacob Siegel Co., Inc	Jan. 31, 1945					
Siegel, Jacob		90,000.00				90,000.00
Smith, Kline & French Laboratories	Dec. 31, 1944					
Boyer, Francis		27,500.00		66,550.00		94,050.00
Kline, C. Mahlon		30,000.00		72,600.00		102,600.00
Tasty Baking Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Baur, P. J		122,578.55				122,578.55
Morris, H. C		122,578.55				122,578.55
Townsend Co	June 30, 1945					
Weidner, H. C		30,000.00		46,222.22		76,222.22
Weirton Steel Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Millsop, T. E		33,666.72		50,000.00		83,666.72
Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bucher, Geo. H		95,000.00		45,000.00	1,500.00	141,500.00
Robertson, A. W		150,050.00		47,000.00	1,350.00	198,400.00
RHODE ISLAND						
Collyer Insulated Wire Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Moeller, Robert C		24,000.00		50,000.00	[13] 22,604.00	96,604.00
SOUTH CAROLINA						
Rock Hill Printing & Finishing Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Joslin, Archie O		55,000.00		28,548.00		83,548.00
TEXAS						
Pollock Paper & Box Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Jacobs, Leslie L		100,000.00				100,000.00
Southern Aircraft Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Brown, Willis C		15,000.00		96,226.93		111,226.93
VERMONT						
E. B. and A. C. Whiting Co	May 31, 1945					
Unsworth, Thomas A		48,000.00		75,000.00		123,000.00
VIRGINIA						
Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Ferguson, H. L		40,000.00			84,831.08	124,831.08
Reynolds Metals Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Reynolds, R. S		75,000.00		20,000.00		95,000.00
WISCONSIN						
The Electric Sprayit Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Deutsch, S		18,360.00		73,360.00		91,720.00
The Falk Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Falk, Harold S		26,000.00		68,567.07		94,567.07
The Parker Pen Co	Feb. 28, 1945					
Frederick, C. L		12,000.00		66,509.85		78,509.85
Western Printing & Lithographing Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Benstead, H. M		9,600.00	123,694.78			133,294.78
Voigt, Elmer G		9,600.00	144,913.40			154,513.40
Wadewitz, E. H		15,000.00	189,206.60			204,206.60
Wadewitz, W. R		9,600.00	152,769.31			162,369.31

[13] Represents adjustment o bonus for 1942.

REPORT OF PAYMENTS OF SALARY, COMMISSION, BONUS, OR OTHER COMPENSATION PAID IN EXCESS OF $75,000, COMPILED FROM INCOME RETURNS, SCHEDULE F-1, FILED FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR 1943 AND FISCAL YEARS ENDED IN 1944—SUPPLEMENTAL NO. 2

Name of corporation and officers or employees	Calendar or fiscal year ended—	Salary	Commission	Bonus	Other compensation	Total
MARYLAND						
Stewart & Co., Inc.	Jan. 31, 1944					
Abbott, T. P.		$35,000.00			$46,404.42	$81,404.42
MASSACHUSETTS						
E. B. Badger & Sons Co.	Dec. 31, 1943					
Badger, Erastus B.		18,000.00	$96,963.75			114,963.75
Hall, Walter T.		18,000.00	96,963.75			114,963.75
Hargrove, George C.		12,000.00	64,642.50			76,642.50
Lunt, George P.		12,000.00	64,642.50			76,642.50
Peters, William A., Jr.		18,000.00	96,963.75			114,963.75
Lever Bros. Co.	June 30, 1944					
Countway, F. A.		30,000.00		$380,947.92		410,947.92
National Fireworks, Inc.	Aug. 31, 1944					
Babbitt, Edwin V.		52,000.00	100,000.00	10,000.00	1,200.00	163,200.00
Clark, George J. J.		52,000.00	100,000.00	10,000.00	1,200.00	163,200.00
MINNESOTA						
Powers Dry Goods Co., Inc.	Jan. 31, 1944					
Olson, Doddrick		36,000.00			48,885.89	84,885.89
NEW JERSEY						
Hahne & Co.	Jan. 31, 1944					
Buck, Junior C.		30,000.00			70,000.00	100,000.00
NEW YORK						
J. N. Adam & Co.	Jan. 31, 1944					
Holder, Albin O.		45,000.00			55,000.00	100,000.00
Blue Bell, Inc.	Nov. 30, 1944					
Fox, J. C.						101,666.68
Handy & Harman	Dec. 31, 1943					
Handy, C. W.		87,000.00				87,000.00
Niemeyer, G. H.		87,000.00				87,000.00
The William Hengerer Co.	Jan. 31, 1944					
Hecht, Harold M.		30,000.00			70,000.00	100,00.00
McCampbell & Co., Inc.	Dec. 31, 1943					
Hughes, John Chambers					95,520.94	95,520.94
Mannion, Frank D.					95,520.94	95,520.94
McCampbell, Leavelle					133,191.47	133,191.47
Storm, Raymond H.					95,520.94	95,520.94
James McCreery & Co.	Jan. 31, 1944					
Davidson, J. Edward		60,000.00			39,412.75	99,412.75
Carl L. Norden, Inc.	Oct. 31, 1944					
Barth, T. H.		86,458.34		1,666.67		88,125.01
PENNSYLVANIA						
Lee Rubber & Tire Corp.	Oct. 13, 1944					
Garthwaite, A. A.		55,000.00			21,392.98	76,392.98
TEXAS						
Pollock Paper & Box Co.	Dec. 31, 1943					
Jacobs, Leslie L.		100,000.00				100,000.00

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking this morning as one of that group of fair-minded Republicans, those people who feel that they are here representing the public, neither big business nor labor to the exclusion of all others.

May I say, on behalf of the public, I will vote to override the President's veto and sustain the modified OPA bill as the best price control we can get under present conditions. I believed on June 25 that the position unanimously taken by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], who is the senior Republican member of the Banking and Currency Committee; the majority leader of the House, Mr. MCCORMACK; the Republican minority leader of the House, Mr. MARTIN; and by our eminent Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, was correct. I disagree with my friend, the distinguished gentleman and Democratic Representative from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who states that he feels he voted for an unworkable and inconsistent bill when the compromise OPA bill was before us.

I believe the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, was correct when he said on June 25 he felt the bill was workable. I am also pleased to agree with this statement of our Speaker on the floor of the House. He said clearly on that date:

> Mr. Speaker, I shall take only a moment. We have in this Chamber this afternoon a most peculiar situation.

And, I might add, we have it again this afternoon, 5 days later.

> Two elements are warring against this conference report. One of those want no price control at all. If this conference report is voted down, they will have their way. Others say that they want more control than is contained in this bill. If this conference report is voted down, they will get nothing, because there will not, in my opinion, be any price-control legislation at all.

We have not heard any variation from that statement of the Speaker that there will be no price-control legislation at all if this bill is not enacted.

> If this House will not vote up this conference report, it will certainly not vote for a continuing resolution, continuing the law as it now stands. Even though the House were to pass a continuing resolution, the leadership of the Senate is doubtful if it has a chance on earth to pass there. So if we want to control any kind of food prices, if we want to control rents and not have people turned out in the streets, as they will be turned out, the only alternative is to vote for this conference report. The responsibility is here. I will not, as far as I am concerned, by my vote this afternoon, shoulder the responsibility of killing all price control.

I also say that as the representative of the people of the southern part of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County, constituting the Thirty-first District of Pennsylvania, I will not shoulder the responsibility of killing all price control, and will therefore vote to sustain the present compromise OPA bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I was for the strongest possible price control bill we could get in both the committee and the House and I voted against all crippling amendments. After taking part in the conference and studying both bills then before us, I am convinced this is the strongest possible bill we can get. It is far stronger than either the House or the Senate bill.

Those who refused to sign the conference report did so because the bill was too strong.

To state my beliefs in this 1 minute is difficult, I believe sincerely that if we sustain the President's veto we will get no legislation at all for at least some time after the act expires, and chaos will occur during that period at least.

If we override the President's veto, if we take this bill, there is no reason in

the world why the Banking and Currency Committee cannot meet again and consider an additional bill or amendments to this bill. There is no law against that. If we pass this bill we have got something in spite of the amendments which I opposed. I do not like the Taft amendment. It is bound to increase some prices, but there is not a single ceiling taken off anything under this bill as it now stands and it will not cause uncontrolled inflation which will happen if we have no bill at all.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday as follows. This is a part of the statement made in the other body by the majority leader. This is what he said:

> This morning the President of the United States called to the White House the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the House, and the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate and the majority leader of the Senate, to discuss this legislation.
>
> With all the force that we could command, in view of the situation which presents itself to us and to him, we urged him to sign the bill when it reached him, on the same ground that I urge that we adopt it here, because the choice is between this bill and nothing. To hope that a joint resolution continuing price controls after next Sunday will be adopted by the two Houses of Congress is an idle dream.
>
> So I say that in voting on the conference report no Member of the Senate should vote under the delusion that if the bill is defeated we can get another one. The choice is between this bill or nothing at all. It is a choice which we do not like to make, but we have to make it, because it is here before us.

We heard our Speaker in the well of this House say it was this bill or nothing. The committee and the House gave long, careful attention to this bill. What could be accomplished by another resolution extending it 3 weeks? Nothing. You would come back with something, but perhaps something worse. The President is asking for the same OPA bill of the past year and without amendments. I voted against the conference report and would like to see OPA end now on everything except rents and the most essential items of living. It should be ended on meat and dairy products now because more cattle roam our ranges than ever before with less meat on the table. The OPA is directly responsible for this condition.

My colleagues, please consider that the leadership of this House and Senate yesterday called upon the President urging him to approve the conference report. They told the President that it was the best bill he could expect and it was workable and that a continuing resolution could not be passed by Sunday night. Indeed it might not be passed, and the responsibility was the President's. The President refused to follow the good advice of the Democratic leadership of the House and Senate. It is now quite evident that he cleared with Sidney and not with ALBEN BARKLEY and SAM RAYBURN.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, if there be faltering hearts over what to do about the veto message and a possible continuing resolution, let me advance two suggestions that may clarify the condition and that serve as reasons for overriding the President's veto. In the first place, as indicated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY], I believe we can substantially comply with the President's request for a short period of further study by accepting the conference bill and then having the committees proceed to a reexamination of the matter. Such a course would provide an interim price control under the new bill and still permit an exploration of any new proposal which might be suggested. This certainly meets in large part the President's hopes and desires. Why not override the veto and let this measure go into effect while the search for what the President refers to as a more workable bill is made.

The second reason is that there will be no continuing resolution today. That may sound presumptuous, but let us see. If anybody walks over to the hopper and introduces a bill and asks for its immediate consideration there will be objection. You can be sure of that. It must then go through the regular course to the Banking and Currency Committee. If they get a rule it will require a two-thirds vote on the floor of the House to get consideration of the rule. There will be only one other way to do it, and that is wait until next Tuesday when it can be entertained under suspension. But price control dies when that clock says midnight tomorrow night. Tomorrow, however, is a nonlegislative day.

You therefore have this choice and I think those reasons are very persuasive, in my judgment, under the very rigidity of the rules under which we operate. There can be no continuing resolution for one thing and, secondly, we can satisfy the President of the United States by giving consideration to what the President calls a workable bill in the 15 days that may elapse and still put this on the books.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most of us are impressed with the statement of the President in the veto message just read. We now have over $29,000,000,000 in circulation with billions more to be poured out by the Treasury as a result of the tremendous spending program that has been authorized by the Congress. Not only have we authorized huge cash outlays for domestic purposes, soldiers' mustering-out pay, veterans' unemployment relief and now soldiers' terminal-leave pay. In addition to these huge flows of money into the channels of trade and business, the money we are lending England and foreign countries will come back to make heavy drafts on the things produced for the sustenance of the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, the country is facing a desperate situation. I shall vote to sustain the President's veto and I shall vote for a continuing resolution. It is the only solution under the circumstances.

With the assurance that a continuing resolution can be passed in time to prevent the collapse of the OPA price control I shall vote to sustain the President's veto.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, we have been told repeatedly on this floor that the cure for inflation is production. We have given the President all the power that he requires to fix those prices which would bring about production. Now, after all of this period, let us see where we are so far as the question of scarcity of goods is concerned.

The country is short of meat, maple sirup, lemons, bread, butter, cheese, milk, barley, ice cream, candy, pie, cake, fruit sirups, onions, bacon, sugar, fats, doughnuts, molasses, coconut oil, olive oil, cottonseed oil. There is a shortage of salesmen, of train seats, of plane seats, of pharmacists, of hotel rooms, of veterinarians, carpenters, piano makers, gardeners, telephone linemen, painters, cooks, and parlor maids.

Nine months after the fourth consecutive biggest wheat crop on record was raised a cold spring wind was blowing through hundreds of empty grain elevators throughout the Midwest. There are shortages of X-ray tubes, dental gold scrap, burlap bags, Pliofilm, manila cordage, bulldozers, quinidine, power cranes, laboratory and medical instruments, fractional-horsepower motors, circular saws, solder, natural resins, road rollers, electrocardiographs, roofing material, greenhouses, plumbing supplies. Paper is short. Artists cannot buy sable-hair paint brushes. There is a shortage of spare parts, and of theaters.

The country is short of lumber, coal, steel, tin, lead, antimony, textile piece goods, shellac, glass, lead pipe, paint, copper, mercury scrap, platinum scrap. The country is short of men's suits, children's clothing, film, cameras, lenses, towels, sheets, pillowcases, automobiles, trucks, tractors, tires, chewing gum, soft drinks, white shirts, pianos, radios, washing machines, refrigerators, work clothing, maple for high heels, shoe tacks, telephones, and female attire, of which I shall not give a bill of particulars.

And, Mr. Speaker, there are 2,000 more items that are short. That is why we have inflation.

Let us take off the strangle-hold of business and let it produce.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to override the President's veto and it seems to me that everybody in this House who feels that we should keep some kind of OPA regulations and some kind of rent control, rather than opening

the doors sky wide for whatever the fates might have in store for us without even the safeguards of an orderly and planned liquidation of OPA, must support the motion to override the veto.

I comend to you the argument advanced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. It seems to me both arguments are logical, irrefutable, and compelling; because if we fail to override the President's veto today every Member of this House knows that even if a continuing resolution should get over to the other body those who are die-hard opponents of OPA would filibuster it beyond the hour of midnight tonight and on Monday morning OPA controls of every kind would be off.

We retain for ourselves by overriding the President's veto, on the other hand, any of the effective arguments contained in the President's veto message because if certain changes are actually necessary to make OPA legislation workable and administrable, as he insists, we still have the 15 days or the 16 days or the 19 days or the 27 days or whatever time is necessary for the Banking and Currency Committee to come back with corrective amendments so we can correct and improve any administrative problems which may arise.

Mr. Speaker, let us approach our decision in this important hour calmly and dispassionately. Let us examine carefully the situation in which we and the country find ourselves and let us explore thoroughly the possible effects of whatever action we may take this afternoon.

Suppose, Mr. Speaker, that we vote to sustain the President's veto. What then will happen? We must anticipate that all price controls depending upon the authority of Congress will become inoperative at midnight tomorrow and that the country will face the confused situation Monday morning certain to arise from such an abrupt, unanticipated, and disorderly discontinuation of all price and rent controls. In my opinion, it is this that will happen. I cannot believe that the other body will act promptly enough today to avert this situation. In that body any one Senator can block action today. In fact, he can block action for several days. From what we have seen at that end of the Capitol the past few days it seems certain to me that if we vote to sustain the President's veto today we are going to have to depend upon such a slender reed of hope for action continuing OPA today that only the giddiest of optimists can believe it will eventuate. If I am wrong, and a measure continuing the OPA on a tentative and temporary basis is approved today as recommended by the President, we still face the fact that it will be many long days before the many minds of both Houses of Congress and the executive departments can be brought into agreement on OPA legislation. Who can predict accurately what will be the legislative result when and if that meeting of minds does occur? It may be a better OPA bill than the one the President vetoed and it may very well be a much less desirable piece of legislation.

Suppose on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, we vote today to override the President's veto. What then will happen? Chester Bowles will remain out of office as Stabilization Director, to be sure, but few will mourn his passing and most will agree that OPA under some other director is bound to do a better job than it has done under his inept and tom-tom pounding guidance. Regardless of how we finally write the law, it is well that Mr. Bowles will no longer be around to pervert its purposes and to stifle production while stimulating propaganda.

What else will happen if we vote today to override the President's veto? In his veto message, President Truman has criticized certain phases of the OPA bill approved in Congress and accepted by both Houses of Congress. He has commended other phases of the bill. Perhaps the President is right and perhaps he is wrong in contending that certain changes in the law and certain phases of the new bill make for unworkability and uncertainty in price control. Time alone can determine that. However, if we override the veto this afternoon and keep OPA in operation we shall have the time and the testimony—the experience and the opportunity—to observe the consequences and to take further congressional action to correct any injustices, inequities, or any unworkable features of the newly rewritten OPA legislation.

Congress will still be here. The Banking and Currency Committee can meet any day. Both Houses of Congress have demonstrated their capacity to act promptly when necessity requires. By retaining OPA as a going concern through overriding the President's veto we also retain the power and the opportunity to refine and improve it as experience dictates. If the President appoints as a successor to Chester Bowles a man of experience and capacity in whom the country and the Congress has confidence, we shall have the benefit of a fresh viewpoint from the administrative angle. The recommendations of this new director will be listened to attentively. Any desirable changes which he can substantiate by convincing evidence can rapidly be written into corrective legislation. Legislation approved today can be changed tomorrow. On the contrary, an OPA set-up which is destroyed today by the Presidential veto may be permanently impaired. It seems to me that we are indeed gambling with fate if we refuse now to override the President's veto and fail to retain OPA controls and keep them operating while we review the situation in the light of the President's arguments and in cooperation with a new and better administrator than the loquacious Chester Bowles.

Mr. Speaker, today's vote just as Tuesday's vote on the final approval or disapproval of the only OPA legislation upon which we then had an opportunity to vote is likely to find Members with directly conflicting points of view voting on the same side of the question. Arrayed against the overriding of the veto we are likely to find not only those who insist that OPA should continue as it is, with no changes, no amendments, no improvements, and no new steps to stimulate production while controlling prices but we are likely also to find on that side Members who are utterly opposed to any further OPA controls of any kind even for the purpose of bringing about an orderly liquidation and discontinuance of OPA. In favor of the motion to override the President's veto we shall find many who believe that some price control is better than none, that under a new director the true purposes of OPA can prevail instead of the political purposes which Mr. Bowles has so largely emphasized, and that a systematic, orderly, planned transition from OPA as it is, to the free economy most of us desire as an eventuality is better by far than an abrupt, unanticipated, unplanned stoppage of OPA next Monday morning as a result of the President's petulant veto.

I do predict, however, that out of the confusion of votes this much will become clear. None of the enemies of price control and OPA will vote to override the President's veto. All those voting to override will be Members who desire some type of controls of rents and prices and who desire to retain the legislation and the set-up we have as a going concern upon which, if necessary, to make new correctives and helpful amendments. All those opposed to OPA and to retention of further controls will be voting to sustain the President's veto even though they will be joined by many who may dramatically proclaim that by such a vote they hope to get a better OPA. They may get a better OPA and they may get none at all. But they take a great and unnecessary gamble with the public's welfare and the veteran's future when they vote to sustain the veto and to stop OPA at midnight tomorrow night in the hope that by so doing they will force their particular price-control philosophies through Congress. If they fail, they and President Truman will be the real executioners of OPA. They must accept the responsibility. They are the ones who have elected to gamble all on this one reckless toss of the dice.

As for me Mr. Speaker, I refuse to gamble so prodigiously with the public's welfare. Let us vote today to override the veto. Let us retain what we have and strive for something better. Let us rescue the President from the angry advisors with whom he has counselled. Let us protect the country against the abrupt shock which may well come from ill-considered action today. Let us continue OPA by overriding the President's veto and if experience and/or evidence then warrant corrective changes and helpful amendments we shall be in position to act intelligently with the assurance that in the meantime none of the controls will have been vacated and we shall not face the possibility of moving from OPA controls to an entirely control-free rental and price situation on a minute's notice and without the benefit of orderly decontrol procedures.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

OPA SCUTTLED BY BOTH HOUSE AND SENATE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this House passed a bill to extend OPA. The bill, when it left this House, was a scuttled OPA bill. It was absolutely worthless, so far as price control was concerned. Crippling amendments had destroyed it. It went to the Senate, and it did not fare well in the Senate, and when it left the Senate it was more of a scuttled bill, if such a thing was possible.

CONFEREES

The Presiding Officer of the Senate and the Speaker of the House appointed conferees to represent their respective bodies for the purpose of meeting in an effort to iron out the differences between the two Houses. We, the conferees, had two scuttled bills to work on. We were the agents of the House and the Senate. It was our duty to reconcile those differences as well as we could reconcile them. We had a duty to perform. Some of the members of the conference, and I was one of them, were approached and the suggestion was made, "Just let them go ahead and write their own bad bill; make it so bad that the President can easily veto it." We turned that down. It was not the right thing to do. We should work honestly and conscientiously and bring back to you the best bill we could bring back. That is exactly what we did. We voted for the conference report and we voted for the bill. If we had not voted for the conference report we would have been stymied. We would have been right up against the dead line and Congress would have been accused of killing OPA. We had to legislate. How do you legislate? Pass something if you cannot get what you want, and every major law that has ever passed represents a compromise of view or a sacrifice of opinion on the part of practically every Member of this body and the other body.

We were willing to try to compromise, but we had to do something. We had to pass a law and we passed it. The President has vetoed it, and it is not inconsistent for those of us who voted for the best thing we could get to sustain the President's veto, and that is exactly what I am going to do.

The President's message concerning one amendment in this bill is absolutely unanswerable, and that is the Taft amendment. There are several good amendments in that bill—amendments that I would like to vote for in any bill—but you cannot justify the Taft amendment and say that you will have price control. If you vote for the Taft amendment, you vote against price control.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. On the question of voting for the conference report, the gentleman's statement is absolutely correct. The problem today is entirely different than it was the other day. Those who are opposed to it have a perfect right to exercise their judgment today. We voted for the conference report to conclude the legislative process and send the bill to the President of the United States for him to exercise his constitutional duty and responsibility.

Mr. PATMAN. The majority leader is exactly right.

If we were to enact this Taft amendment, it would cause a race between wages and prices. That is exactly what causes inflation in every country on earth. They first have an increase in prices, then the workingmen cannot live on their wages because the prices are too high, and the workingmen get an increase. Then, of course, there has to be an increase in prices, and there is a race between wages and prices. The result is ruinous inflation. A vote for the Taft amendment would be a vote for ruinous inflation.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder whether or not the gentleman subscribed to that administration viewpoint which started out by saying that wages could be raised as much as 50 percent without increasing prices, and if that did not have much to do with the present difficulties?

Mr. PATMAN. I never said that. Nobody on this floor said that. I never heard anyone in a responsible place say it.

Mr. HALLECK. Did not the gentleman hear Mr. Davis say it?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I did not hear him say it.

Mr. HALLECK. Did not the gentleman read in the paper that he said it?

Mr. PATMAN. I did not agree with it if he said it, because I do not believe that way. Anyway, we know that the Taft amendment is a legislative mandate for inflation. That is exactly what it is. It forces inflation. As between this bill as it is now with the President vetoing it and no price control at all, I am willing to risk no price control at all—absolutely. I have thought this question through to the best of my knowledge and ability, and I am ready to have no price control at all rather than have one that absolutely forces ruinous inflation upon this country.

This bill involves the value of the dollar. During the war prices were fixed, and by reason of prices being held down the price of steel, for instance, a commodity that went more into the war machine than any other one commodity, was not increased one penny a ton for five long years, or during the war. By reason of the fact that the prices of the materials that went into the war machine were held down our national debt today is $100,000,000,000 less than it would have been without the OPA. That is an enormous amount. Our tax burden would be increased, our debt would be $100,000,000,000 larger today had it not been for OPA holding down prices during the war on the cost of the war machine alone. On the war cost alone there is $100,000,000,000 saved.

Now we are in the reconversion period. We should take off controls as quickly as possible—no one will dispute that. But as long as commodities and goods are scarce, can we properly protect the public unless we have some way of controlling these scarce goods and commodities? We have voted for generous appropriations for veterans of this war. Of course, we should have done that. We have voted to allow them pensions and compensations and retirement benefits and insurance. Now, then, will we permit the only agency that stands between them and a worthless dollar to be killed? That is the question involved here today. We have 15,200,000 veterans who served during this war. We voted terminal leave for them of three to five billion dollars in addition to all the other benefits. Will we turn around now and permit the only agency that keeps the value of the dollar which is worth 76 cents to be destroyed and thus permit the value of the dollar to go down to nothing? That is also the question involved here today.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I am very strongly in favor of trying to control inflation. As I understand the parliamentary situation, if the President's veto is sustained, we have nothing at all left which we can amend or work on. Is that right?

Mr. PATMAN. That is exactly right. We must pass a continuing resolution.

Mr. MAY. Can we pass it?

Mr. PATMAN. That is not my responsibility. I have made up my mind that I prefer no price control, no controls at all, in preference to a legislative mandate to force ruinous inflation upon the country. I am not going to vote to give these veterans and their widows and children this money and then turn around and vote to destroy the agency that keeps that money valuable. You know and I know that if we kill this agency the value of the dollar will not be 76 cents as it is today, as low as it is, but will not even be worth 50 cents. It will not be worth 25 cents. It will be practically worthless so far as buying many of the goods and commodities that people will have to buy. That is the question involved here today. Let us think about it and vote for an effective price-control law and not one such as we have here that would be wholly ineffective. As for me, I am not criticizing any Member as to the way he votes. That is his prerogative. I shall not criticize any Member, but if I were to vote to kill the OPA I would feel as though I was personally stabbing in the back 15,000,000 of our veterans of this war to whom we all owe a duty and an obligation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARRY. Does an "aye" vote mean to pass the bill, despite the President's veto?

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

Under the Constitution, the vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 173, nays 142, answered "present" 1, not voting 116, as follows:

[Roll No. 188]

YEAS—173

Abernethy
Allen, La.
Almond
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Andrews, Ala.
Arends
Arnold
Barrett, Wyo.
Barry
Beall
Bender
Bennett, Mo.
Blackney
Bolton
Brown, Ga.
Brumbaugh
Bryson
Buck
Buffett
Bunker
Butler
Campbell
Carlson
Case, N.J.
Chapman
Chelf
Chiperfield
Church
Clark
Clason
Clements
Cole, Kans.
Cole, Mo.
Cooper
Corbett
Courtney
Cravens
Cunningham
Davis
D'Ewart
Dirksen
Domengeaux
Dondero
Doughton, N. C.
Durham
Earthman
Eaton
Elliott
Ellsworth
Elston
Engle, Calif.
Fallon
Fenton
Flannagan
Fogarty
Folger
Fuller
Fulton
Gamble
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gearhart
Gifford
Gillie
Goodwin
Gossett
Graham
Grant, Ind.
Gregory
Gwinn, N. Y.
Hale
Halleck
Hancock
Hand
Hare
Hart
Hébert
Hendricks
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Holmes, Mass.
Holmes, Wash.
Hope
Horan
Jenkins
Jennings
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Ill.
Johnson, Ind.
Judd
Kean
Keefe
Kelly, Ill.
Kilburn
Kilday
Kunkel
Landis
Lea
LeFevre
Lemke
Luce
Lyle
Lynch
McConnell
McDonough
McMillan, S. C.
McMillen, Ill.
Manasco
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Mathews
May
Michener
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Mundt
Murray, Tenn.
Norblad
O'Neal
Pace
Philbin
Phillips
Pickett
Poage
Pratt
Price, Fla.
Priest
Rains
Ramey
Randolph
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Richards
Riley
Robertson, Va.
Robsion, Ky.
Rockwell
Roe, Md
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Russell
Scrivner
Sharp
Sheppard
Simpson Ill.
Smith, Maine
Springer
Stefan
Sundstrom
Taber
Talbot
Talle
Tarver
Tibbott
Trimble
Voorhis, Calif
Vorys, Ohio
Wadsworth
Weaver
Whitten
Whittington
Wigglesworth
Wilson
Wolcott
Woodruff
Zimmerman

NAYS—142

Allen, Ill.
Angell
Bailey
Barden
Bates, Ky.
Beckworth
Biemiller
Bishop
Bland
Bloom
Brehm
Brown, Ohio
Bulwinkle
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Cannon, Mo.
Carnahan
Case, S. Dak.
Chenoweth
Clevenger
Clippinger
Combs
Crosser
Curtis
D'Alesandro
De Lacy
Delaney, James J.
Delaney, John J.
Dingell
Douglas, Calif.
Douglas, Ill.
Doyle
Ellis
Feighan
Fellows
Fernandez
Flood
Forand
Gallagher
Geelan
Gillette
Gordon
Gore
Gorski
Granahan
Green
Griffiths
Gross
Gwynne, Iowa
Hagen
Harless, Ariz.
Havenner
Hays
Healy
Henry
Hobbs
Hoch
Hoffman, Pa.
Hook
Howell
Huber
Hull
Jarman
Jensen
Johnson, Luther A.
Johnson, Lyndon B.
Jones
Jonkman
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
King
Kirwan
Knutson
Kopplemann
LaFollette
Lane
Lanham
Larcade
Lesinski
Lewis
Link
McCormack
McCowen
McGregor
Madden
Maloney
Mankin
Marcantonio
Mason
Monroney
Murdock
Murray, Wis
Neely
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara
O'Konski
O'Toole
Outland
Patman
Peterson, Fla.
Pfeifer
Pittenger
Plumley
Price, Ill.
Rabaut
Rabin
Resa
Rich
Rizley
Rogers, N. Y.
Rowan
Ryter
Sabath
Sadowski
Sasscer
Savage
Schwabe, Mo.
Schwabe, Okla.
Shafer
Short
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Wis.
Somers, N. Y.
Spence
Starkey
Sullivan
Sumner, Ill.
Thom
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Traynor
Vursell
Walter
Wasielewski
Weichel
White
Winter
Wolverton, N. J.
Wood
Woodhouse

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Cooley

NOT VOTING—116

Adams
Anderson, Calif.
Andrews, N. Y.
Auchincloss
Baldwin, Md.
Baldwin, N. Y.
Barrett, Pa.
Bates, Mass.
Bell
Bennet, N. Y.
Bonner
Boren
Boykin
Bradley, Mich
Bradley, Pa.
Brooks
Buchanan
Buckley
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Cannon, Fla.
Celler
Cochran
Coffee
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Cox
Crawford
Curley
Daughton, Va.
Dawson
Dolliver
Drewry
Dworshak
Eberharter
Elsaesser
Engel, Mich.
Ervin
Fisher
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibson
Gillespie
Granger
Grant, Ala.
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Harness, Ind.
Harris
Hartley
Hedrick
Heffernan
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Izac
Jackson
Johnson, Okla.
Kearney
Kefauver
Keogh
Kerr
Kinzer
Klein
Latham
LeCompte
Ludlow
McGehee
McGlinchey
McKenzie
Mahon
Mansfield, Mont.
Mansfield, Tex.
Merrow
Miller, Calif.
Morgan
Morrison
Murphy
Norrell
Norton
Patrick
Patterson
Peterson, Ga.
Ploeser
Powell
Quinn, N. Y.
Rankin
Rayfiel
Reece, Tenn.
Rivers
Robertson, N. Dak.
Robinson, Utah
Rodgers, Pa.
Roe, N. Y.
Rooney
Sheridan
Sikes
Slaughter
Smith, Va.
Sparkman
Stevenson
Stewart
Stigler
Stockman
Sumners, Tex.
Taylor
Thomas, N. J.
Tolan
Torrens
Towe
Vinson
Welch
West
Wickersham
Winstead
Wolfenden, Pa.
Worley

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the veto of the President was sustained and the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Latham and Mr. Daughton of Virginia override, with Mr. Sikes sustain.

Mr. Gillespie and Mr. Thomas of New Jersey override, with Mr. Dolliver sustain.

Mr. Kearney and Mr. Auchincloss override, with Mr. Izac sustain.

Mr. Harness of Indiana and Mr. Ploeser override, with Mr. Rooney sustain.

Mr. Winstead and Mr. Towe override, with Mr. Klein sustain.

Mr. Hartley and Mr. Slaughter override, with Mr. Cooley sustain.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall and Mr. Cole of New York override, with Mr. Hedrick sustain.

Mr. Rivers and Mr. Morrison override, with Mr. Patterson sustain.

Mr. Bennet of New York and Mr. Elsaesser override, with Mr. Adams sustain.

Mr. Camp and Mr. Vinson override, with Mr. Kefauver sustain.

Mr. Torrens and Mr. Ervin override, with Mr. Jackson sustain.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Rankin with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Kinzer.
Mr. Norrell with Mr. Dworshak.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Coffee with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
Mr. Rayfiel with Mr. Andrews of New York.
Mr. McGlinchey with Mr. Gerlach.
Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.
Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Jackson with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH and Mr. ANGELL changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. HARTLEY, and the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. SLAUGHTER. I voted "No." I withdraw my vote and answer "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The message and bill, together with the accompanying papers, are referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I introduce a House joint resolution, which I sent to the Clerk's desk, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended

Resolved, etc., That section 1 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1946" and substituting "July 20, 1946."

SEC. 2. Section 6 of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1946" and substituting "July 20, 1946."

SEC. 3. The last paragraph of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944, shall not apply with respect to operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation until July 20, 1946: *Provided*, That no new subsidy or purchase and sale operations shall be undertaken under the authority of this section, and no change shall be made in the basis of any operations existing on June 29, 1946, for which funds are made available under this section which will increase the rate of any subsidy or the rate of loss incurred with respect to any commodity.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this joint resolution shall take effect as of June 30, 1946, except as to offenses committed subsequent to June 30, 1946, and prior to the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, and no suit, action, or prosecution shall be instituted with respect to any such offenses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand the parliamentary situation, if objection is made to the present consideration of the resolution which the gentleman from Kentucky introduced, the resolution will be immediately referred to the

Committee on Banking and Currency; is that correct?

The SPEAKER. A bill cannot be introduced from the floor of the House. The gentleman from Kentucky has not dropped this resolution in the box.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understood the gentleman from Kentucky made the statement that he was introducing it. May we be advised of the situation at the present time? Has or has not the resolution been introduced?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky can answer that question.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. SHORT. I withhold my objection.

The SPEAKER. The only resolution the Chair knows anything about is on the reading clerk's desk and it is not in the box.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Then it has not been introduced?

The SPEAKER. Not unless the gentleman from Kentucky cares to do that.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HÉBERT (at the request of Mr. LARCADE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Frank R. Schwengel, president of the Distilled Spirits Institute.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Frank A. Godehaux.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. ALMOND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Hon. Clifton A. Woodrum, a former Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three editorials.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS—PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight Monday, July 1, 1946, to file a report on the bill (H. R. 6911) to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; and that the same privilege may be extended to those desiring to file minority views, if there be such.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6837) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. KERR, Mr. MAHON, Mr. NORRELL, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. TIBBOTT, and Mr. TABER.

J. B. McCRARY CO., INC.—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith without my approval the bill (H. R. 3494) for the relief of J. B. McCrary Co., Inc., and for other purposes.

The bill provides for the payment of the sum of $75,829.16 to J. B. McCrary Co., of Atlanta, Ga., in full settlement of its claims against the United States for losses alleged to have been sustained by it in the performance of a contract for the construction of the Warner Robins housing project near Atlanta, Ga.

It appears that the Federal Public Housing Authority advertised for bids for the construction, on a lump sum or fixed-fee basis, of 65 brick buildings for a war housing project at Warner Robins, Ga. The specifications required that the work be performed within 60 calendar days from the date of notice to proceed and contained a provision for liquidated damages of $500 per day for each day's delay. It also provided that wages paid for labor performed under the contract would not exceed the minimum wages fixed for that area by the Secretary of Labor under the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276a). The claimant was the low bidder and its bid was accepted. A contract was entered into and notice to proceed was given on February 4, 1943. The work was not completed by April 6, 1943, 60 calendar days after notice to proceed, nor was it finished until October 23, 1943. By a change order dated November 5, 1943, the contracting officer granted the claimant an extension of sufficient time to avoid the payment of any liquidated damages.

The claimant asserts that it sustained an out-of-pocket loss of $75,829.16 in the performance of the contract due to first, the failure of the Government to provide roughing-in measurements for material and equipment when needed; second, delays by the Government in delivering material; and third, the impossibility of securing sufficient bricklayers, resulting from the fact that the maximum wage permitted to be paid under the contract was considerably less than that being paid to bricklayers on other construction jobs in the area.

The United States has waived its immunity to suit on claims for damages arising out of contracts, express or implied, and the Court of Claims has been designated as the forum to hear, determine, and render judgment on such claims (U. S. C. 250). Although the claim covered by the bill under consideration is of the type cognizable by the Court of Claims, the record in this case fails to disclose that the claimant has taken any action to avail itself of its right to sue the United States in that court.

Since relief by private act of Congress should be granted only when no remedy is provided by law, and since the claimant has failed to pursue the remedies afforded it by general law, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 29, 1946.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and accompanying bill referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered printed.

LAWRENCE PORTLAND CEMENT CO.—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning without my approval the enrolled enactment, H. R. 3391, for the relief of Lawrence Portland Cement Co., of Thomaston, Maine.

H. R. 3391 is in effect a retroactive subsidization of costs which were incurred prior to the time such costs became eligible for subsidy payments, and it cannot, therefore, be said that the costs would not have been incurred or that the production would not have been achieved except for the subsidy.

In authorizing payment of subsidies the Congress has enunciated the policy that subsidy payments for excess wartime costs are to be made only to achieve the maximum necessary production of commodities which might not be achieved in the absence of the subsidy. The various executive agencies and departments functioning the subsidy programs have consistently followed this policy.

If this bill should become law, the Government must necessarily anticipate a large volume of demands of a similar character, the effect of which, if granted, would be to extend the various subsidy programs far beyond their original scope and purpose.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The WHITE HOUSE, *June 29, 1946.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message, together with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered printed.

SALISH AND KOOTENAI TRIBES OF INDIANS—VETO MESSAGE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith without my approval the bill (H. R. 2678) conferring

jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in any and all claims which the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana, or any tribe or band thereof, may have against the United States, and for other purposes.

This bill proposes to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to adjudicate any and all legal and equitable claims which the Confederated Salish (or Flathead) and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana may have against the United States, including any claims arising under the treaty of July 16, 1855 (12 Stat. 975), or any subsequent treaty, agreement, act of Congress, or Executive order. The jurisdiction thus to be conferred, it is provided, would extend to claims arising by reason of any lands taken from these Indians, including lands lost by erroneous surveys, or lands opened to settlement, lands used for dam, power, and reservoir sites or irrigation projects, or lands lost by submergence resulting from the erection of reservoirs, without compensation and without the consent of the Indians given in the usual manner. The bill declares that any taking of the lands of the Indians by the United States, without compensation and without their consent, or the reservation thereof, for any of the above purposes, to be sufficient grounds for suitable relief, and the court would be required to award the Indians just compensation for such lands as for a taking under the power of eminent domain.

In addition to other objectionable features of the bill, an attempt is made in its provisions to define the "grounds for equitable relief" and the basis upon which the court shall render judgment in favor of the Indians and award to them just compensation "as for a taking under the power of eminent domain." It is possible that under the provisions of the bill the use by the United States of any lands "formerly * * * possessed" by the Indians even though the Indians were without any recognized title would constitute a sufficient basis "for equitable relief" and "for a taking under the power of eminent domain." Thus the bill does not merely waive the statute of limitations and laches, and provide a forum for the adjudication of any preexisting claims which the Indians may have against the United States, but it seeks to create liability against the Government which would not otherwise exist. Moreover, by providing for the payment of just compensation, the bill would probably require the Government to pay interest, for a period of more than 30 years, on a claim that did not even exist prior to its passage. Neither on legal nor moral grounds would there seem to be any justification for legislation of this kind.

For these reasons, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 28, 1946.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

The message together with the accompanying bill, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING ANNUAL REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk, and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 10 (b) (4) of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12 (l) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress, the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 29, 1946.*

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is recognized.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the gentleman from Michigan, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6056) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

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 statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6056) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other 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 amendments numbered 11, 13, 54, 77 and 78.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 43, 45, 48, 49, 53, 55, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 75, 79, and 80, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$23,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,915,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,219,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,360,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$10,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,996,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That pursuant to section 204 of Public Law 334, Seventy-ninth Congress, automobiles in possession of the Foreign Service abroad may be exchanged or sold and the exchange allowances or proceeds of such sales applied to replacement of an equal number of automobiles of the same general type and class"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$25,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$12,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That on and after October 1, 1946, all functions necessary to the compilation of foreign trade statistics shall be performed in New York, New York: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $950,000 shall be expended for this purpose"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$19,622,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$875,000, together with not to exceed $120,000 of the unexpended balance of this appropriation for the fiscal year 1946"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Preliminary planning and surveys, Federal Airport Act: For all expenses necessary for preliminary planning and surveys required for the initiation of the Federal-aid airport program as authorized in section 5 (a) of the Federal Airport Act, approved May 13, 1946 (Public Law 377), including personal services in the District of Columbia; the purchase (not to exceed nineteen), repair, and operation of passenger automobiles; $2,975,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, of which amount not to exceed $15,000 may be transferred to the appropiration 'Maintenance and operation of aircraft, Office of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics', to provide for the maintenance and operation of aircraft, and $5,000 may be transferred to the appropriation 'Printing and binding, Department of Commerce.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: For carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act of May 13, 1946 (except section 5 (a)), $45,000,000, to be available until June 30, 1953, of which $43,260,000 shall be for projects in the States in accordance with sections 5 (b) and 6 of said Act, and $1,740,000 shall be for projects in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico in accordance with section 5 (c): *Provided*, That not to exceed $2,250,000 of the foregoing amounts shall be available for necessary planning, research, and administrative expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia; the purchase (not to exceed eighty-three), repair, and operation of passenger automobiles; of which $2,250,000 not to exceed $25,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Maintenance and operation of aircraft, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics", to provide for the maintenance and operation of aircraft, and $30,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Printing and binding, Department of Commerce".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$17,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and at the end of the matter so restored and, before the period, insert: "; and appropriations of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Weather Bureau shall be available in an amount not to exceed $20,000 for furnishing food, clothing, medicines, and other supplies for the temporary relief of distressed persons in remote localities, reimbursement for such relief to be in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 8, 26, 39, 40, 46, 50, 56, 57, 58, 65, 73, 74 and 81.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
BUTLER B. HARE,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
KARL STEFAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
STYLES BRIDGES,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
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 amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6056) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The conferees are agreed that items of appropriation for the Department of State include $19,284,778 for the information and cultural program, $3,659,806 for the intelligence program, and $1,148,707 for the foreign economic liquidation program. The first and third of the foregoing sums are contained in the bill as passed by the Senate. The second program, approved by the Senate in the amount of $4,150,326, is reduced by the conferees, as follows: Transportation, Foreign Service, $88,120; Foreign Service quarters, $60,000; cost-of-living allowance, Foreign Service, $40,000; miscellaneous salaries and allowances, Foreign Service, $259,000; contingent expenses, Foreign Service, $43,400. The conferees are further agreed that publication of the magazine Amerika may be continued since it has been represented to the conferees that the publication is practically self-sustaining.

Amendment No. 1, relating to departmental salaries: Appropriates $23,600,000, instead of $23,861,000, as proposed by the Senate and $17,400,000, as proposed by the House; the reduction in the amount as passed by the Senate to be applied to the regular activities of the Department.

Amendment Nos. 3 and 4 relating to contingent expenses: Places in parentheses the words, "foreign or domestic," and limits expenditures upon the purchase of broadcasting time, all as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5, relating to contingent expenses: Increases the limitation for purchase and exchange of books, maps, and periodicals, newspapers, teletype rentals, and tolls, to $525,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $300,000, as proposed by the House. This increase is in conformity with the added amounts approved for the information and cultural program and the intelligence program.

Amendment No. 6, relating to contingent expenses: Appropriates $10,221,221, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,100,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7, relating to printing and binding: Appropriates $1,433,900, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,000,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9, relating to transportation, Foreign Service: Appropriates $1,915,700, instead of $2,003,808, as proposed by the Senate and $1,875,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10, relating to Foreign Service quarters: Appropriates $5,219,000, instead of $5,279,000, as proposed by the Senate and $4,750,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 11, relating to Foreign Service quarters: Eliminates the Senate provision exempting Egypt, Great Britain, Spain, Brazil, Panama, Cuba, Turkey, Switzerland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, and the Netherlands Possessions from the monetary limitation for quarters, and restores the cities of Cairo, London, Ankara, Madrid, Rio de Janeiro, Panama, and Habana, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12, relating to cost of living allowances, Foreign Service: Appropriates $3,360,000, instead of $3,414,600, as proposed by the Senate and $2,900,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13, relating to representation allowances, Foreign Service: Appropriates $800,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $902,400, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14, relating to salaries of clerical, administrative, and fiscal personnel, Foreign Service: Appropriates $10,200,000, instead of $10,576,380, as proposed by the Senate and $8,600,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15, relating to miscellaneous salaries and allowances, Foreign Service: Appropriates $5,996,000, instead of $6,255,480, as proposed by the Senate and $4,600,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16, relating to Foreign Service, Auxiliary: Appropriates $3,300,000, instead of $3,656,913, as proposed by the Senate and $2,400,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 17 and 18, relating to contingent expenses, Foreign Service: The first changes spelling of one word, and the second appropriates $9,100,000, instead of $9,171,890, as proposed by the Senate and $8,000,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 19, 20, and 21, relating to contingent expenses, Foreign Service: Provide limitations for the purchase of automobiles abroad; amendment No. 21 eliminates balance of the paragraph, after the word "to" on line 19, as follows: "replacements, and such replacements shall not be chargeable against the numerical limitations hereinbefore set forth," as proposed by the Senate, and in lieu thereof includes "replacement of an equal number of automobiles of the same general type and class."

Amendment No. 22, relating to emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service: Appropriates $9,000,000, instead of $9,500,000, as proposed by the Senate and $8,500,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23, relating to United States contributions to international commissions, congresses, and bureaus: Includes the amount of $800 for Cape Spartel and Tangier Light, Coast of Morocco, and the amount of $1,722.57 for the International Bureau of Permanent Court of Arbitration, both in conformity with existing treaties, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24, relating to United States contributions to international commissions, congresses, and bureaus: Corrects total for the paragraph to include amounts added under amendment numbered 23, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25, relating to United State participation in United Nations: Clarifies authority for attendance at meetings.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Amendment No. 27, relating to the offices of the Attorney General, etc.: Appropriates $667,250, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $633,250, as proposed by the House. The added sum of $34,000 is required for Federal-State relations activity carried on heretofore in the War Division which was abolished on December 28, 1945.

Amendment No. 28, relating to the Administrative Division: Appropriates $1,190,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,150,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 29, relating to the Criminal Division: Appropriates $898,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $840,000, as proposed by the House. The added sum of $58,000 is required for the execution of responsibilities imposed on the Attorney General by the Foreign Agents' Registration Act of 1938, as amended. This activity was carried on heretofore in the War Division.

Amendment No. 30, relating to contingent expenses: Provides a limitation for miscellaneous expenditures, including newspapers, of $850, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $350, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 31, relating to salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division: Appropriates $1,900,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,700,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendments No. 32, relating to salaries and expenses, Lands Division: Appropriates $2,650,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,500,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 33, relating to salaries and expenses of district attorneys, and so forth: Appropriates $4,560,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,530,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 34, relating to salaries and expenses of marshals, and so forth: Appropriates $4,642,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,570,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35, relating to the Immigration and Naturalization Service: Appropriates $25,500,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $24,500,000, as proposed by the House. The added $1,000,000 is required for the maintenance and transportation of alien enemy detainees. No funds were included in the Budget for this program because it was anticipated that all alien enemies in detention would be deported or released prior to the close of fiscal year 1946.

Amendment No. 36, relating to construction of buildings and facilities, Federal Prison System: Provides that $635,000 of the amount transferred to the appropriation, "Construction of buildings and facilities," by the Navy Department, under the authority contained in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1943, shall be available for the construction of dwellings at existing institutions, as proposed by the Senate. The above amount is part of the sum of $1,500,000 transferred to the Federal Prison System as payment for a penal institution taken over by the Navy as a war emergency measure.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Amendments Nos. 37 and 38, relating to technical and scientific services: Increases the limitation for printing and binding from $105,000 to $130,000, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates $3,800,000, instead of $4,000,000, as proposed by the Senate and $3,400,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 41 and 42, relating to compiling census reports and so forth: Appropriates $12,000,000, instead of $13,000,000 as proposed by the House, and $11,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and restores the House provision requiring functions necessary to the compilation of foreign-trade statistics to be performed in New York, N. Y., amended to make the effective date October 1, 1946, and limiting expenditures to $950,000.

Amendments Nos. 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 51, and 52, relating to the Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics: Appropriates for general administration, Office of the Administrator, $4,353,102, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,000,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates for establishment of air-navigation facilities $19,622,200, instead of $18,100,000, as proposed by the House, and $20,812,200, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $36,544,418 for maintenance and operation of air-navigation facilities, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $35,541,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates for technical development $875,000, instead of $750,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and continues available ($120,000) the 1946 unexpended balance, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $7,075,000 for enforcement of safety regulations, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,200,000, as proposed by the House, and provides for certain transfers to other appropriations, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates for maintenance and operation of aircraft $1,593,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,200,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $2,975,000 for preliminary planning and surveys, Federal Airport Act, instead of $3,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, limiting, however, the number of passenger automobiles to be purchased to 19 instead of 38, and omitting authority to purchase any aircraft; and appropriates for the Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act, $45,000,000, instead of $52,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, with approximately proportionate reductions in amount limitations, and provides for the purchase of 83 passenger automobiles instead of 167, and eliminates authority to purchase aircraft.

Amendments Nos. 53, 54, and 55, relating to the Coast and Geodetic Survey: Appropriates for salaries and expenses, departmental, $3,014,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,000,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates for salaries and expenses, field, $4,800,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,800,000, as proposed by the House, and restores the House provision providing for reimbursement of officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for extending aid in needy cases.

Amendments Nos. 59, 60, and 61, relating to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce: Appropriates for departmental salaries and expenses $4,900,000, instead of $4,600,000, as proposed by the House, and $6,157,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates for field office service $4,750,000, instead of $2,500,000, as proposed by the House, and $6,500,000, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates for export control $500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, and 69, relating to the Patent Office: Appropriates for salaries $5,620,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,800,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates for photolithographing $660,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $350,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates for miscellaneous expenses $147,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $77,000, as proposed by the House, and appropriates $952,000 for printing and binding, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $800,000, as proposed by the House, to be apportioned as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 70, 71, and 72, relating to the Weather Bureau: Appropriates for salaries and expenses $17,500,000, instead of $16,303,000, as proposed by the House, and $18,338,000, as proposed by the Senate; establishes the amount limitation upon expenditures for personal services in the District of Columbia at $1,525,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,485,000, as proposed by the House; and authorizes the Navy Department to transfer without charge equipment and supplies for upper air soundings, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 75, 76, 77, and 78, applying to miscellaneous provisions, Department of Commerce: Extends the authority of the Secretary to delegate to subordinate officials the power to authorize payment of travel and incidental expenses to include expenses of transportation of the immediate families of personnel, as proposed by the Senate; and restores the House provision making certain appropriations available for supplying medical services to personnel in Alaska, providing for their subsistence upon a reimbursable basis, and for travel expenses of personnel, upon appointment, from place of residence to points outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, amended to permit of an expenditure of not exceeding $20,000, upon a reimbursable basis, for relieving distressed persons in remote localities.

Amendments Nos. 79 and 80, relating to the Judiciary: Appropriates for salaries, United States Supreme Court, $598,590, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $591,200, as proposed by the House, and appropriates for salaries of judges $3,200,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,000,000, as proposed by the House.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

No. 2, relating to an informational program outside continental United States, Department of State. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 8, relating to surplus property disposal, Department of State. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment reducing the amount to $6,000,000.

No. 26, relating to the termination of the employment of personnel by the Secretary of State when deemed necessary or desirable in the interests of the United States. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 39, relating to a census of business, agreement.

No. 40, relating to a census of manufactures. The House managers will insist upon disagreement.

No. 46, relating to the maintenance and operation of air-navigation facilities (Executive Order 9709). The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment, reducing the appropriation proposed from $2,874,000 to $2,500,000.

No. 50, relating to warehousing for airplane parts, Civil Aeronautics Administration, and limiting the amount to be expended for the repair or overhaul of aircraft. The House managers will move to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate, increasing the amount limitation upon the repair or overhaul of airplanes from $100 to $200, and including labor as a cost factor.

No. 56, relating to the transfer of seven vessels from the Navy Department to the Coast and Geodetic Survey. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 57, limiting departmental salaries of Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce at seat of government and making an amount thereof available for Office of Small Business. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment reducing the amount proposed.

No. 58, broadening the scope in specified respects of the appropriation of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for departmental salaries and expenses. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 65, establishing under the Patent Office a charge of 10 cents per copy for design patents and certificates of trade-mark registration. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 73, relating to the conduct by the Weather Bureau of meteorological investigations in the Arctic region. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 74, relating to the maintenance and operation of meteorological facilities (Executive Order 9709) by the Weather Bureau in foreign countries and in Territories and possessions of the United States. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 81, relating to limitations on expenditures of funds to pay salary and wages of anyone who engages in a strike against the Government, or who is a member of an organization that asserts the right to strike against the Government, and so forth. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
BUTLER B. HARE,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
KARL STEFAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. RABAUT (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the conference report and statement were printed in full in the RECORD of yesterday I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this conference report for the following more objectionable reasons: $19,284,778 have been allowed by the conference committee for the State Department to carry an information and cultural-relations program throughout the world; $3,659,000 have been allowed to be appropriated for an intelligence program for the State Department, and the third item involves a ninefold increase in the field service of the Department of Commerce. In general, the bill appropriates too much money in nearly every paragraph.

These three outstanding items are particularly objectionable, it seems to me. I was against them when the bill was before the House formerly, at which time we allowed nothing for intelligence and we allowed approximately $10,000,000 for an informational program.

I merely want to make my views clear for the RECORD. We are taking a step in the wrong direction by commandeering all the information that leaves the United States of America through the ether, through the telegraph wires with the thoughts of hired Government-paid employees of the State Department. This conference report will set up as a propaganda agency for the United States to the exclusion of private news-reporting services.

To illustrate and emphasize what I mean, I call attention to amendment No. 4 on page 2 of the bill which deals with broadcasting time provided for in this appropriation bill. That is a limitation on the $19,000,000 information program of the State Department. It is a limitation inserted by the Senate which, of course, is retained in this bill by the conference report. The Senate amendment states:

Except that funds herein appropriated shall not be used to purchase more than 75 percent of the effective daily broadcasting time from any person or corporation holding an international short-wave broadcasting license from the Federal Communications Commission without the consent of such licensee.

There are some six or seven international broadcasting licensees in the United States. This amendment had to be put in by the Senate. Part II of the Senate hearings shows that unless the amendment were inserted the State Department would insist on 100 percent of the broadcasters' time. With this amendment they can only use 75 percent of the time of any international broadcasting licensee.

Mr. Speaker, this proves to you the extent to which the State Department intends to blanket out and blacken out all private news agencies on the wire and in the air. I am against that in principle and I am against it as far as spending Federal money is concerned.

The conference report contains $453,330,612, as compared with the House version of the bill, which provided for $365,166,758; both Senate and House versions included $15,000,000 for a census of business and manufactures. These items are in disagreement and will be voted upon separately after we dispose of the conference report. The rest of the figures are comparatively correct.

The conferees have allowed an increase of $88,000,000 for carrying on the functions of the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments in the executive branch of the Government, and the Judiciary.

When we are staggered with a $1,900 per capita debt, I think this is a wholly unwarranted increase in public expenditures for the fiscal year 1947 for these departments of Government and the judiciary. Trouble seems to increase throughout the world in proportion to the increased funds we give the State Department every year. There was provided $15,000,000 for 1 year for the State Department when I went on this committee in 1941. Instead of $15,000,000 in the fiscal year 1941 we are now spending the colossal sum of $128,636,572 for that one agency alone during the fiscal year 1947.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. I merely want to say that I am glad the gentleman is continuing his good work on this fight. I opposed the bill before and I am still against it and I hope we will have a chance to express our opposition here today.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman. I intend to vote against the conference report for those reasons.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important conference report. It deals with the appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal judiciary. I am supporting the report with the exception of two items on page 55 dealing with the census. You will recall that when we brought these two items here the House overruled my amendment. When the bill went to the Senate the Senate struck out both items, and these two items come back to you in disagreement.

There will be preferential motions offered by me and my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] to eliminate these items and proceed to concur in the Senate amendment. In this way you can save $15,000,000 or more.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I want to inquire about this item for international short-wave broadcasting. I know the gentleman has done some effective work in that program during the war, but this is a postwar program. We were told when this bill was before this body that the State Department was planning a long-range program which would meet the objections of some of us that it was at present a monopoly program.

Mr. STEFAN. I can explain that to the gentleman to his full satisfaction. The gentleman will recall that the people who own the radio station in Boston were interested in securing 25 percent of the time. An amendment has been placed in the bill, and both sides are agreeable to it. I am sure the people who own that radio industry in Boston are satisfied, and I am sure the gentleman from Ohio, who has worked so hard to get this into the bill, will also be satisfied. Seventy-five percent Federal time and 25 percent private-industry time is the way it is now arranged.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I thoroughly approve of this as a stopgap measure, but I wonder whether, during the conference or otherwise the gentleman has heard about the long-time plans

Mr. STEFAN. I understand a study is to be made.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I wonder if the gentleman would comment on those items for the census in the light of the fact that the House earlier this week rejected a bill out of the Committee on the Census.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; the House overwhelmingly defeated that authorization bill. They apparently wanted some basic law. You will find these two items on page 55. They are items in disagreement—amendments numbered 39 and 40. We bring these items back in disagreement and ask that you sustain the minority when we offer these motions.

The total amount for the four departments carried in this bill as it passed the House was $365,166,758. The bill as it passed the Senate carried $453,330,612. You will be interested to know, however, that the increase of $88,000,000 in the Senate bill as compared with the House bill will be found mainly in the item implementing the Federal-State-aid airport program, which has been authorized and

signed by the President. It is implemented with funds in this bill. I know every one of you that has an airport in your district will be interested to know that appropriations are contained in this appropriation bill to implement the Federal-State-aid airport program.

The other items which bring this increase up to $88,000,000 are increases in the information service of the Department of State, and also the Intelligence Service, which the House left out. These items are now in the bill and agreed to.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HENRY. I have two questions to ask. First, referring to page 70 of the bill, line 17, will the gentleman tell me what the conference agreement was as to the total amount?

Mr. STEFAN. The committee allowed for additional field offices in the Department of Commerce.

Mr. HENRY. But the dollars-and-cents amount is what?

Mr. STEFAN. The Small Business Office was reduced in the conference with the Senate.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Like other agencies, the State Department is leading people to think that all they need to do is get more people in order to improve their policies, which are having such disastrous consequences, but it seems to me that what we ought to do is to make a stern fight against these increases and these policies that are bringing about such disasters. They are occurring at the top. It is a matter of quality, not quantity.

Mr. STEFAN. I explained that the major increase in the bill is not in the Department of State. The major increase is in the Department of Commerce.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. There is a $30,000,000 increase in the State Department; is that not right.

Mr. STEFAN. Approximately that.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Their policy abroad is to finance conflict between England and Russia and give the Communists the Spanish and Argentine Governments.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, we are not a policy-making committee—we are an appropriations committee.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. But this is a chance to stop the policy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

In order to keep the matter straight about the census, I will quote from Thirteenth United States Code, page 217:

> Census of manufacturing industries, collection and publication: The Director of the Census is authorized and directed to collect and publish for every second year after 1927 statistics of manufacturing industries, and the Director is hereby authorized to prepare such schedules as in his judgment may be necessary.

Regarding the census of business, we find the following to be the law in Thirteenth United States Code, page 201:

> The above reference contains authority for the taking of a census of distribution of business in the year 1930 and every 10 years thereafter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. As I understand it, there was a provision in the bill that would allow the State Department to remove certain objectionable persons who they felt had very strong communistic feelings and who should be removed from the State Department. Is that correct?

Mr. RABAUT. The gentlewoman will find the language in amendment No. 26.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. In connection with your statement relative to the manufacturing census, it will be taken this fall as I understand it, but how long will it take before industry may have some benefit of that census?

Mr. RABAUT. The Census Bureau will take care of that. What we are talking about here is the funds to take the census.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I understand that we are providing for funds to take the census but when will get the benefit of the census—next year, or the year after?

Mr. RABAUT. I imagine it would take 6 or 8 months to arrange it into statistical form.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. How about the penalty clause for failing to file a report?

Is that still in the bill?

Mr. RABAUT. No; that is not in this bill. This is the appropriation bill. That was in the legislative bill.

AVIATION AMENDMENTS DISCUSSED

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to ask several questions of the Chairman and members of the subcommittee. In the first instance, I inquire if the $100,000 passed as an amendment in the House for an air marking program, to help the constantly expanding private flying field, is included in the conference report and in the bill as it comes before us this afternoon.

Mr. RABAUT. That was not in disagreement but some restorations have been made to it, as I understand. Presumably, it is still in the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That provision should be retained. The second question relates to the amendment which would give the fixed base operators and airport repair shops the opportunity, by contract, to repair CAA aircraft rather than the CAA doing that job.

Would the gentleman explain exactly what was done in the conference between the Senate and the House, and if agreement has been reached on an acceptable amendment?

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, with reference to that amendment, the Senate struck out the language used by the House in the gentleman's amendment and inserted new language. The new language reads as follows:

> That no funds in this paragraph shall be expended for the pay of any employee of the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the maintenance of more than one major parts warehouse, or for the repair or overhaul of aircraft when such repair or overhaul cannot be peformed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration through exchange or substitution of parts or materials maintained by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the cost of labor, parts, and materials not maintained in stock would be in excess of $200: *Provided further*, That all repair and overhaul of aircraft of the Civil Aeronautics Administration which cannot be performed within the foregoing limitation shall be done on contract after submission of bids.

The subcommittee argued that question for about 2 hours and finally we inserted the words on page 61 of the bill, "The cost of labor, parts, and materials not to exceed $200." So that the result of the amendment is that they can perform repairs where the cost of parts and labor does not exceed $200.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the conference agreement is preferable to the Senate language and it does partially embrace the thinking of the House. We desired that there not be conflict between the private fixed base operator in the repair of aircraft, and the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, which we thought that agency should not enter, because private enterprise would be curtailed.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Has the gentleman listened to the explanation of the amendment given to you by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I listened very carefully. I appreciate also the courtesy of the gentleman from Virginia in discussing this matter with me earlier this afternoon.

Mr. STEFAN. What does the gentleman think about the words "and cost of labor, parts, and materials"?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think, as I indicated earlier, that this is an improvement and more nearly effectuates the action of the House than did the Senate votes in passing the language which was put in the bill.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I think it covers the same purpose that the gentleman had in mind when he presented the amendment in the House, which limited the cost of the labor to $100 per airplane This includes labor, parts, and materials, and raises it to $200, but gets at the same purpose.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman.

There is one additional question which I feel is important. I note that when the Senate had this appropriation bill, the amount of $52,000,000 was placed in the measure for carrying out the purposes of the Federal Aid Airport Act. Of

course we have not had such legislation before us until today. I ask if the $52,000,000 remains in the compromise or whether another figure was substituted.

Mr. RABAUT. There is substituted a figure of $45,000,000.

Mr. RANDOLPH. And then this final inquiry: That amount of money would be available until 1953, which would be the date on which the 7-year authorization act of $500,000,000 would run, is that correct?

Mr. RABAUT. That is correct.

Mr. RANDOLPH. And this airport fund could be supplemented by other amounts during the first year, if the Congress so desires?

Mr. RABAUT. If the Deficiency Committee is in session.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am grateful for that assurance and I thank the gentleman, and desire also to state my belief that it will be necessary for Congress to provide additional matching money during the coming fiscal year. If I felt it more practical, under our parliamentary situation, I would urge my colleague to support an increase to at least $70,000,000. We must avoid unnecessary delay in construction and improvement of necessary airport facilities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has again expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 2, line 10, after the word "through", insert "individuals, including aliens, or."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 5, line 23, insert the following:

"Surplus property disposal: For all expenses necessary to enable the Department of State to carry out its functions and activities relative to disposition of surplus property pursuant to the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (Public Law 457), as amended, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and employment of persons outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to civil-service and classification laws; travel expenses, including attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the activity for which this appropriation is made; transportation of prospective customers (not to exceed $9,000); cost of living and living quarters allowances and transportation of families and effects including cost of living allowances for military personnel assigned or detailed to the Department, all under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe; stenographic reporting, translating, appraising, and other services in foreign countries by contract, all without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; payment of rent in foreign countries in advance; purchase and exchange of books, maps, periodicals, and newspapers; printing and binding, including printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); entertainment (not to exceed $50,000); hire, maintenance, operation, and repair of passenger automobiles; advertising without regard to section 3828 of the Revised Statutes; maintenance and operation of aircraft; $7,000,000."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$7,000,000" named in said amendment insert "$6,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 26: Page 35, line 11, insert the following:

"Nothwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, on or before June 30, 1947, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States, but such termination shall not affect the right of such officer or employee to seek or accept employment in any other department or agency of the Government if declared eligible for such employment by the United States Civil Service Commission."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 39: Page 55, line 7, strike out all of lines 7 to 13 inclusive.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONES moves that House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and concur in the same.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, this amendment concerns the census of business.

The census of business was initiated in 1929. Thereafter such censuses were taken covering the years 1933, 1935, 1937, and 1939, when the last one was taken. The censuses of 1933, 1935, and 1937 were taken by order of the Secretary of Commerce—at that time Secretary Roper—under authority of section 8 of the organic act of the Department of Commerce. The censuses of 1937 and 1939 were taken under authority of Public Law No. 13 of the Seventy-first Congress. We think these censuses should be continued. I quoted a moment ago from the law covering the census—Thirteenth United States Code, page 201.

The disruption caused by the war make it very necessary that the Government and the agencies of the Government have the facts so that they may become known to the Government through the taking of these censuses. If we propose to abandon the census in these times when we have had both the war period intervene and the reconversion period at our door, I feel we would be doing an injustice to the business of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 189]

Adams	Gore	Patterson
Anderson, Calif	Gossett	Peterson, Ga.
Andrews, N. Y.	Granger	Ploeser
Auchincloss	Grant, Ala.	Powell
Baldwin, Md.	Green	Quinn, N. Y.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Rankin
Barden	Hall, Leonard W.	Rayfiel
Barrett, Pa.	Harness, Ind.	Reece, Tenn.
Bates, Ky.	Harris	Richards
Bates, Mass.	Hart	Rivers
Bell	Hartley	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bennet, N. Y.	Hedrick	Robertson, Va.
Bonner	Heffernan	Robinson, Utah
Boren	Hoffman, Mich.	Rodgers, Pa.
Boykin	Holifield	Roe, N. Y.
Bradley, Mich.	Izac	Rogers, N. Y.
Bradley, Pa.	Jackson	Rooney
Brooks	Johnson, Okla.	Sabath
Buchanan	Kearney	Sharp
Buckley	Kefauver	Sheridan
Bulwinkle	Keogh	Sikes
Byrne, N. Y.	King	Smith, Va.
Camp	Kinzer	Sparkman
Cannon, Fla.	Klein	Stevenson
Celler	Kunkel	Stewart
Cochran	Latham	Stigler
Coffee	Lea	Stockman
Cole, N. Y.	LeCompte	Sumners, Tex.
Colmer	Luce	Taylor
Cox	Ludlow	Thomes, N. J.
Crawford	Lynch	Thomas, Tex.
Curley	McGehee	Tolan
Daughton, Va.	McKenzie	Torrens
Dawson	Mahon	Towe
Dolliver	Mansfield, Mont.	Vinson
Domengeaux	Mansfield, Tex.	Voorhis, Calif.
Drewry	Merrow	Wadsworth
Dworshak	Miller, Calif.	Welch
Eberharter	Morgan	West
Elsaesser	Morrison	White
Engel, Mich.	Murphy	Whitten
Ervin	Norrell	Wickersham
Fisher	Norton	Winstead
Gallagher	Outland	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gardner	Patrick	Wood
Gibson		Worley
Gifford		
Gillespie		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 296 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON (at the request of Mr. REED of New York) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] is recognized.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, before the quorum call which, by the way, I did not request, we had before us for consideration Senate amendment No. 39, which would strike out, as the Senate did, $10,000,000 for a business census.

You will remember that by a narrow margin we passed a business census appropriation for $10,000,000 when this bill was before the House in the first instance. The Senate, however, struck out this provision and here is what the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations had to say about the business census:

It is recommended by the committee that the following paragraph be stricken from the bill:

"Census of Business: For the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing (including printing and binding) the census of business or distribution, as authorized by the act of March 14, 1903 (5 U. S. C. 604), including the employment by the director of personnel at the seat of government and elsewhere without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, $10,000,000."

The committee goes on to say:

The committee can find no specific authority in 5 U. S. C. 604 for collection of statistics dealing with business or manufactures and have, therefore, deleted the paragraphs mentioned above.

The committee does not condone and will not abet the practice of extending the scope of statutory authority by administrative determination to cover functions not within the reasonable intent of the Congress in framing the statutes.

If you will look at title 5, section 604, you will find no authority for a business census whatsoever. The nearest language relied upon is as follows:

He—

Secretary of Commerce—

shall from time to time make special investigations and reports as he may be required to do by the President or by either House of Congress, or which he himself may deem necessary and urgent.

This language does not authorize a business or distribution census. "Investigation" and "reports" are not "censuses."

There is authority for a business census, however, as the chairman pointed out, under title 13, section 201. Under authority of this latter section of law the original census was taken in 1930 and adtional censuses are legal only every 10 years thereafter. That would mean that a distribution census might be taken in the year 1951 for 1940 business and distribution facts; but for this appropriation bill which provides funds for the fiscal year 1947 there is no authority in law. This amendment covering the taking of a census of business, and appropriating $10,000,000, does not cover the total amount for the taking of the business census—it will be much more than that. This amendment is only for the purpose of providing work, in my opinion, during the 9 years while there is no authority for census taking and keeping an army of employees on the pay roll for 9 continuous years instead of for 1 year in 10.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. Is not this the same sort of stuff that I will call alfalfa that the House rejected the other day?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. PITTENGER. There was an amendment offered then.

Mr. JONES. Yes. On page 1021 of the hearings the gentleman's position is borne out when Mr. Grieves testified before the committee as the Chief Economist of the Bureau of the Census and was asked by Mr. Sourwine:

Is the same thing true with the business census?

Mr. GRIEVES. Yes, sir; except that under the present law that would not be taken until 1951.

This official of the Census Bureau does not contend there is authority in law for a business census.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, the House has passed on the question of whether it wants a census of business earlier this week when it turned down the legislative authority for a business census, which legislation provided penalties in case businessmen would not answer the questionnaires. The House turned down that legislation.

Insisting on House disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 39 is an attempt to put in an appropriation bill legislation legalizing and appropriating $10,000,000 for a census of business and distribution when there is no basic authority in the law in the face of defeat of the basic legislation this same week. There is no authority whatsoever except as appears in this language. The proof of the pudding is that if this business census had been authorized by law, by basic authority, this amendment would not appear technically in disagreement. It would have been put in the conference report and would have been adopted with the rest of the conference report.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This is the same proposal we had before the House when the gentleman offered a motion to strike it out and it lacked 1 vote of carrying in the committee when the thing was considered?

Mr. JONES. That is right. It carried on a voice vote and was defeated on a record vote.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And it was the gentleman from Ohio that proposed the motion to strike out the $10,000,000.

Mr. JONES. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I submit this amendment should be defeated for the further reason that never before in the history of any nation has the Government known more about business and private enterprise, never has the Government known more about distribution, because it has had this information tied up through complete and arbitrary control in the Civilian Production Administration, the Office of Defense Transportation, and the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, so that the memory of the Members of the House may be brought to date on this census matter, the conferees are simply upholding in their position in this conference, the action of the House which approved the appropriation. When you go to a conference and you do not defend the House, you are criticized. When you go to a conference and you defend the House you are criticized. So where are you?

If there was ever a time that a business census should be taken, it is right now. We have had the war period with many, many businesses discontinuing operation. We have the reconversion period at our door as well as the legislation of the Congress of the United States giving assistance to GI's to go into business all over the Nation.

Mind you, you are underwriting all of them. When they go into business they want to find out something about it, and you do not want them to go into business and lose their money without having the facts at hand. My colleagues, what are we thinking about? Let us look at the hearings, not before the Senate, but before your own committee; hearings of this size (indicating a volume). It covers several pages. Here is what it says:

It provides Government and business with a complete picture of the distribution operation of the country, especially the size and location of markets. It establishes a number of bench marks by which the businessman who is selling may gage the success of his efforts in his usual field, as well as his prospects in going into new lines or new locations. It is an essential part of the planning of a marketing operation. Mr. Chairman, on the part of people who are searching for markets, and who wish to judge their size and character as for instance, between the east coast and the west coast. Furthermore, it provides the raw material necessary for an intelligent review of the cost of distribution as a whole, as well as the cost of operating individual business establishments. It would provide the first comprehensive information of the kind since 1939.

What are we thinking about? Are we just on the rampage against any kind of progress? Is this another attack? Is this another wreck, ruin, and delay program? I am asking you.

This amendment should be supported and the position of the House should be sustained.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I gather from the remarks that have been made on this provision that the bone of contention is whether or not there is authority in law to gather these statistics by the Bureau of the Census in the Department of Commerce. I reach that definite conclusion from the statement just made by my genial and close friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], when he said that if there had been authority in law and it had been embodied in the bill, it would have been included in the report of the committee.

I would like to submit for the consideration of the House as to whether or not

there is provision in law for this, and I am going to quote from the act of March 14, 1903. The act reads as follows:

He—

The Secretary of Commerce—

shall also from time to time make such special investigations and reports as he may be required to do by the President or by either House of Congress, or which he himself may deem necessary and urgent.

Is that not authority in law for the Secretary of Commerce to collect information or statistics regarding the business of the country, regarding production of the country, or regarding statistics on any other subject which he may think is urgent?

Let me go just a little further and see whether or not this is the first time this authority has been exercised. I want to read again from one of my great friends of the past.

I find here a photostatic copy of a directive from the Secretary of Commerce to the Director of the Census, dated May 11, 1921. It is as follows:

In conformity with the authority contained in section 8 of the act of Congress approved February 14, 1903, I hereby authorize and instruct you to collect statistics concerning stocks, production, prices, and other data that will form a part of an efficient report on the business movement of the country. These statistics are now deemed necessary and urgent.

It is signed, "Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman understands that none of these statistics would be available for anybody who would use them for about 18 months from the day they are taken. Of what value could they possibly be under those circumstances, with conditions in the state of flux they are in now?

Mr. HARE. I stated at the outset that the issue involved here is whether or not the Bureau of the Census has the authority or the right under the law to collect these statistics. My friend admitted that, if there were specific authority of law, they would be included in this report and the report of the committee would have been adopted. I am not undertaking to discuss the value of these data. That question has not been raised, except by the inquiry of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. In fact, the real value of the statistics is virtually admitted by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is reading from Thirteenth United States Code, page 201, is he not?

Mr. HARE. No; I am reading from the act of February 14, 1903.

Mr. STEFAN. What code section is that?

Mr. HARE. Fifth United States Code, page 604. The statistics referred to in that act are the same kind of statistics we are trying to provide for in this bill, the same kind that were asked for by Secretary Hoover in 1921.

Then on March 19, 1927, Secretary Hoover said, addressing a communication to the Director of the Census, I quote:

In conformity with the authority contained in section 8 of the act of Congress approved February 14, 1903, I hereby authorize and instruct you to collect statistics and other information concerning business cycles that are essential to a proper understanding of the business movement of the country, which is referred to in my order of May 11, 1921.

What better authority do you want than the original act I quoted at the outset and the exercise of that authority by Secretary Hoover in 1921 and in 1927? But we do not stop there. We go just a little further and find that the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Lamont, on March 18, 1929, issued the following directive to the Bureau of the Census, and said:

In conformity with the authority contained in section 8 of the act of Congress approved February 14, 1903, I hereby authorize and instruct you to collect statistics concerning distribution, stocks, production, prices, and other data that will form a part of an efficient report on the business movement of the country.

Now, gentlemen, it seems to me that it is perfectly absurd to say that the authority was not specific.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Can the gentleman advise the House if the census were taken under this provision and business people failed to comply or reply, then the heads of those businesses could be penalized according to the law which we rejected this week.

Mr. HARE. I hope the gentleman will understand. I am not questioning what was done then. I am replying to the arguments made here in opposition to this item.

Mr. JUDD. I am asking for information on that one point.

Mr. HARE. I am replying to the arguments made here in opposition to this item as to whether there is authority in law. If my friend will bear with me I will give him the advantage of my considered judgment that no authority could be any more specific.

Mr. JUDD. I thought you had completed your argument on that. I was asking for information on this one point.

Mr. HARE. There is nothing in this bill about the penalties or anything of that nature whatsoever.

Mr. JUDD. Then no businessman would be fined or sent to jail if he failed to reply to the questionnaires?

Mr. HARE. Not under this bill; no.

Mr. JONES. Mr, Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman quoted the authority for this amendment in Fifth United States Code, page 604, which was passed February 16, 1903. If that was reliable authority, then it certainly would not have been necessary to have passed title 13 of section 201, which provides specifically for a census of distribution in 1930 and every 10 years thereafter. The Commerce Department in seeking legislation and asking for title 13, section 201, as a provision of basic law, must have thought that they did not have the authority to take a distribution census until they had this law passed on May 17, 1932.

Mr. HARE. I am speaking of the general authority of law to the Secretary of Commerce. If the Secretary of Commerce does not see fit in his judgment to collect statistics that Congress feels are necessary, then the Congress has the right by statute to authorize specifically that such information shall be gathered. In other words, and I am reading from the act of March 14, 1903:

The Secretary of Commerce shall also from time to time make such special investigations and reports as may be required of him by the President to do or by either House of Congress.

That gaves the specific authority referred to.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. If that is true, why then did the chief economist of the Bureau of the Census testify before the Senate committee as follows in answer to this question:

You have a bill pending in both Houses of Congress to change the basic statutes so as to give you authority to do that?

That is, authority to do what—to take this business and manufacturing census. And what was the answer that the chief economist gave? He said:

That is right.

In the Senate and among the members of your committee here there is great doubt as to whether or not there is authority in basic law to do the work for which you are asking that these amendments be approved.

Mr. HARE. I am not prepared to deny the statements made by my good friend, the gentleman from Nebraska, but I am emphasizing that there was not any doubt in the mind of Herbert Hoover in 1921 and there was no doubt in his mind in 1927 and there was no doubt in the mind of the Secretary of Commerce in 1930 that definite authority had been provided under the act of March 14, 1903—Fifth United States Code, page 604—and my contention is that since the authority has been exercised from time to time, there is sufficient authority to justify the action of this committee some few months ago and was affirmed by the action of the whole House when it formally approved this provision when it passed the House in early April of this year.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the preferential motion which I have offered to recede and concur, if adopted, will result in a $10,000,000 saving?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know what is in the bill. The gentleman does not state a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to save the membership a great deal of time. I have a preferential motion on the Speaker's desk to move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment on the item of business manufactures. I wonder if we could not consider both of these at the same time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will object to that.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 86, noes 62.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 150, nays 143, not voting 139, as follows:

[Roll No. 190]

YEAS—150

Adams	Fenton	Keefe
Allen, Ill.	Fuller	Kilburn
Andersen, H. Carl	Fulton	Knutson
Andresen, August H.	Gamble	LaFollette
Angell	Gavin	Landis
Arends	Gearhart	Lanham
Arnold	Gifford	LeFevre
Barrett, Wyo.	Gillette	Lemke
Beall	Gillie	Lewis
Bender	Goodwin	Luce
Bennett, Mo.	Graham	McConnell
Bishop	Grant, Ind.	McCowen
Blackney	Griffiths	McDonough
Bolton	Gross	McGregor
Brehm	Gwinn, N. Y.	McMillen, Ill.
Brumbaugh	Gwynne, Iowa	Martin, Iowa
Buck	Hale	Martin, Mass.
Buffett	Halleck	Mason
Byrnes, Wis.	Hancock	Mathews
Campbell	Hand	Michener
Canfield	Henry	Miller, Nebr.
Carlson	Herter	Mundt
Case, N. J.	Heselton	Murray, Wis.
Case, S. Dak.	Hess	Norblad
Chenoweth	Hill	O'Hara
Chiperfield	Hinshaw	O'Konski
Church	Hoeven	Phillips
Clason	Hoffman, Pa.	Pittenger
Clevenger	Holmes, Mass.	Ramey
Clippinger	Holmes, Wash.	Randolph
Cole, Kans.	Hope	Reed, Ill.
Cole, Mo.	Horan	Reed, N. Y.
Corbett	Howell	Rees, Kans.
Cunningham	Hull	Rich
Curtis	Jenkins	Rizley
D'Ewart	Jennings	Robsion, Ky.
Dirksen	Jensen	Rockwell
Dondero	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.
Eaton	Johnson, Ill.	Schwabe, Mo.
Ellis	Johnson, Ind.	Schwabe, Okla.
Ellsworth	Jones	Shafer
Elston	Jonkman	Short
	Judd	Simpson, Ill.
	Kean	Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Maine	Taber	Wigglesworth
Smith, Ohio	Talbot	Wilson
Smith, Wis.	Talle	Winter
Springer	Tibbott	Wolcott
Stefan	Vorys, Ohio	Wolverton, N. J.
Sumner, Ill.	Vursell	Woodruff
Sundstrom	Weichel	

NAYS—143

Abernethy	Geelan	Neely
Allen, La.	Gordon	O'Brien, Ill.
Almond	Gore	O'Brien, Mich.
Andrews, Ala.	Gorski	O'Neal
Bailey	Granahan	O'Toole
Bates, Ky.	Grant, Ala.	Outland
Beckworth	Green	Pace
Biemiller	Gregory	Patman
Bland	Hare	Peterson, Fla.
Bloom	Harless, Ariz.	Pfeifer
Brown, Ga.	Havenner	Philbin
Bryson	Hays	Pickett
Bunker	Healy	Poage
Cannon, Mo.	Hébert	Price, Fla.
Carnahan	Hendricks	Price, Ill.
Chapman	Hobbs	Priest
Chelf	Hoch	Rabaut
Clark	Hook	Rabin
Clements	Huber	Rains
Combs	Jarman	Resa
Cooley	Johnson, Luther A.	Richards
Cooper	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Riley
Courtney	Kee	Roe, Md.
Cravens	Kelley, Pa.	Rogers, Fla.
Crosser	Kelly, Ill.	Rowan
D'Alesandro	Kerr	Ryter
De Lacy	Kilday	Sabath
Delaney, John J.	King	Sadowski
Dingell	Kopplemann	Sasscer
Domengeaux	Lane	Savage
Douglas, Calif.	Larcade	Sheppard
Douglas, Ill.	Lesinski	Slaughter
Doyle	Link	Somers, N. Y.
Durham	Lyle	Spence
Earthman	McCormack	Sullivan
Elliott	McGlinchey	Tarver
Engle, Calif.	McMillan, S. C.	Thom
Fallon	Madden	Thomas, Tex.
Feighan	Maloney	Thomason
Fernandez	Manasco	Traynor
Flannagan	Mankin	Trimble
Flood	Marcantonio	Walter
Fogarty	May	White
Folger	Mills	Whitten
Forand	Monroney	Whittington
Gallagher	Murdock	Wood
Gary	Murray, Tenn.	Woodhouse
Gathings		Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—139

Anderson, Calif.	Ervin	Morgan
Andrews, N. Y.	Fellows	Morrison
Auchincloss	Fisher	Murphy
Baldwin, Md.	Gardner	Norrell
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gerlach	Norton
Barden	Gibson	Patrick
Barrett, Pa.	Gillespie	Patterson
Barry	Gossett	Peterson, Ga.
Bates, Mass.	Granger	Ploeser
Bell	Hagen	Plumley
Bennet, N. Y.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Powell
Bonner	Hall, Leonard W.	Pratt
Boren	Harness, Ind.	Quinn, N. Y.
Boykin	Harris	Rankin
Bradley, Mich.	Hart	Rayfiel
Bradley, Pa.	Hartley	Reece, Tenn.
Brooks	Hedrick	Rivers
Brown, Ohio	Heffernan	Robertson, N. Dak.
Buchanan	Hoffman, Mich.	Robertson, Va.
Buckley	Holifield	Robinson, Utah
Bulwinkle	Izac	Rodgers, Pa.
Butler	Jackson	Roe, N. Y.
Byrne, N. Y.	Johnson, Okla.	Rogers, N. Y.
Camp	Kearney	Rooney
Cannon, Fla.	Kefauver	Russell
Celler	Keogh	Scrivner
Cochran	Kinzer	Sharp
Coffee	Kirwan	Sheridan
Cole, N. Y.	Klein	Sikes
Colmer	Kunkel	Smith, Va.
Cox	Latham	Sparkman
Crawford	Lea	Starkey
Curley	LeCompte	Stevenson
Daughton, Va.	Ludlow	Stewart
Davis	Lynch	Stigler
Dawson	McGehee	Stockman
Delaney, James J.	McKenzie	Sumners, Tex.
Dolliver	Mahon	Taylor
Doughton, N. C.	Mansfield, Mont.	Thomas, N. J.
Drewry	Mansfield, Tex.	Tolan
Dworshak	Merrow	Torrens
Eberharter	Miller, Calif.	Towe
Elsaesser		Vinson
Engel, Mich.		Voorhis, Calif.
Wadsworth	Welch	Winstead
Wasielewski	West	Wolfenden, Pa.
Weaver	Wickersham	Worley

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Gillespie for, with Mr. Patterson against.

Mr. Kunkel for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Rooney against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Elsaesser for, with Mr. Drewry against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Lynch against.

Mr. Dworshak for, with Mr. Rayfiel against.

Mr. Hoffman of Michigan for, with Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Fellows for, with Mr. Winstead against.

Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Mr. Harness of Indiana for, with Mr. Harris against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Sheridan against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Hedrick against.

Mr. Scrivner for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Mr. Plumley for, with Mr. Kefauver against.

Mr. Kinzer for, with Mr. Coffee against.

Mr. Engel of Michigan for, with Mr. Byrne of New York against.

Mr. Merrow for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Rankin with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Camp with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Doughton of North Carolina with Mr. Bennet of New York.

Mr. Norrell with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Ervin with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Davis with Mr. Towe.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Stockman.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40, page 55, strike out all of lines 14 to 20.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEFAN moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 40.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I will not detain the House long on this motion for the reason this amendment is similar to the one you voted on just a little while ago with the exception that this is for the census for manufactures and an appropriation of $5,000,000 is sought. The Senate struck this out and it is being brought to you here on the motion of the chairman of the subcommittee to insist on the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendment, thus keeping this in

the bill. The committee was not unanimous on it. The committee divided 3 and 2. The Senate insisted on leaving it out on the ground there is no basic law for this particular census. I personally feel we should save expenses now. Only a few days ago the House voted definitely against continuing certain censuses and I feel that in view of the fact time is so precious today and that a vote has already been taken on a similar measure, I ask that you vote for my amendment to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. This work can be done later if it is needed and at a time when there is more labor available.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, the question for consideration now is similar to the one that we have just acted upon. The House included in the bill provisions for a business census and also a provision for a census of manufactures.

The facts are that these census surveys were made regularly every 2 years until 1939. We have not had a census either of business or manufactures since that date because of the war. We are therefore without statistics at the present time for our reconversion and other essential postwar programs in which the people of the United States and the Government are interested.

Moreover, both the business and manufacturing censuses will be of tremendous help to small business, and particularly to veterans who are coming out of the Army and are considering entering the manufacturing business.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. This has nothing to do with business We just voted that down.

Mr. GARY. I said it was similar. Manufacturing is a very substantial part of business. It has been my privilege on numerous occasions to use statistics that have been compiled in the census reports. They have been invaluable in numerous research projects. The House included the provision in the bill. The Senate struck it out. We are simply asking that it be retained.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

This census will perhaps receive the same consideration across the aisle that the census of business received a moment ago. This comes in spite of letters from chambers of commerce all over the United States that have practically flooded the Membership of Congress. It comes as a direct rebuff to the business houses that have written us telling the necessity for this census. It comes from the small business people all over the Nation.

I am not going to detain the House and hold them for another roll call, but I am going to ask for a standing vote in order that we may have a count on this census that is now before us and place the blame for its failure where it belongs.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RABAUT) there were—ayes 79, noes 84.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. STEFAN and Mr. RABAUT.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 111, noes 97.

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 46: On page 59, line 3, insert the following:

"Maintenance ond operation of air-navigation facilities (Executive Order 9709): For all necessary expenses of maintenance and operation of air-navigation facilities, by contract or otherwise, in foreign countries and in territories and possessions of the United States, in accordance with Executive Order 9709, dated March 29, 1946, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $2,874,000, of which not to exceed $200,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "General administration, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics", for necessary expenses in connection with the general administration of the program."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum "$2,874,000" named in said amendment, insert the following "$2,500,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 50: On page 61, strike out all lines 13 to 17 inclusive and insert the following: "That no funds in this paragraph shall be expended for the pay of any employee of the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the maintenance of more than one major-parts warehouse, or for the repair or overhaul of aircraft when such repair or overhaul cannot be performed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration through exchange or substitution of parts or materials maintained by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the cost of parts and materials not maintained in stock would be in excess of $100: *Provided further*, That all repair and overhaul of aircraft of the Civil Aeronautics Administration which cannot be performed within the foregoing limitation shall be done on contract after submission of bids."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "That no funds in this paragraph shall be expended for the pay of any employee of the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the maintenance of more than one major parts warehouse, or for the repair or overhaul of aircraft when such repair or overhaul cannot be performed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration through exchange or substitution of parts or materials maintained by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the cost of labor, parts and materials not maintained in stock would be in excess of $200: *Provided further*, That all repair and overhaul of aircraft of the Civil Aeronautics Adminstration which cannot be performed within the foregoing limitation shall be done on contract after submission of bids."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 56: Page 68, line 14, insert:

"The Navy Department is authorized to transfer without charge to the Coast and Geodetic Survey two AGP seaplane tenders, two PCS submarine chasers, and three SC submarine chasers from the reserve or surplus to the needs of the Navy Department, each of the seven vessels equipped with the necessary launches and ship's outfit."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 57: Page 69, line 17, after the matter stricken out, insert "(not to exceed $5,757,000, $1,557,000 of which is to be exclusively for the Office of Small Business at the seat of government)."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 57 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "(not to exceed $4,500,000, $500,000 of which is to be used at the seat of government for aids and services to small business)."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 58: Page 69, line 22, after the word "law" insert "including the purchase of commercial and trade reports; employment of aliens; temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the civil-service and classification laws (not exceeding $50,000)."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 65: Page 72, line 2, after the word "patents" insert "and 10 cents per copy for design patents and certificates of trade-mark registration."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 73: Page 79, line 17, after the word "soundings" insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That in the conduct of meteorological investigations in the Arctic region, pursuant to Public Law 296, approved February 12, 1946, the funds herein appropriated shall be available for the appointment of employees at rates to be fixed by the Chief of the Weather Bureau without regard to the civil-service laws and classification Act, but the maximum base rate of pay shall not be in excess of $7,500 per annum and at no time more than three employees shall be in a pay status at such rate of pay, and no other employees shall receive in excess of the base rate of pay of $5,000 per annum; the furnishing of food, shelter, and protective clothing and equipment, without repayment therefor, to employees of the Government assigned to Arctic stations; and the War and Navy Department are authorized in the fiscal year 1947, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to transfer without charge to the Weather Bureau materials, equipment, and supplies, surplus to the needs of the War and Navy Departments and necessary for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of Arctic weather stations: *Provided further*, That the unexpended balance of the amount appropriated for Arctic weather stations under authority of said act for the fiscal year 1946 is hereby merged with this appropriation and continued available for the purposes thereof until June 30, 1947."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 74: Page 80, line 18, insert:

"Maintenance and operation of meteorological facilities (Executive Order 9709): For all necessary expenses of maintenance and operation of meteorological facilities, by contract or otherwise, in foreign countries and in Territories and possessions of the United States, in accordance with Executive Order 9709, dated March 29, 1946, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $2,000,000, of which not to exceed $40,000 may be expended for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and concur in the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$2,000,000" named in said amendment insert "$1,750,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 81: Page 95, line 24, strike out lines 24 and 25, and on page 96 strike out lines 1 to 17 inclusive and insert:

"SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5990) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, for the consideration of Senate amendment No. 1.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 2, line 1, strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 1.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARY) there were—ayes 98, noes 6.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 195, nays 100, not voting 137, as follows:

[Roll No. 191]

YEAS—195

Abernethy	Folger	Mills
Allen, Ill.	Fuller	Mundt
Allen, La.	Gallagher	Murray, Tenn.
Almond	Gamble	Murray, Wis.
Andersen, H. Carl	Gathings	Norblad
Andresen, August H.	Gavin	O'Brien, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.	Gearhart	O'Konski
Arends	Gifford	O'Neal
Arnold	Gillette	O'Toole
Barrett, Wyo.	Gillie	Pace
Barry	Goodwin	Patman
Bates, Ky.	Gossett	Peterson, Fla.
Beckworth	Graham	Pfeifer
Bell	Grant, Ind.	Philbin
Bennett, Mo.	Gregory	Phillips
Bishop	Griffiths	Pickett
Blackney	Gross	Plumley
Bland	Gwynne, Iowa	Poage
Brehm	Halleck	Price, Fla.
Brown, Ohio	Hand	Rabaut
Brumbaugh	Hare	Ramey
Bryson	Hendricks	Reed, Ill.
Buck	Henry	Reed, N. Y.
Buffett	Hess	Rees, Kans.
Butler	Hill	Resa
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoch	Rich
Campbell	Hoeven	Rizley
Cannon, Mo.	Hoffman, Pa.	Robsion, Ky.
Carlson	Hope	Rockwell
Chapman	Howell	Roe, Md.
Chelf	Hull	Russell
Chenoweth	Jenkins	Ryter
Chiperfield	Jennings	Schwabe, Mo.
Church	Johnson, Calif.	Schwabe, Okla.
Clark	Johnson, Ill.	Scrivner
Clason	Johnson, Ind.	Shafer
Clements	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Short
Clevenger	Jones	Simpson, Pa.
Clippinger	Jonkman	Smith, Ohio
Cole, Kans.	Kean	Smith, Wis.
Cole, Mo.	Kee	Somers, N. Y.
Cooley	Keefe	Spence
Cooper	Kerr	Springer
Courtney	Kilburn	Sumner, Ill.
Cravens	Knutson	Sundstrom
Crosser	Landis	Taber
Cunningham	Lane	Talbot
Curtis	Lanham	Talle
Davis	Lea	Thom
D'Ewart	Lewis	Thomas, Tex.
Dingell	Luce	Thomason
Domengeaux	Lyle	Tibbott
Dondero	McConnell	Vorys, Ohio
Durham	McCowen	Vursell
Earthman	McDonough	Walter
Eaton	McGregor	Weichel
Elliott	McMillen, Ill.	White
Ellis	Maloney	Whittington
Ellsworth	Mankin	Wigglesworth
Elston	Martin, Iowa	Wilson
Fallon	Martin, Mass.	Winter
Feighan	Mathews	Wolcott
Fenton	May	Wolverton, N. J.
Flannagan	Michener	Wood
	Miller, Nebr.	Woodruff
		Zimmerman

NAYS—100

Angell	Gordon	Larcade
Bailey	Gorski	LeFevre
Beall	Granahan	Lemke
Biemiller	Green	Lesinski
Bloom	Hagen	Link
Bolton	Hale	McCormack
Brown, Ga.	Hancock	McGlinchey
Bunker	Harless, Ariz.	McMillan, S. C.
Canfield	Havenner	Madden
Carnahan	Hays	Manasco
Case, N. J.	Healy	Marcantonio
Case, S. Dak.	Hébert	Monroney
Combs	Herter	Murdock
Corbett	Heselton	Neely
D'Alesandro	Hinshaw	O'Brien, Mich.
De Lacy	Hobbs	O'Hara
Delaney, John J.	Holmes, Mass.	Outland
Dirksen	Holmes, Wash.	Pittenger
Douglas, Calif.	Horan	Price, Ill.
Douglas, Ill.	Huber	Priest
Doyle	Jarman	Rabin
Engle, Calif.	Johnson, Luther A.	Rains
Fernandez	Judd	Randolph
Flood	Kelley, Pa.	Richards
Fogarty	Kelly, Ill.	Riley
Forand	King	Rogers, Fla.
Fulton	Kirwan	Rogers, Mass.
Gary	Kopplemann	Rowan
Geelan	LaFollette	Sadowski
		Sasscer

Savage	Starkey	Trimble
Simpson, Ill.	Stefan	Wasielewski
Slaughter	Sullivan	Weaver
Smith, Maine	Traynor	Woodhouse

NOT VOTING—137

Adams	Gillespie	Patterson
Anderson, Calif.	Gore	Peterson, Ga.
Andrews, N. Y.	Granger	Ploeser
Auchincloss	Grant, Ala.	Powell
Baldwin, Md.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Pratt
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Quinn, N. Y.
Barden	Hall, Leonard W.	Rankin
Barrett, Pa.	Harness, Ind.	Rayfiel
Bates, Mass.	Harris	Reece, Tenn.
Bender	Hart	Rivers
Bennet, N. Y.	Hartley	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bonner	Hedrick	Robertson, Va.
Boren	Heffernan	Robinson, Utah
Boykin	Hoffman, Mich.	Rodgers, Pa.
Bradley, Mich.	Holifield	Roe, N. Y.
Bradley, Pa.	Hook	Rogers, N. Y.
Brooks	Izac	Rooney
Buchanan	Jackson	Sabath
Buckley	Jensen	Sharp
Bulwinkle	Johnson, Okla.	Sheppard
Byrne, N. Y.	Kearney	Sheridan
Camp	Kefauver	Sikes
Cannon, Fla.	Keogh	Smith, Va.
Celler	Kilday	Sparkman
Cochran	Kinzer	Stevenson
Coffee	Klein	Stewart
Cole, N. Y.	Kunkel	Stigler
Colmer	Latham	Stockman
Cox	LeCompte	Sumners, Tex.
Crawford	Ludlow	Tarver
Curley	Lynch	Taylor
Daughton, Va.	McGehee	Thomas, N. J.
Dawson	McKenzie	Tolan
Delaney, James J.	Mahon	Torrens
Dolliver	Mansfield, Mont.	Towe
Doughton, N. C.	Mansfield, Tex.	Vinson
Drewry	Mason	Voorhis, Calif.
Dworshak	Merrow	Wadsworth
Eberharter	Miller, Calif.	Welch
Elsaesser	Morgan	West
Engel, Mich.	Morrison	Whitten
Ervin	Murphy	Wickersham
Fellows	Norrell	Winstead
Fisher	Norton	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gardner	Patrick	Worley
Gerlach		
Gibson		

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Robertson of Virginia with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Havenner with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Rankin with Mr. Kunkel.
Mr. Whittington with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Voorhis of California with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Tarver with Mr. Sharp.
Mr. Hook with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Kilday with Mr. Ploeser.
Mr. McKenzie with Mr. Latham.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Elsaesser.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Dolliver.
Miss Pratt with Mr. Gillespie.
Mr. Doughton of North Carolina with Mr. Auchincloss.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO and Mr. CARNAHAN changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. SHAFER, and Mr. ELSTON changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House agree to the further conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COFFEE, GARY, FLOOD, O'NEAL, STEFAN, HORAN, and CANFIELD.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT AND STABILIZATION ACT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 689, Rept. No. 2444), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other rule of the House immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 371) extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and all points of order against said joint resolution are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK AND HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask recognition in order to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for tonight and next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. So far as the rest of the afternoon is concerned, I do not know that I can give much information to the House. I do not know of any conference reports. Would the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] inform the House as to the situation?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have no further conference reports and there will be no more conference reports ready tonight. We will have conference reports ready on Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. That being the case, that gives the House very essential and valuable information.

Mr. TABER. Would it not be proper at this time perhaps to have arrangements made so that conference reports on Monday might be taken up on Monday even though they were not filed until then? Perhaps we ought to cover that tonight.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is an excellent suggestion.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the suggestion made by the gentleman from New York, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider conference reports on Monday which are reported on that day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. With reference to the program for next week, of course, on Monday the joint memorial exercises will be held for our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will any legislative business be taken up after the holding of the memorial exercises?

Mr. McCORMACK. Then the OPA extension bill on which a rule has just been reported will come up. Then, of course, conference reports will be considered. In other words, we will have a legislative day on Monday after the exercises are over.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. How long will the memorial exercises last?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to state exactly, but probably an hour and a half.

On Tuesday there is the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar to be taken up. The bill H. R. 6811 will be taken up under suspension. There is the railroad retirement bill, which I have kept on the calendar for the next legislative order of business. That will be continued Tuesday and Wednesday until disposed of. Of course, conference reports will take preference.

Calendar Wednesday has been dispensed with. If on Wednesday the railroad retirement bill is completed and other legislation is out of the way, and if we can consider another bill, I have put down the Reed bill, H. R. 5924.

On Thursday there is no business.

On Friday and Saturday we will have general debate on the British loan.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I wonder if the leaders would consent to an agreement. The Committee on Military Affairs has been considering the atomic-bomb legislation and has been handicapped very much during the past week or 10 days due to difficulties in the committee, plus the fact that the House has been meeting at 10 o'clock on several days, which is the hour that the committee meets. Yesterday the committee found itself without a quorum and was unable to proceed, and the committee therefore recessed until 10 o'clock Tuesday.

Now, if it is not too much of an upset of the leader's program, I wish we could agree to set aside the previous agreement and let the House meet at 11 o'clock at that time so that we may have 1 hour for the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is a proper request.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the previous order entered that when the House adjourns on Monday next it adjourn to meet on Tuesday at 10 o'clock be vacated, and in substitution thereof I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday next it adjourn to meet on Tuesday at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand that on Tuesday a bill reported from the World War Veterans Committee will be taken up for consideration, the bill that provides for not cutting the single men while hospitalized, and also a 20 percent flat increase in all compensation.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is H. R. 6811, I believe. That is the bill I had in mind. If that is not the correct number, the bill I have in mind is the one to take care of veterans in the hospitals.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. To not cut the single men in the hospital. It was a very cruel provision that cut them in the beginning.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the bill I had in mind.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There will be 16 hours' general debate on the British loan bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That means it will go into the following week?

Mr. McCORMACK. In all probability, yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. At what time do we convene on Wednesday morning?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is all according to the status of the railroad retirement bill at that time. If it appears we should come in at 11 o'clock, I will confer with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. As it now stands, it will be 12 o'clock. In any event, it would not be before 11 o'clock.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if the distinguished majority leader will look at that paper and see if he can see any sign of hope for bringing up the water pollution control bill in which a great many of us are interested.

Mr. McCORMACK. To be frank, this particular piece of paper is vacant on that bill. However, I want to say the House has done a remarkable job. This House has done a month's work this week. I want to express my gratitude. The gentleman realizes the situation I am in regarding next week. If the gentleman will confer with me the latter part of next week, I will do everything I can. If we can see things ahead I know there will be cooperation, where we can meet at 10 o'clock and call up legislation, with a view to as early an adjournment for the summer as possible.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] has expired.

COAST GUARD APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6428, an act making appropriations for the Coast Guard, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. D'ALESANDRO, Mr. KOPPLEMANN, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. TABER, Mr. KEEFE, and Mr. CANFIELD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. James A. Farley.

Mr. PRICE of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

SPEAKER AUTHORIZED TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House the Speaker be authorized and empowered to sign any enrolled bills found duly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "The Fence That Made Cattle History."

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. HEALY) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by the president of the Association of World War Pilots II, and also an editorial from the Compton Herald.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include several newspaper editorials.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAY NURSERY SCHOOLS

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5933) to authorize and direct the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to establish and operate in the public schools and other suitable locations a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McMILLAN of South Carolina, HEALY, and BEALL.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] is recognized for 30 minutes.

PROGRESS IN THE CALIFORNIA PHYSICIANS' SERVICE

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, more than 2 years ago, on March 20, 1944, to be exact, it was my privilege to discuss on this floor the background, development, and achievements of the California Physicians' Service. I pointed out at that time that this whole subject of group medical care and health insurance seemed fated to always be discussed with a maximum of heat and a minimum of light. I mentioned that it was my firm conviction that the leaders in the medical profession of this country should be taking an active lead in the planning for more adequate health facilities for our people.

This afternoon I want to discuss some of the progress that has been made in the work of the California Physicians' Service, as well as mention other developments in different parts of the country. I emphasize today, as I emphasized 2 years ago that my remarks have no connection whatsoever with any legislation that has been proposed either in this House or in the Senate; I am not here to comment upon the merits or the demerits of the many suggested health bills with which all of us are somewhat familiar. My remarks are to be directed solely to what I personally believe to be a genuine contribution to health planning in America, and especially to the outstanding achievements of the doctors of my own State of California.

Two years ago in my discussion of California Physicians' Service I pointed out that the doctors of medicine in California had banded together voluntarily to offer to the people of the State the opportunity of budgeting their medical, surgical, and hospital costs. While the entire operation of California Physicians' Service is not actually an insurance business there are some of the same elements about it that we generally look for in insurance. Principal among these is the element of a pooled fund. The subscribers to the service—the patients—put in their monthly contributions and the doctors render the service and agree to take as their payment only that amount which is actually earned. The doctors are the underwriters of the fund; if there is not enough money to pay them what their services would normally command, they take what is available and accept that as full payment for their services.

This type of underwriting is designed for only one purpose and I believe we should pay tribute to that one underlying motive. It is a motive of public service, regardless of the financial return to the doctors.

While we must admire the unselfishness of these doctors in their willingness to provide professional service and think about financial return later, we must also

look at the practical side of what this attitude means.

In the case of California Physicians' Service it means that we have in one group a large number of doctors—more than 7,000 in this one State—who have established a system of service which is available for public as well as private bodies. This group has already entered into two contracts with departments of the Federal Government—the Federal Public Housing Authority and the Farm Security Administration. These contracts have meant a cooperative working agreement between Government on the one hand and private professional men on the other. While I would not venture to say that these contracts have been 100 percent satisfactory in all respects, I am thoroughly satisfied that the net result of these agreements has been the provision of high quality medical care which otherwise would not have been available. Both Procurement and Assignment Service and the Federal Public Housing Authority have gone on record as commending California Physicians' Service for providing a needed medical service in the housing projects in California during the emergency.

The point is that where you have a cooperative group of doctors banded together in their own organization you can deal collectively with this group for the provision of needed medical services which otherwise might not be furnished. And it is a big step in the right direction.

The finest example of such dealing that has come to my attention for many months is the contract recently executed between California Physicians' Service and the Veterans' Administration for the provision of medical care for service-connected disabilities. The new Administration of the Veterans' Administration found itself confronted with a tremendous accumulation of service-connected disabilities which could not possibly be handled in the hospitals and facilities now operated by the Administration. Greatly to the credit of General Bradley and his chief medical officer, General Hawley, the Veterans' Administration acted without delay to see to it that the veterans received their out-patient care. Contracts were signed with California Physicians' Service and Michigan Medical Service, and other State-wide groups of doctors organized on a similar basis. Under these contracts the doctors in the organized group provide the medical services authorized by the Veterans' Administration and the Administration takes care of the payment for such services.

The net result of this agreement is that the veterans are receiving the care to which they are entitled—and they are receiving it at home from their own family doctors. They need not be institutionalized. They need not travel to veterans' facilities which may be inconveniently located both for the veterans and their families. They need not undergo any great measure of restrictive paper work. They merely go to their own doctors on proper authorization and receive the care they need and to which they are entitled.

This phase of the program is new. It has been in existence for only a few short months, but it has already proved itself capable of meeting this pressing problem and of assuring our returning veterans that their medical problems will be promptly, adequately, and efficiently handled.

When the program was first put into effect, Gen. Omar Bradley paid tribute to the doctors of California for their part in making this care available to the veterans. He said, and I quote:

> I want to congratulate the physicians of California on the excellent manner in which the medical profession of California is cooperating in rendering care to the veterans.

After the program had been in effect for a short while, Gen. Paul R. Hawley, chief medical officer of the Veterans' Administration, paid a further tribute to the doctors and to the entire program. He said, and again I am quoting:

> I heartily approve of the care that is being rendered to California veterans by the medical profession in that State. I believe that California Physicians' Service, as an agency of the California medical profession, has made possible in a very short time immediate and efficient medical care to the veterans of California.

From the veterans themselves we have had similar expressions of approval. I will quote only one at this time, but similar statements have been made elsewhere and they all add to the growing volume of evidence of the effectiveness and practicality of furnishing medical service to the veterans on this hometown basis. The man I am now quoting is Dr. Burthel Henning, of San Francisco, a private practitioner, who serves as chairman of the medical advisory board of the California State Department of the American Legion. Dr. Henning says, and again I am quoting:

> The agreement between California Physicians' Service and the Veterans' Administration is a forward step in prompt care of veterans with service-connected disabilities. The Veterans' Administration cannot maintain doctors and hospitals in every community in the State, but this agreement makes it possible to extend medical and hospital service to these veterans in their own towns. The advantages to the veteran and to his whole community are obvious.

Without elaborating further, I believe we have here ample evidence that this form of cooperative action by the doctors of California has gone a long way toward meeting a serious problem for the returning veterans to whom we all owe so much. I will add only one more thought before going on to another subject. The doctors of California have met the challenge of medical service to the returning veterans in splendid fashion. More than 1,000 doctors have joined California Physicians' Service in the past 6 months, many of them being veterans themselves. All of them have agreed to take care of the veterans under this new program. To me, this is a wonderful example of forward-looking planning in the health field.

Now, on another front—the farm front—we find this same cooperation acting for the health interests of our citizens. We have often heard it said that our rural residents are so far removed from the metropolitan centers that they cannot secure adequate medical care. We have heard our farm neighbors referred to as the forgotten men in an economy which centers around our large cities. True, our farmers are removed from some of the facilities of the cities but in the matter of medical care I am proud to state that California Physicians' Service has again shown itself interested in and willing to provide adequate medical, surgical, and hospital care for the farmers.

Within the past 6 months there has been signed a contract between California Physicians' Service and the State Grange of California for the provision of this care. The contract is a practical document, based on a progressive 3-year program, to start with medical services on a moderate supply basis and to increase the scope of the coverage as time goes on, as experience is gained, and as the farmer members become accustomed to the high quality of medical service they will receive under this plan.

Our farmers have long since gathered together in producer cooperatives. Now they are contracting with another producer cooperative—this one operated by the doctors, for the benefit of the grange members. This is the first exampe to my knowledge of such a contractual arrangement. Time alone will tell the story of its success but I am sure that where two cooperative groups such as the farmer and the doctors agree on the basic principles of service, the program must push ahead. I can see no failure in a plan of this kind; only success for all concerned.

Indicative of the reception of this program by the grange, let me quote you from the message of Mr. George Sehlmeyer, master of the California State Grange, to his members. Mr. Sehlmeyer said, and I quote:

> We urge that you and your grange give this plan immediate consideration * * * it should not only result in building our membership but at the same time will bring medical care and hospital service to our members at reasonable cost.

At a grange meeting in one California county, Mr. Sehlmeyer expanded on his previous statements and pointed out how the freedom of action of the indivi-ual members would be preserved under this cooperative movement:

> The hospital and health care plan worked out between the State grange and California Physicians' Service would be * * * a purely voluntary group contract. Our grange members would be free to subscribe to * * * the system or not. There would be no involuntary assessment of the entire membership.
>
> In the second place, this plan does not limit its beneficiaries in their selection of physicians or hospitals but gives them free choice of more than 7,000 physcians and surgeons in every part of the State and of any licensed hospital in the State.

Recently Mr. Sehlmeyer stated that—and I quote:

> This is the first time in California, or any other State I know of, that a cooperative arrangement has been made providing for a prepaid medical service to farm families over the area of an entire State. We have high hopes for its success.

In publishing that statement, the editor of the Grange News added his own editorial comment, stating that—

The eyes of the Nation are on California again. That the California State Grange is again about to set the pace for others to follow is shown by requests received by the Grange News from the National Grange Monthly and other Grange publications in the East and Midwest, asking for news releases on the progress the prepaid medical plan is making here.

These statements are sufficient to show the interest in this program by the farmers of California who are affiliated with the State grange. There are about 30,000 of them, and together with their families they make up a group of about 75,000 people. Their medical care and hospital service contract with California Physicians' Service indicates once again how the problems of furnishing prepaid medical and hospital care can be met on a group basis and on a voluntary basis. If this plan is successful, and I believe firmly that it will be, I anticipate that it will spread to many other States.

I could go on at great length with similar examples of the progress of California Physicians' Service. For instance, one of the large oil companies of California which has long maintained its own medical care program for its employees, has recently arranged with California Physicians' Service to provide medical and hospital care for the families of these employees. Here again we see a group movement made possible by an organization of professional men on one side anxious to provide the best in medical care for the people and willing and able to deal intelligently with an employer who is likewise anxious to provide for the health care needs of his employees and their families.

I need not go any further on this line. There are many examples that could be given but I think the ones mentioned are sufficient to indicate the pioneering spirit of the doctors of California.

These are some of the new developments in prepaid medical care in California. It is worthwhile also to look at the progress of the regular program, the prepayment program that has been operating since 1939. In my address to this House 2 years ago I dwelt particularly on this regular program and I would like now to bring that information up to date. In the past 2 years California Physicians' Service has doubled its membership. Today it is serving more than 228,000 beneficiary members. This number is still too small for a State the size of California but this rate of growth, which has come about despite the heavy labor turnover during the reconversion period, indicates that this prepayment medical care service is really geared up to go places today.

The initial period of groping and feeling the way has passed. The trial and error experiments of the early days are over. Today California Physicians' Service has a workable program, beneficial to the public and acceptable to the physician, a program which is daily demonstrating its value in terms of increased enrollment.

Before closing I want to point out that California is not the only State where progress of this type has been made. We know that there are similar medical cooperatives in 29 States today. Some of them are still in their infancy but all of them are dedicated to public service and all of them command our respect and admiration. California is by no means the largest of these. The largest is doubtless the Michigan Medical Service, which has long served the people of Michigan and which today has enrolled in its service about one person out of each six in that State. In Massachusetts we have the Massachusetts Medical Service, a thriving and lusty infant which has captured the public mind and is spreading rapidly in that State. We have other plans in New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio—the list is too long to read here. In some of the more sparsely settled States we also have prepayment medical care plans. One was recently started in Montana, another in New Mexico.

Today there are more than 3,600,000 people enrolled in the voluntary sickness-insurance plans. This is just about double the number enrolled a year ago and the rate of growth of these plans is now assuming large proportions. In fact, these medical cooperatives have grown more in their early years than the Blue Cross plans, with which we are all familiar, grew in a comparable period at their inception.

I should point out that it is a tribute to the doctors of several of the larger States that they have given freely of their time, their money, and their experience to help out their smaller neighbors. This is true with California Physicians' Service and it is likewise true with Michigan Medical Service, Massachusetts Medical Service, and others. The movement toward cooperation exists not only within State borders but crosses over State lines to effect a national cooperative movement which is snowballing right now and from which we will hear much more in the future.

A few months ago I read with interest of the national medical-care program sponsored by the American Medical Association and its constituent State medical associations. It proposes that the 48 State medical associations take the lead in establishing their own State-wide programs of prepaid medical care insurance, and then, through the central office facilities of the American Medical Association, put into effect a reciprocal agreement between the State plans for the benefit of the members, the public. This plan allows each State to develop its own program on the basis of the actual needs and requirements in that State. When this is done, there is provision for the interchanging of membership benefits between the States, so that the member from California who is injured in New Jersey will receive the same medical and hospital care there that he would receive if he were at home.

This movement is still new but I believe it indicates a real desire on the part of the medical profession to serve the public. As an example of this desire, may I quote briefly from an address given in Los Angeles on May 7 of this year by Dr. Philip K. Gilman, president of the California Medical Association? Doctor Gilman said, and I quote:

Today medicine realizes that the public is the master of us all and that what is good for the public is good for medicine.

That statement points the way toward improved medical-care plans for the benefit of the public. Further, it shows an attitude on the part of the medical profession which of necessity must lead to an even greater public service by doctors of medicine than we have witnessed in the past. It is unfortunate that a few medical men have sometimes given a different impression to the American people.

It is under a policy such as Doctor Gilman has outlined that the State medical associations, acting through the American Medical Association, have set up their Nation-wide pattern of prepayment medical service.

This service has two primary functions. One is to aid and assist in the establishment of prepayment medical-care plans in all those areas where such plans do not already exist. The other is to serve as a clearinghouse between the various State or regional programs. Under this project a member of a State prepayment plan in California would be honored as a member of the Michigan plan if he happened to be in Michigan and to require medical, surgical, or hospital service there and then. This type of reciprocal agreement will be spread from State to State, from region to region, resulting eventually in what will actually be a Nation-wide service operated on State or regional lines for the benefit of the people in that State or region.

We cannot hope to achieve immediately uniformity between widely separated States in the matter of the health-care needs of their people. But we can achieve a working arrangement such as associated medical-care plans, is developing, so that our people may move around as freely as they desire and may count upon receiving the same benefits away from home that they would expect in their own front yards.

I salute this Nation-wide movement of the American Medical Association and its constituent State medical associations and I salute particularly the part the physicians of my own State of California have had in helping to develop this movement. It is through organizations such as this that the benefits of modern medical science can and will be applied to all of our people. It is through organizations such as this that our people will become educated to the availability of high-grade medical service on a budget basis. And, finally, it is through organizations such as California Physicians' Service and its fellow State-wide plans, together with their own national organization, that the best in medical science will be brought to all of our people under a cooperative, voluntary plan.

I have always contended that the medical profession has a responsibility, a serious responsibility in leading the way toward an America where health care is available to all citizens. Without criticizing any other suggestions, without even commenting on other plans, I do believe that such work as is

now being done by the California Physicians' Service is a bright beacon. The progress already made is a most hopeful sign of what we can expect in the future. I am proud to call to the attention of Congress and the American people this excellent work that is going on in California under the leadership of the medical men and women in my State.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the method used in entering into those contracts with the United States Housing Authority? How is it done? Is it a voluntary proposition?

Mr. OUTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What part, then, does the Government play in that contract?

Mr. OUTLAND. The Government plays no part at all.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It is with the people living in these houses?

Mr. OUTLAND. Oh, I misunderstood the gentleman. The Government plays no part as far as doctors are concerned. It is the California Physicians' Service which enters into that type of contract. The Government plays an indirect part inasmuch as it assists with its own agency.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I did not understand that.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I want to commend the gentleman from California for bringing this to the attention of the House. I believe the answer to the admitted inequity in the distribution of medical care is to be found along the lines of the experiments in the gentleman's State, and the experiments in Michigan and in my own State as well as several others. By your experiment in California and our experimenting in Minnesota and others in Michigan with voluntary systems, we can develop experimental data on which we can work out a sound actuarial program of medical care which I believe will give a better way of solving the difficulties that we all know we face than any other system I have seen. I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank the gentleman very much. In view of the gentleman's wide experience in the medical field I should like to make an additional comment. Does not the gentleman from Minnesota feel that the experience which is being gained through what may be termed "the trial-and-error method" in California, in Michigan, in the gentleman's own State, and in other places there is being laid the basis for what will eventually be an increased health service for the American people on a sound basis, cooperatively worked out between groups and individuals on the one hand and the medical profession on the other?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; because the practice of medicine is so personal and intimate that if there is not the wholehearted cooperation of the doctor—I do not care what the system looks like on paper—it will not work. If the doctors, the community, and the Government organization work together in formulating the plans and it is mutually agreeable, it has a good chance of being successful.

Mr. OUTLAND. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. In my experience the system will work if a doctor is working for the patient. If the doctor is working for the Government, then it does not work. For some reason or other there is not the incentive, there is not the intimate personal relationship when a doctor is working for the state and gets paid by the state as is the case when the doctor is working for the patient even though he is paid through the patient from this mutual-insurance fund.

Mr. OUTLAND. While the experience we have been getting in California and elsewhere is probably not the complete answer, at the same time it is furnishing data and background on which future plans can be made to increase the medical service to the American people.

Mr. JUDD. That, I think, is the single greatest value of it. Some people look at the admitted inadequacy of medical care to some group under our system and they say, "Scrap it." I do not think that is the answer. If a system has good points, hang onto them, and modify them and correct them, in order to work out a system to provide adequate medical care.

Mr. OUTLAND. I will say this to the gentleman that it has always been my contention that in the long run the providing of adequate care for the American people will have to be worked out not by forcing some type of plan on our doctors, but through asking their cooperation in meeting that problem. In California, it seems to me, our physicians have worked out what at the present time is probably the best plan in the United States. It has not gone far enough. It does not cover enough people. There are many inequities to be corrected, but it is a big step in the right direction.

Mr. JUDD. If the gentleman will yield further, I want to make this observation. What I have felt we ought to do in this whole problem is do the thing that a scientist or a physician does when he makes a new discovery. He has a remedy that he is convinced is good and it will cure this or the other disease, but he does not try it out on himself. He first tries it out on the guinea pigs and the rabbits and the monkeys, and then he gets some volunteers before he tries it out on himself. I do not know whether this system will work. So we should try it out in some county or some municipality rather than in one fell swoop try it out on the country as a whole.

Mr. OUTLAND. I agree with the gentleman, but I trust that he does not place the citizens of California in the category of guinea pigs.

Mr. JUDD. But if it was not done from the outside and superimposed on them in that manner it would ultimately lead to the correct solution.

Mr. OUTLAND. I want to say one thing further. When I was in California I was a member of the Health Service which was rendered by the California Physicians Service, and to me it was an excellent way by which I could budget monthly to take care of the health needs of myself and my family, including an emergency, such as hospitalization. There were additional provisions in the California Physicians' Service for it, and I am sure the gentleman knows that this movement has already spread to a great many other States outside of California. I think there are about 20 now that have various plans.

Mr. JUDD. To me this is one of the genuises of this form of government. It should not be imposed from the top. In all of the 48 States you can have trial and error, and until we know what is sound and what is unsound, as in education and as in medicine, we ought by all means to keep decentralized the system where we can carry out such experimenting in order to make sure that the ultimate system adopted for the country will be sound. I thank the gentleman for bringing this to the attention of the House.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, as I understand this program is expanding; it is growing.

Mr. OUTLAND. That is correct. It is expanding and growing, I will say to the gentleman from Ohio, not only in California but other States are experimenting along the same line as I have tried to point out.

As I said in response to one of the statements of the gentleman from Minnesota, to me it is a very healthy omen, a very good sign that the medical profession itself is waking up to its responsibility in regard to more decent care for the American people.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell me what the plan is called?

Mr. OUTLAND. California Physicians' Service.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very much interested because we have a low-cost plan in the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. OUTLAND. Yes. I am familiar with the plan to a very limited degree.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT AND STABILIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 29, 1946.

Memorandum for the Speaker:

On page 10 of the Message of the President returning to the House of Representatives today, without approval, H. R. 6042, "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes," the date October 1–15, 1946 appears incorrectly in the next to the last paragraph. This date should read October 1–15, 1941 (instead of 1946).

Will you kindly have the official copy and the RECORD corrected accordingly?

CHARLES G. ROSS,
Secretary to the President.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. PACE, for Tuesday and Wednesday, July 2 and 3, 1946, on account of urgent official business.

To Mr. SHERIDAN (at the request of Mr. GREEN), indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. TOWE (at the request of Mr. EATON), for 4 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD), from June 29 to July 5, 1946, on account of illness.

To Mr. HARTLEY (at the request of Mr. SUNDSTROM), for 3 days, on account of official business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2234. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1654. An act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3517. An act to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, and persons of races indigenous to the Philippine Islands, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4512. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5244. An act to authorize the appointment of additional foreign-service officers in the classified grades;

H. R. 5716. An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended;

H. R. 6335. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6429. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; 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.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following title:

On June 28, 1946:

H. R. 6042. An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

On June 29, 1946:

H. R. 1654. An act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3517. An act to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to the Philippine Islands, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4512. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5244. An act to authorize the appointment of additional foreign-service officers in the classified grades;

H. R. 5716. An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended;

H. R. 6335. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6429. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; 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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 1, 1946, at 11:30 o'clock a. m.

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. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6828. A bill to provide for continuance of the farm labor supply program up to and including June 30, 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 2435). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4720. A bill to amend the act of December 7, 1944, relating to certain overtime compensation of civilian employees of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2436). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 4718. A bill to provide optional retirement for Government officers and employees who have rendered at least 25 years of service; with amendments (Rept. No. 2443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 689. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 371, joint resolution extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2444). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. DOYLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1351. A bill for the relief of Maxine Estelle Boyle, Max W. Boyle, and E. B. Rosegarten; with amendments (Rept. No. 2437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1631. A bill for the relief of William Tolar Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 2438). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2850. A bill for the relief of Felix Napiorkowski; without amendment (Rept. No. 2439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5874. A bill for the relief of Joseph Maezer; with amendments (Rept. No. 2440). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4496. A bill for the relief of Anne Robinson Norwood; without amendment (Rept. No. 2441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6321. A bill for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Geissman; with amendments (Rept. No. 2442). 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. BIEMILLER:

H. R. 6931. A bill to provide appropriate medals for mothers of members of the armed forces who lost their lives in action against an enemy of the United States in World War II; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 6932. A bill to provide for further research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to improve and facilitate the marketing and distribution of agricultural products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 6933. A bill to change the name of the Chemical Warfare Service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. J. Res. 370. Joint resolution granting certain property to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and relinquishing jurisdiction therein; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. J. Res. 371. Joint resolution extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. Con. Res. 159. Concurrent resolution to direct the President to take the necessary action to prohibit the exportation of not more than 2 percent of all durable goods produced, processed, or sold under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and/or the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. Res. 688. A resolution for the development and control of atomic energy; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 6934. A bill for the relief of Avelino, Francisca, Stella, and Iris Iglesias and Avelino Iglesias, Jr.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. EARTHMAN:

H. R. 6935. A bill granting a pension to Mollie Manis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 6936. A bill granting an increase of pension to Grizelda Hull Hobson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 6937. A bill for the relief of the Atlantic Meat Co., Inc., of Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2048. Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON presented a petition of L. F. Varvel, Sr., route 1, box 120, Easterly, Tex., favoring House bill 6340; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 1, 1946

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Charles W. Flint, D. D., resident bishop, Washington area, Methodist Church, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, humbly yet boldly we approach Thee. We are of many minds, differing in judgment on many matters, even worshiping in divers manners, but just now we are one as we bow in reverence before Thee, the God and Father of us all. Our voices are stilled that we may hear Thy voice.

Reorient us. Our insights are so fragmentary; at best, they are but broken lights of Thee; give us of Thy wisdom that we may be wise. Each day, this day, trace Thy designs on the trestle board of our souls.

Not only enlighten, but also empower us, so that, day by day, we may nearer and nearer approximate the doing of Thy will on earth, even as it is in heaven.

We ask in the name of Him by whom we come to God, the Life, the Truth, the Way. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Saturday, June 29, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 29, 1946, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

S. 896. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes;

S. 2219. An act to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended; and

S. 2122. An act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5933) to authorize and direct the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to establish and operate in the public schools and other suitable locations a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina, Mr. HEALY and Mr. BEALL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 1 to the bill (H. R. 5990) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COFFEE, Mr. GARY, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. HORAN, and Mr. CANFIELD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6056) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 26, 39, 40, 56, 58, 65, 73, and 81 to the bill, and concurred therein; and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 46, 50, 57, and 74 to the bill and concurred therein, severally with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6428) making appropriations for the Coast Guard, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. D'ALESANDRO, Mr. KOPPLEMANN, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. TABER, Mr. KEEFE, and Mr. CANFIELD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 29, 1946,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that during the adjournment he signed the bill (H. R. 6682) to amend sections 81, 82, and 83, and to repeal section 84 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SIMPLIFICATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF CREDIT SERVICES TO FARMERS—APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 29, 1946,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CAPPER, and Mr. AIKEN conferees on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5991) to simplify and improve credit services to farmers and promote farm ownership by abolishing certain agricultural lending agencies and functions, by transferring assets to the Farmers' Home Corporation, by enlarging the powers of the Farmers' Home Corporation, by authorizing Government insurance of loans to farmers, by creating preferences for loans and insured mortgages to enable veterans to acquire farms, by providing additional specific authority and directions with respect to the liquidation of resettlement projects and rural rehabilitation projects for resettlement purposes, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

A letter from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a full report of that Board covering operations during the year 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS ON AUDIT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION AND WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on audit of United States Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate 18 telegrams in the nature of petitions from citizens of the United States praying for the continuation of the Office of Price Administration, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appro-